

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Paris, 7 - 8 November 1993

Present

Robert DAUDELIN	President
Eva ORBANZ	Secretary General
Clyde JEAUVONS	Treasurer

**Members**

Hoos BLOTKAMP  
José Manuel COSTA  
Jan-Christopher HORAK  
Jorge NIETO  
Vladimir OPELA  
José Maria PRADO  
Guy-Claude ROCHEMONT  
Steven RICCI  
Roger SMITHER  
Ivan TRUJILLO BOLIO

**Commission Heads**

Joao BENARD DA COSTA	Commission for Programming and Access to Collections
Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing Commission
Henning SCHOU	Preservation Commission

**Honoary Member**

Harold Brown

**Visitors**

Paolo Cherchi Usai (only on November 7, PM)  
Michael Moulds (only on November 7, PM)

**Secretariat**

Brigitte VAN DER ELST	Executive Secretary
-----------------------	---------------------

Excused

Ronald MAGLIOZZI	Head of Documentation Commission
------------------	-------------------------------------

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Paris, 7 - 8 November 1993

**A G E N D A**

---

	Page
1. Adoption of the agenda	16
2. Approval of the Minutes of the EC meetings in Oslo/Mo	16
3. Matters arising from the Minutes of the EC meeting in Mo	16
4. Membership questions:	17
4.1. Reconfirmation of Members : Luxembourg, Kobenhavn, Rochester, Ottawa, London (NFTVA), New York (Moma)	
4.2. New candidates for affiliation: Cinémathèque de Bretagne, Cinémathèque Méliès, Mo i Rana/National Library, Croatian Cinematheque	
4.3. Miscellaneous	
5. Finances :	27
5.1. FIAF's current accounts	
5.2. Draft budget for 1995	
5.3. - Report of the working group on membership dues - Possible deletion of affiliates in arrears of payment of their subscription : Rio de J., La Paz, Lima, Luanda, Quito, San Juan de Puerto Rico, Bogotà (C.Distr.)	
5.4. Report of the Fundraising Committee	
6. Comments on the written reports of the specialized Commissions	32
7. Projects and publications underway	23
8. New working groups: Training (C. Jeavons) Cinema Museums (J.C. Horak) Election procedures (Orbanz/Blotkamp)	36
9. Centenary plans	38
10. Future Congresses : Bologna 1994 Los Angeles 1995	38
11. Relations with Unesco and other international organisations	39
12. Any other business	40

## 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft agenda was modified as follows : point 4.3 (possible deletion of affiliates in arrears of payment of their subscription) was brought under Finances and the order of items under Point 5 (Finances) was restructured accordingly.

Mr DAUDELIN said the discussion during the afternoon session would have to be arranged so as to take full advantage of Michael Moulds and Paolo Cherchi Usai's visit at 3 PM.

The agenda was then adopted.

## 2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETINGS IN OSLO/MO

Referring to page 27, point 9.4., second paragraph, Mr SCHOU did not recall there had been any formal decision about Tony Cook leaving the Preservation Commission. Mr JEAUVONS recalled this had been assumed from the discussions in Oslo. The decision however still needed to be officially carried into effect by the NFTVA.

The minutes of the EC meetings in Oslo and Mo were then approved.

## 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF EC MEETING IN MO

- Page 6 (top): Ms ORBANZ had not informally talked with Gregory Lukow and Susan Dalton in order to receive some clarifications about who was effectively in charge of the NCFVP and its official representative in FIAF, but she would do this in writing after the EC meeting.

- Page 11 : following Mr ROSEN's point of view, Mr DAUDELIN recalled that building up the category of Associates was part of the new Executive Committee's mandate.

- Page 15 : in answer to Mr DAUDELIN, Mr JEAUVONS reported nothing specific had been done following his proposal to produce a list of well-known films that have been saved and can now be seen, explaining this was only a tactic in the general fundraising campaign.

- Page 17 : re. need to find a professional fundraiser. This issue would be discussed today under point 5.4.

- Page 19 (top): Mr DAUDELIN reported he had been able to arrange a meeting with Ms Madeline Gobeil, one of Mr Federico Mayor's Assistants. Besides, he had been invited to join the Honorary Committee Unesco had formed for the celebration of the Cinema Centenary (cfr. pt. 10).

#### 4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

##### 4.1. Reconfirmation of Members

###### 4.1.a. Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg

The Cinémathèque had not provided yet the missing elements in their reconfirmation file, which Ms ORBANZ had asked following the Oslo meeting. It was therefore decided to postpone their reconfirmation again, pending more details on their preservation activities/budget.

###### 4.1.b. Other Members due for reconfirmation

The other Members due for reconfirmation were :

- National Film and TV Archive (London)
- Film Department/ MOMA (New York)
- Det Danske Filmmuseum (Kobenhavn)
- Audio-Visual Sector, National Archives of Canada, (Ottawa)
- Film Department/George Eastman House, International Museum of Photography (Rochester)

In order to speed up the procedure, and given the EC members had been able to examine in advance each of the reconfirmation files, Ms ORBANZ suggested that the concerned archives be reconfirmed all in once. However, she first called for possible comments or questions on these files.

Mr DAUDELIN thought that Ottawa's new status of autonomy was not clear and felt that film was a very small concern to them.

Ms BLOTKAMP deplored that, in general, the provided information in the reconfirmation files was difficult to interpret and did not provide a sufficiently reliable base for decision. Shouldn't we change the procedure altogether, in its contents but also in its form, in order to be more "elegant" towards the archives ?

Mr SMITHER said this was one of the topics he would try to explore in the debriefing paper for the discussion in Bologna. He thought the concept of autonomy was very complex and believed that maybe we should try to find another way of defining a "purity of intent" about film preservation.

Referring to Eileen Bowser's paper, in which she questioned the current reconfirmation procedure's *raison d'être*, Mr JEAUVONS believed that FIAF's Rule 6 re. autonomy was very seldom followed in practice by larger institutions; we should therefore redefine to what extent the requirements for autonomy should be applied, taking into account the

complexity of each archive's structure. There were three different ways to go from here:

- either we leave it alone and judge by experience, tradition and history what are/are not the acceptable levels of autonomy in archives;
- or we take the opportunity of reconfirmation to examine carefully the set of archives who happen to be coming under the microscope at that time. In that case we should have a very positive in-depth study of these archives by reading their reports, studying their reconfirmation papers, etc, in order to see how they really operate;
- or, we just continue to accept each archive's account of itself and reconfirm them accordingly.

Referring to his experience in Canberra, Mr SCHOU believed the Rule on autonomy was a very valuable requirement and could sometimes prove very useful to preserve the various film archival departments' cohesion within a larger institution.

It was decided to further discuss the reconfirmation procedure in Bologna. Meanwhile, Ms ORBANZ suggested to have a vote on the reconfirmation of these 5 archives.

Decision : unanimous reconfirmation.

Mr HORAK accepted Ms ORBANZ' proposal to write a letter to the Film Department/George Eastman House at the International Museum of Photography in Rochester about improving support for film preservation.

Should the reconfirmation procedure be questioned now ? Mr DAUDELIN knew by experience there was a very great deal of work done by the Secretary General behind this short reconfirmation vote. He believed this work was very valuable and should be trusted, adding that regular re-examination of the archives was good for FIAF and the member itself.

Mr SMITHER felt we should not spend our time questioning procedures of long standing before re-discussing the Federation's general orientation.

#### 4.2. New candidates for affiliation

At the request of Mr COSTA, it was decided to insert in the admission questionnaire whether the candidate applies as Provisional Member or Associate.

##### 4.2.a. Cinémathèque de Bretagne

Mr DAUDELIN commented on their activities and believed they perfectly met the criteria for Associateship. After describing the links between La Cinémathèque de Toulouse



and the candidate, Mr ROCHEMONT also supported their candidature as Associate.

Decision : unanimously in favour of admission as Associate.

#### 4.2.b. Cinémathèque Méliès

Several EC members were hesitant towards their candidature.

Mr DAUDELIN was particularly unhappy with the pretentious and non-grounded note Madeleine Malthète-Méliès had added to her questionnaire. Secondly, he had heard that there was no harmonious collaboration between La Cinémathèque Méliès and la Cinémathèque Française. Besides, he had some doubts on a possible development for this very specialized archive, holding a collection of no more than 170 films. Finally, we should not take a decision before clarifying whether their affiliation would imply easier access to their specialized collection.

