

# MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Berlin, 14-16 May, 1987**

<b>Members</b>	Anna-Lena WIBOM	President
	Guido CINCOTTI	Secretary-General
	Raymond BORDE	Treasurer
	Wolfgang KLAUE	Vice President
	Hector GARCIA MESA	Vice President
	Sam KULA	Vice President
	Eileen BOWSER	
	Robert DAUDELIN	
	David FRANCIS	
	P K NAIR	
Eva ORBANZ	Deputy Treasurer	
<b>Reserve Members</b>	Jan DE VAAL	
	Cosme ALVES-NETTO	Deputy Secretary General
	Paul SPEHR	
<b>Honorary Members</b>	Einar LAURITZEN	ABSENT
	Vladimir POGACIC	
	Jerzy TOEPLITZ	
<b>Commission Heads</b>	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation
	Karen Jones	Acting Head, Documentation ABSENT
<b>Executive Secretary Interpreter</b>		Brigitte VAN DER ELST
		Jill JOHNSON

# FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page	
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Approval of Minutes of Glasgow EC Meeting	1
3	Report on the Preparations for the Berlin Congress	2
4	Membership Questions	
4.1	New Candidates for Observership	
	a    Buenos Aires: Museo Nacional del Cine	2
	b    Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional	4
	c    Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum	4
	d    Miscellaneous Potential Observers	5
	e    Commercial Archives & FIAF in the 1990's	7
4.2	Situation in Bogota & Cinemateca Distrital	7
4.3	New Candidates for Membership	
	a    Luxembourg: Cinémathèque Municipale	8
	b    Los Angeles: UCLA Film & TV Archive	10
4.4	Confirmation of Members	11
	a-h  Habana, Lausanne, Beijing, Pyongyang, Bucuresti, Montevideo (CU), Lisboa, Los Angeles	
4.5	Confirmation of Observers	12
4.6	Other Membership Questions	
	a    Ottawa	14
	b    Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum	15
	c    Article 102: Canada and the Chinese Archive	16
5	Review of Agenda for General Assembly	
5.1	General: GA1-5	16
5.2	50th Anniversary: GA6	17
5.3	Documentation Commission Report: GA7	23
5.4	Cataloguing Commission Report: GA8	23
5.5	PIP	26
5.6	Preservation Commission Report: GA9	30
5.7	Financial Report: GA11	31
5.8	Elections: GA14	32
5.9	Projects & Publications underway: GA10	32
5.10	Modification of FIAF Statutes and Rules: GA13	33
5.11	Future Congresses: GA15	33
5.12	Relations with international organisations: GA17	35
5.13	Open Forum: GA16	35
6	Any Other Business	
6.1	Symposium on Archive management	36
6.2	Tribute to Mr De Vaal and Rules concerning Honorary Members	36
6.3	Invitations for future EC Meetings	37
6.4	Tribute to Mr Kula	37

# MINUTES

Dr Heinz Rathsack, Director of the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek (SDK), welcomed the Executive Committee (EC) to Berlin and the Kinemathek. He expressed their pride in being able to host the FIAF Congress and the first joint FIAF/FIAT/IASA Technical Symposium, and outlined some of the arrangements.

In addition, delegates were invited to the Opening Ceremony of the Kinemathek's major Exhibition on Film History in Berlin at the old Hotel Esplanade which is to be the future Filmhaus of Berlin and home of the Kinemathek, the Film School and related institutions. They would of course be pleased to discuss their plans with any archives interested.

He thanked Ms Eva ORBANZ and colleagues for all their work in preparing the Congress and wished everyone an enjoyable and profitable meeting.

Mrs WIBOM formally opened the meeting with a welcome to all present including particularly two Honorary Members, Mr TOEPLITZ and Mr POGACIC. She was pleased the entire EC had been able to attend. Later, Mrs ORBANZ reported apologies and greetings from Mr LAURITZEN and Mr SVOBODA.

