

F I A F

Lisbon Congress

First Meeting of the Executive Committee 13 - 15 April 1989

Members

Anna-Lena WIBOM	Stockholm	President
Guido CINCOTTI	Roma	Secretary-General
Raymond BORDE	Toulouse	Treasurer
Wolfgang KLAUE	Berlin - East	Vice President
Hector GARCIA-MESA	Havana	Vice President
Eva ORBANZ	Berlin - West	Vice President
Eileen BOWSER	New York	<i>Absent</i>
Robert DAUDELIN	Montreal	Deputy Secretary-General
David FRANCIS	London	
Maria Rita GALVAO	Sao Paulo	
P K NAIR	Poona	<i>From late on Day 2</i>
Luis DE PINA	Lisboa	Deputy Treasurer
Bob ROSEN	Los Angeles	

Commission Heads

Harriet HARRISON	Washington DC	Cataloguing
Henning SCHOU	Canberra	Preservation
Michelle SNAPES	London	Documentation

Executive Secretary
Interpreter & Minutes Secretary

Brigitte VAN DER ELST
Jill JOHNSON

FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page
1 Adoption of the Agenda	1
2 Approval of the Minutes of the Montreal Meeting	1
* Discussion on general format of the Minutes	1
3 Report on the Preparation for the Lisboa Congress	2
4 Review of all Points on the Agenda for the General Assembly	4
GA1 Official Opening	4
GA5 President's Report	4
GA6 Membership Policies	4
GA7 Relations with Unesco & other international organisations	5
GA8 Report of the Documentation Commission	9
GA8a PIP	10
GA9 Financial Report	11
GA10 Projects & Publications Underway	16
P1 100th Anniversary of the Cinema	16
P2 Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films	17
P3 PIP <i>See GA8a Page 10</i>	
P4 Bibliography of Catalogues of Cinematographic Equipment	17
P5 Revised Edition of the Handbook for Film Archives	18
P6 Glossary of Laboratory Terms	18
P7 Bulletin	18
P8 Proceedings of 1984 Historical Symposium in Vienna	20
P9 Proceedings of 1986 Restoration Symposium in Canberra	20
P10 Bibliography of FIAF members' publications	20
P11 International Directory of Cinematographers	20
P12 Proceedings of 1988 Silent Cinema Symposium in Paris	20
GA11 Report of the Cataloguing Commission	21
GA12 Future Congresses	22
• Havana	22
• 1991 and later years	25
• Alternative for 1991: Athens	26
* Procedure for Selection of Symposium Topics	27
• 1992	28
GA13 Report of the Preservation Commission	30
GA14 Open Forum	31
GA15 Membership Questions <i>See EC5 below (p34)</i>	
GA17 Election of the new Executive Committee	32
Chairing of the GA Sessions	33

5	Membership Questions	
5.1	Discussion of the Paper prepared by the Working Group on Membership	34
5.2	Reconfirmation of Members: Athens, Bruxelles, Koblenz, Praha,, Stockholm, Warszawa, Sao Paulo	38
*	Discussion on policy re destruction of nitrate Future Reconfirmations	39 41
5.3	Reconfirmation of Observers: Managua, La Paz, Caracas	41
5.4	New Candidates for Observership: Bologna: Cineteca Comunale Dublin: Irish Film Institute Gemona: Cineteca del Friuli Lima: Filmoteca de Lima Washington: NARA	42 43 44 46 48
5.5	Miscellaneous & Other Requests for Affiliation	49
6	Legal Problems in Film Archives: Discussion of Unesco Draft Proposal	49
7	Any Other Business	
7.1	Saur	50
7.2	Critical Filmography of Third World Cinema	52
7.3	Poster Collector seeking exchanges with FIAF	52
7.4	Guidance on poster preservation	53
7.5	Outsiders at FIAF Congresses	53

* = Non Agenda Items

MINUTES

Mrs WIBOM, President, formally opened the meeting, noting that MM NAIR and Mr ROSEN were expected later. She reported the sad and unexpected absence of Mrs BOWSER who had broken her arm on the way to the airport and it was agreed to telex her good wishes. She cordially welcomed two Honorary Members, Mr Einar LAURITZEN and Mr Jan DE VAAL, who was attending for the first time in this role.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was formally adopted with a few minor additions.

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr SCHOU, who had not been able to be present at the Paris or Montreal meetings, said he would provide some follow-up information to the Minutes in his Commission report and made the following additional points:

- p48 He confirmed he had attended the FIAT Congress and Mr Konlechner the IASA Congress but understood it was not necessary to submit a Report.
- p23 In response to his question, Mrs ORBANZ agreed the amount mentioned in paragraph 2 should be in dollars only.

On the Paris Minutes which he had just received, he mentioned there had been some mis-spelling of names and wanted to make some minor corrections for the record:

- Mr ROSEN had said there was only one non-European member on the 3 Commissions but in fact on the Preservation Commission they had 2 non-Europeans.
- p22 His Commission had invited nominations for new members in a questionnaire they had circulated.

There being no further comments, the Minutes were implicitly approved.

Discussion on general format of the Minutes

Mrs WIBOM invited comments on the general format of the Minutes, mentioning that a lot of energy and money was being spent to produce them. In particular, there was the problem that one made promises but was not reminded of them until 3 months later. Perhaps they could have a Decision or Action List on a single page which could be prepared more quickly.

Mrs ORBANZ reported that for the meetings of the German archives, she produced the Action List the next day and sent out the detailed Minutes later. She felt both were important.

In the discussion, it was universally agreed that an immediate Action List would be useful. Mr CINCOTTI asked if it could be produced and distributed

before they went home. Mrs WIBOM suggested the previous meetings' Action List should figure as a standard agenda item.

In response to Mrs VAN DER ELST's question as to whether they needed so much detail, Mr DAUDELIN and Mr FRANCIS both strongly supported the present form. Mr DAUDELIN found the detail very valuable and recalled how useful it had been to be able to go back several years later to find the detail of a discussion, particularly on delicate membership issues. Mr FRANCIS noted how useful it had been in the recent complicated membership discussions to have the subtleties of the arguments recorded so they could continue forward with the discussions instead of covering the same ground. Mr CINCOTTI agreed they needed the detail for the historical record.

Decision: Mrs VAN DER ELST to produce a brief Action Sheet as soon as possible after each meeting. The Minutes to continue to give the detail of discussions.

3 REPORT ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE LISBON CONGRESS

Mr DE PINA and his colleague Mr Jose Manuel COSTA reviewed the programme for the administrative arrangements for the Congress, covering both working and social events. Mr DE PINA was particularly pleased that they had been able to arrange a first meeting of the Lusophone archives.

At the official opening, they were expecting the Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs and the Portuguese filmmaker Manuel de Oliveira. In addition to the General Assembly (at the Hotel Altis) and the Symposia (at the Gulbenkian Foundation), they had arranged the following:

- the first meeting of Lusophone archives (or portuguese speaking)
- a special lunchtime presentation by the Preservation Commission
- a meeting of the European Community archives (arranged with Fred Junck)
- Public Symposium on "Brighton Ten Years After" and Domitor AGM
- Meetings of the 3 Commissions

On the social side, delegates were invited to numerous events, including:

- filmshow for the Chaplin Centenary at the Gulbenkian Foundation to mark the opening of the Congress (Sund)
- evening cocktail party at the Cinemateca Portuguesa and screening of super 8 movies of former FIAF Congresses & some early films (Mond)
- dinner and concert by famous Portuguese guitarrist, Carlos Paredes, In Palacio overlooking sea (Tues)

- afternoon excursion into the country with a cocktail in Sintra and baroque quartet concert and dinner at the Palace of Queluz (Wed)
- reception by the Portuguese Film Institute and Tobis Laboratories in the Tobis Film Studios founded in the 1930's & visit to their modern labs (Thurs)
- informal farewell dinner at a farm with banda, fado & jazz (Sat)
- lunches for all delegates at the Novotel Hotel (5 days)
- twice nightly public film-showings of old and recent Portuguese films (with subtitles in French, English or Spanish) at the Cinemateca throughout the Congress (free entry with Congress badge)
- opportunity provided by the Portuguese Film Institute to view video cassette of any Portuguese film of the last 5 years
- optional guided tours of two city art museums (Wed morning)
- world première of Stravinsky ballet "Les Noces", at Gulbenkian (limited free seats) (Frid)
- two photographic exhibitions in the foyer at the Gulbenkian Foundation:
 - Argentinian portrait photographer of cinema personalities;
 - exhibition from Toulouse of photogrammes from silent films.

In reply to Mr KLAUE who asked whether the Lufthansa sponsorship (provision of 6 airline tickets) had been publicised, Mr COSTA said they had not been asked to do anything special but Lufthansa had been mentioned in the delegates' Congress booklet. On the other hand, they had had problems with TAP who had not been so generous but had asked a lot in the way of publicity in return.

Transcriber's Note:

Mr KLAUE also asked if any delegates had visa problems. This question was not returned to so presumably there had been no problems.

They were expecting a total of 200 people, with about 150 delegates to the General Assembly and some 40 extra people for the Symposia. Some outside speakers had been invited to present very brief papers to the Symposia but the main emphasis would be on open discussion.

Simultaneous translation would be available in Portuguese, Spanish, French and English in the General Assembly and in French and English and translation from Portuguese at the Symposia.

It was agreed that Mr GARCIA MESA's paper on developing archives as submitted in the Paris Congress would be better discussed in the Open Forum rather than in the Symposium. It was also agreed it should be further discussed in Havana.

Break for Coffee

4 REVIEW OF ALL POINTS ON THE AGENDA FOR THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The EC then prepared for the General Assembly by discussing each Agenda item, checking timing, participation and that all documents were available.

Transcriber's Note: Items are grouped in GA sequence, not in discussion sequence.

GA1 Official Opening

Mr DAUDELIN hoped the Secretary of State would be willing to attend at least for the President's Report. Mrs WIBOM agreed, remembering how interested her own Minister had been in the President's Report in Stockholm.

GA2-4 It was agreed the business items could be held over until after GA5.

GA5 President's Report

Day 2

Mrs WIBOM's presented a draft Report for the EC's consideration. She recalled that she and perhaps many others had been depressed on leaving Paris as in many ways the Congress had not been as they had hoped, in spite of all the hard work they had done. There had been some organisational problems, particularly the lack of an involved host. However, on reviewing their achievements, she realised it had been a landmark in bringing FIAF to public attention and thought it would be useful to make this clear on this, their next public occasion. In addition, she would like to include some of the statistics compiled by Mrs VAN DER ELST from the Annual Reports (43 archives out of 80 participated). Ms VAN DER ELST asked if the remaining archives could be encouraged to contribute in future years as the cumulative picture was very interesting.

Discussion in the afternoon of Day 3

The EC Members made a number of comments and suggested additions. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that she would prefer to see some of the items suggested incorporated in a President's Report for the book of Annual Reports, together with information on Commissions, publications, symposia and meetings, so the Book provided an overview of the Federation and its work for each year. In that case, the period covered would need adjusting to the calendar year so that it corresponded to the members' reports and the Reports at the Congress might then take on a different form.

Decisions: In the absence of Mrs BOWSER, Mrs HARRISON and Mr ROSEN to help with the final editing. No decision was taken on extending the contents of Annual Reports Book.

GA6 Membership Policies

A decision on what would be presented at the GA was postponed until after the EC discussion of this point under EC Agenda point 5.

GA7 Relations with Unesco and other international organisations

Day 2

Mr KLAUE would report to the GA on the whole year but updated the EC on developments since Montreal.

In Unesco, there was considerable uncertainty about the place of the Programme for Audiovisual Archives which might be moved from the Division of Communication to the PGI (Programme Général d'Information) which also has responsibility for libraries (information and documentation science). This was discussed with Arnaldo at the NGOs Round Table in Brussels and there was likely to be a meeting with Unesco in May on how to strengthen the role of the av archives in the Unesco programme and explain the NGOs position, their experiences and reactions to possible changes. If it was transferred, it is unlikely Arnaldo would continue to be responsible, which was a pity as he was very cooperative and knowledgeable.

During the NGOs Round Table, they also discussed ways to extend the activities and publicity of NGOs responsible for AV materials, including:

- use of more Unesco publications to describe what each organisation is doing.
- more exchange of information between the organisations so that individual members are aware of the other 3 organisations
- use Unesco General Conference to show films and exhibitions on archive activities.
- encourage all members to make active contact with the National Unesco Commissions who are the real decision makers
- produce a "catastrophe paper" as soon as possible, some 3 or 4 pages where each NGO sets out its urgent problems and identifies how av heritage is endangered.

Mr KLAUE said he would next report to the GA on various meetings attended by FIAF representatives:

- IPDC (International Programme for Development of Communication), a separately funded Unesco programme: Roger Smithers attended. Two project proposals were discussed:
 - Regional Preservation & Training Centre, Brazil
Rejected because other projects from Brazil took priority
 - Development of Audiovisual archive, Sudan
Small allocation (\$90,000) under supervision of Coordinating Committee of Technical Commissions.
- European Film Museums Liaison Group, Dusseldorf, December 1988.
Mr KLAUE attended. Because of competition between the Film Museum in Frankfurt and the Film Institute in Dusseldorf, this long-planned

European meeting had been upstaged by another international meeting hosted by Frankfurt 3 months previously.