Mr HORAK knew by experience that Ms Malthète-Méliès was not very cooperative and pointed to the commercial side of this cinémathèque.

Ms ORBANZ wondered whether all their income was re-allocated to preservation. Mr COSTA said the preservation situation of Méliès films was not clear.

Mr JEAUVONS said most of Méliès films had been preserved by FIAF archives. Before we take a decision, we should have a clearer view of the Méliès family's exploitation rights and make sure they do no commercial exploitation. Ms Malthète-Méliès should be asked what kind of relationship she plans to have with FIAF in case she's accepted.

Mr TRUJILLO said this case related to the issue of FIAF's relations with private collectors.

The following day, after discussing with Michelle Aubert, Mr DAUDELIN reported that preservation of Cinémathèque Méliès' films was done in Bois d'Arcy.

After a long conversation with Dominique Paini the following day as well, he reported that Cinémathèque Française had valid reasons to strongly oppose to Cinémathèque Méliès joining FIAF.

Decision : it was unanimously decided to refuse Cinémathèque Méliès' candidature. Mr DAUDELIN to write to Madeleine Malthète-Méliès.

#### 4.2.c. Nasjonal Bibliotekavdelinga i Rana

Ms ORBANZ reported their file was complete and believed they could possibly qualify as Provisional Member, but she and other EC members felt that any decision on their application was premature because 1) we had received no detailed comments so far from Det Norske Filminstitut on this application and 2) the preservation plans announced in their file first needed to be carried out.

If, as announced, the National Library in Mo i Rana does become the preservation center of Norwegian film, Mr COSTA said we should anticipate what our relationship would be with the Norwegian Film Institute when they no longer do preservation.

Decision : Ms ORBANZ to write a letter to Mo i Rana saying we feel it is a bit premature and prefer to wait until their preservation scheme is effectively operating.

#### 4.2.d. Croatian Cinematheque at the Croatian State Archive

Referring to their candidature file, Ms ORBANZ recommended their admission as Provisional Member.

Decision : unanimously in favour of admission as Provisional Member

#### **4.3. Membership : miscellaneous**

##### Cinemateca Vaticana

Following the decision of the previous EC meeting, Ms ORBANZ had written to Mgr Enrique Planas to explain the EC's point of view but she had received no answer so far.

##### Taipei : renaming of the archive

Mr Jing's last proposal for the renaming of his archive was: Film Archive, Taipei. After lengthy discussion it was finally decided that Ms ORBANZ would write a letter to Beijing in the sense that "we are very happy to inform them that our colleague has come up with a solution that should satisfy all parties. Although it is not our practice to interfere or to dictate their name to our affiliates, we are most happy to make the adjustment in our future list of addresses as follows : Film Archive, Taipei in TAIWAN".

##### New requests for affiliation

It was decided that our active membership policy would be discussed at a later stage together with the cinema museums issue.

#### Deutsches Filmmuseum - Frankfurt

Ms ORBANZ reported that financial cuts had led to the closing of the cinema which was part of the Filmmuseum. There was a plan to keep the cinema going but as a commercial enterprise. Several heads of archives had already reacted personally to Mr Schobert's letter. As to FIAF's reaction to this change, it was decided that Ms ORBANZ would draft a letter in German to Mr Schobert, signed by the President.

#### Fee for lending copies to FIAF members

Ms ORBANZ was concerned that FIAF archives would no longer be able to borrow copies from their American colleagues without paying a fee of 150 US\$. A higher rate was requested for non-FIAF presentations of their preserved films.

Mr HORAK explained that American archives had now decided to charge this fee when lending films to their overseas FIAF colleagues because of the considerable amount of work involved in the handling and shipping of American films massively requested by their overseas colleagues. He added they were introducing this measure very reluctantly but had no alternative. Mr RICCI confirmed this was not a theoretical choice but a practical obligation generated by budget cuts.

Although he shared Ms ORBANZ' concerns, Mr BENARD DA COSTA believed that, sooner or later, the American rule would be followed by other FIAF archives. This would change "les règles du jeu" within FIAF and did require thorough consideration by the EC, especially if this rule was imposed later by other archives. Mr DAUDELIN believed this was an issue to be examined by the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections, adding this system might affect the quality of screenings.

Mr JEAUVONS agreed in spirit with the American policy but one had to consider the knock-on effects of this in several cases, particularly in the case of the NFTVA which would then have no other alternative than double charge access to American films from its study collections for which they were already considered as a second-rate distribution library and were under pressure from their neighbours to give access to these films because it was cheaper.

Also, he believed it was culturally important that, when one is doing cultural screenings of a national cinema, it should come from the nation itself, together with the documentation, advice and programming notes that go with the film.

He wondered to what extent this new measure was going to affect poor archives, who could certainly not afford to pay



fees ? He finally asked where the quid-pro-quo was ? Would American archives pay for foreign films ?

Mr HORAK said another knock-on effect was the Pordenone type events and their consequences, several archives wanting to repeat Pordenone at their place afterwards. Even commercial users are now coming to American archives because producers refuse to make new 35mm materials.

For Mr COSTA, this problem concerned FIAF's rules for internal relations and was linked to a larger issue: the rationalization of our work as regards the shift from "preservation only" to showing films on an international level. Why not therefore create an international film collection of the most wanted films, based in several parts of the world and becoming a central/regional FIAF repository which could be called upon separately or within the context of different film archives ? This suggestion was seconded by Ms BLOTKAMP and Mr JEAVONS, who believed it had become the brief of the Programming Commission to develop this idea. Mr RICCI strongly underlined the need to receive some assistance from the Programming Commission to help solve this unpleasant situation.

Mr JEAVONS said some thinking on this issue should also try to offer solutions to the problem of prints coming back from users in a highly damaged state.

In the case of regional repositories of films, Mr BROWN said not to forget the costs for handling and packing plus the problem of servicing the copies and checking them once they are returned and sent again.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said the issue of an international FIAF depository of films had already been discussed during the Commission meeting in Locarno but had raised many complex problems (cost, copyright,...). It would be further discussed within the Commission and with the whole Federation.

Mr DAUDELIN said we should repeat our guidelines for handling and shipping films making them even more general and explicit.

Mr RICCI believed it was in that spirit of suggestions that the situation could be helped : we should find ways of sparing the time and money involved in inspecting and repairing a print when it has come back.

#### Israel Film Archive

Mr DAUDELIN reported from Lia van Leer's letter that the archive had finally received official recognition from the Israel government, which would grant the archive not only government financial support but also the legal deposit of national production.

## 7 PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

### 7.1. International Index to Film and TV Periodicals

Mr MOULDS reported on the CD-ROM project (Annex .....). Extensive publicity would be done as soon as the leaflet is produced (end of December). He hoped to sell 40 issues this year and would need about 150 next year to break even. Sales of the CD-ROM were crucial to their future as microfiches were getting increasingly unpopular, especially with educational institutions. He was eager to receive suggestions for additional files to the CD-ROM.

Mr JEAUVONS encouraged promoting the CD-ROM in as many ways as possible (archives' newsletters, FIAF Journal, Centenary Calendar...). Mr MOULDS said that the possibility of publicizing the CD-ROM via FIAF archives' newsletters had not been exploited yet.

Mr RICCI said the four FIAF Commissions should investigate other ways in which CD-ROM and all kinds of FIAF information could be delivered in the future such as internet and long-distance networks.

Referring to the CD-ROM's considerable storage space, Mr SCHOU suggested to make it more "FIAF" by adding papers from the various Commissions.

Ms ORBANZ suggested to add some information on our holdings, in order to differentiate our disk from the others.

### 7.2. FIAF Bulletin : Journal of Film Preservation

Referring to the latest issue of the FIAF Journal, Mr CHERCHI USAI raised the following issues :

1. The editorial control should be improved as there were still many typing errors.

2. Getting contributions from the membership was still difficult and suggestions to encourage submissions in an effective way were welcomed. In its present format, the FIAF Journal was dealing with two aspects : FIAF news and more general archival activities. For the time being, it was appropriate to keep these two aspects into a single publication, given the difficulty to collect enough material for only one issue and because the Bulletin was now intended to be used as a promotional tool to inform the general public about archive work. But in the future, we should envisage to separate these two aspects in two different publications.

3. Availability and diffusion. In order to meet the increasing financial requirements of the Journal's publication, one had to stimulate subscriptions. One way of doing this was to first publicize the Journal by sending it free for one or two year(s) to a selected series of people who could promote it. Archives should therefore be asked to provide us with a list of institutions/individuals likely to do this promotion job.