## 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was adopted subject to some minor additions and adjustments for additional meetings in connection with various projects (50th Anniversary, PIP, etc).

On the question of additional meetings, it appeared that Mr Ledoux had approached several EC members asking for a meeting with the EC but had made no formal approach. It was felt that if he had matters concerning FIAF that he wanted to raise officially, he should raise them first in the General Assembly; secondly, any request for a formal meeting should be accompanied by an indication of topics to be discussed. As individuals, the EC members were very happy to meet him, especially after his many years of non-attendance of FIAF events, but outside the context of the formal EC meeting.

## 2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF GLASGOW MEETING

There were two comments:

p35 Berlin Congress arrangements:

Mrs ORBANZ made a minor correction to the hotel information and confirmed the name of the IASA representative as Mr Schüller

p8 Luxembourg:

Mr NAIR (who had not been at the meeting) felt all should be very concerned if "irreplaceable copies were being spoilt through repeated use" but there was in fact no evidence of this.

The Minutes were approved.

### 3 REPORT ON PREPARATIONS FOR BERLIN CONGRESS

Mrs ORBANZ reported that some 116 people were expected for the GA:

47 Members, 12 Observers, 1 Subscriber, 1 former Observer (Venezuela) and 10 FIAF Summer School delegates.

and 270 for the Joint Technical Symposium (including 35 IASA, 33 FIAT).

Other NGO's to be represented were ICA, IFTC, CILECT (Bob Rosen) and Unesco.

For the Unesco meetings, they expected 27 participants on Equipment for Archives and 13 for Curriculum Development for Training Archivists.

She gave details of the formal Opening by a representative of the Cultural Senate, the Opening Reception in the Egyptian Museum (to which the Press had been invited), the Excursion by bus and canal for some 250 people, the Film Programmes every evening at 8 and 10.30, and the 9 companies which were taking part in the Exhibition in the coffee area during the GA and the JTS. On the day of the Closing Reception and the Opening of the SDK Exhibition, Dr Rathack would be made an Honorary Professor.

Mrs WIBOM thanked her on behalf of the EC for all the very efficient planning which had gone into making this such a major event.

### 4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

#### 4.1 New Candidates for Observership

##### 4.1a Buenos Aires: Museo del Cine "Pablo C Ducrós Hicken"

The following discussion took place early on Day 3

Mrs WIBOM and Mr CINCOTTI welcomed Mr Guillermo Fernandez Jurado, Director in charge of the Museo, and his wife Mrs Paulina Fernandez Jurado, who was also a director as well as being Executive Director of the FIAF Member, Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina, but attended as interpreter. The EC had examined the dossier and needed some clarifications before coming to a decision.

##### - Information on the collections

There seemed to be some contradictions in the information supplied. In a 1985 letter, they had mentioned 600 feature films and 12,600 newsreels; in April 1986, they mentioned 173 feature films (supplying the list) and 2,300 newsreels. Mr Fernandez Jurado explained through his wife that the 173 films were their own collection and 440 were on deposit from the National Cinematographic Institute. They were all Argentinian films on acetate only.

##### - Acquisition policy

There was no legal deposit but the Institute had the right since 1967 to ask producers to deposit copies of all commercially produced films for diffusion at Festivals abroad. They had passed to the Museo some old films no longer required. There was a budget for the purchase of copies of further films.

- Budget

Of the \$80,000 budget, more than 90% was spent on staff, the remainder on management/operational expenses. This implied that no money was spent on preservation or copying.

It was explained that just a month ago Mr Fernandez Jurado had succeeded in getting a contract signed by the Municipality and the Institute to ensure the safeguarding of old Argentinian films. There was now an obligation on all those institutions holding film to ensure that a dupe negative existed or was made for every old Argentinian film held. The Institute would be providing the money for this project.

- Relations between the Museum and the Institute

The Director of the Institute was a former film director and they had excellent relations. They were separate autonomous institutions, the Institute being a national body, the Museum municipal.