Dusseldorf decided to provide a permanent secretariat for European film museums (1 person) with sponsorship from the Nordrhein Westfalen region, and the group approved two initial projects:

- Annotated Directory of all European film museums or museums with film department
 - Annual List of film exhibitions in European museums
- NGOs Annual Round Table, Brussels, March 1989 (Mr KLAUE attended)
In addition to the Unesco and other discussions reported elsewhere, the different organisations reported as follows:

FIAT Working on Glossary of Television Archive terms

Holding seminar on tv archive management, Lisbon, 1989

Holding 1990 Congress in Tokyo (hence not at JTS Ottawa)

IASA Set up new Commission to discuss future of organisation,

e.g. to integrate "mixed Media" archives (sound, video, film)

1989 Congress in Oxford, (end of August/beginning of September)

Bibliography of av archives (sound, film and video), due 1989

Other publications in pipeline: Directory of Sound Archives;

Training for sound archivists; Technical Manual

On the legal problems of archives, they considered a paper prepared by Ms Kofler, a Unesco trainee (now circulated to EC) and agreed the topic needed wider international discussion as all the different kinds of av archives were in need of more solid legal support for their activities. Each NGO would discuss it among its own members and then meet with Unesco again in 1989 to define specific goals for a joint campaign. (Meeting later fixed for December)

Summarising Unesco/FIAF activities, Mr KLAUE reported:

- Contract for \$10,000 for publication of 2 reports:
 - FIAF/FIAT 1987 International Survey of film/television archives
 - Prague study on fungus and bacteria
- Unesco booklet identifying most urgent tasks of av archives produced following June 88 meeting in Paris to discuss 1987 Survey (200 copies for members due to be distributed in Lisbon)
Mr BORDE later said he had been asked to prepare the French translation but no-one had yet seen the French edition.
- Missions
 - Mr Alho, Finland to advise Cyprus on development of film archive
 - Mr Dimitriu, Switzerland, to advise various African countries
 - Mr Klaue, GDR, to Kuwait and Iraq re "Gulf Project"(Apparently, there seems little hope of substantial funding for other

countries but there is interest and funding to develop film & tv archives in their own countries. Kuwait had very modern but largely unused equipment and facilities but very inexperienced staff. Baghdad had traditional film production and the beginnings of a film archive and film department under the Ministry of Information; the very much larger television archives, including a film collection, though belonging to the same Ministry, were administered separately)

On the administrative side, key activities were:

- Letter from Mrs WIBOM to Director-General of Unesco on importance of Unesco support for development of av archives
- Paper (by Mr KLAUE) on FIAF's position in response to Unesco's World Communication Report where the section on film archives (presumably by Christopher Roads) was full of mis-information, including the idea that film preservation was no longer needed in the age of video and other modern techniques. There was no awareness or information on the basic problems of film archives and preservation activities.
- Paper (by Mr KLAUE) with proposals for Unesco's World Decade of Cultural Development, 1988-1997, including
 - celebration of 100th Anniversary of first public film showings
 - 10-year target to establish av archives in every country of the world to guarantee the preservation of each nation's av heritage.

Projects underway included:

- Contract awaited on Training and Curriculum Development (meeting with other NGOs in Berlin in May 1989)
- Unesco Regional Workshop in Thailand for Technical Training, July 1989
- Small sum (\$22,000) offered to Argentina for Regional Seminar

Mr KLAUE mentioned that the new President of IFTC was Mr Bolla, a former Assistant Director General of Unesco, in charge of Communication and Culture, who had been very helpful and supportive in the development of the 1982 Unesco Recommendation. Mr Bolla had sent a circular to the international organisations some two months ago expressing an interest to establish closer links but there had been no follow-up. He was also President of the European Getty Foundation in Paris.

In the discussion, Mr SCHOU asked to be put in contact with the Chair of IASA's new mixed media Commission.

Action:

- Mr KLAUE to continue as FIAF's contact man with UNECSO.
- Mr BORDE & CINCOTTI to study Ms Kofler's paper on legal problems and report to the EC.

New film museum initiatives

Mr FRANCIS asked if FIAF was going to recommend a response to its members: the Dusseldorf paper implied they were seeking a coordinating role which was much wider than the museum field and covering all film archive activities within the museum and archival field. Mrs VAN DER ELST said they had asked FIAF to circulate a large questionnaire but Mr KLAUE suggested they should be given the addresses which were not secret and make the approaches themselves if they wished. He thought FIAF should leave it to the discretion of its members and try to avoid an official stance at this stage, especially in view of the rivalry between the Frankfurt and Dusseldorf factions.

Mr CINCOTTI very much regretted what he called the "italianisation" of these bodies getting involved in an archive politics and felt that, while leaving its members every freedom, FIAF should nevertheless take a position and try to provide some guidance.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that most of the participants were in fact FIAF members which suggested that FIAF itself was not paying enough attention to the exhibition activities of archives. They had already noted this when considering their future membership policy and in the meantime he suggested they should not be too enthusiastic but cooperate when asked and see how the two groups developed.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that the first meeting was going to be in London as part of the European Film and Television Year. When they failed to get the money, they switched to Frankfurt who were planning a meeting with similar aims, namely, to bring together a very informal group just to talk about exchange of exhibitions. There had been no intention to form an organisation and the Dusseldorf approach was much broader.

Mr KLAUE said FIAF was not officially invited to Frankfurt so there was no reason to mention it at the GA. On the question of the Dusseldorf questionnaire, Mrs VAN DER ELST was advised to let them have the brief list and encourage them to buy the 50th Anniversary Book.

Training project for Latin American archives

Mrs GALVAO said they had done a lot of work to prepare the programme and, in the light of Unesco rejection, asked for suggestions on alternative sources of finance. No-one had any ideas.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that when the new Director General, Mr Federico Mayor, took over, there was a \$400 million deficit so it was not surprising so much had to be cut but FIAF and the other NGOs were doing their best to fight for the archival projects. One solution might be to persuade the UK and the USA to rejoin.FIAF Summer School

In response to Mr GARCIA MESA, Mr FRANCIS said they hoped to get funding for a Summer School in 1991 but it was still too early to make any commitment. He thought it was very important and it was time someone took over the burden from Mr KLAUE who had worked so long and so hard.

Report of possible changes within Unesco

In response to Mrs WIBOM, Mr KLAUE confirmed that A Status organisations, received money for their work without any direct control by Unesco whereas B Status organisations (like FIAF) could only obtain money on a project basis. He did not think the A Status would be changed as the organisations' whole finances were based on Unesco subsidies and they had a very strong lobby within Unesco (IFLA & ICA received hundreds of thousands of dollars; IFTC about \$50,000). A new rule that organisations had to have a minimum of 30% of the membership from developing countries was being applied to new applications. FIAF's position was not threatened. FIAT would have no chance of obtaining recognised Status but an application from IASA was pending.

There were also possible changes in access to the two main funding channels: the Regular Programme and the Participation Programme. Currently only countries can submit projects for funding from the Participation Programme although international organisations can support such requests. It was hoped that the system might be changed to allow NGOs to submit their own projects. Till now, all Unesco funding to FIAF, as a B status organisation, had been by individual contracts under the Regular Programme and it seemed this system would continue in principle, although the monies available were drastically reduced.

GA8 Report of the Documentation Commission

Day 2 after GA 12 Havana

Mrs AUBERT's Report was circulated and Mr FRANCIS was prepared to answer questions.

Union List of Early Silent Trade Catalogues

He had agreed with Mrs AUBERT to invite EC discussion of the project for the Union List of Early Silent Trade Catalogues as they had opposing views: he was very keen to include some questions on trade house magazines as during this early period they were effectively catalogues and he felt there was very little information about them whereas Michelle thought information was already available and didn't want people put off by too big a questionnaire. There were certainly very many of them, issued in small quantities so they were now very rare and he suspected there were very few complete sets for any country. They were generally illustrated with detailed analysis of the films so were very valuable, especially for the early period from 1910 to 1920.

Mrs ORBANZ thought it would be useful to include them, especially in view of the suggestion the previous day that they should collect more equipment information.

Mrs WIBOM suggested they could always ask for the information but stress that it was optional. Mr ROSEN thought they should certainly ask for the information even if many found it was too difficult to complete. With the recent publication of the AFI Kings ?? Catalogue with its comprehensive listing of American films, he expected a major scholarly focus on that period similar to that generated by the Brighton Symposium. Just to know which archives had material, even without knowing what it was, would be useful.

Decision: EC support generally in favour of asking the questions but with no pressure on archives to spend time seeking detailed answers.

International Directory of Film and Television Documentation

Mrs VAN DER ELST said she had been unable to obtain free copies for Observers as well as Members so FIAF had paid for the Observers' copies. These should have been distributed soon after the Paris Congress.

Seminar on documentation and computerisation in Sao Paolo

Mrs GALVAO said nothing had been fixed as the money available from Unesco was insufficient. The seminar had been proposed by the Cinemateca Argentina and it was Mr Arnaldo from Unesco who had suggested it be held in Sao Paolo. She would discuss with Mrs Jurado.

Mrs ORBANZ noted that there were two projects completed, one just beginning and the Summer School under discussion. She thought they could encourage Mrs AUBERT to take on some new projects but Mrs VAN DER ELST said at present they lacked Commission members to do the work.

Mrs WIBOM thought it was an excellent report and the Commission seemed to be cooperating well with Mr Moulds. Mr FRANCIS hoped the EC might have time for a discussion with Mrs AUBERT and Mr Moulds at the second EC meeting after the Congress. Mrs HARRISON pointed out there was a clash with the Documentaton and Cataloguing Commission meetings.

Action: Meeting to be put on agenda for second EC.

GA8a PIP

Mr FRANCIS drew EC attention to the importance of the PIP Report which was very positive, with a good outlook for the future now that the 3 major problems of the past (accommodation, distribution and computerisation) had been resolved. If the Supporters could maintain their present level of support, he felt PIP had a good chance of not needing further money from FIAF.

Apart from the regular service, their major opportunity for generating extra income came from the sale of the annual volumes, where each sale brought in a considerable part of the cover price as warehousing and inhouse distribution costs were now very low. They had several volumes in reserve but needed to space out their publication so as not to inhibit sales of the previous ones: 1987 was about to be published and they would leave about 8 months before the next. They would also be publishing the television volume plus two cumulations of the microfiche information which had already been pre-sold.

On the indexing side, Michael Moulds had recently met with Gillian Hartnoll of the BFI and there seemed a good possibility of mutual cooperation, either by avoiding overlaps in indexing or by extending the range of periodicals covered (incidentally improving still further PIP's competitive position vis-à-vis the American rival). He felt this collaboration might develop on a friendly basis in about a year's time, once the problems with the BFI computer project SIFT had been sorted out.

Mr DAUDELIN noted from the Report that they still had some indexing problems and suggested the EC should ask Mr Moulds to identify the problems and seek further help from the GA. Mr FRANCIS agreed and mentioned that there should also be a strong appeal to the membership in connection with the large number of outstanding subscriptions.

[**Action:** As a listed defaulter, Mr ROSEN promised to chase his Accounts people.]

No-one seemed to know why there was so little response to the Indexer's Workshops which was cancelled as there were only two applications (including Australia), even though all staying costs were being paid by FIAF.

Mr FRANCIS explained that matters relating to the PIP Supporters were not included in the Report but Mrs AUBERT would announce at the GA that new Supporters were always welcome and that there would be a PIP Supporters meeting after the GA when Mr Moulds arrived.

GA9 Financial Report

Mr BORDE opened with praise for Mrs VAN DER ELST's management of the finances. For the 1988 accounts, he referred to 3 headings where the budget had been exceeded (external work fees, telephone/telex and the FIAF 50 Congress expenses).

He mentioned that the publication of the Proceedings of the Paris Congress had been jointly funded by FIAF (20,000FF), the Toulouse archive and Institut Jean Vigo (15,000 FF each), and the FIAF 50 budget (10,000 FF). The print run of 1000 copies had cost 100 FF the volume; free copies would be distributed

to the membership and a stock held in Brussels; the remainder would be sold in bookshops at 140FF. He was particularly proud to announce that in this case the Proceedings of a Congress had been published before the next Congress. Mrs VAN DER ELST added that after numerous problems the 1981 Rapallo Proceedings had finally been published.

Mr BORDE confirmed that the overall position was still healthy and they had sufficient funds to cover the budgeted deficit of 1989 and also that in the proposed budget of 1990 if they wished.