However, he was rather discouraged by the lack of cooperation of the membership in any aspect of the diffusion of the Bulletin or to bring in some paid publicity, in spite of all the efforts made until now.

4. Future developments. With energies currently available, the editorial board had reached almost a maximum and would need another three issues to provide results which it could really be proud of.

Mr CHERCHI USAI's report brought about some comments from several EC members :

Mr SCHOU suggested to send out publicity for the Bulletin together with the flyer on the CD-ROM.

Mr COSTA praised the FIAF Journal in its present format, saying we had reached a good balance between internal and external news. He was confident subscriptions could easily be obtained from the archives' usual audience if the latter were informed of the coming issues' contents. Mr CHERCHI USAI regretted this was not possible for the moment because there were no regular contributions he could count on.

In answer to Mr DAUDELIN, the editor said no distribution policy had been designed yet to market the FIAF Journal in specialized bookshops but he was rather sceptic about the financial return from this type of distribution.

Mr JEAVONS wanted to encourage the archives to buy some copies of the FIAF Journal and resell them to whatever outlet they can find (museums, bookshops,...). He also stressed the need to find advertisers for the Journal to support the high publication costs.

He suggested to publish regular series of profiles of our colleague archives and reprint existing articles in other journals. Also, since not everyone could or had the time to deliver a finished piece but might have very good "raw material" to offer in terms of information, he asked to what extent would the editors be able to process this material and make it publishable? Mr CHERCHI USAI said this was already happening but insisted that, given the editors' limited availability, the more they could get in an acceptable form for publication, the better it was.



On the issue of advance planning, Ms ORBANZ remarked we could ask for more papers on the topic of future Symposia to those in charge of their organisation. Ms BLOTKAMP would like to see more book reviews.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA believed one should regularly foresee special issues on polemical questions of general concern. And also a regular column of lost and found films.

Mr RICCI said it was important to continue focussing the attention of members on critical issues and to find a way of integrating the Journal into the possible changes that were being discussed by the EC members. He concluded UCLA was interested in having an intricate relationship with the Journal about the Congress in Los Angeles.

In answer to Ms HARRISON, Mr CHERCHI USAI explained the editorial board's selection and revision policy, saying the Commissions' expertise was considered as one of the admission criteria for technical articles. The Bulletin was meant to be an easily readable Journal without too many footnotes and avoiding jargon as its audience also included non-specialists. It was therefore not meant to be a truly academic publication, but a contribution to the permanence and the knowledge of the film heritage.

Ms ORBANZ thanked Mr CHERCHI USAI for the excellent work achieved by the Journal's editorial Board.

### 7.3. International Directory of Costume and Set Designers in Film

Ms ORBANZ had received a letter from SAUR informing us of the decrease in sale figures and adding that the issue n° 13 (Russia) would be the last volume of the series unless FIAF wanted to contribute financially. Besides, Mr KRAUTZ had informed Ms ORBANZ he would step down from his editor's position for this publication.

Pointing to the absence of SAUR publicity for FIAF publications, Mr SMITHER suggested to look at our relationship with this publisher at the next EC meeting in Bologna and therefore prepare a kind of overall report on our collaboration with the editor. (Eva: how should we do this?)

### 7.4. Promotion leaflet for FIAF

The project was temporarily dropped as Ms AUBERT considered the Bulletin and the Calendar were presently playing this role of promotion. Furthermore, she was still planning to publish the results of the Survey she had made last year among the whole FIAF membership, results which would prove quite revealing of the archives' and FIAF's achievements.



#### 7.5. Proceedings of the Newsreel Symposium

Mr SMITHER reported that Jim Ballantyne from the British University's Film and Video Council in London hoped to find some support to publish the International Directory of Newsreel Collections, proposed by Mr Klaue.

The outstanding amount from the Lauritzen Foundation's grant for the symposium was made available to support publication of the Symposium's proceedings, which Mr SMITHER and Mr KLAUE were willing to edit and have published after Bologna. Contributions would be transcribed by the Secretariat, including the papers prepared by Jorge Nieto and Amy Kronish.

Mr HORAK felt that Mr SMITHER and Mr KLAUE should practice editorial discretion to select papers to be published; he also had a suggestion for a publisher that might be interested.

Mr SMITHER finally reported that Jerry Kuehl was interested in running a Newsreel Symposium 2 in London.

#### 7.6. FIAF Statistics

Answers to FIAF's annual questionnaire for statistics were difficult to compile whereas Ms AUBERT's similar but general (not annual) questionnaire (see above) had proven very successful. Ms VAN DER ELST therefore proposed to simplify FIAF's questionnaire in view of a quicker compilation, thus enabling the President to incorporate results in his report to the General Assembly. This was agreed.

#### 7.7. Book : "Pathé 1900"

Mr DAUDELIN reported that this publication, edited by Domitor and co-financed by FIAF, had just come out. FIAF would receive a hundred copies to be distributed to all affiliates.

#### 7.8. Directory of Moving Image and Sound Archives

Mr KLAUE's report on the publication had been circulated.

Following Ms ORBANZ' suggestion, the decision on a possible second edition including more institutions was postponed until the next NGO Round Table (March 1994).

Mr SMITHER supported the Directory but thought that future editions should distinguish more clearly between commercial and non-commercial archives.

On the issue of publications in general, Ms BLOTKAMP suggested to appoint someone in the EC responsible for publications (deadlines, contact with editor, financing...). This could certainly be a task for the possible future Senior Administrator.

A list of all planned publications and their priorities should be drafted. Ms ORBANZ recalled that M. Aubert had prepared some years ago an application form for publications to

#### 7.9. A philosophy of film archiving (Ray Edmondson)

Although there was a general interest from FIAF to take active part in the proposed discussion about *A philosophy of film archiving*, the paper issued by Ray Edmondson about IASA's expanding into other audiovisual media brought about many comments from the EC members. After a short discussion, Mr DAUDELIN agreed to answer to Mr Edmondson and explain that, considering the importance of the issues underlying his proposals and the lack of time left, the EC had postponed its decision until Bologna where we would have the opportunity to meet with him and discuss the matter.

### 5 FINANCES

#### 5.1. Current Accounts

Mr JEAUVONS, who had recently met with Ms VAN DER ELST in Brussels to examine the accounts, commented on them in great detail for the benefit of the newcomers to the EC.

He stressed the need to discuss whether or not the EC meeting budget should be raised to partly support the participation of EC members.

The "Bulletin" item was considerably over budget because of our decision in Norway to upgrade the Journal and have a heavier print run.

The figure for "training and summer school" was a kind of standing figure against the possibility of having a special training session during the budget year. As this figure had not been spent this year, it would be bounced forward into next year's budget.

The centenary Calendar had represented a considerable expenditure but transportation costs for future issues would be lower. Assuming everyone did appreciate the calendar, Mr JEAUVONS said this project would continue to be an expense against the "Centenary" entry and would be carried on by Cornelia Emerson at UCLA in Los Angeles.

To summarize, the year end result was quite healthy, and the Treasurer announced he would make a suggestion concerning the problem of membership payments later down the agenda.

Following Mr RICCI's suggestion, it was decided that the Secretariat would do another round of the circular letter about anticipatory payment.

## 5.2. Draft budget for 1995

The budget for 1995 had been drafted on line with the 1994 budget, hoping that there would be money put in the Centennial and Development funds.

Some adjustments were made in the 1994 budget :

- Bank charges were adjusted down to 30.000,- BEF.
- Special Publications were adjusted down to 150.000,- BEF for 1994 and to 200.000,- for 1995.
- Mr HORAK suggested to adjust the 1994 expenditure figure for the Bulletin up to 400.000,- BEF.
- At Ms ORBANZ' request, office supplies and equipment were budgeted slightly higher. She also reminded not to forget payment for interpretation at the EC.

In answer to Mr SCHOU, Mr JEAUVONS said that any surplus from the yearly Commission budget could either be kept in the bank account to hold against any deficit we might make in the future or be rolled over and earmarked for a particular Commission purpose.

In this respect, Ms BLOTKAMP believed there should be more discipline in foreseeing potential events and earmarking money for them (Special publications, Summer Schools, Commission projects...). Mr JEAUVONS agreed, encouraging people to notify the Secretariat as soon as possible of what expenses they expected for publications, travel, participation costs, etc. Anyone who thinks he/she has a valid reason to call on the FIAF funds should always submit his/her request to the Treasurer.