In response to Mr NAIR, it was explained that the Institute was primarily offering a circulating film library service for countries abroad only and was not involved in preservation. However, they were providing the funding for making negatives of early films, as they were a wealthier organisation.

- Organisation chart

Mr CINCOTTI asked if the 22 headings related to future plans or present activities and was advised there were more than 40 employees, paid for by the Municipality.

At this point, Mr Fernandez Jurado asked if his application could be postponed.

**Decision:** No action until the candidate submits.

**Relations between the Museum and the Cinemateca**

In spite of the withdrawal, Mrs Fernandez Jurado volunteered to repeat for the EC the history she had given to MM FRANCIS and KULA in Canberra.

In 1970, a collector of apparatus died; the widow wanted to offer the collection to the Cinemateca but they could not accept as they had no money to use on the collection. Mr Fernandez Jurado was at the time Cultural Adviser to the Municipality of Buenos Aires and asked if they would like to have a Museum of Argentinian Cinema. This was agreed and the Cinemateca provided collections of photographs, books, documents of which they had duplicates. The Director for the first 5 years was the Cinemateca member who had acquired the original donation; for the next 5 years, it was the Founder Director of the Cinemateca and for the third 5-year period, Mr Fernandez Jurado was appointed. There were therefore very close and friendly relations between the Museum and the Cinemateca. The Museum had been created simply because the Cinemateca had no funds for the collection.

#### 4.1b Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that they had been deleted two years previously for non-payment of subscription. They had now been able to resolve their financial difficulties. Mr GARCIA MESA and Mr ALVES NETTO both warmly supported their readmission. A representative from the Archive was expected at the GA and they would also be present at the Cuban Film Festival in November.

**Decision:** Unanimous admission, applicable from receipt of subscription.

#### 4.1c Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that he had received the dossier only the day before and it lacked the declarations of co-operation with the FIAF archives in the same country.

- Ms ORBANZ confirmed that Mr Walter Schobert had been invited to the Berlin Congress as agreed at Glasgow but the papers had arrived too late to be distributed in advance.
- Mrs VAN DER ELST had reminded him in November last that the cooperation declarations were required.

Mr KLAUE pointed out it was the task of the applicant to get the agreement from the existing members. In addition, he felt it was not clear from the budget or statutes to what extent they were concerned with the collection and preservation of film itself, as opposed to other historical documents or artefacts. On a general note, he suggested that with the increasing number of film museums, FIAF might now consider setting up a special Working Group or even a Commission concerned with their special interests. Mr CINCOTTI agreed that FIAF should consider its attitude to such "museums" which were proliferating on a regional and local basis in different countries.

Ms ORBANZ knew very little about their collection or activities. Although an Associate Member of the Federation of German Archives, they never attended the meetings or communicated with others. Originally just a cinema, they obtained generous funding from the city of Frankfurt to establish the museum and were now buying films but she did not know if they were for screening only and what storage and/or preservation facilities they had. If they used their money for a preservation programme, she would welcome them in FIAF.

Mr DOGAGIC reported that he knew Mr Schobert quite well (he had visited Belgrade several times) and had visited him two days previously on his way to Berlin. He was specially interested in avant-garde cinema and in addition to screenings had produced some excellent publications. They were wealthy and doing excellent work.

Mr FRANCIS, speaking as someone responsible for a film museum, reverted to the idea of an international network of cinema museums. They could be very attractive for FIAF in its role of encouraging preservation as they often had funds not available to archives which enabled them to acquire collections and to commission quality prints of classic films for screening on their own premises. He agreed with Mr KLAUE and Mr CINCOTTI that a special

discussion was needed to define how best FIAF might cooperate with such organisations in pursuit of FIAF's overall objectives.

In discussion it was noted that they were in the same building as the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde, occupying the third floor which was paid for by the City of Frankfurt, and sharing with the Institut the Library on the fifth floor.

#### **Decision:**

Ms ORBANZ to confirm to Mr Schobert he is welcome to come to Berlin for the Congress but it is not necessary for his candidature which is not yet ready for consideration.

