

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. REPORT OF THE PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

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

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

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

Activities might include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr Cincotti envisaged to be addressed:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[End of Day 2]

7. ROLE OF COMMISSION HEADS IN EC MEETINGS

See Decision under 5.2

8. PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS

8.1 Projects and Publications underway

P1 100th Anniversary of the Cinema/1892-1897

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

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