The draft budget for 1995 would be distributed as usual to the membership well in advance of the General Assembly.

## 5.3. Possible deletion of affiliates in arrears of payment for their membership subscriptions

Referring to the list of unpaid subscriptions, the Treasurer raised the question of how to deal with those archives who are chronically late or in great difficulty ?

Although he fully understood the intentions behind the plan to restructure our membership subscriptions system in order to provide a permanent situation of support for those who will continue to struggle, Mr JEAUVONS felt it was premature to try to institute now a system of radical changes in the

fee structure, which might create embarrassing situations and could in the end lead to claims of unfairness and inequality. Most hardship cases were from one part of the world where there reside no hard currency or no money at all. On the other hand, they were in that context relatively few and identifiable. The situation could not be called a general crisis and be used as a basis for restructuring a relatively stable subscription system which brings in adequate revenue. Whatever fee structure we reconstruct, we will not be able to get anything from those who have a "zero-ability" to pay. We should rather take the hardships cases one by one on their merits for the time being and judge their circumstances and choose whether or not their predicament is genuine and serious enough to need special support from FIAF either in all or in part, and subsidize the subscriptions from any FIAF surplus revenue. We should therefore put in place a system whereby the Treasurer and the Secretariat create and lead a small advisory subgroup on membership subscriptions to monitor and administer special cases, emergencies and disasters.

We should also try to arrive at a fairer system by following up Mary Lea Bandy's proposal, i.e. to lean on major archives and invite them to pay voluntary extra annual sums (500 US\$ or 1,000 US\$) if and when they can do so, to go into a specific earmarked support fund for the more needy archives. This would imply a more active and generous recruitment attitude and a greater latitude towards Associates.

In conclusion, Mr JEAUVONS believed it fair to hope and expect that anyone who wants to be a member of FIAF and derive all the benefits from it must, in principle, try to pay at least something towards his/her membership even if he/she can't pay it at all. If they show good faith, it is then easier to try to match their needs on at least a loan basis even if it is unpaid loan.

Mr HORAK fully agreed with the Treasurer and strongly supported the "case by case" approach, especially for newer Associates.

Ms BLOTKAMP also agreed with the approach : figures should then be adjusted accordingly in the 1995 budget. Mr JEAUVONS said the figure would emerge either in notes or in reporting.

Ms ORBANZ agreed in theory but did not fully share Mr JEAUVONS' optimism, pointing out that some "hardship cases" had not even been able to pay the non-increased subscriptions of 1991.



Mr TRUJILLO reported that Luis Rosario Albert had left the archive of Puerto Rico but their subscription for 1992 was underway. In Rio, problems of payment were linked to difficult communication between the Cinemateca and the Brazilian Museum of Modern Art.

Mr NIETO reported that Cinemateca Distrital in Bogotá also had some difficulty in obtaining the money from its parent institution. He had also received a fax from Lima accepting to pay the due amount. He agreed with Mr JEAUVONS it was premature to restructure the membership system but still, he believed we needed a kind of sliding scale of dues and was not really in favour of helping archives in difficulty with FIAF money.

In addition to case by case examination, (and the above mentioned cases showed one had to be very well informed), Mr JEAUVONS suggested that, rather than adopting another needy archive, "rich" archives pay a contribution to a central support fund which the Treasurer could then dispense to the genuinely hard-up.

Ms BLOTKAMP urged not to forget the notion of "adoption" in terms of technical assistance or consultancy, saying that difficulty in paying subscription fees was often hiding other kinds of problems requiring assistance. In this respect, Ms ORBANZ said the annual reports were a very interesting source of information on the archives' various problems

Mr COSTA advocated that one of the *raisons d'être* of our Federation was to offer active international solidarity. FIAF itself has very little means to help. It is therefore important that everybody contributes to this solidarity according to his own capacities. In that respect, he spoke in favour of a sliding scale of fees, related to each archive's budget, insisting on keeping a significant Development or Emergency Fund. He believed we should develop a more active policy for subscribers directed to institutions interested in being kept informed of the film archives' world. Mr HORAK deplored that some subscribers were behaving as if they were affiliates. We should either encourage them to become Associate or be very strict in our relationship with them as far as loans and exchanges are concerned.

Mr JEAUVONS said that Ms AUBERT's draft proposal for a graded system of membership fees could be further examined but he repeated his concern that this was not the appropriate solution for the time being, which Ms AUBERT had also agreed.

#### 5.4. Report of the Fundraising Committee

There were two aspects underlying the "fundraising" issue:

1. creating more publicity for FIAF and making it known worldwide. The projects concretised so far to this end were the "FIAF 100 years of cinema fund drive" leaflet and the centenary calendar, which archives had been asked to disseminate as largely as possible. Mary Lea Bandy was still working on the possible creation of a Honorary Committee which would act as a representative element of the fundraising in FIAF. The EC was waiting for her report. She was also progressing the idea of trying to get Cannes in 1994 to give FIAF the Rossellini prize (20.000 US\$ cash), in which case, an important event (reception + screening of a restored film) would be organized in Cannes to celebrate the achievement. This would be a golden opportunity to raise awareness of the need for fundraising towards FIAF.

2. raising 1,000,000 US\$ for the Endowment Fund by

a) Internal fundraising. All FIAF affiliates had just received the circular letter entitled "A film show for FIAF", in line with Luis de Pina's suggestion. The proposal issued in Mo i Rana by Anna-Lena Wibom and Michelle Aubert to enlist some 20 FIAF archives to get funds towards our Endowment Fund had not been successful. According to Mr JEAUVONS, the trouble with this proposal was that archives were already involved in fundraising for themselves. In London, he had approached Mr Paul Getty Jr but had received no answer yet.

b) External fundraising. The Treasurer was convinced we could not raise serious funds without employing someone to do this job, either by a professional fundraiser outside FIAF, on a self-financing basis, or through a permanent Chief Executive Officer at the Secretariat. In this case, fundraising would help to pay this person's salary. Going into such a campaign did require a list of concrete projects to be funded. In answer to Mr RICCI, Mr JEAUVONS said the definition of such key-projects should be obtained from a round up letter sent to all our affiliates. Ms VAN DER ELST explained she had been approached by Fudji's representative for the European Community countries, who had expressed Fudji's interest in receiving a list of key-projects to be sponsored, with detailed costing.

Mr JEAUVONS reported many kinds of projects had already been identified (summer schools or any kind of training event, FIAF technical manual, storage buildings for archives in tropical countries, travel and hotel costs for delegates from developing countries at the 1995 Congress, scholarship to underwrite archive training, creation of a classic film

print collection...) but all these should be defined and needed time-consuming preparation before they could be presented: another possible task for a Senior Administrator. He believed Fudji's contribution could easily be solicited for receiving film stock, or to grant cash prizes for preservation and restoration achievements within FIAF.

Ms BLOTKAMP insisted that a possible Senior Administrator should first of all try to consolidate the category of Subscribers and thereby raise funds via the selling of the information we already have (address'lists, databases...).

On the issue of recognition of donors, especially in the case of the 1995 Congress, Mr RICCI asked for guidance on how to distinguish between recognition for a donation to the Endowment Fund and recognition for sponsorship of certain Congress events.

Mr SCHOU disagreed with the idea of associating any of the Preservation Commission work with film stock manufacturers; this would make the Commission run the risk of losing its independence and credibility.

Conclusion : the Development and Centenary Funds are still empty. C. JEAUVONS, M. L. BANDY and M. AUBERT would be responsible for the next stage of this approach and would stir the fundraising initiatives by namely coopting more relevant persons.

## 6 COMMENTS ON THE REPORTS OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

### 6.1. Report of the Documentation Commission

In the absence of Mr MAGLIOZZI, Mr DAUDELIN called for remarks on the Commission's written report that had been circulated to the members.

Several EC members felt perplexed towards the last paragraph of Mr MAGLIOZZI's report. Mr RICCI felt the intention of our brainstorming session had been misunderstood. We should let this know to Mr MAGLIOZZI and insist that we give him full confidence in his work. His report again showed that the Commission was very active and dedicated. Mr COSTA fully agreed. Mr DAUDELIN said he would report about this to Mr MAGLIOZZI.