Meet with Mr Schobert if he comes to Berlin and write officially to ask for dossier to be completed by

- declarations of cooperation with other German archives
- detailed information on films in the collection
- translation into one of the official languages.

Mr KLAUE and Mr FRANCIS to prepare a discussion paper on possibilities of cooperation between FIAF and film museums for discussion at the autumn EC meeting. (see also 4.1e)

#### **4.1d Miscellaneous Potential Observers**

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that enquiries had been received from:

- Barcelona: Filmoteca de Catalunya
- Bamako, Mali, Africa: Cinémathèque Nationale  
Following past contacts, the Director had written in February declaring their intention to apply to join.
- Windhoek, Namibia, Africa: Service des Archives  
Were preparing their candidature

In response to Mr BORDE, Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that no further communication had been received from:

- Bruxelles: Centre du Film sur l'Art  
No news for over a year.
- Paris: Cinémathèque Gaumont  
They had approached Mr BORDE who had pointed out that their commercial status barred them from joining FIAF. They suggested FIAF was depriving itself of contact with collections which dated back to the beginning of the century.  
(Mr ALVES NETTO noted that Gaumont offered access to their films but at an exorbitant rate of some \$1000 a minute!  
Later, Mrs WIBOM mentioned they were considering a request from Gaumont to undertake some restoration work for them)

At this stage, there was a discussion on Commercial Archives and FIAF in the 1990's: see 4.1e.

Mr KLAUE reported on delegates who were attending the current FIAF Summer School and the prospects for new Observers. He hoped members of the EC would make a point of meeting with them during their stay in Berlin:

*i New institution*

- Mali: Cinémathèque du Mali

This was a very new institution and the Director was looking for closer contacts with FIAF.

*ii Relatively advanced institutions*

- Sri Lanka: National Archive

Deputy Director in charge of developing a new National Film Archive

- Indonesia: National Archive

The only institution in Indonesia which is likely to continue with film archive work. FIAF's existing Observer has very little chance of surviving independently and autonomously.

- Morocco: Cinémathèque Marocaine

Unesco had a special mission to Morocco which might be interesting for FIAF.

*iii No institution in sight yet at:*

- Syria: Institute of Cinematography ? *Chene organisation of government small collection*

- Afghanistan: Someone has a collection of films and asked for help but no organisation exists *Afghan*

- Jordan: representative from a TV archive only; no film archive

- Tanzania: Audiovisual Institute: no change for years

Mr KLAUE mentioned that the 4 potential Observers, especially those affiliated to national archives, found the fee of Sw francs 400 rather high as they have to be affiliated to so many international organisations. They would be happier if they could be affiliated to FIAF in some less expensive way.

**Other potential Observers:**

- Tokyo: National Film Centre

Mr KLAUE mentioned they had written to him saying once more they would be making an official application to "become a Member as soon as possible"

- Sénégal: Cinémathèque Nationale

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned he had recently met one of their Cultural Advisers on a mission in Montreal who had said that a national archive had been set up some two or three years ago headed by the film-maker Tidiem A. He had encouraged him to ensure they approached FIAF but the Secretariat had received no contact. *very correct spelling.*

- Singapore

Later in the meeting, Mr KULA reported that, following his tour of S E Asia in 1985, he had heard recently that the Singapore Government had now decided that the responsibility for establishing a film archive would be given to the National Archives of Singapore. He thought they would in due course want to join FIAF as Observers.



#### 4.1e **Commercial Archives and FIAF in the 1990's**

In the discussion on Cinémathèque Gaumont above, Mr BORDE suggested that, in addition to the "museum question", FIAF should also consider the possibilities of contact with commercial organisations which held important collections of early film, eg Gaumont, MGM, Pathé.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed and felt the production houses could perhaps be encouraged to set up a separate organisation or foundation which was non-commercial so that they would be eligible to join FIAF.