Several archives still owed their subscriptions for 1988 but the major problem was presented by Managua which was still 3 years behind after various problems with cheques. Mr GARCIA MESA said he had tried without success to reach the archive and hoped that perhaps the Latin American archives could find a solution to avoid the archive having to be automatically deleted from the Federation.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported Mr Varga had telexed he was arriving for the Congress, bringing their 1988 Report, and that payment for 2 years was being sent by bank draft. Mr KLAUE suggested two or three members of the EC should meet with him on arrival to clarify the situation and meanwhile he should be asked to bring a photocopy of the transfer authorisation. If there was no evidence of transfer, he agreed with Mr CINCOTTI they would have to confirm the automatic deletion, however much they sympathised with individual difficulties. Too many promises had been made and not been kept. Mr BORDE, Mr GARCIA MESA and Mr DAUDELIN agreed.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that eventually some archives were able to pay: they had just received two years' payment from Caracas who were keen to return to FIAF and would be sending their Report. (Sec: Report not yet received)

Mrs WIBOM pointed out that, if deletion was to be automatic, then presumably the archive had no right to attend the Congress. Mr CINCOTTI suggested it would be more appropriate for them to pay their subscription than to spend money on attending the Congress. Mr FRANCIS agreed with the automatic deletion but suggested that it should be formally recorded at the EC meeting after the Congress. This seemed less embarrassing than doing so at the EC meeting immediately before the Congress and thus excluding them from the Congress, when the archive may have already made all the travel arrangements to attend. Mr BORDE supported this proposal.

Action: Send telex to Managua as proposed above.

Decision: Record (where ?) that in future automatic deletions would not be formally recorded at the EC meeting immediately before a Congress.

On the question of Rio de Janeiro who were two years' behind with their subscriptions, Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the new Director was doing everything possible to sort out the situation. They would not have the right to vote at the Congress unless Mr Vieira brought proof of recent payment.

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled that normally the previous year's accounts were distributed to members well before the GA and not discussed or even mentioned at the GA unless someone from the floor had a question. She asked if everyone was still in agreement with this policy as she was anxious to avoid the situation in Paris when people asked for further copies during the discussion and she had to rush out of the meeting to get copies made and distributed. Mr BORDE confirmed that it was necessary to report formally on the previous year's accounts but he could do it without going into detail.

1990 Budget

Mr BORDE said this was based on the assumption that there would be no increase in subscriptions and they would draw as necessary on the Belgian Francs reserves in Brussels. He felt they would however have to increase the subscription in 1991. No income had been forecast from Unesco contracts. On the expenses, they had allowed for inflation at 4%, including increases in salaries, social security and office rental. The EC would need to decide what allocation it wanted to propose for the Development Fund.

Mr BORDE then mentioned two further points:

- \$1500 had been provided to the Coordinating Committee of the Technical Commissions from funds provided by Unesco. They required a covering invoice from Mrs ORBANZ.
 - They had received an estimate from the Austrian Film Archive for the publishing of the 1984 Historical Symposium proceedings. The sum involved was 700,000 Belgian francs which was more than FIAF's total annual allocation to Publications.
- Mr KLAUE reported that this request had been withdrawn and they were not now asking FIAF for any money.

In reply to Mr DAUDELIN, Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the office lease expired at the end of 1988 but the owner was being slow to renew the lease for his personal financial planning reasons. They were continuing to pay the rental every 3 months but, in principle, they could be turned out at 3 months' notice. Other properties in Brussels would be much more expensive and less well located. Mr FRANCIS wondered if it would be worth paying a full year in advance to get greater protection.

Subscriptions

On the question of subscriptions, Mr KLAUE asked that they should introduce

the idea of a possible increase in subscription in 1991 very carefully. An alternative would be to reduce expenditure instead but they should closely examine the impact on the Federation's activities. There might also be the possibility of reducing the Special Publications sum as Saur in Munich might publish FIAF manuscripts as they do for other international organisations: this would be mentioned at the GA but they were still far from the contract stage. It was increasingly difficult for archives to find the subscription money and he suggested the delays in payment were an indication of the problems of transferring hard currency.

In response to Mrs VAN DER ELST, Mr FRANCIS explained that the proposed subscriptions for the new Membership categories had been based on the assumption that they would need to generate the same overall subscription revenue as now.

Later in the meeting, Mrs WIBOM asked if others shared Mr KLAUE's views. She pointed out that the subscription had been kept the same for 6 years which meant a real reduction in income of some 20%. Mr DAUDELIN suggested it might be better to have the subscriptions indexed linked each year to avoid the major discussions every 5 years or so and the problems for archives for whom the sum was a significant item.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that FIAF was unlike similar organisations in that many things were given free, including participation of 3 members at Congresses. If they wanted to avoid increasing the annual subscription, they could introduce the idea of a registration fee for the Congress. He warned that such a proposal might in fact be more difficult for some members but he put it forward as an option to consider.

Mr BORDE mentioned the major benefit of being a FIAF member which alone would justify an increase in subscription when needed; that was the considerable status it gave to an archive in its relations with producers and rights-holders. He mentioned that archives like his, which had been young archives 20 years ago, had been prepared to make the sacrifice to find the money because they wanted to be members of FIAF. He thought indexation was a possibility but was convinced that an increase of some sort was inevitable after 6 years of inflation.

Mrs WIBOM felt that in principle the subscription should be increased only if they felt they were being prevented from undertaking specific projects because of a lack of money. She was not clear in her own mind whether the level of funding currently available from the Budget was limiting their imagination in proposing new projects. They had already identified the need for a Development Fund and were aware of the financial difficulties faced by

the Commissions. If they really wanted to meet these and other needs, then they should actively go out and seek the money instead of allowing the Federation to be restricted in its activities by a budget based on subscription income which was being steadily eroded by inflation. She felt it was essential to try and find money from other international organisations on a more systematic level.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that some archives, including small ones, were paying substantial additional "subscription" to the Federation through their membership of PIP, Commissions or the EC itself. On the other hand, some large archives were contributing little beyond their annual subscription.

Mr GARCIA MESA warned that many developing archives might have to leave FIAF if the subscription was increased.

Mr KLAUE indicated that he was not necessarily against raising the subscription but wanted to stress the importance of preparing the arguments very carefully. The members should be clear that the EC had already explored all alternative possibilities. They should cite as examples the value of the Lufthansa sponsorship and the possible contract with Saur. He agreed they could approach international foundations but generally such funding was for specific projects (which would imply more work) rather than the organisation as a whole. They could also consider a membership drive to get more subscription income. Even if they decided they had to raise the subscription, they should remember it would present a problem for all members with non-convertible currency. Last time they increased the subscription, they had lost Roumania. Some Members might decide to pay less by reverting to being only Observers. Mrs GALVAO supported his views.

Mr LAURITZEN recalled the time of Langlois when it was possible to ask the richer, more active archives, to pay more money. Some archives were already paying more to PIP and he wondered if they might consider extending the principle and ask the larger archives to increase their basic subscription. Mr CINCOTTI appreciated the idea but thought it impracticable as times had changed and most archives now had budgets determined by state officials who were not personally interested in archive work.

Mrs WIBOM suggested a small working group to consider fund-raising. Mrs ORBANZ recalled Mr ROSEN had already agreed to join such a group and Mr KLAUE confirmed he would help.

Decision: Draft 1990 budget to be presented to the GA without change.
Working group on fund-raising: Mrs WIBOM, Mr ROSEN, Mr KLAUE plus Mr BORDE and Mrs VAN DER ELST ex officio.

Development Fund

Mr KLAUE confirmed he would circulate the draft paper for the GA updated as discussed in Montreal. The only change had been the idea of accepting not only cash but also other contributions, as for instance training facilities or provision of second hand equipment to a developing archive.

Mrs WIBOM reported she had consulted the Scandinavian International Development Agencies and her colleagues in Denmark, Norway and Finland. They would be happy to receive proposals which have to be initiated by the country seeking help. They had been able to help Nicaragua and Cuba by getting the respective Swedish consulate or embassy to apply with full details of a specific project. It worked at intergovernmental level and once the project was approved, an organisation in the funding country or an international body has to take responsibility for the project. In Scandinavia, the money could certainly be channelled through the FIAF Development Fund. FIAF therefore needed to teach its young members from developing countries how to benefit from this system. Mr KLAUE agreed to add this to his report.

Decision: Allocation to Fund in 1990 Budget to be 120,000 Belg Frs.

GA10 Projects & Publications Underway

Mrs ORBANZ confirmed she had reminded the Project Coordinators to come to the GA prepared with written or verbal reports and had received some.

P1 100th Anniversary of the Cinema

Mr KLAUE clarified that although he had made some initial proposals and would introduce the topic at the GA, he in no way saw himself as responsible for the project itself. It was a project for the whole of FIAF. Mr CINCOTTI suggested it would be more historically accurate and less controversial to talk of the 100th anniversary of the first public screening. The Americans for example considered the screening in Paris on 28 December 1895 to be just another date in a continuing process. Mr BORDE recalled that in any case the first public screening was by the Skladanowsky Brothers in Berlin on 1st November 1895. It was suggested a more appropriate title would be: "100th Anniversary of the first public screenings", agreeing on the year 1895 but not a specific date.

Mr DE PINA mentioned that perhaps they could link this with the celebration of the beginning of the different national cinemas in the years immediately following. It was acknowledged that this would be a project for each nation concerned although the Institut Lumière was likely to be swamped with requests for early films. Perhaps archives would want to circulate their national celebration programmes to other archives.

Action: Wait for response from GA.

P2 Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films

Mr FRANCIS reported he had prepared a first draft but would liaise with Mr SCHOU who had also prepared some pages for his new manual. Rather than simply presenting shipping guidelines he felt it was essential to put the problem in context and therefore proposed a number of brief sections:

- an introduction explaining why there was a problem
- advice on how to identify a nitrate film
- advice on basic physical handling
- guidelines for shipping.

He had photocopied the relevant sections from the IATA regulations which referred to lots of other packaging standards which he could not yet identify. Although air regulations were international (at least for IATA countries), it seemed that each country had its own regulations for rail and road. FIAF had to decide whether to prepare its own Recommendations; if so, they should be at least as high as the highest national standard.

Mrs GALVAO stressed it was urgent to have something immediately, even a draft recommendation, that they could circulate to all the foreign embassies in Brazil as they were regularly receiving nitrate films from Latin American countries sent without any precautions at all. Mr FRANCIS said they would try to produce a draft for discussion and circulation as soon as possible.

Mrs ORBANZ felt that the information should be restricted to shipping guidelines as information on identifying and handling nitrate was available elsewhere. The most important thing was to get something useful out fast and probably based on IATA as they were the only international rules existing. Mr FRANCIS said he and his staff felt that any document giving Guidelines or instructions on any subject should first put them in context and indicate why they were necessary. In this case, even though the information was available elsewhere, the people who were responsible for shipping may not be aware of it or have access to it and could well be people with no knowledge of film and its particular dangers. The background information could be given very briefly and simply, with cross-reference to the manuals if further details were needed. Mr SCHOU and Mrs WIBOM fully supported Mr FRANCIS v, especially as there was much unnecessary fear of nitrate.

Action: Mr FRANCIS to present to the GA as work in progress with the hope to have a document before the next Congress (perhaps via the Bulletin).

P3 PIP Discussion recorded under ~~6A~~ Agenda item 8a

P4 Bibliography of Catalogues of Cinematographic Equipment

Mr DAUDELIN reported that nothing new had arrived in the last year and they suggested it might be useful for future activity to be channelled via the

Documentation Commission, especially as one of the team was a member of the Commission. Montreal was happy to continue with the project but needed to find a way to revitalise it and get more information before they could publish anything useful.

Mr FRANCIS said this would fit in very well with the Commission's own initiative on a Union List of Early Silent Film Trade Catalogues for which a questionnaire was being prepared. Perhaps an equipment questionnaire could be prepared and distributed at the same time as the same person would be likely to be responding.

Action: Verbal reminder at the GA and later written reminder by Documentation Commission of the need to obtain more material.

P5 Revised Edition of the Handbook for Film Archives

Mrs VAN DER ELST read a short report from Mrs BOWSER saying editing work was complete and camera ready copy was being prepared at the University of North Texas where John Kuiper was now working. A draft contract with an American publisher was being submitted to the EC. They hoped to publish in 1990, in English only.

P6 Glossary of Laboratory Terms

Mr SCHOU said Peter Williamson of his Commission was still awaiting the draft from Mr Spehr and Mrs ORBANZ had no reply to her reminder.

Action: Await arrival of Mr Spehr.

P7 Bulletin

Mr DAUDELIN was unhappy that it was difficult to get contributions for some of the regular sections, especially the Technical column. They kept getting repeats of Annual Report information. They were still trying to get some younger members to join the Editorial Board.

Mr SCHOU suggested that expectations for a steady flow of technical information might be too high: technical papers might well be based on months of research and, in those cases, where they had sought information by circulating questionnaires, they often had very limited response.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said there had been no response to the invitation for advertisements.

Mr DAUDELIN was interested to know how the Bulletin was used within archives and if it sat on the curator's desk for 6 months. Mrs HARRISON said it was circulated at the Library of Congress but not always very fast or reliably. She would prefer it to be in a central place for staff reference but not for borrowing. She did not think it would help them to have a notice at

the front reminding curators to circulate it among their staff as the principle was already accepted.

Mr LAURITZEN confirmed how much he appreciated receiving the Bulletin, especially during the period he was not able to attend FIAF meetings.

Mrs ORBANZ said they had recently submitted two articles, one particularly asking for comments, but they received no feedback at all which had been very disappointing.