Ms VAN DER ELST submitted to the EC's approval Mr MAGLIOZZI's and Ms DALTON's suggestion to update Jacques Ledoux' catalog of silent feature films and put it on a database similar to the "Treasures" Database on Silent Cinema. Gabrielle Claes had already welcomed this project but reminded that the question of confidentiality of this catalog still remained.



Mr COSTA strongly encouraged the development of databases in general but doubted we should keep secrecy. Commissions should make it a priority to work at making national databases more compatible. In this respect, Ms HARRISON said the Cataloguing Commission was eager to receive the EC's ideas and help in pushing the common standards that had already been set up, now that Internet was nearly operational.

Mr HORAK felt the creation of such an integrated database was the task of the Cataloguing Commission rather than any other Commission. He suggested to the Documentation Commission to look into areas of documentation which, seemingly, had been neglected in the past, i.e. standards for storage of all kinds of paper documents held by many archives in very large collections, that are important in the study and documentation of cinema history. Ms ORBANZ replied this project was on the agenda of Mr MAGLIOZZI's paper: "History and Goals of the Documentation Commission", (New York 1992 EC meeting). Mr HORAK then asked to make this project an area of concentration now.

#### 6.2. Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Ms HARRISON presented the various documents included in her written report.

She called for some EC guidance to determine on which of the following main areas of projects the Commission should concentrate :

- 1) standards for cataloguing moving images;
- 2) production of projects such as databases;
- 3) occasional papers.

She then commented each Commission project and recommended Ms Olwen Terris as full member of the Commission, which was accepted. She explained that the corresponding members system was used as a means of establishing a more direct communication and getting additional interest in the Commission's proposed projects.

The Treasurer accepted Ms HARRISON's request to save for 1994 the money left from the 1993 Commission's allocated budget (namely to subsidize C. R. de Souza's travel to the next Commission meeting).

Ms BLOTKAMP recognized the importance of a common format but also encouraged developing software conversion systems, saying it would take long before archives change their software system in view of standardization. Ms HARRISON explained that using the same communications' format was a prerequisite to making software systems convertible.



Ms ORBANZ asked whether the Cataloguing Commission was informed of the proposed Joint Cataloguing Symposium (announced by Gerald Gibson, and noted in the Round Table NGO's calendar of events) and what their point of view was. Ms HARRISON said that it was an interesting project, although she had not heard about it. Participation of the Cataloguing Commission would depend on an early involvement in the preparation of this event.

Mr COSTA said some corrections were needed in the FIAF Glossary of Filmographic Terms as regarded specific regional terms and did not believe additional languages would be worth publishing in book form, given the publication's restricted interest outside the archive world.

### 6.3. Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr Schou commented on his written report, and especially the extension of the Commission brief to electronic media, which was strongly approved.

Mr JEAUVONS took this idea a stage further and suggested that the Preservation Commission think of expanding itself to embrace all technical matters relating to archival moving images, including not only preservation of film and electronic media but also matters of restoration and presentation (standards for cinematheque projections, copying of all kinds, etc...). This would be a way of maintaining a monitoring eye on the fast developing and sometimes out of control ideas and techniques. It would also, from an internal point of view, help to close the gap between preservation and access work. The Commission should therefore be called the "Technical Commission" rather than the "Preservation Commission".

Mr SCHOU was officially asked to :

1. change the name of the Commission into "Technical Commission"
2. expand the brief of the Commission and redefine its mandate
3. expand its current membership.

### 6.4. Report of the Commission for Programming and Access to Collections

Changes in membership : Manuel Martinez Carril did no longer attend Commission meetings and Steven Ricci had resigned from the Commission after the Mo i Rana Congress as a result of an overload of work.

The Commission members now were : J. BENARD DA COSTA (President), G. CLAES, C. GAUTIER, E. KRAMER and D. PAÏNI.

They had met in Locarno (9-11 August 1993) to elaborate on the Commission's main themes of discussion, namely :

1. programming and today's audience
2. programming and the concept of exhibition of a collection (film archives/film museums)
3. programming and re-writing of the cinema history
4. programming and the status of cinema vs. other art forms
5. role of archive programming in (re)discovering the specificity of contemporary cinema.

The discussion on these objectives would be carried on during the Bologna meeting at the end of November, whereafter, the Chairman would send a written report to the Executive Committee.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA then reported on the ongoing projects :

1. Jean-Pierre Verscheure's Manual for technical standards and guidelines for projection was nearing completion. Mr BENARD DA COSTA explained that, by elaborating on the identification of different sound techniques, Mr Verscheure had largely gone beyond the Commission's intention.

It was agreed that, if this work was to be officially published by FIAF, it should first be submitted to the Programming Commission's approval and "double-checked" (as a matter of consistency with other works published under FIAF's name) by the Preservation Commission before being recommended for publication to the EC.

It was agreed to simultaneously look for an editor.

Mr SCHOU raised the questions of how to finance the book's color reproductions and how to clear copyrights on photographs and diagrams.

2. Mr CHERCHI USAI was progressing his work on the Manual for research and access to collections, due to be presented at the Bologna Congress and published in July 1994.

3. The Comments on the Survey on programming and access in film archives and the results of a survey on programming in film archives from 1989 to 1993 would also be presented at the Bologna Congress.

4. The Commission had already received a few answers to the questionnaire sent to all FIAF archives regarding the five categories of programmes to be held in the context of the cinema centenary and the work on the Alan Dwann retrospective was going on.

## 8 NEW WORKING GROUPS

### Training

Mr JEAUVONS reported there had not been much progress because of the pressure of other obligations. The Training Group's members were : Clyde Jeavons, Ivan Trujillo, Steven Ricci and Michelle Aubert.

The following Consultants were also envisaged: Vittorio Boarini, David Cleveland (East Anglian Film Archive), Maxime Fleckner (Wisconsin Center for Film & Th. Research), + by implicit cooption: the Commission Heads.

Mr JEAUVONS reported the training group intended to produce a training questionnaire to be sent to all FIAF archives to 1° analyse the extent of formal training in FIAF and all the needs for training within film archive environments and 2° extrapolate a more detailed training plan from that analysis.

Ongoing activities included

- 1° Unesco's plan to hold a meeting of the working group on Curriculum Development for the training of personnel in moving images and recorded sound archives in Brussels, December 1993 and
- 2° the European Union FORCE programme, designed to bring together technical film archivists and film laboratories and develop mutual training of technical staff in all aspects of film restoration/preservation. Target date: January 1994.

Both 1° and 2° would be reported on at the next EC meeting.

The working group's intention to hold a Summer School in 1995, possibly in Berkhamsted, was generally welcomed.

Mr JEAUVONS concluded by saying that the coordination of such training activities and consultancy initiatives would be a significant function for a possible FIAF senior administrator.

Mr HORAK reported that AMIA was involved in a similar training approach for film and television archives.

### Cinema Museums

Referring to his written report which strongly advocated the expansion of FIAF's mandate to museums dedicated specifically to the history of the cinema, Mr HORAK raised two questions :

- should we establish an effective working group ?
- should this working group invite the institutions listed in the report to become associated with FIAF ?

We were now all under pressure to make our collections accessible to a larger audience, and there were radical differences in the concept of museology and the way film history was presented. There were already a lot of institutions involved in this kind of exhibitions, which did not necessarily have collections of moving images. As we shared their concerns for exhibition, we should think of integrating them into FIAF.

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr BENARD DA COSTA agreed this was a major issue for most FIAF members. Referring to our Statutes and Rules, Ms ORBANZ added this expansion was one of the Federation's objectives. She believed a working group should be established to evaluate the way of broadening of FIAF to these institutions.

Mr DAUDELIN reported on a symposium on filmmuseums which he had attended in Düsseldorf recently where, together with Mr Klaue, he had insisted that FIAF was the right forum for such reflection to take place. The concept of museology in the field of cinema was still non-existent, which led to enormous mistakes. It was time for FIAF to start working on this issue.

Mr COSTA thought such a working group should concentrate on the concept of museology in the wider sense, i.e. on the integration of all FIAF affiliates in the actual film culture, and not limit itself to the acquisition, exchange, preservation and cataloguing of artefacts. The relation between film archives and film museums should be the subject of one of our future major symposia. Mr HORAK agreed, but said we could not wait for such a symposium to bring film museums into FIAF, at least the non-profit institutions.

Mr DAUDELIN said Mr HORAK's reflection should be pursued at the General Assembly as it applied not only to our respective exhibition policies but also to the institutional future of FIAF.