Mr FRANCIS felt FIAF was losing its way in considering individual applications from organisations which were so diverse; for the 1990's, it was essential for FIAF to rethink its approach to the different types of organisations which had custody of films. He had already identified 5 distinct Categories of organisations that they could usefully establish contacts with:

- C1 traditional archives
- C2 commercial archives
- C3 museums
- C4 documentation centres
- C5 screening organisations.

He suggested the EC should set aside a full day to discuss papers on each of these Categories prepared by different EC members and consider whether FIAF should devise a new structure to serve their different needs. Mr CINCOTTI supported this proposal and mentioned that in Italy the collections of the early production houses were being bought up by state and private television companies.

#### **Decision:**

- Mr CINCOTTI and Mr BORDE to prepare paper on C2: Commercial Archives.
- !! No decision was made on who would prepare papers on other Categories.

#### 4.2 **Situation in Bogotá & Cinemateca Distrital de Bogotá**

Mr CINCOTTI reported that with the formation of the Foundation encompassing 5 organisations, including indirectly the existing Observer (Cinemateca Distrital de Bogotá), the status of the Observer was still not clear.

Mr ALVES NETTO and Mr GARCIA MESA agreed and pointed out that the situation was very fluid.

A month ago, a number of archives (but not the Secretariat or officials of FIAF) had received a letter from the new Director of the existing Observer (Madame Maria Elvira Talero) which made no mention of the Foundation. In addition, with the recent death of Mr Salcedo, they felt the Cine Club de Colombia (one of the 5 organisations within the Foundation and a former member of FIAF) would cease to exist and it was not clear what would happen to its film collection. Following the recent change of government, there had

also been a change at the top of the global organisation Focine, which had a new President since the Foundation's last contact with FIAF.

Mr GARCIA MESA suggested FIAF should write to both Ms Triana, now head of the Foundation, and the lady who had succeeded her at the Cinemateca Distrital, asking them to clarify the relationship between their two organisations. Mr ALVES NETTO and Mr CINCOTTI felt that if the status of Observer was to be transferred to the Foundation, then the existing Observer should make the request, not just the Foundation. Meanwhile, Mr CINCOTTI suggested that, as the existing Observer had supplied its annual Report and 1986 Subscription, it could be routinely reconfirmed (see 4.5g).

Early on Day 3

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Nieto, representing Mrs Claudia Triana, had arrived the evening before, with a new candidate's dossier from the Fundacion. She had explained to him that it was too late for consideration by the outgoing EC.

### 4.3 New Candidates for Membership

#### 4.3a Luxembourg: Cinémathèque Municipale

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed Mr Borde's "excellent visit report". Mr BORDE made 5 brief comments:

- This was an example of an archive which had begun as a private, non-profit-making foundation (in 1977) and was later taken under the cultural wing of an official public body (in 1978).
- Their 16mm and 17.5 mm collection was particularly important for the French archives as it contained copies of films that no longer existed in 35mm, especially for the period 1930-45 (including some of the 400 films believed lost, from the total of 1300 feature films identified in the recent 1929-39 Inventory of French Films)
- he stressed that their screening programmes consisted of very popular films and they were not projecting unique copies of rare films.
- he had seen the sites and progress being made on a major building programme for archive activities
- he stressed that Luxembourg was an independent nation, and not part of Belgium.

Mr KLAUE asked if they were strictly "non-commercial" and if they respected Article 103 when acquiring films from a FIAF member territory. In this connection, he mentioned Mr Ledoux's objection that they were obtaining films from a Belgian distributor (who was also distributor for Luxembourg).

Mrs BOWSER noted that originals of popular films were not necessarily preserved elsewhere: she would be happier if Luxembourg provided the American archives with titles of their American films before projection

in case some were in fact unique. She admired their activities and welcomed them as Observers but was not sure that they qualified as full Members whose primary task was the active preservation (ie not mere storage) of film.

Mr FRANCIS also admired their activities but felt their real value was in acquisition where they had an important but controversial role as they had the resources to purchase films that might otherwise be lost.

