

Referring to the Statutes, Ms BANDY recalled that Commissions must carry out projects that help archives to develop their activities in line with FIAF's goals. Commissions should focus more on their fundamental purposes (e.g. the training of developing archives).

In accordance with Ms AUBERT, Mr SCHOU encouraged more dialog between the Commissions and the membership. We should find ways of stirring up our affiliates' response to Commissions' calls for collaboration and efforts to increase their membership. Ms AUBERT thought that, besides the Commissions, the membership should be encouraged to get more often together around certain projects. She believed that the membership itself should also think about the future of Commissions.

To Mr CHERCHI USAI, it was clear that the Commissions should be the interface between the membership and the « outside world ».

It was decided to ask Commission Heads to respond to and expand on Mr MAGLIOZZI's introductory notes early enough to allow EC members to read about what they think before the Congress in Jerusalem.

It was also suggested (but not formally decided) to devote half a day in the next EC to the future of FIAF and more particularly the future of Commissions.

Treasures Database Project: Ms CLAES's was worried that many elements of FIAF members' holdings were included on this database without them knowing it. As long as the question of the database's right-ownership was not clarified, she would oppose to the making public of the information already put on the database, although she approved the principle of exchanging information. Ms AUBERT recommended that Mr SMITHER write to Mr Magliozzi to reflect the EC's questions which Mr SMITHER formulated as follows : who does this work all belong to and where is it (in Susan Dalton's own database or in a public database) ? Susan Dalton should be asked to take the next opportunity of coming over to Europe to clarify this situation with Mr SMITHER.

As regarded Mr Moulds' intention to apply to Getty for funding, Mr JEAUVONS feared that such an application might be in conflict with his approach to Getty for obtaining funds for FIAF.

d. Commission for Programming and Access to Collections

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that the Commission's last meeting had been held most recently in Paris, which explained why he had not had the time to prepare a written report.

During its meeting, the Commission had examined the following items :

1. The Programming Commission's workshop in Los Angeles on "How to Use Our Collections" had been affected by the simultaneity of other events and had therefore been less attended than expected. However, the debate had been very lively as the matters dealt with were central questions in archives' activities. These topics definitely needed further discussion within FIAF. The Commission had noted with interest Mr JEAUVONS' intervention according to which the question of access to non-fiction films should become a major item in the Commission's future contributions. Mr BENARD DA COSTA suggested that we publish Mr PAINI's paper in the next issue of the Journal of Film Preservation. He finally expressed his feeling that there was a general attitude of "anti-intellectualism" toward the film heritage as a whole whereas we had to defend the art of cinema, as an art that invented new forms to the service of fiction. The Commission also verified that many FIAF archives had non-fiction films; how to promote and program this heritage should therefore also become a major concern to the Commission.

Mr SMITHER welcomed the idea of carrying on the debate on non-fiction films in the Journal. It was agreed that the Commission would contribute Mr PAINI's paper to the next issue of the *Journal*, if possible with other contributions from Ms CLAES' and Mr JEAUVONS.

2. Jeu des catégories : un jeu pour le centenaire du cinéma. The publication had been most recently publicised in «Le Monde », with the immediate effect of stimulating orders by a public mainly composed of individuals, libraries and journalists. Mr BENARD DA COSTA believed this was very encouraging. He solicited the help of the Brussels Office in order to cover unanticipated publication costs (about 7.000 US\$). No decision was taken on this matter.

3. Manual on Access : reactions to the publication had been received from Wolfgang Klaue as well as the National Film and Sound Archives in Australia and were agreed to be published in the next issue of the Journal. Mr BENARD DA COSTA hoped to obtain further response from the membership and more especially the Executive Committee members.

The Commission was at a turning point : now that it had already accomplished a good deal of its primary mandate since its creation in 1990, Mr BENARD DA COSTA found this was the appropriate moment to leave the Commission's presidency over to somebody else. He therefore resigned from his post of president of the Commission and recommended that the EC accept Ms CLAES as his successor, while he wished to remain a member of the Commission.

A long discussion followed on the appropriateness of accepting as the new head of a Commission somebody who already stood as an elected member of the EC.

This brought about the question of whether or not we should maintain the recommendation issued by the EC during its Paris meeting in 1993 and according to which "The EC shall separate its function as a decision making body and an instrument of communication by holding separately sessions of elected members only and meetings of a wider group including Honorary Members and Presidents of Commissions."

The EC finally decided not to revoke the recommendation and unanimously accepted Ms CLAES as the new Head of the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections.

e. **Long-term plan for FIAF** : no report had been produced for this meeting.

f. **Future of the Commissions** : Cfr. supra, pt. 6.c.

11 PROJECTS AND PUBLICATION UNDERWAY

a. **FIAF Journal of Film Preservation**

Mr CHERCHI USAI expressed the editorial board's disappointment with the last issue of the Journal that had just come out as it did not correspond to what they expected. Ms AUBERT believed that we needed a professional editorial executant. The question was : should he/she be based in Brussels or closer to the editorial group ?

Ms BANDY invited Mr DIMITRIU to do an evaluation of the Brussels office participation in the Journal and come back to the EC with an analysis showing 1) the level of work involved and 2) who is doing what.

Mr CHERCHI USAI wished to raise again the question of inserting a Newsletter about the Federation's current activities. He also evoked the possibility of skipping the next issue in order to take the time to reconsider the whole framework of the publication. This was also a matter of not spending the Federations money for the purpose of a project we were not fully satisfied with. Ms BANDY recalled that we would then fail to fulfil our commitments towards our Subscribers who were entitled to receive two issues per year. Mr DIMITRIU should think about this problem. The Treasurer finally stressed that this was not a question of finances but should only be taken as an opportunity to re-think the whole issue of the Journal.