Mr FRANCIS reported they circulated two copies among the staff but from the comments received, they felt quite remote and detached from the world of FIAF and its concerns. He was at a loss to help them feel more involved. Perhaps this was a particular problem with the larger archives.

Mr CINCOTTI felt there were no secrets and the important thing was to find ways for the Bulletin to reach those who would be interested in it. He kept one copy in his office and circulated the other to selected individuals who he expected to be interested, including technicians, inviting them to respond with their own comments or contributions. Sadly, none had been received.

Confidential or not ?

Mrs GALVAO and Mr GARCIA MESA had not realised that the Bulletin was FIAF-confidential and asked if the Bulletin should be withdrawn from their libraries. Mr GARCIA MESA mentioned that as part of their public Information and Documentation Service they were approached by technicians from the Film or Television Institutes for specific technical information and on occasions had found the Bulletin very useful.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said there had been frequent suggestions that the Bulletin should be made public. One solution had been to ask the authors to indicate if their article was confidential and very few had insisted on confidentiality. Mrs BOWSER and others felt that the EC Report should be kept confidential but they could remove those two pages and have the rest of the Bulletin made available to the public. Mr DAUDELIN agreed that the membership discussions in the EC Report should certainly not be made public but this could be sent in a separate Newsletter to the Curators. Mrs GALVAO and others thought the outside readers were not interested in the EC anyway. Mr DAUDELIN still thought it would be interesting to have archives report in the Technical Column on their experiences with different items of equipment, a proposal that had been rejected by others because of possible difficulties with the manufacturers.

Action: EC information to be removed from Bulletins displayed in archive libraries. In future, EC reports to be distributed separately.

Later in the discussion, Mrs VAN DER ELST reminded the EC that unrestricted articles of the Bulletin could be freely photocopied.

Concerning the lack of response to Bulletin articles, Mrs WIBOM reminded the EC that for many archive staff there was a language problem: it was difficult enough for them to read an article in English or French; to write a reply would be beyond their competence or the time available. It was a real problem as some of her staff would find some of the technical items very interesting if they were accessible. Mr CINCOTTI was surprised as he thought English was widely used in Sweden; even in Italy with its almost "dead" language, most archive staff could understand English, especially technical subjects, although sadly not French. Mr KLAUE confirmed that the language certainly limited the circulation. Mr DE PINA said that most of his staff could read Spanish, French and English with no problem. They kept a copy of the Bulletin in their library which was available to a public of students, technicians and historians particularly interested in the cinema.

P8 Proceedings of 1984 Historical Symposium in Vienna

Mr KLAUE reported the manuscript was ready in English and German but final editing and preparing was needed. Saur were willing to publish it.

P9 Proceedings of 1986 Restoration Symposium in Canberra

Mr SCHOU reported that they were now looking for financial sponsorship from outside and had hired an editorial assistant to help. They hoped to publish sometime during 1989.

P10 Bibliography of FIAF members' publications

Mrs ORBANZ thought there was no news. Mrs Vosikovska would report.

P11 International Directory of Cinematographers.

Mr Krautz would present a verbal report and show the latest edition.

P12 Proceedings of the 1988 French Silent Cinema Symposium in Paris

Mr BORDE would report. Mr CINCOTTI congratulated Mr BORDE on his achievement in completing his project so quickly.

Mrs WIBOM added the Swedish Film Institute had prepared an exhibition and catalogue on Swedish film theatres (in Swedish and English). They had identified 13 theatres from different periods, starting in 1906, that they felt should be preserved in their present original form. This had been made possible by funding from the European Film and Television Year and the Lauritzen Fund for Film Historical Research. A copy would be distributed free to all FIAF members. Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested they should write a brief article about it for the Bulletin and perhaps also advertise it for sale. Mr DE PINA asked that a copy be sent to the Secretary of State who was supervising a project on the restoration of old Portuguese cinemas.

Mr BORDE announced that they would be calling on members for help in connection with a week of films on the French Revolutions and they would be getting a free copy of the Catalogue.

"Non-FIAF projects in progress"

Mr FRANCIS wondered if it would be possible to have a second project list, "Non-FIAF projects in progress", to which FIAF gave its moral support. He cited the case of the Chaplin restorations being funded by the Chaplin family which he hoped FIAF archives would support. Mr KLAUE felt it would be very helpful to the members who were constantly asked for help on different projects, to know which ones the EC had assessed and approved. They had had a similar "FIAF patronage" system some years ago. Mrs ORBANZ had understood the Chaplin article in the Bulletin was already an implicit FIAF approval. Mr FRANCIS agreed that publication in the Bulletin might imply FIAF approval and feared this might put too much responsibility on the Editorial Board. He would prefer to see a formal list of approved "Non-FIAF projects": projects would only go on the list once they had been discussed by the EC and approved by the GA. When submitting a new project for the list, the EC could provide a brief outline and either recommend support or invite discussion; at subsequent GA meetings, he envisaged a brief progress report on each, either under Projects & Publications underway or Open Forum. The List should be on a different colour paper to highlight the difference between FIAF and non-FIAF projects.

To get the idea launched, he suggested they should invite reactions from the GA in Lisbon to the idea that the Chaplin project should be given the "FIAF Seal of Approval". They could then indicate that if the GA wished, such a facility could be made available for other major projects and those interested should send proposals to the Secretariat for discussion by the EC.

Decision: Mr FRANCIS to present Chaplin project and general idea at the GA.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked if Treasures from the Film Archives, published in September 1988 had actually been received by all members. Most of the EC recalled seeing it but it seemed not to have reached the Sao Paulo or Havana archives. Mrs ORBANZ mentioned their free copy had been slow in coming.

GALL Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Mrs HARRISON picked out the highlights of her Report:

- **Evaluating Computer Systems**

This was now distributed. She confirmed to Mrs VAN DER ELST that this could certainly be included on the list of FIAF Publications for sale. She also understood that Mrs BOWSER planned to include it as a chapter in the revised Handbook.

- Glossary of Filmographic terms

The Revised Edition would cover 12 languages and was due in May.

- Cataloguing Rules

She advised the EC that 25 requests had been received for review copies and 4 had returned extensive comments by the deadline of March 15 (Australia, BFI, Netherlands and UCLA). Mrs VAN DER ELST felt many just wanted the Rules for use rather than for the opportunity to make comments. Mrs HARRISON was keen to await the reactions of the international organisations, particularly IFLA and ICA (as the ICA 1990 Ottawa congress was covering cataloguing). Mr KLAUE thought that SAUR, who were also the IFLA publishers, would want to be satisfied that the Rules were IFLA approved so IFLA was the most important body to approach; a second copy should be sent to the Secretariat with a request to pass it on to the right person. If the manuscript was ready by September, Saur could probably publish before the end of the year. Mrs HARRISON said she would try but had extra commitments at work because of staffing problems.

- Union List of films from the Nitrate era

Mrs HARRISON said Mrs VAN DER ELST had come with a new List of participants for presentation at the GA and again stressed that all the work was being done in the Secretariat rather than by the Commission. Mrs VAN DER ELST was advised that they should strictly maintain the original principle that only those who contributed could ask for information from the system. She asked that Mrs HARRISON should encourage members to continue to return their cards. There were already 10,000 titles in the system.

There were no further comments on the remainder of the Report and Mrs WIBOM thanked Mrs HARRISON and the Commission for their many useful projects and publications.

Mr DE PINA announced that they had translated Evaluating Computer Systems into Portuguese which would be very useful for them and the developing Lusophone archives. He also circulated a copy of their new National Filmography, the result of some 10 years' research. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that the 7th volume of the National Swedish filmography had appeared, completing the period 1896 - 1970, which had been a 15-year project.

GA12 Future Congresses

1990 Havana

Mr GARCIA MESA reported considerable progress had been made in the detailed planning since the distribution of Newsletter no 1 in Berlin, thanks to the considerable support of the Cataloguing and Preservation Commissions and he would be discussing the Documentation portion in Lisbon. He reviewed the scheduling and noted they could extend the working sessions from 6 to 7pm if

needed. The Latin American film symposium on the first day would continue in the evening in the archive film theatre. Day 2 (up to 8 hours) was devoted to Preservation and Day 3 to Cataloguing and Documentation.

Mr KLAUE stressed the importance of Lufthansa support in bringing Asian delegates to Lisbon and asked what was being done to ensure the presence of people from developing countries in Havana where the Symposium was specifically designed for their needs. Mr GARCIA MESA confirmed they were seeking help from various international and regional organisations. They had applied for funding for travel and staying costs through the Unesco Participation Programme via the Cuban National Commission, were seeking the moral support of the Cuban Unesco delegation in Paris and hoped FIAF could also help via its Unesco contacts. They were also hopeful of getting support from the Latin American Film Foundation for travel and staying costs of Latin American colleagues. They had no problems with expenses in their own national currency. They were very keen to invite not only colleagues from developing countries but named individuals from embryo archives.

He had brought with him the detailed projects descriptions and budgets for the developing archives symposium and for the FIAF Congress. Of a total Congress budget of \$150,955, they had asked for \$48,700 for transportation and staying costs of some 20 to 22 visitors from developing countries, leaving \$102,255 for the Congress itself.

Mr KLAUE said the Unesco Regular Programme money for 1990 was already committed so the only chance was via the Participation Programme. However, this worked on a quota system so if Cuba had submitted other projects, there might not be any money left, as had happened with the Brazilian project. Mr GARCIA MESA had stressed in his application that it was not a Cuban project but a tri-regional project so it should surely interest Unesco. Mr KLAUE suggested FIAF should write to the Director General of Unesco, supporting the project and that Mr GARCIA MESA should find 4 or 5 developing countries from the different regions who would support the request.

Mr GARCIA MESA was considering writing to specific archives to ask if they had problems in attending. He also raised the possibility of inviting FIAF archives to each sponsor a delegate from a developing country. Mrs WIBOM supported this but suggested it might be easier administratively for such archives to be sent an invoice for a Congress registration fee to cover the amount concerned. Mr KLAUE wondered if it was possible to use funding from the Canadian government in connection with the Ottawa meeting which was immediately following the one in Havana. Mr GARCIA MESA said he would prefer the funding and travel arrangements to be handled by the Secretariat in Brussels. He mentioned that the new Director of International Relations at

the Cuban Ministry of Culture was a personal friend and had promised as much financial support as was needed for the Congress expenses within Cuba.

Mr DE VAAL asked if they could get some support from the International Film School, both in the way of financial support and through attendance of their students from developing countries. Mr GARCIA MESA confirmed that he regularly visited and lectured there and they were very keen to attend; in fact attendance at the Congress meetings and the screenings was being incorporated as part of their curriculum. They had room for nearly 400 delegates so they would be very welcome.

Mr FRANCIS asked if all the Commissions were meeting in Havana, referring to a note in the previous Minutes that they might find it too expensive. Much depended on the availability of cheap flights and whether these were dependent on 7 or 14 days' minimum stay. For the EC meeting in Cuba, a 14 day stay had meant a 50% reduction in price; Mrs VAN DER ELST and Mr GARCIA MESA confirmed that the cheapest flights were now available for a 7 day minimum. There were two factors to consider: the staying costs payable by FIAF and the cost to the archive of having staff away from the office for an extended period. FIAF normally paid the staying costs of Commission members for 3 or 4 days out of the Commission budgets and the Commission Heads would need to calculate whether their budget could stand staying costs for 7 days. In addition, it emerged in the discussion that it had not been decided who was responsible for the additional staying costs of Commission members during their participation in the Symposia but Mr GARCIA MESA offered to pay those. Mrs HARRISON then mentioned there was the problem of the days intervening between the Symposia and the Commission meetings. It was agreed that Mr GARCIA MESA would meet the Commission Heads to finalise the schedule and calculate how many days that had to be paid for.

The next morning, the EC received copies of the paper showing the staying costs at the Hotel Nacional although cheaper hotels would be available. Mrs HARRISON calculated that the cost for the Commissions with 9 members staying in single rooms for the week would come to some \$5000-6000, which was far too much for the Commissions' budget.

Action:

- FIAF to prepare letter in Lisbon to the Director General of Unesco
- Mr GARCIA MESA should ask 5 developing countries from different region to support the request.
- Mr GARCIA MESA to prepare a written request to members to sponsor a delegate or to pay a registration fee. This would be distributed to delegates in Lisbon and comments invited at the GA.
- Mr GARCIA MESA to meet Commission Heads to finalise schedule, calculate costs and finally decide whether it was feasible for

- Commissions to meet in Havana.
- Mr GARCIA MESA to get cost information distributed as soon as possible so archives could put the figures in their budgets.

Day 2

Mrs ORBANZ gave the dates for the two events in Ottawa immediately following the Havana Congress:

- the ICA Symposium, April 30 - May 3
- the Joint Technical Symposium organised by IASA and C-C, May 3 - 5 (followed by IASA Congress, May 7-10)

Mr SCHOU said that although for the three technical events there would be overlap of topic, they were trying to avoid overlap of content. For the developing archives in Havana, they were presenting a basic introduction to the layman but they hoped that delegates would be interested to build on this knowledge and go on to Ottawa for the meeting with the film and tape stock manufacturers and a more advanced discussion. In Ottawa, the overall JTS theme was the instability of carriers (photographic and electronic images, magnetic sound recordings, vinyl and compact discs, etc), with contributions from FIAF, IASA and possibly FIAT. The ICA Symposium was designed for archive administrators, concerned with management, collection control, including intellectual control.