It was agreed to make this item an agenda point for the next EC meeting and to include it in the larger debate on the expansion of FIAF membership during the General Assembly.

Decision : Mr HORAK to draft a letter to non-commercial museums inviting them to Bologna to initiate discussions and to chair the workshop on film museums in Bologna.

#### **Election procedures**

Cfr. Ms BLOTKAMP's discussion paper on the future of FIAF. This item was postponed until the next EC meeting



## 9 CENTENARY PLANS

Calendar : it was decided to put a date and number on the following issues of the Calendar. Mr COSTA said one should find a way of encouraging more archives to contribute to this Calendar in order to make it truly representative.

Ms VAN DER ELST encouraged the EC members to use the FIAF Centenary Logo especially intended to centenary-related projects.

## 10 FUTURE CONGRESSES

### 10.1. Bologna 1994

Mr BOARINI's written report was circulated. Some clarification was still needed regarding registration fees. The question of "commercial" sponsorship for some Congress activities was discussed and agreed upon.

#### Dates

The EC accepted Mr Boarini's request to postpone the Congress by 1 day (23 instead of 22 April), in order to avoid accomodation problems (there was a Cosmetics Trade Fair scheduled in Bologna until April 25).

#### Workshops

1. Film museums : half a day
2. Film schools/film archives : Mr RICCI would investigate whether Bob Rosen was still willing to hold a session on this.

Mr HORAK reported that Mr Geoffrey Selznick was willing to have a forum in Bologna to present the results of his recent attempts in Beijing to recreate the technicolor process in preservation using separation negatives.

Mr JEAUVONS thought the contents of this demonstration should first be carefully examined by the Preservation Commission before we allow it to take place during the Congress.

Final decision: Mr HORAK to ask Mr Farinelli possibly to plan this demonstration in the frame of the Festival *Il Cinema Ritrovato*.

Mr SCHOU suggested to hold the Preservation Commission meeting in Bologna and would write to the organizers to this end.

### 10.2. Los Angeles 1995

Mr RICCI reported that the organizers had begun negotiations for accomodation, translation, visas, etc. They were also preparing the Congress logo which should be ready for Bologna.

Report to be continued in further details in Bologna.

## 11 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### 11.1 Relations with Unesco

Ms ORBANZ reported the 15,000 US\$ Unesco grant initially intended for the 1993 (cancelled) JTS had been re-allocated to the following contracts :

1. meeting of the working group for the Curriculum Development for the training of personnel in moving images and recorded sound archives.
2. TCC meeting at the end of November 1993 in Germany

Ms ORBANZ had sent some comments on the Unesco budget for 1994-1995, insisting that training be foreseen also for audiovisual archives.

She had also written a six-page letter to Unesco in view of the upgrading of the Federation from B to A Status and was still waiting for an answer.

After repeated approaches, we had obtained that the "Memory of the World" project also include audiovisual archives.

Mr DAUDELIN had been invited to join the Unesco Honorary Committee for the Cinema Centenary to endorse the actions Unesco intended to develop on that occasion but, for schedule and geographical reasons, Ms AUBERT had represented FIAF at the Unesco General Conference on November 2d where its President, Mr Federico Mayor, had underlined the importance of saving the world film heritage and asked Unesco to financially support this task.

Mr DAUDELIN was to meet with Madeleine Gobeil on the next day about our Centenary related projects and our collaboration with Unesco on this matter.

### 11.2. Relations with other international organisations

Council of Europe : Mr JEAUVONS reported that the elaboration of a convention for the protection of audiovisual materials in Europe was progressing. The draft document related to this issue would become a working paper at the Bologna symposium on legal deposit.

CITRA : Mr TRUJILLO reported on the last CITRA (Conférence Internationale de la Table Ronde des Archives, sub-group of ICA) conference in Mexico and suggested to invite a CITRA representative to our congresses.

Lumière : Mr COSTA reported that

1° new restoration projects had been agreed,

2° the project for the search of lost films had obtained some concrete results in Madrid,

3° the European filmography had reached a final proposal for its format, which would be tested in a meeting in Madrid, beg. December.

He concluded by saying that Lumière was growing among the various MEDIA programmes (increased work, increased awareness, increased budget).

## 12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

EC meeting in Fall 1994 : Mr DAUDELIN would investigate the possibility of meeting in Tunis during the Carthage Festival. Otherwise, Mr TRUJILLO offered to host the meeting in Mexico.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Paris, 5 - 6 November 1993

**Present**

Robert DAUDELIN  
Eva ORBANZ  
Clyde JEAUVONS

President  
Secretary General  
Treasurer

**Members**

Hoos BLOTKAMP  
José Manuel COSTA  
Jan-Christopher HORAK  
Jorge NIETO  
Vladimir OPELA  
José Maria PRADO  
Guy-Claude ROCHEMONT  
Steven RICCI  
Roger SMITHER  
Ivan TRUJILLO BOLIO

**Commission Heads \***

Joao BENARD DA COSTA

Commission for Programming  
and Access to Collections  
Cataloguing Commission  
Preservation Commission

Harriet HARRISON  
Henning SCHOU

\* only from November 5 on 14.00

**Honorary Member**

Harold Brown  
Wolfgang Klaue

**Secretariat**

Brigitte VAN DER ELST

Executive Secretary

**Excused**

Ronald MAGLIOZZI

Head of Documentation  
Commission



MINUTES OF THE EC MEETING IN PARIS / 5 - 6 NOVEMBER 1993

The first session of this meeting was held in the presence of the elected members of the EC only.

After a word of welcome by Dominique Païni, director of the Cinémathèque Française and host of our meeting, the President, Robert Daudelin introduced the debate. He underlined that total liberty of speech should be the rule and that the responsibility of the debate remained with the group who had prepared it, i.e. José-Manuel Costa, José-Maria Prado and Hoos Blotkamp.

Referring to the numerous and interesting papers they had received from most of the EC members, J-M. Costa said that most of the mentioned problems came to a few main issues:

- the identity of FIAF's membership
- the accessibility to the collections (are we dealing with this correctly?)
- the nature and size of FIAF (more members, different kinds of members?)

These essential questions could take years to be solved but we should aim for the Centennial deadline.

They also needed a strong basic structure of the Federation (General Assembly, Executive Committee, Commissions, Secretariat, Congresses...) and this is why the group proposed to limit the agenda of today's meeting to the only questions related to FIAF's structure. The big issues of membership should be discussed at a later stage when the structure and the governing bodies of FIAF have been clearly defined and strengthened. This approach was supported by Chris Horak.

H. Blotkamp explained their reasons for holding this first part of the EC meeting with "elected" members only. The "group", after reading some of the papers, felt there was obviously a problem of communication between the EC and the Commissions. They thought it was a question of "leadership" of the EC rather than "power".

A general discussion followed on the work of :

- a) the Executive Committee
- b) the Commissions

Clyde Jeavons recalled that no power authority had ever been used in the EC, but it was worth discussing whether this was effective. Perhaps the time had come to shrug off some of our amateurism and make a few changes in our work habits. Roger Smither also felt that FIAF lacked a policy-making body. As the GA was difficult to galvanize to exert this right, the EC should be entrusted with this task.

C.J. felt that "better efficiency" had to do with better geographical representation, specialized groups of archives, etc... Economics was a major factor in this issue. To appoint a senior Administrator at the Secretariat might alleviate several of the above problems, also in taking some of the burden off the EC members' shoulders. Both R. Daudelin and E. Orbanz agreed on this: the officers in the EC were willing to do more for FIAF but simply did not have the time nor the means.

C. Horak agreed that the elected EC must have an executive function and not only an advisory role. He endorsed W. Klaue's suggestion to divide the tasks among all EC members.

Jorge Nieto felt there was a confrontation between an "ideal" and a "feasible" FIAF. We should try to be highly practical and economical in order to be able to help individual archives rather than search for the ideal structure.

Speaking on Commissions, S. Ricci hoped one could find a way to make them more representative geographically and profession-wise. We must recognize that their work is voluntary and be thankful for that, but also support them with more "interest" and active guidance.

GC Rochemont fully supported this statement. C. Jeavons felt they were underbriefed and undermonitored by the EC, but this was probably the EC's fault.

For R. Smither, the problem of "lack of communication" with the Commissions was a phoney issue. The Heads of Commissions regularly reported both to the EC and the GA, but the response was almost total silence from both bodies. Their 2d role was to extend the constituency of FIAF: they represented vital professional skills and the membership should be aware of this perspective. We should continue to invite them to attend EC meetings but perhaps not the whole meeting. V. Opela entirely agreed with R. Smither.

