

7.4. Report of the Programming Commission

Mr BENARD da COSTA commented on his written report including the completed activities and future projects of the Commission.

Between the meeting of Athens and Pordenone, some members of the Programming Commission (G. CLAES, C. GAUTHIER, P. CHERCHI USAI, J. BENARD DA COSTA and C. JEAUVONS) had informally met in Valencia.

The Symposium on Programming in Montevideo was the main issue on the agenda of Pordenone, based on the draft program that Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL had presented to the EC in Athens. The Commission had decided to devote half a day of this symposium to the Latin-American situation, under the coordination of Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL. The organisation of the remaining program had been left to the care of the Commission and had been agreed upon by Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL.

Revision of the Toulouse questionnaire: having unanimously agreed that this was no longer up-to-date (the returned answers were not precise enough to meet the needs of the work) the Commission had elaborated a new document to be sent in December to all Archives' curators and programming department heads, with the hope it would be returned before the following Commission meeting.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA drew the attention on some of his report's remaining issues, namely Mr CHERCHI USAI's proposal to introduce the Access Policy Guidelines for cultural uses in Montevideo and Steven Ricci's proposal to form a working group within FIAF discussing the relationship between film archives and film schools. He indicated that the first meeting of this working group could be placed within the Montevideo workshop schedule.

He also expressed the Commission's willingness to participate in the preparation of the cinema centennial.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA reported that the name of the Commission had been re-discussed both in Valencia and Pordenone : it had been generally felt that the members of the GA in La Havana had voted for the "concept" of the Commission rather than for the name itself (cultural uses), which was too vague as a term. He asked the EC to raise the issue again during the next General Assembly. The word "access" brought about a short debate between different members of the EC.

Mr ROSEN and Ms AUBERT approved the Programming Commission's project to study the relationship between film archives and film schools. Mr ROCHEMONT also supported this project, stating that a film archive could not be a service supplier but had to participate in the cultural reflexion of its environment.

For Mr ROSEN, the "key" question in programming was : how can an archive play a role in winning and educating a growing audience (younger people, filmmakers...). Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that this issue would be examined by the working group and dealt with during the Montevideo symposium.

Ms ORBANZ found the report very interesting but regretted it did not mention Mr DE PINA's project (one free screening for FIAF).

Ms WIBOM, supported by Mr JEAUVONS, pointed to the large amount of projects scheduled by the Programming Commission for the Congress and wondered about their financial feasibility.

Mr DAUDELIN thanked Mr BENARD DA COSTA for his report.

7. GENERAL DEBATE ON THE WORK OF THE COMMISSIONS

Mrs WIBOM reported on the meeting of the working group on Commissions which had been held on November 25 and was attended by herself, V. OPELA,

H. SCHOU and M. AUBERT.

It had been generally agreed that the work of the Commissions created FIAF's public face and a lot of FIAF's raison d'être. The relations between the EC and the Commissions should be vitalized. The EC should demand more from Commission heads, a more dynamic approach to the reporting and the definition of projects.

The group had agreed that it was necessary to describe criteria for membership in a Commission.

For Commission heads and members, a curriculum vitae should be requested. Commission members should all be mainly occupied in their respective Commission's field.

The EC should (in cooperation with Commission heads) prepare guidelines describing the tasks of the Commission heads, who should also get more precise information about their respective finances.

It had been further suggested that Commissions should consist of five members only (including the President), with the possibility of inviting corresponding members, a method that would encourage and stimulate the future nomination to full membership in the Commission.

Mr SCHOU personally believed that reducing the number of members was in contradiction with the recognized argument that as many people as possible should gain experience through participation in the Commissions.

A lengthy discussion had taken place regarding the introduction of a rotation system in Commission membership - maybe similar to the system used in the EC.

V. OPELA and H. SCHOU had strongly stressed the need for continuity and the difficulty of recruiting qualified members. They had further underlined the difference between EC-executives and Commission members. EC executives were selected by the GA for their general qualities whereas Commission members were selected on professional grounds. The important thing for a Commission President was that his superior competence was recognized by the other members. Competence could not be measured by voting.

Ms AUBERT and Ms WIBOM had favoured the rotation system, confident that among the more than 85 FIAF members there were certainly a lot of qualified people, willing and able to serve on the various Commissions. But Mr SCHOU was against it.

It was also suggested that the Commission heads should nominate a vice-president in case the president was (temporarily) unable to fulfill his assignment.

Within the EC one member should be nominated to stay in closer contact with Commission heads, for any FIAF matter that might occur during the year.