Mr KLAUE suggested Mrs Vosikova and Mr SCHOU should be asked to speak at the GA and encourage participation in these two events. He feared that many would find it too expensive. However, as joint organisers with IASA, FIAF had a certain moral obligation to encourage attendance. Mrs ORBANZ expected there would be a large attendance from IASA as it was just before their Congress. Mr DAUDELIN thought it was essential to check the flight schedules as flights between Cuba and Canada were only once or twice a week and it would not be advisable to attempt to travel via the USA. Mr KLAUE confirmed that the JTS was entirely funded with Canadian government money and no contribution was expected from FIAF.

Mrs ORBANZ reported that Mr SCHOU would introduce the JTS at the GA. There would be a further meeting between the Coordinating Committee and Industry in Vienna at the beginning of May and in June Helen Harrison (IASA) would be going with Bill Storm to discuss further details in Ottawa.

1991 and later years

In the absence of Mr NAIR, the EC concluded there would be no Congress in Poona.

After the discussion about Athens below, Mr CINCOTTI asked what was to be done about the Poona Congress in the absence of news from Mr NAIR. Mrs WIBOM said that when she had last spoken to Mr NAIR he had still been very doubtful that he would get confirmation. They had never seen a written document from Poona. She appreciated that they had very difficult problems, starting with their situation far from the capital and the decision-making centre, with an infrastructure that was difficult to manage. In addition, the increasingly high standards set in recent years were putting very heavy burdens on potential hosts. She would like to see FIAF revert to very much simpler congresses, perhaps with greater contribution to the organisation by FIAF, to open the possibilities to "poorer" countries. Otherwise, with the many problems, they could not expect to hold a congress in developing countries. Mr SCHOU felt they should wait to see if Mr NAIR arrived with an invitation.

Alternative for 1991: Athens

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that discussions with Mrs Mitropoulos about a Congress in Athens had been very satisfactory. The invitation was firm and she would be arriving with more documents and a new proposal for the Symposium but was willing to consider alternative ideas from the EC.

Mr CINCOTTI thought it was important for the EC to discuss the Congress with Mrs Mitropoulos before voting in the GA. He felt it was dependent on substantial funding from the new government which would not be in position until June. However, Mrs VAN DER ELST understood that government funding would be easier under the new regime but in any case Mrs Mitropoulos had the promise of financial support.

They would need further discussion before deciding on the Symposium topic. Mrs GALVAO said the Latin American archives favoured the theme, Video in Film archives, proposed by Mr KLAUE. Mr GARCIA MESA agreed, had prepared a paper on it and hoped it could be raised in Open Forum in Lisbon and Havana although it needed more extended treatment in a symposium. Mr FRANCIS thought it was a good topic but not one of interest to the Greek archive.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that 1991 was 12 years after Brighton where they had had an interesting comparison of different methods of film/video/film transfer and, with the developments in technology, it would be interesting to revert to that topic. It could well be a topic that was not of particular interest to the Greek archive but they had a tradition that one symposium was organised by FIAF itself.

Mr KLAUE and Mr FRANCIS suggested they should perhaps seek a historical theme as Mrs Mitropoulos was a film historian. (Mr CINCOTTI suggested "The

Trojan War in the cinema"). Mr DE PINA agreed and thought it was time for FIAF to give the floor to film research. For the video theme, he thought there might be PAL/SECAM format problems. Mr DAUDELIN felt it would be useful if the EC had some firm ideas as the ideas previously suggested by Athens had been too general and vague. Mr FRANCIS thought that even if FIAF took responsibility for one of the symposia, the other should be close to the heart of the host. As Maria Komninos, was a lecturer and independent film maker, she would be a very good leader of a seminar on what archives were doing for preservation of independent cinema. This was a topic which was certainly of major interest to his archive.

Mr DAUDELIN supported this idea, especially as it would give them the opportunity to bring in people from other film archives that were not normally represented. He added that there was an International Congress of Experimental Film in Toronto in late May and part of the congress was a Round Table on that issue with people from 6 or 7 independent institutions. Mr DE PINA also supported the idea, saying that the archives were often the only place where such films were shown. It was generally agreed that this would be an interesting topic for Athens and perhaps video could be taken in Madrid.

Action:

- Await arrival of Mr NAIR for news of situation in Poona.
- Mrs VAN DER ELST and Mr CINCOTTI to meet with Mrs Mitropoulos before the GA, in particular to discuss possible symposium topics. If appropriate, decision on Athens to be taken by GA.

Procedure for Selection of Symposium Topics

During the discussion about the Athens Symposium, Mr ROSEN raised the general principle behind the selection of symposium topics. He was disappointed that it seemed the video topic was going to be postponed as he thought it was of compelling interest. He saw the symposia as a pivotal part of the Congress and the prime reason for people's attendance. He felt therefore that the choice of topic should emerge from a real dialogue between the EC and the host country and not just be the reflection of the host's idiosyncratic interests.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that very often the Commissions assisted the host archive with their expertise in preparing the Symposia. Mr ROSEN was not so much concerned with expertise but with the identification of subject matter that was sufficiently important and compelling to encourage members to come together from around the world to talk about it. Mrs WIBOM agreed with him that the goal was that all should go home as "better archivists".

1992

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled there was a long-standing invitation from Madrid for 1992 in connection with the 1492 Anniversary. If they were to vote 3 years in advance, then they needed a firm confirmation of the invitation for voting in Lisbon.

Action: Mr DE PINA to send telex to Madrid to ask them to come prepared to make a presentation to the GA.

Day 3 afternoon: the EC reverted to the question of Congress locations in 1991 and 1992

- *Mr NAIR had arrived late on the afternoon of Day 2*
- *Madrid had indicated that they could not host a Congress*

Mr NAIR regretted his late arrival due to meetings with the authorities in Delhi but he was now pleased to confirm that although there had been no time to obtain a written document, he had been authorised by the Government to offer to hold a FIAF Congress in Poona in 1991.

He suggested it should be held between the 15 and 30 March, partly for climate reasons, partly because they had to spend their budget by 31 March. Poona was a half-hour domestic flight from Bombay which was well served by the international airlines and it had adequate facilities, including hotels. The two Symposia would be held at the archive and the GA in a private auditorium which could handle the recording and interpreting requirements. He and his colleagues felt one should have some connection with the prolific Indian cinema and his preference for the other was some aspect of training. He invited suggestions from the EC for the specific topic and wording.

He closed by stressing that Poona was a small town and he hoped to count on extra manpower support and assistance from the FIAF EC, members and Secretariat to ensure the Congress was a success. When later pressed to indicate what extra manpower he had in mind, he mentioned only as example the guidance of Commission heads and the possible supply of technical equipment on loan.

Mrs WIBOM explained that in the absence of any information from him the EC had voted for Athens for 1991 although the final decision would rest with the GA.

Mrs WIBOM, Mrs ORBANZ and others were rather concerned that at this late stage this was the first written invitation from the archive and there was still no written commitment from the Government to confirm that the Congress would take place. Mr KLAUE felt they should explain the situation quite openly at the GA and ensure they were fair to both Poona and Athens. They should say that the EC had been waiting for a formal invitation from

Poona for over a year and when Mr NAIR failed to arrive at the EC, they had to find an alternative. Mr DAUDELIN hoped it would not end in a "beauty contest" atmosphere like they had had with Australia, with everyone preferring Athens simply because Poona seemed so far away.

Mrs WIBOM stressed they had been hoping for years to hold a congress in Mr NAIR's part of the world and this was the first and only opportunity. The EC recognised that it would put extra burdens on the Secretariat and Commission Heads, as was the case with Havana, and that they might need to make a supplementary budget allocation to cope with the fact that there was less local support. For instance, Mrs VAN DER ELST had made a special visit to Cuba for discussions with Mr GARCIA MESA. She noted in passing however that Poona, with its population of 3.5 million, was certainly not a small town.

Mr NAIR confirmed that he believed the government and the archive would be equally willing to host the Congress in 1992, although he himself was scheduled to retire in 1991. On the financial side, he could find resources for all the local arrangements, perhaps even including the simultaneous translation. The local 5-star hotels were very cheap. He would hope to get help from Unesco or elsewhere for international travel. In response to Mrs WIBOM, he said that maybe in 6 months he could give detailed budget information with details of events and hospitality that could be provided. He was negotiating concessionary rates with Air India. Mr GARCIA MESA offered to sit with him and help work out details, based on his own current experience of organising a congress in a third world country.

Mr SCHOU was concerned at the burden on the Commissions in planning yet another Technical Symposium, following so soon after Havana and Ottawa and the need to get out the proceedings as well.

It was agreed that Mr CINCOTTI would ask Mrs Mitropoulos if 1991 and 1992 were equally acceptable. Mr FRANCIS advised caution as her previous invitation had not been handled very elegantly. She had stepped in again at the last minute and might not be willing to change. Mrs GALVAO recalled that there was still the possibility of bringing forward Uruguay from 1993.

GA13 Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU presented 3 documents: the Report for the GA, the programme for the lunchtime presentation and a new paper for the Technical Manual, "Preservation of Moving Images and Sound". The EC suggested he should plan to restrict his Report to the GA to 30 minutes but the Chairman would allow additional time for questions.

His Report was similar to that presented in Montreal. There had been quite a demand for his new general introduction to the preservation of moving images and sound (1.A.1) and he had already distributed some 150 xerox copies. Mrs GALVAO and Mr GARCIA MESA had agreed to have it translated into Portuguese and Spanish. Mrs VAN DER ELST asked that steps could be taken to have it translated into French as they were constantly being asked for French texts on preservation.

Action: Mr SCHOU to ask Mr Schmitt for help or to ask Secretariat to pay outside translator for first draft that Mr Schmitt could edit.

In connection with Mr Brown's new Aids to Identification (1.A.2), Mr SCHOU thanked Mr FRANCIS for allowing Mr Brown to get more samples from Berkhamsted and had asked the Secretariat to reserve extra publication money as its usefulness was dependent on quality reproduction of the photographs. He could not suggest a publication date yet.

He was pleased to report that the East European Sub-Commission was so active and that, with the progress on items 1.A.1-8, there would soon be a steady flow of materials for the large Technical Manual ring binder.

After lunch, Mr SCHOU briefly reviewed the 6 projects of the total 34+ PresCom projects that had now been given priority (1.C1-6) and there was some discussion of the vinegar syndrome project, as below.

- **Vinegar syndrome**

Mr FRANCIS preferred to leave the reporting to Mr Cook who had done so much work on it. BFI's main priority was to find treatment to stop or slow down the vinegar syndrome so they had decided not to go ahead with supporting the polyester study, especially as they had never had any problem with film they had duplicated themselves.

On the question of seeking sponsorship from Unesco or elsewhere, Mr FRANCIS said they were unhappy with the terms imposed by the stock manufacturers, (that they should not reveal any results without their prior approval). There was still much work to be done because the researchers at Manchester who had indicated some potential solutions were not willing to undertake the detailed testing procedures necessary before anything could be applied to

national heritage material. The BFI had approached the British Standards Institution but it was outside their terms of reference. Mrs WIBOM felt there was no longer any possibility of Unesco help anyway and she would talk to Mr SCHOU separately about alternative possibilities.

Mr FRANCIS suggested the Commission should meet with Mr Cook and discuss his report before deciding what to do next. He was reluctant for there to be any formal statement to the GA at this stage, especially as it was such a contentious issue, and in the reference to the East European Sub-Commission work at the end of point 1.A.1, he would prefer the possible causes not to be itemised. It was agreed simply to say that there had been a good response to the questionnaire and work was in progress.

Mr SCHOU would thank various individuals and archives for their support and Mr DE PINA for translating into Portuguese the SMPTE paper.

In the discussion, Mrs WIBOM was pleased to note that they had now set priorities and Mr SCHOU indicated that each project had its own coordinator so that he himself was not a bottleneck.

Mr SCHOU then explained his plans for the lunchtime presentation. Before closing his report, he referred to the Montreal minutes where it was suggested that, because an archive had cold storage facilities, it was doing something for preservation and could therefore be confirmed. He referred to his recent document with a clear definition of "true" preservation which would exclude the short term preservation of viewing prints. Mr FRANCIS felt Mr SCHOU's definition of preservation was very useful, especially the distinction between "active" and "passive" preservation. It could be useful in the context of the confirmation process, to refer people to this definition and insist on "active" preservation. Mrs WIBOM noted that, in the case Mr SCHOU had quoted, FIAF was keen to encourage a developing archive, but they would certainly be glad to use the definition.

Mrs WIBOM closed the discussion by thanking Mr SCHOU and his Commission for all their valuable work.