E. Orbanz also saw no reason to exclude the Heads of Commissions from EC meetings, on the contrary. As for the Honorary Members, whilst acknowledging their great experience and the services they might still render to the Federation, she said that most of their letters referred to the fact that they had lost contact with our work. We should do everything in our power to have them participate in our work and our meetings.

C. Jeavons agreed we should be open to voluntary participation and work on their part, in special tasks that would fit their individual skills, but not impose an active role on them.

For reasons of efficiency and better functioning of the meetings, the following Recommendation was finally passed (by 10 votes for and 3 votes against): "The Executive Committee 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."

After lunch, the EC members were joined by Henning Schou, Harriet Harrison (Heads of Commissions), Harold Brown and Wolfgang Klaue (Honorary Members).

The President summarized the discussion of this same morning and asked for comments on the part of

1° Honorary Members

J.M. Costa repeated his suggestions to entrust the Honorary members with tasks such as:

- representing FIAF in some international forums (e.g. Unesco), not for active participation but to affirm our existence and the necessity of AV preservation;
- to present papers on film archiving at some important conferences, on behalf of FIAF;
- participation in FIAF's annual Symposia to present the experience of the past. Etc...

H. Schou having underlined that Harold Brown was already more than active in the Preservation Commission, W. Klaue responded to J.M. Costa's suggestions with the need to be realistic and remember that Hon. Members were not anymore in close contact with the daily life of the Federation and therefore could not represent it very usefully. As for participating in Symposia, it would be difficult for most of the Honorary Members as they did not dispose of the backing and logistics of their institution anymore.

H. Brown added that, as regarded his particular field of expertise, he did not see the use of sitting at administrative meetings but he could still be helpful by giving advice through the mail or other writings if needed. Based on this discussion, Ms Blotkamp said the group would try to come up with suggestions on how to take advantage in the future of the great experience of our seven present Honorary Members, for the benefit of FIAF.

## 2° Commissions Heads

Both H. Schou and H. Harrison agreed that they would like to see the work of their Commission expanded geographically and covering the various types of archives that exist, but there were limitations to a larger membership for the Commissions both in the Rules and for economic reasons. Corresponding membership was interesting but had its limits too, especially when there were no deadlines of actual meetings to motivate their work for the Commission. R. Daudelin recalled that the notion of corresponding membership had also been evoked as a way of solving the problem of a wider geographical representation.

C. Jeavons insisted on the consultancy role that FIAF Commissions should play. We are the experts in the archive field and yet we do not advise new archival institutions enough. He thought that the financial problem was not a real problem. Finally, he wondered whether a new Commission on Training would not be useful.

W. Klaue said FIAF had always expected from its Commissions to compile specialized information in their field and to spread this knowledge around the membership. This second role is not entirely fulfilled. He did not think new Commissions were a solution but perhaps one could think of other ways, e.g; "working-groups" put together for a limited period of time and for a definite task. He again recalled that Commissions' activities were based on available unpaid human resources, not so easy to find. Perhaps they had a tendency to start too many projects at a time which consequently took time to complete, but this is where some guidance of the EC would be useful. Therefore it was necessary that regular contacts with the EC be foreseen in the Rules, and not only to discuss their particular field. Commission Heads must also be kept aware of the general policy of the Federation.

Referring to Rule 77 (Heads of Commissions should formulate programs of activities), Jorge Nieto felt that the membership should be consulted on priorities for these programs, taking into consideration the needs of all the archives, including developing archives. Ivan Trujillo also raised the problem of the participation of archive staff (other than curators) in the specialized workshops at annual Congresses.

C. Jeavons thought that the Commissions, whilst very active, were perhaps too much "project-based" and not enough "issue-based". There should be more debate on general issues and this debate could be generated by the Commissions themselves, not only by the EC.



Eva Orbanz agreed that, whilst it had already started, a new more concrete trend in the activities and reports of the Commissions should be encouraged: e.g. greater participation in the Symposia, better contacts with the "industry" and the publication of practical rules...

On the issue of consultancy, Harold Brown said that the Commissions very rarely had a call from the people who needed their help. How could the archives be prompted to express what they expected from the Commissions?

Following V. Opela, an obstacle to greater participation from the membership was that Commissions had reached such level of expertise that it was difficult for ordinary staff members of the archives to contribute to their work. Roger Smither added that the people attending General Assemblies or the EC meetings were not the right people to be alert to what the Commissions are about. The General Assemblies are on the whole a gathering of curators; the Commissions seek beyond that to communicate with the specialized staff in the archives. Perhaps there is no solution to this problem, even by organizing workshops at Congresses since these staff members don't come to Congresses.

To fill in vacancies in the Commissions' membership is another problem since so many conditions are required: a certain level of expertise, the ability to work fluently in one or two languages, an archive sufficiently tolerant to allow you the time to work for FIAF and with enough money to finance your travelling to the meetings, plus a curator who will allow comparatively junior staff to take part in FIAF activities (to have a slice of the FIAF cake!) which they sometimes reserve to themselves.

H. Harrison said it was a good idea to limit the number of projects but some of them nevertheless required a lot of time to complete because they needed the cooperation of all members who very often failed to respond.

To answer the suggestion of C. Jeavons to merge the Commissions of Cataloguing and Documentation, she proposed to have once and for all a real debate on this question. She would also welcome the help of external consultancy for some of the Commission's projects.

G. Rochemont would like to see more contacts between the FIAF Commissions and the outside world, the non-film world, the other arts.

Wolfgang Klaue thought one should keep the structure of the Commissions as they are now. The actual trend goes towards better specialization rather than integration. He reiterated his suggestion to establish "working-groups" for limited terms of reference, e.g. Training - Legal matters - Filmmuseums - Philosophy of film archiving (Ray Edmondson's project). He also favored the commissioning of external help for some of the projects.

Hoos Blotkamp suggested to make an inventory of all professional issues that have to be dealt with in FIAF and follow them up by either entrusting them to some Commission or working group, perhaps to an outside consultant or even to one special expert in FIAF. The solution could also simply be conveyed from the experience of another professional body.

J.M. Costa stressed the necessity for the Commissions to complement each other and therefore to exchange minutes and programs as much as possible. He also advocated joint meetings of the Heads of Commissions. About the Commission's program, he felt it was wrong to discuss the projects one by one but would prefer general discussions at General Assemblies on the whole program and target of each Commission.

J.M. Prado supported this point of view and insisted on the importance to distribute reports and documentation to the membership well in advance of Congresses where they would be discussed.

To conclude, Hoos Blotkamp suggested that a small group should prepare a paper on this topic for the next EC meeting in April, including analysis of the present Commissions' program and achievements, proposals for priorities, etc... The group should be external to the actual Commissions. It was finally reduced to two persons for the preliminary analysis: Hoos Blotkamp and Brigitte van der Elst. The second phase should consist of an inquiry among the membership, a gathering of opinions among the staff of the FIAF archives who benefit from the Commissions' projects, to know what their reaction is to the hard work done until now by these Commissions. Would they have suggestions for different more useful projects? Another approach, etc...? Maybe this is an impossible task but it should be tried.

#### 4. FIAF Congresses

Summarizing the group's analysis of the members' papers on that topic, J.M. Costa introduced the debate by saying that they were all concerned about the lack of participation of the delegates in FIAF Congresses. It seems to derive mainly from insufficient preparation and maybe wrong presentation

of the topics to debate; also the information comes in too late before Congresses.

Secondly, when a decision has to be taken by the General Assembly, it should be presented more clearly and the EC should put forward its own position on the topic.

On Symposia: the two main problems seem to be their organization and the choice of topics.

Their organization should start at least 2 or 3 years in advance and proceed by stages: e.g. several stages of production of papers and discussions, preparatory meetings on a regional level or other partial groupings producing intermediate papers.

As for the topics, they should be very broad and encompass the participation of all the Commissions. Very specialized meetings should not be the subject of Symposia but rather of workshops, summer schools, etc..

The "group" wanted to make a concrete proposal: to hold annual Congresses but General Assemblies only every second year and one or two Symposia every year.

I. Trujillo and Ch. Horak did not see any inconvenience in keeping a GA every year as long as it was well organized and perhaps shorter. W. Klaue added that a GA every second year would imply more power given to the EC, e.g. for incorporating new members. H. Blotkamp saw no problem in doing this.