GA14 Open Forum

Mrs ORBANZ and Mr DAUDELIN listed some possible topics, including those suggested by a study of the most recent Annual Reports. Mrs ORBANZ mentioned:

- Equipment pool (request from Zimbabwe)
- Film classics on video or other form
(She noted that Perth were building a video library of major films; she was not sure if this should be held over for Videos in the Archive)

- Training
(Dakka looking for training but perhaps this should be discussed separately. Apparently they would not be attending after all)
- Poona mentioned experience of Regional Archives.
- "What do you do with nitrate after copying ?"
(Koblenz and others now have policy of destroying it once copied)

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned:

- film museums: a new direction in the film archive movement
He asked if Mr FRANCIS or someone from London could talk about their new Museum and possibly someone from Astoria (New York) and Frankfurt. Mr FRANCIS felt there were more important things to talk about in Open Forum and wouldn't be happy doing it as it was such an ancillary activity and in any case had already been written up in the Bulletin. He would prefer to hear a presentation by archives who had seen significant developments in their recent activities, especially those not represented on the EC or Commissions.
- list of prints for exchange (from Cinémathèque Universitaire: he was not sure this should be Open Forum)

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned again that some of the Reports were so brief that he would like to ask members to give more information. For example, year after year there were only 10 lines from Algeria, even though they were very active; Lyons always seemed to be expecting something to happen "next year".

[In passing, he asked if the EC had seen articles by Bernard Chardere in Positif where he was very critical of FIAF, claiming its members were always abusing its own rules, printing pirate prints and circulating poor copies, etc., but this was not a topic for Open Forum]

Transcriber's Note: Why not have a session on

"The public image of FIAF: does it need improving/correcting ? if so, how ?"

Mrs VAN DER ELST felt it was up to the members to raise what interested them and not for the EC to manage. Mrs WIBOM fell from past experience that they should have some subjects in reserve to fill possible silences.

GA15 Membership Questions: see item 5 of EC Agenda

GA16 Discharge of the Outgoing EC

GA17 Election of the new Executive Committee (discussed Day 3)

Mrs WIBOM recalled it was Election Year and the third two-year period under their revised Statutes & Rules. There was initially some confusion over whether all Officers and all Ordinary Members would have to stand down in 1991 but Mr KLAUE recalled that the rotation principle for Ordinary Members was introduced later (Berlin 1987).

Following the invitation to the membership, there were now 24 candidates for the 13 posts, including 7 for President, 6 for Secretary General and 6 for Treasurer.

Mrs GALVAO said her candidature was submitted by her Director in her absence. As her archive also had two members serving on commissions, she thought she should withdraw as they could not afford 6 air-tickets a year. She thought it very important that, once elected to serve, members should attend all the meetings. Mr NAIR thought there ought to be other considerations besides the ability to pay but it was pointed out that FIAF just did not have the funds to pay on a regular basis. That is why it was a condition of candidature that the archive should commit to pay the travel and staying costs of attendance at meetings. Mrs WIBOM suggested that in exceptional cases they might be able to draw on the Development Fund. As the next Congress was in Havana and there could be a training seminar in Sao Paolo, the EC persuaded Mrs GALVAO to stand once more.

Chairing of the GA Sessions

It was agreed that the four sessions should be chaired respectively by Mrs WIBOM, Mr KLAUE, Mrs ORBANZ and Mr DE PINA (members only & election session).

5 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

Discussion of items 5.2 began on Day 2; 5.1 was taken on Day 3

5.1 Discussion of Paper prepared by Working Group on Membership

Mrs WIBOM began by explaining that she had taken this point after the individual membership situations because, whatever decisions they might take in Lisbon, the earliest time they could become effective was after the 1990 Congress, and it would not have been fair to keep archives waiting all that time.

Mr FRANCIS reported that his paper included the views of Mrs ORBANZ but, for various practical reasons, did not take into account the Minutes of the last EC meeting or the latest views of Mr ROSEN. He would like to reiterate their thanks to Mrs VAN DER ELST, without whose contributions as group member, rapporteur and host, they could not have made such progress.

Mr FRANCIS recalled that the starting point for the discussion was the feeling that FIAF had to decide whether it wished to become a larger organisation or not. He began with the following points:

- everyone in the Group agreed that it was important for FIAF to open doors or at least have some communication or relationship with a lot of organisations which could not even become Observers under the present Statutes and Rules
- there was also the underlying feeling that after 50 years one probably needs to look at one's organisation anyway
- he personally felt there were many groups of people with archival interests outside FIAF who would well be the new blood of the Federation (eg Celtic Film Festival; the different groups who attended recent meetings in Bruges/Spa, Bari and Bologna); if FIAF could not serve them, they might find themselves obliged to set up some other organisation
- the 9 points listed on page 2 all arose out of these considerations.

He had come to the meeting with a paper which he had hoped could be presented to the GA but, during the discussions on individual cases, he became increasingly uneasy. In particular, he feared that the solutions and definitions proposed were too simple and it would be too easy to satisfy them "on paper". He now felt it would be wrong to introduce such a major change without involving the membership in the discussion. The situation was very complex and needed very careful preparation of the background and the issue. A brief Open Forum would be inappropriate and he proposed instead a full day's Symposium for the full membership with prepared contributions from specific categories of members, observers and even potential applicants.

He regretted presenting this change of view without warning and, in spite of his previous comments, was now very glad they had had the individual membership discussions first as this had highlighted some of the many problems. Mrs WIBOM said there was no need for apologies: the paper was extremely useful to help everyone clarify their thinking. She appreciated the need to have more diversity of views, especially as in the end the Working Group consisted only of existing full Members.

Mr ROSEN made two points. First, he found the discussions about new admissions demoralising, confusing and apparently without principle so there was certainly a real need for change. This need was reinforced by Mr KLAUE's report of the development of activities relating to film preservation in other international organisations. They needed to convey to the membership the feeling that this was an important issue, central to the Federation's future. Secondly, he agreed with Mr FRANCIS that they had not yet found workable solutions, not because the Working Group was not representative enough, but because the issues were so complicated. They had to reconcile the need to expand FIAF to serve organisations with varying film preservation activities without losing their own core commitment to long term preservation of the national production as the overriding priority. He suggested they should raise it in the GA as a crucial, urgent and complex issue and give time for a preliminary exchange of ideas, leading to a serious discussion at the next Congress, as the basis for preparing concrete proposals for change.

Mr KLAUE agreed that distributing a paper implied finality, that the decisions were all ready to be voted on, but felt it was essential to introduce the issue in Lisbon and invite people to make recommendations in writing or discuss it with members of the Working Group in Lisbon. Now was the time to seek out ideas rather than offer solutions. Mrs WIBOM fully agreed, recalling that there had long been complaints about their handling of membership issues and the time it took at the EC meetings. It was agreed to rearrange the Lisbon agenda to have the discussion in the same Session as the Open Forum and to set aside a full afternoon of the GA in Havana. It was generally agreed that the GA was more appropriate than a Symposium as the GA underlined that it was an important business matter. It should be open to members and observers and hopefully with the active participation of international and regional organisations and embryo archives who were not yet formally associated with FIAF. Mr GARCIA MESA welcomed this decision as it would further enhance the importance of the Havana Congress.

Mr FRANCIS then asked for a review of the Working Group's paper to see if there were any points that the EC rejected. He reviewed the key points:

- change to three Membership categories, with new "Observers" being those who had no wish or qualification to become full Members.

- attempt to quantify or assess quality of preservation work.
He was not happy with the simple percentage they had proposed but felt some measure was needed.

Mr ROSEN agreed but stressed that the most important task in Lisbon was to put the suggestions in context: to give the background and identify the problem. He reiterated his belief that the overall goal was to make the Federation more open to organisations with related activities while at the same time reaffirming the core commitment of long term preservation of national production. Once the goal had been established, they could move on to the importance of finding objective criteria for membership, in particular to make the distinction between the associated activities (which were important) and the core activities of ensuring the long term preservation of national production. They should invite ideas from the GA for defining these criteria, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Mr BORDE asked that they use Mr SCHOU's two preservation definitions and distinguish between "passive" storage and "active" restoration and provision of appropriate preservation conditions.

In response to Mr NAIR, Mr FRANCIS explained that the subscription for Observers was deliberately mid-way between the other two. Provisional Members were likely to be small organisations, with limited resources, perhaps also unconvertible currency, whereas Observers could well be quite substantial organisations which could afford to pay more but should not pay as much as full Members who had more rights. Mr ROSEN agreed that these goals should be presented but, at this stage, they should not mention specific subscription suggestions.

Mr CINCOTTI approved of the concept of Provisional Members but suggested the term implied "temporary"; he would prefer the term "Candidate Member". Mr FRANCIS warmly welcomed this suggestion and asked for an alternative to the word Observer for the new concept, to avoid confusion in the discussions. The EC agreed on "Associate", avoiding Associate Member as any term with Member attached became used loosely. It was suggested they should also use the term "Full Member" (membre effectif).

Mr FRANCIS moved on to the next key point:

- whatever changes were introduced, it should be accepted as a matter of principle that all existing members would be required to meet the new standards. He asked for a commitment from the EC that they fully accepted this implication. There was universal agreement and Mrs GALVAO added that the Latin American archives were already planning to discuss this which she considered fundamental.

At this point, Mrs VAN DER ELST asked if they should proceed with the Reconfirmation of Members but Mrs ORBANZ and others confirmed that they were obliged to work within the existing Statutes and Rules until changed.

The next key point was:

- a major change in FIAF policy so that the main privilege of full Members should be the exchange of viewing copies, rather than traditionally of master material. There was thus no requirement for a member to lend viewing copies to Associates: it would remain optional, entirely at the discretion of the member concerned. This was a central and controversial issue as the main function of many organisations, like the film museums, who would fall into the category of Associates, was to make presentations.

Mr FRANCIS agreed with Mr ROSEN's suggestion that perhaps, rather than being specific, they should prepare to introduce such a change by affirming the principle that the loaning of materials is tied to the preservation activity which is the core activity of the Federation. Mrs WIBOM stressed that they should make it clear that all the proposals were only ideas for discussion.

After the lunch break, Mr FRANCIS noted the remaining key points which he felt were less controversial:

- he felt everyone acknowledged the need for specialist sections. However, they needed to consider the implications for the increased activities in planning the format of congresses which were already longer than in the past. He thought they might move to a new format, with a short business meeting at the beginning and end, and a single Symposium and various specialist working events in the central part. He envisaged the groups would organise themselves rather than putting an extra burden on the Secretariat or EC. Mr ROSEN indicated they would need to decide whether organisations sharing common goals would be expected to seek the official approval of the EC for the formation of such a new section or whether it was simply affinity groups initiating meetings on an informal basis.
- for reconfirmation, the basis proposal was less reliance on the completion of forms and more on information from various other sources.

The discussion closed with agreement that they would try to limit the discussion to about an hour and Mrs WIBOM or Mrs ORBANZ as Chair of the session would make quite clear that this was the first stage in a long process before any changes could be incorporated in the Statutes and Rules. They were inviting ideas, in Lisbon and in the coming year, and planned an extended GA session in Havana so that the membership was fully involved in defining what changes would be best for the Federation. It might also be mentioned in the President's Report.

5.2 Reconfirmation of Members

5.2a Athens: Tainiothiki Tis Ellados

In reviewing the dossier which was rather short on information, Mr CINCOTTI noted there was no change to the Statutes & Rules. He thought it strange there was no reply to the question about printing viewing copies as he understood their main activity was projection and providing distribution copies to cine clubs, etc. The budget claimed they spent 25% on film preservation but there was no mention of restoration.

The collection was quite substantial (about 4,000 features and 2,000 shorts) Their vaults which he had visited some 5 years ago were quite small but adequately climate-controlled and it seemed there was a long term plan to build new facilities.

Mr DAUDELIN asked how many staff they had but it was not clear from the documents or the organisation chart which had many specific headings. There was a large non-executive Board of 25 members. He noted that there was a misunderstanding of the point of Question 9 as they had given the name of the technician as the person "controlling the collections". Mr CINCOTTI said several archives had misinterpreted the question in the same way.

Action: The New Secretary General to clarify wording of Question 9.

Mr CINCOTTI invited the EC to decide whether to reconfirm them, subject to further information being provided, or to postpone the decision. Mr DAUDELIN and Mr CINCOTTI felt there was no reason to refuse Reconfirmation: it would just be useful to have some more information for the dossier.

Decision: Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation. Mr CINCOTTI to meet privately with Mrs Mitropoulos to clarify the questions raised.

5.2b Bruxelles: Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique

Mr CINCOTTI said they had returned the questionnaire and the 1987 budget but no organisation chart or balance sheet. There was some misinterpretation of the questionnaire here also as it was claimed 70% of the budget was spent on preservation and another 70% on acquisition !

Mrs WIBOM read out a letter from Danielle Nicola, Deputy Curator, regretting they could not be present in Lisbon as they were preparing a gala in Brussels on April 22 to celebrate the European Cinema & Television Year (which had granted them 200,000 ecu (about 220,000\$) for preservation.

Decision: Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

5.2c Koblenz: Bundesarchiv-Filmarchiv

Mr CINCOTTI asked for assistance in interpreting the dossier as it was presented in German. There was no organisation chart although they claimed to have sent it and no budget.