C. Jeavons also felt it was useful to keep an annual GA, much better prepared. He even advocated a "Congress organising sub-committee", involving the host, the Secretariat, a few chief Executives, perhaps Heads of Commissions or some ad-hoc key people, with central coordination by a paid senior administrator, as already suggested for the Secretariat. Too much time is used during GAs for reports which could be done in writing well in advance. This area could then be subject to intense accountability on key questions which would have been extracted in advance and posed at the GA instead of our rather unfocused and unprepared Open Forums. Professionalism was also absolutely essential for the Symposia, as well as more external participation.

JM Costa agreed but felt that the main problem was to change the spirit of our Congresses. Make the Symposia a concern for all delegates like the GA is and not make such a cut between the two events.

Speaking of membership issues, he also felt that as FIAF was growing fast, it was not possible anymore to give the responsibility of voting on all these administrative matters to the whole General Assembly. This should be the task of the EC.

S. Ricci suggested that the FIAF Journal be supplemented by a regular Newsletter on FIAF organizational matters and planning of GAs and Symposia.

R. Smither wanted that some space be retained at our General Assemblies for improvisation and spontaneity. Open Forums should not necessarily be a shamble.

Ch. Horak felt that Symposia should not be left wholly in the hands of the host archives (But S. Ricci insisted on leaving some responsibility to the host archive to develop topics that interested them). A planning group was essential. Film screenings as well. And a "call" for papers rather than an invitation to participate should be made.

E. Orbanz agreed with the above ideas. They were not all new, but the reason why they were not enforced was often the lack of cooperation from the membership and of financial means: one had to pay expert-speakers to come to our Symposia.

W. Klaue thought we could never organize Symposia which will interest and satisfy every Member. From experience he could tell that the success of a Symposium did not depend so much from the general organization as from its theme. We should look for topics with a wide-interest range and this was difficult to find every year, let alone two per year. The lack of response from our membership is frustrating but we have to face reality, even with the best intentions. He also suggested to examine the ways of other international organisations, similar to FIAF, in organizing their Congresses in order to pick out some interesting solutions.

J. Benard da Costa joined the meeting at this point.

C. Jeavons described the FIAT model for their Congresses. He agreed with W. Klaue that some flexibility and freedom should be retained for the organization of our Congress even if it is done by an appointed organizer and that enough leeway should be given to the host, while FIAF support is given where needed.

J.M. Costa suggested some themes for FIAF Symposia:

- Film museums: this should be a basic issue for all the archives and not only a theme for workshops.
- Legal problems
- The special field of each Commission should not be a topic for Symposia, but perhaps another type of meeting such as the Joint Technical Symposium in the case of Preservation; however it would be interesting to discuss the interrelations between those Commissions, e.g. the



point of convergence between Cataloguing, Documentation and Programming. H. Blotkamp very much supported this approach.

V. Opela underlined that some topics of Symposia would be unattractive to the general membership but still very important for our work. Therefore we should study them and even attract some specialists from outside FIAF.

On the periodicity of General Assemblies, R. Daudelin felt it was important to have at least a short GA every year otherwise some members might take this as a pretext not to attend the annual Symposium. For this reason and several others already enumerated, R. Daudelin, W. Klaue and J.M. Costa made the following proposal: to hold a 2days GA + election every second year and 1day GA the year in between. More responsibilities should then be given to the EC as concerns: admission of members, finances (except for membership fees' issues), and a few other administrative matters. ChH however said one should be cautious not to take away too much power from the GA. This idea had already been rejected by the GA at the Havana Congress in 1990. Democracy was a touchy business that should be fully respected.

J. Benard da Costa, E. Orbanz and R. Smither agreed with this argument, especially as concerned membership questions; the fact that the delegates did not use their rights to discuss or veto the EC's proposals should not mean we take these rights away from them. H. Blotkamp thought the solution here was to find a balance between total democracy and efficiency in our work. We could combine more responsibility for the EC with openness and transparency towards the GA. No question from the GA should ever remain unanswered.

R. Smither also favored Ivan Trujillo's idea of "poster" sessions for the usual administrative reports. By this he meant that such reports, with full details, be "posted" during the Congresses in a place where everyone could read them and that at some definite times, Heads of Commissions or some of their members would be available to answer possible questions from interested delegates. One could complement these with workshops if needed.

After W. Klaue had recalled the duties and tasks of the GA, as described in art. 14 of the Statutes, it was decided that, together with S. Ricci, he would make some suggestions on the structure of future General Assemblies. S. Ricci would furthermore prepare a working document on this matter for the meeting in Bologna.

## 5. Role and tasks of the Executive Secretariat

H. Blotkamp introduced the topic. She said the Secretariat was perhaps the strongest instrument of FIAF since it was permanent and located in one permanent place. It is an executive body which carries out the instructions of the GA and the EC. The question then is: what should the GA and the EC expect from the Secretariat? How could this tool be reinforced and utilized at best?

After B. van der Elst had explained in details how the Secretariat was functioning at present, Ch. Horak asked the Treasurer how realistic it was, budget-wise, to hire a full-time senior Administrator to undertake all the tasks that had been evoked since the beginning of this EC meeting, and probably some others.

C. Jeavons thought the problem was not insurmountable: the function should be considered as almost self-supporting in the sense that those new activities might generate more income for the Federation, and there were other funding strategies that could be used for this minor increase to the budget. He also insisted that this new job was not meant to replace the honorary functions of FIAF's present officers. Those were still very necessary for general monitoring and wider policy decisions. He proposed, with B. van der Elst, to draft a job description with a quite specific brief for the full-time post he had in mind: to think ambitiously and not be scared of raising the level of work.

E.Orbanz and J.M. Costa insisted that the whole question should be examined in the wider context of FIAF's professionalization and see what were the other services that archives were willing to pay for.

Ch. Horak added that, if the decision to hire a Senior Administrator was made, the relationship of this person with the other bodies of the Federation, his duties and rights, would have to be defined and incorporated into Statutes and Rules since it would mean quite a change in the functioning of FIAF.

It was decided that C. Jeavons and B. van der Elst would draft a tentative job description including all the possible tasks which might improve the professionalism of the Federation and the services to its affiliates. This model would be presented for assesment at the next EC meeting.

## 6. Follow-up

JM. Costa posed the problem: How do we go on from here and tackle the real important discussion on the bigger issues lying in front of us: - Identity of FIAF and its membership  
- Accessibility  
- Nature and size of FIAF.

How will the decisions made during the last two days on the structure of the Federation affect the very next General Assemblies and Symposia? How do we involve the General Assembly in this discussion?

S. Ricci, supported by H. Blotkamp, suggested to have a special session at the General Asssembly of Bologna in which some EC members would provoke a debate on all these questions: the future of the Federation. This first debate could then generate a more formal structure and intermediate papers to prepare the Los Angeles Symposium where those big issues would be shaped into very concrete proposals.

C. Jeavons underlined that only relatively small adjustments to our structure were necessary to be able to go forward; he proposed to convert the Open Forum at the GA in a presentation session with a menu of topics and questions arising from our discussion here (e.g. style of future membership, matters of finances, technological future of the moving image, etc...), not to expect a full debate at that meeting but to get people's minds working and obtain concrete results for the L.A. Symposium.

It was finally decided that the 2d day of the GA in Bologna would be entirely dedicated to a special well prepared (by whom?) session on this topic, preceded by the sending of a paper drafted by Roger Smither. The idea to publish some parts of the Paris debate or some of the Paris preparatory papers in the FIAF Journal, prior to the Congress, was finally abandoned. We should not give the impression that the EC has already prepared a position paper on those issues, but rather stimulate the members' opinion and get it to come towards us. One could also commission a few papers from selected people "outside" the EC and let them be compiled and articulated by R. Smither.

W. Klaue was asked to contribute a few thoughts on the identity of FIAF members, emerging from his work with the World Directory of AV archives. He added that one should integrate the reponsibility and duties of FIAF to preserve the moving image heritage, world-wide; there are still large areas in the world where this is not done, which should have an impact on the future tasks of the Federation.

Roger Smither agreed to prepare a first draft for the EC members by mid-January; to be distributed to the whole

membership, with possible amendments, by the middle of March, together with the GA agenda.

The President should introduce the special session as a brainstorming session "with a purpose".

I. Trujillo ended the session with the remark that the EC should not expect very much participation from the general membership. They are not prepared and probably not very concerned!