Mrs ORBANZ clarified the response to Question 13: 30% of the budget was spent on preservation but they could also include under preservation the 60% on staff costs as all those staff (52 people) were fully engaged in preservation which was the archive's main activity. She did not know the total budget but they had about 2 million DM to spend on film copying and were obviously very active in preservation: their Annual Report indicated they had copied 300 features, 2,800 shorts and transferred 286 nitrate films to safety stock. They had a new building with new vaults but were still trying to get the air conditioning for the colour films working properly. They were still investigating the cause of the nitrate fire they had last year and had mentioned in the Report their new policy of destroying the nitrate once it had been copied (see discussion below). She was very happy for them to be reconfirmed.

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation.

Non-Agenda Item:

Discussion on policy re destruction of nitrate

During the consideration of Koblenz, the EC had a brief exchange of views on attitudes to the destruction of nitrate. Mr FRANCIS felt very strongly that it was important not to destroy the nitrate as new technology might well emerge to give the opportunity to make better copies in future than now. He thought it was a central issue and was not happy with the idea but did not know what to do: perhaps it should be raised in Open Forum. Mr ROSEN agreed that it was an important issue but felt it could not be held against the archive in the Reconfirmation as there was no FIAF declaration or rule against it. Mr FRANCIS felt it might be a Reconfirmation issue if pressure was being exerted on the archive to destroy the nitrate against its will. Mrs ORBANZ reported that her archive was certainly against the destruction of nitrate films and were surprised when the Bundesarchiv announced it at the meeting of the German film archives. There had been pressure from the Federal Government but the Bundesarchiv were happy to go along with that view. They had established some internal guidelines and were not for instance destroying the very early colour films. She felt it might well be something to discuss in Open Forum and see if the members could come to some consensus of rules in this context. Mr GARCIA MESA agreed it was very serious and felt it should certainly be discussed in Open Forum in Lisbon.

Mr GARCIA MESA then went on to describe a very worrying situation in Cuba. The film authorities were building new vaults for the preservation of the

Cuban film heritage, including both commercial and government films, and are short of space so are thinking of destroying the dupe negatives of foreign films. All the titles were on computer and they were distributing the printout within the Cuban Film Institute, asking which dupe negatives could be destroyed. He had strongly opposed this and suggested that at least they should be offered to archives within FIAF. It was suggested he should raise this in Open Forum.

Mr CINCOTTI had the same problems in Italy when he was constantly being asked by the bureaucrats when the nitrate vaults would be emptied. He recalled that FIAF had discussed the problem some 5 years previously and agreed that nitrate should be kept as long as it was usable.

Mr NAIR arrived during the discussion of the next item (4.45pm on Day 2)

5.2d Praha: Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav – Filmovy Archiv

Mr CINCOTTI had received a good dossier but without the annual budget and without indicating staff numbers on the otherwise detailed organisation chart. He was happy to recommend reconfirmation.

Once more, there was some difficulty in reconciling the replies to the questionnaire. Mr FRANCIS was surprised from Question 14 that 20% of income came from laboratory work yet Mrs GALVAO noted that in Question 11 they said they had no laboratory.

Decision: Unanimous Reconfirmation.

5.2e Stockholm: Cinemateket – Svenska Filminstitutet

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier and again noted there was no budget. Mrs WIBOM said the total expenditure was included in their Report.

Decision: Unanimous Reconfirmation.

5.2f Warsaw: Filmoteka Narodowa

Mr CINCOTTI noted that there was no balance sheet. They had extensive storage for nearly 20,000 titles though standards were not ideal. Most of the income came from state subsidy, supplemented by small sums from projections and sale of publications.

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned at this stage that, like Warsaw, more and more members were just sending in the Questionnaire. This was recommended by the Membership Group for the future, unless the archive wanted to draw attention to specific problems.

5.2g Sao Paolo: Cinemateca Brasileira

Mr CINCOTTI only received their questionnaire that morning and noted there was no organisation chart or budget information beyond a statement that it totalled \$670,000. Revenue was 70% from the government, 10% from laboratory work and the rest from the private sector. Mrs GALVAO explained that the budget in the Annual Report was the government funding whereas the questionnaire gave the total funding, including monies received by the recently created Friends of the Cinemateca (called SAC). The organisation chart was the same as originally submitted. There were several modifications to their statutes: the significant ones were included as an annex in English.

Decision: Unanimous Reconfirmation.

5.2h Future Reconfirmations

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the next batch would be Amsterdam, Moscou, Istanbul, Roma and Beograd.

5.3 Reconfirmation of Observers

5.3a Managua: Cinemateca de Nicaragua

This was discussed the following day after the arrival of Mr Vargas who had telexed he would be bringing one year's subscription and the 1988 Report.

5.3b La Paz: Cinemateca Boliviana

Mr Susz had telexed it was "impossible to come" to Lisbon, without explanation, even though he had been offered both travel and staying costs.

There had been some confusion over the subscription which had in fact been paid.

Mr GARCIA MESA and Mrs GALVAO offered to sort out what must be a misunderstanding.

5.3c Caracas: Cinemateca de Venezuela

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled they had many problems in paying their subscription but that in Berlin someone had come and promised it would be sorted out. However, nothing was paid in 1987 and they were considered automatically deleted. Since the beginning of 1989, she had had several telephone calls via the embassy saying they were going to pay and finally in March she received 2 years' subscriptions which she had set against the years 1987 and 1988. She had thanked Madame Carmen Luisa Cisneros who had presumably replaced Mr Izaguirre and explained that they could probably be reinstated but FIAF would also need the missing Annual Reports.

Decision: Readmission automatic if Reports received within 3 months.

5.4 New Candidates for Observership

5.4a Bologna: Cineteca Comunale

Mr CINCOTTI reported that since the meeting in Montreal they had sent the required letter of commitment to cooperate, countersigned by the 3 existing Members. Mr CINCOTTI stressed that, according to the Rules, the commitment was only made by the candidate and it was not reciprocal; the existing Members were taking note of it but not committing themselves to cooperate with the candidate. He reviewed the dossier again, stressing that many of their films were purchased commercially, and they had what one might call a very aggressive cultural policy. He recommended accepting them.

Mr FRANCIS quoted the first part of Rule 12, concerning the commitment to cooperate:

".....note should be taken of the written opinion of the members which should have been previously requested by the Secretary General."

and asked if the Members had been formally asked for comments. Mrs VAN DER ELST said that Members were always informed when there was an application from their country and sent the dossier for information, which was their opportunity to respond.

Mr BORDE had two questions about the collections:

- the composition of the 3000 feature films: did it include any rare Italian productions or silent films ? what was mix of 35 and 16 mm ?
- were all the copies obtained on the "free market" ?

He was inclined to the view that the criterion for a FIAF member was that the collections were based on deposits by producers or rights holders, whether by voluntary or legal deposit. This was to separate out the true archives, preserving the cultural heritage, from private collectors.

Mrs WIBOM felt it was an interesting question but one could not introduce such a criterion for assessing a particular candidate (as Observer, not Member) when it was not in the Statutes or Rules or any documents sent out. In any case, in many countries there was no legal deposit.

In response to Mr DAUDELIN, Mr CINCOTTI reported that the collection was included gifts and deposits but was mostly purchases. Mr DAUDELIN recalled that they had admitted Luxembourg as a full Member, even though much of its collection was acquired by purchase. He was more concerned about the proliferation of archives in Italy but was ready to abide by the recommendation of the existing Italian members. Mr CINCOTTI reported that Bologna had substantial funding for a laboratory which would be able to serve archives throughout Europe.

Mr KLAUE asked if there was any national framework for cooperation between the Italian archives, as in F R Germany and the United States. Mr CINCOTTI referred to an agreement signed in Rapallo in 1981 (in the context of the then Article 104) by the 3 Members; in most cases, Rome was empowered to speak for the other two. Bologna had sought cooperation with Rome on a bilateral basis and generally been supported.

Mr NAIR was interested because he had a similar emerging situation in India. To avoid opening the floodgates in some countries, he thought it was not sufficient to circulate the new candidate's dossier and ask for comments.

The existing archives should be

- specifically asked if they had objections to a new archive joining FIAF when there were already several in the country, and
- asked for formal commitment to collaborate with the new archive if it was admitted to FIAF.

This was his understanding of FIAF's policy and, if this had been done, then he had no objection to accepting Bologna.

Mr CINCOTTI asserted the commitment was to collaborate and cooperate within the requirements spelt out by the Statutes and Rules. He added later that although they were funded by the local municipality, the scope of their work was on a national level.

Mr ROSEN made explicit the fact that the discussion was once more about membership rather than about this particular candidate. As candidates might be anywhere on the spectrum from being potential full Members to simply interested parties, it was inevitable that the discussion could not be satisfactorily resolved till they had defined the membership criteria.

Decision: On Bologna, unanimously in favour.

5.4b Dublin: Irish Film Institute - Archive section

Mr CINCOTTI introduced the dossier which he found well prepared. He recalled that the Film Archivist, Mrs Sunniva O'Flynn had already attended a FIAF Congress. They had been greatly helped by the National Film Archive in London. Mr FRANCIS was very happy with the situation and confirmed that the Archivist in charge had very clear ideas about what she wanted to achieve. He felt that Observer status would be useful to them but he was not sure, as in other cases, whether it was better to appoint the embryo Archive Section or the parent Institute.

Mr DE PINA cited the example of the Cinemateca Portuguesa which had been admitted as the Cinemateca Nacional, when it was just an archive section within the Ministry of Information. Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that the

application on the Institute letterhead was in the name of the Archive Section which hoped to be autonomous eventually but had no independent existence at present.

Decision: Unanimously in favour. The letter of appointment would use their formula, welcoming them as the Archive Section.

End of Day 2

5.4c Gemona: Cineteca del Friuli

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that this was a private association, originally a cineclub, which was famous as the organisers of the important Silent Cinema Festival at Pordenone, an autonomous province in the same region. There was no organisation chart: they achieved excellent results relying almost entirely on voluntary help. Mr DAUDELIN was rather confused to read that their collection was essentially projection copies for circulation among the cineclubs in Friuli and they had no storage facilities yet elsewhere they claimed to do regular restoration work.

As for the previous candidate, Mr CINCOTTI asserted that, in accordance with the FIAF Statutes & Rules, the signature of the existing FIAF members was a recognition of the candidate's commitment to cooperate but not a mutual commitment. Mr DAUDELIN understood that the Members' signature implied that they had no objection to their admission. Mr CINCOTTI said it implied neither support nor rejection. Mr FRANCIS said he could not make that interpretation from the English version of Rule 12: the failure to produce a comment was, at the very minimum, a passive acceptance of a situation.

Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested that FIAF had been at fault as they had not formally asked for their comments when sending the dossier. Mr DAUDELIN agreed that it was important to resolve the point as everyone was aware there were some 60 other Italian archives that might want to apply; he found it very surprising that the first two should be so coolly accepted by the Italians without comment. Mr CINCOTTI found no contradiction between the English and French versions of Rule 12. Mr FRANCIS said Rules had to be interpreted as a whole and repeated that Mr CINCOTTI's interpretation was not valid for Rule 12 as a whole. Mrs WIBOM agreed.

To resolve the situation, it was suggested that FIAF should formally write to the Italian members and ask them formally for their opinion on the candidature. Mr BORDE thought it was quite reasonable to go back to the Italian members for their opinion, seeing that it was they who had previously declared they were concerned at the proliferation of members.

Mrs ORBANZ referred back to Mr DAUDELIN's question about preservation and

asked what they were doing. Mr CINCOTTI said they began as a film cultural organisation and their activities were now recognised as important worldwide. They were already asking other FIAF archives for loans of films for Pordenone and had begun to acquire copies (he did not know whether it was via deposit, loan or purchase). They then began to acquire unique copies, from private collectors, former distributors, etc., and kept them "in storage which didn't yet exist" (sic!) and claimed to have started "restoration", as historical researchers and, on the physical level, using a specialist laboratory in Rome. Its situation was quite similar to Bologna. The films were either obtained from the other Italian archives or unique copies that they were attempting to reconstruct.

Mr ROSEN was confused by these discussions which were based on vague and imprecise information. In this case, the document claimed that 30% of the budget was spent on "film preservation" but there was no information on what that meant. He had no information on the collection, the proportion that was unique, original or just copies of material held by others. It then emerged that there was a list of films which was being circulated round the EC table.

Mr FRANCIS suggested they needed to add further questions:

"Do you have viewing copies separate from your preservation copies ?

"What % of your collection consists of viewing copies separate from your preservation copies ?"

He believed that if this was correctly answered it would help them in their discussions. He suspected that when a copy was made, it was described as preservation, even though the copy was then used as a viewing copy. There was a further problem associated with the very early cinema: because of the high volume of production, many films existed only in a sub-standard format. They had to decide whether they had reached a stage in the history of the cinema where there was no chance of finding anything better and a collection of unique material in a sub-standard format becomes very important to the history of the cinema and needs long-term preservation. This was particularly applicable to Bologna and Friuli. From the FIAF documentation now published, they should be able to estimate how much of their material is not available elsewhere. It would be very interesting to know what material held by these two archives, and used as viewing copies, was not available anywhere else in the world.

Mr ROSEN said there were two aspects: first, the interpretation of Rule 12 and then the interpretation of the documents and how to interpret the vague numbers being supplied. He wanted to reinforce Mr FRANCIS's point and suggested two additional questions:

- Please estimate what percentage of your collection is unique material or the best surviving material ?

(This would help FIAF know whether it was primarily an archival collection or a study collection)

- Please estimate what percentage of your preservation work is devoted to making preservation masters, as distinct from access prints ?

Decision:

- Mr FRANCIS and Mr ROSEN to draft unambiguous versions of the new questions.
- Advise Friuli and the existing Italian members that clearer statements were required from the existing Italian members.

5.4d Lima: Filmoteca de Lima

Mrs GALVAO summarised the background to the formation of this small archive which was uniting the collections of the Cinemateca Universitaria (directed by Dr ReyneI who was now very old) and the Cinemateca de Lima (President Nora de Izcue, directed by filmmaker Francisco Andriansen). Dr ReyneI had already donated his collection and they had recently learnt that the collection of nitrate films at the National Library would also be deposited at the Filmoteca (half as archive copies, half as distribution copies). These would be restored with the help of the Latin American Film Foundation.

Mr GARCIA MESA added they all supported the candidate. Isaac Leon Frias, the Director, was a talented film historian and researcher, much supported by the media in Peru and throughout Latin America. The EC found the information available very confusing and Mrs GALVAO attempted to clarify what she acknowledged was a very confusing situation.

She explained that the money to preserve the films now in the Library and the other nitrates held by the old Cinemateca de Lima will come from the the New Latin American Film Foundation but, as stated in the letter, the films would be held under the jurisdiction and responsibility of the new Filmoteca.

The new archive was important from 3 points of view:

- collections from all the archives of the country would be brought together in the Filmoteca.
- Filmoteca would take care of the nitrates now in the Library
- Filmoteca would take care of the nitrates collected by Mrs de Izcue, ex-President of Cinemateca de Lima, who had no preservation money.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed that the future was great but for the present there was no archive in the real sense. Mrs GALVAO agreed and said that Joao Socrates who had just been viewing the films to decide how best to spend the \$10,000 they had to start work with, would be coming to Lisbon with the latest news.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said one could not compare Peru where there was no other archive, with Italy where there were 3 FIAF Members. Mr Leon Frias was very serious and very much needed FIAF support to get the Filmoteca moving.

It was more like the original situation in Thailand where there was nothing when they were first admitted but who had made fantastic progress since. Mrs WIBOM was delighted with the application and the fact they had a contact with this country and felt they should try to support them in any way possible. Mr FRANCIS appreciated this point but it was difficult to ignore specific statements like the one in the Observation section that said there was no nitrate, no negatives and just a few ex-distribution prints.

Note from Secretariat: It emerged later that the Report was out of date.

He would prefer FIAF to respond with enthusiasm at their plans and say that as soon as the national heritage was within their control we would be delighted to reconsider the application and recommend them as Observers.

Mr DAUDELIN regretted that they were once more faced with their own institutional contradictions: on the one hand, they want to encourage the creation of an archive in a country where none existed and they had lots of sympathy for the situation in Latin America; on the other hand, they were at odds with the principles that were supposed to be guiding the Federation. If they accepted Lima, they were accepting an organisation which was principally, if not exclusively, engaged in projection and had nothing more than good intentions on the preservation side. Fortunately, they had the two Latin American colleagues with them to give more information. Mrs VAN DER ELST added that Mr Leon Frias was coming to Lisbon so they would be able to talk to him; she understood the situation in Peru was changing fast and they might be able to make a favourable decision at the next EC meeting.

Mrs GALVAO reminded the EC of the importance of FIAF's initial intervention with the Peruvian authorities, through a letter from Mr KLAUE stressing the importance of nitrate and the danger of keeping it at the Library. This letter had been very important in getting the situation moving and FIAF's continuing support would also be very important.

In the context of FIAF's support to Latin America, she referred to the discussion yesterday of two Latin American archives, Bolivia which might no longer be a member for lack of money and Venezuela which hoped to return. Given the amount of work that Bolivia was doing for the film heritage, it was madness to consider that they would be outside the Federation while Cinemateca de Venezuela, who did hardly any conservation work, was inside. She did not know how to resolve the situation but it was evident that the existing criteria were not allowing them to assess the real activity of the archives.

Decision: Discuss with Mr Frias and Mr Socrates in Lisbon and put on the agenda for the next EC.

5.4e Washington: National Archives & Records Administration

Mr CINCOTTI reported the State Archivist had sent a very impressive and complete dossier, describing its well-established and financed film section, which was dedicated to preserving records of the historical and political development of the nation. It was a very specialised archive but certainly worthy of being welcomed to FIAF. Mr ROSEN added that in addition to the government records it had an extensive news-reel collection.

Mr KLAUE asked if they should adopt the National Archive itself or the Motion Picture, Sound and Video Branch. If they ever wanted to become full members, the archive section would need to demonstrate autonomy and perhaps they should mention this already at this stage. They had had the same problem with Ottawa and Koblenz and in the case of Koblenz it had taken some 3 or 4 years of discussion to reach a satisfactory compromise. Mr ROSEN said that operationally the archive appeared to be independent but he agreed it would be best to ask the question and have them alerted to the importance of autonomy.

Mr DAUDELIN knew the organisation well and was happy to welcome them. He suggested the letter of acceptance should state very clearly that FIAF was admitting the Branch. Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled they had already adopted this procedure with Zimbabwe. Mr FRANCIS was a great admirer of their work and would be happy to welcome them to the Federation. Within the terms of the new membership proposals, they would fall within the category of Specialised Archives. They already had the case of the Imperial War Museum, the Cinémathèque des Armées in France in Holland and there were likely to be similar organisations in most countries of the world.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to start off correctly with such a large organisation (especially from the same town as the Library of Congress, where the Motion Picture Division is the FIAF member). Both he and Mr KLAUE would prefer to send a very friendly letter welcoming the application, appreciating their work and underlining that the application was considered to be submitted by the Branch, as in the case of Dublin. Mrs HARRISON felt this approach would in fact be very helpful for the Branch. She had last spoken to Bill Murphy at a meeting some 6 months previously when he had said they wanted to be associated with FIAF and become full Members eventually, but the National Archive staff had even more trouble finding funding for foreign travel than the Library of Congress.

Decision:

- Motion Picture, Sound & Video Branch/NARA unanimously accepted as Observer.
- MM ROSEN and FRANCIS to provide draft of recommended letter, after talking with Mr Murphy.

5.5 Miscellaneous & Other Requests for Affiliation

Progress on other requests was as follows:

- Instituto Capo Verdiano de Cinema

Mr DE PINA reported they were keen to establish an archive and the Director would be attending the Congress in Lisbon.

- Tokyo: National Film Center

Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed they had submitted a full dossier and visited the office in Brussels and several other archives but had said they were not yet ready administratively.

- Netherlands: Nederlands Information Service/Audiovisual Archive

Mrs VAN DER ELST understood the situation with the Filmmuseum had not been satisfactorily resolved and they would probably not go ahead with their application.

At the close of the session, Mr CINCOTTI noted that Observers should be advised that their status was effective as soon as the subscription had been received.

6 LEGAL PROBLEMS IN FILM ARCHIVES: DISCUSSION OF UNESCO DRAFT PROPOSAL

Mr KLAUE had distributed two papers on legal matters, both of which had been discussed at the recent NGO group meeting in Brussels.

- Legal problems relating to audiovisual archives: working paper prepared by Birgit Kofler (qualified lawyer & stagiaire at Unesco) under contract to Unesco
- Guidelines for audiovisual archives on access and reproduction drafted by Helen Harrison of IASA and revised after the NGO discussion

The Kofler paper was a compilation of legal problems, prepared with help from the Secretariat and Mr KLAUE himself. The intention is to have a wider discussion of the legal problems of audiovisual archives with the hope of modifying the international Conventions, or at least their interpretation. Later in 1989, it was hoped to have the first consultation with legal experts from Unesco and other international organisations and representatives from FIAF, FIAT, IASA, ICA and IFLA, perhaps leading to model legislation, a publication of some kind or wider discussion on a higher level with representatives from the International Copyright Conventions. All the international organisations concerned with audiovisual archives were invited

to comment and identify what they wanted to achieve. Mr KLAUE felt they were not equipped to do this but at least they could set up a working group of two or three people to review the paper, define priorities and perhaps identify any additional problems.

The Helen Harrison Copyright Guidelines had been revised after the Brussels meeting and the idea was that it should be circulated among the membership of all the NGOs. He and Mrs VAN DER ELST felt it did not totally reflect what was recommended at the meeting but once this had been put right, he suggested they should be published in the FIAF Bulletin as Guidelines but with an introduction to indicate that they were by no means binding rules. He asked for comments and whether anyone had worries about it going in the Bulletin. He would not suggest mentioning to the GA at this stage. Mr DAUDELIN thought the NGO paper was very general and could be put in the Bulletin with no problems.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that the Council of Europe was working on harmonising the European national legislation under the responsibility of a Mr Valter from CNC in Paris.

Mr KLAUE suggested the initial working group on the Unesco paper should be drawn from people within FIAF (not necessarily the EC) who were aware of the problems. They could consult legal experts later. Mr CINCOTTI and Mr BORDE agreed to work on it together. Unfortunately, the French translation (done quickly in Brussels) was very poor and would need re-working. Mrs WIBOM suggested Unesco should be asked to translate it as their documents had to be in both languages. Mr FRANCIS offered to submit his comments to Brussels.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Saur

Mr KLAUE reported on the visit he made with Mrs ORBANZ to SAUR the specialists in librarianship, archive science, information and documentation, who were already publishers for IFLA and ICA and were willing in principle to publish for FIAF. He circulated a sample of one of their books for ICA: they were published economically and so were not specially beautiful. The EC had to decide if they agreed in principle, before they negotiated terms in detail.

Of the FIAF projects nearing completion, SAUR expressed interest in:

- Glossary of filmographic terms, 2nd edition
Note from Secretariat: Now to be printed in Brussels with EYFTV money
- Moving Image Heritage Survey Report

- FIAF Cataloguing Rules (subject to comments from IFLA)
- Dictionary of Technical Terms by Cataloguing Commission
- Proceedings of Vienna Symposium

Of the projects still underway, SAUR were interested in:

- Bibliography of filmographies, 2nd edition
- Catalogue of technical equipment for av archives by Coordinating Cttee
- Study on fungus and bacteria by Czech archive
- Guide to the Technical Equipment required by Audiovisual and Film Archives, to be produced by the Technical Coordinating Committee or C-C.

They would consider two ideas raised by the NGOs at their last meeting:

- Glossary of audiovisual archive terms, combining separate publications produced by FIAF, FIAT, and IASA
- World directory of audiovisual archives: film tv and sound
This would fit in with existing series but obviously FIAF could not handle it without the cooperation of the other NGOs

SAUR themselves raised the following suggestions:

- Film Preservation Publication, new updated edition
To fit in with an existing series. Mr SCHOU was considering this.
- International Directory of Film Directors
Again FIAF could not handle this but could provide information about existing national publications or projects.

SAUR confirmed that they were definitely not interested in PIP as they did not think they could increase the sales figures and it was difficult to take over an already established project.

Mr KLAUE regretted that after a 4-hour meeting they had not reached an outline contract but SAUR had agreed the principle insisted on by FIAF that 100 copies would be provided free of charge for distribution to members. He said FIAF could not expect to earn income from this publisher but at least they would not have to pay out for their publications, as they had been doing up till now.

SAUR expressed interest in offering their services to individual archives if their manuscripts fitted in with their programme and this should be mentioned at the GA. They asked that FIAF should appoint one person as Coordinator to provide liaison between SAUR and the individual archives or other international organisations. SAUR preferred manuscripts in English and preferably without illustrations unless a subsidy could be obtained. Their publications were simple and cheap; for instance, their Glossary publication was not nearly as elegant or exciting as FIAF's.

Mrs GALVAO expressed interest in finding out costs for their filmography which was to be published in individual volumes. Mr KLAUE stressed that the principle was that FIAF would pay nothing but also receive nothing, unless there were substantial sales: the formula had to be agreed in principle for the outline contract and in detail for each contract. SAUR acknowledged that for many publications there would be very limited sales. Sometimes they published very small editions, of 100 or even as few as 30 copies, but at a price which would cover costs and include a profit for them. They were an independent company within the Butterworth Group.

Mrs ORBANZ felt the arrangement would benefit both sides: SAUR were very anxious to get FIAF manuscripts to extend their range within their existing specialist fields and FIAF would benefit through appearing in their substantial and widely-distributed Catalogue.

Mr ROSEN and Mrs WIBOM warmly welcomed the SAUR offer which would reduce FIAF costs and improve its distribution. Mrs ORBANZ agreed to act as Coordinator provisionally, stressing that she had no idea how much work would be involved.

7.4 Guidance on poster preservation

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique had asked which archive specialised in posters as they wanted advice on preservation. Mrs ORBANZ recommended they should give all the work to the local paper archive as they had done with their own large collection. She and Mrs WIBOM were both happy to give advice on cataloguing posters.

There being no further business, Mrs WIBOM formally closed the meeting with thanks to the host, Mr DE PINA, and the interpreter.