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that if there were doubts on the "commercial" question they should have been resolved when they applied to become Observers as the regulations on this point were no different.

Mr BORDE was satisfied that they were not in any way a commercial organisation. He was also satisfied that they were not breaching Article 103. He pointed out that Luxembourg was a unique case in that the distributor for the country had its headquarters in another country; he felt that the archive's acquisitions from that distributor were in its capacity as national distributor for Luxembourg and were therefore perfectly in order. In cases where the archive had been able to purchase material in France that the French archives were unable to purchase themselves, they had always obtained prior clearance from a French archive. Finally, on the question of active preservation, as a relatively young archive, they still had very few preservation/restoration problems but he felt they would handle them as appropriate when the time came.

In reply to Mrs WIBOM, Mr BORDE explained that there had been very little national production, much of it erotic, but he believed it was virtually all preserved by the archive on a voluntary deposit system, including shorts and work by film-makers just beginning their careers.

Mr FRANCIS returned to the question of Article 103 but pointed out that the problem was not primarily that of obtaining clearance from the territory Member (as required by the Article) but the fact that by offering money for films, they were in fact creating a market value for them, which made it difficult for the national archive to subsequently ask and expect voluntary donations. He had mixed feelings about how to react as, although they created problems by setting a market price, they were nevertheless doing valuable and important work in obtaining and retaining films that might otherwise be totally lost (as was the case with 16mm RKO films purchased from a bankrupt UK distributor).

Mr KULA asked if there was any legal or procedural reason to delay a decision on the dossier and, in particular, whether there were any documented violations of Article 103. Although, as Mr CINCOTTI pointed out, EC members did not have to explain their voting, Mr POGACIC recalled that the EC as a whole should be able to give the reason for its decision to the candidate.

They could only reject a candidate for reasons covered by the Federation's Rules.

Mr FRANCIS acknowledged that, as far as he knew, Article 103 as currently worded was not in fact being infringed. There was in fact no provision in the Rules that was relevant to the situation he had described. Nevertheless it was worrying, because although producers were generally ready to donate material to archives, the 16mm versions were generally not in the hands of the original producers but in the hands of people who wanted money for them. Archives who were willing to compete in the market by purchasing material were in fact damaging the hard-won tradition of the whole archive movement which was based on free donations or legal deposit.

Mrs ORBANZ felt the important question was not where, but whether, the films were actually preserved. If Luxembourg was ensuring their preservation, she saw no problem. Mr BORDE confirmed that the archive had no nitrate but the acetate films were currently being stored under adequate conditions although even better conditions were planned for the new vaults.

Mr NAIR felt that if a distributor was in liquidation and the national archive was unable to offer money for the collection, it was reasonable that the distributor should seek purchasers, either inside or outside the country; if the purchaser was an archive able to preserve them, he did not see how the archive movement itself was harmed.

Mr FRANCIS responded by citing his own archive's circumstances: all films from film companies (producers and distributors) were provided free; they only bought films when offered by a private collection. Official archive buying, especially in their country, created a precedent and was therefore potentially very damaging to their relationships with the film companies. However, both he and Mrs WIBOM stressed that this point could not be held against the present candidate as it was not in the Federation's Rules.

Mrs BOWSER agreed also but again stressed that they did not qualify as full Members because their first priority was not preservation.

Before the vote, it was confirmed that the archive's dossier was in order and that neither Mr Ledoux nor anyone else had made a formal complaint against them.

**Decision by secret vote:** In favour 2, against 6, absentions 3.

#### 4.3b Los Angeles: UCLA Film & TV Archive

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the application was completely in order, with signatures from all the existing US members. He noted that two-thirds of their budget was spent on preservation. He felt they had all the qualities required of FIAF Members.

Mrs BOWSER supported their candidature and said it had been interesting to see their growth from a university collection to a fully-fledged archive undertaking very high quality work. She and several EC members had visited the archive so she assumed no special visit was needed.

**Decision by secret vote:** Unanimously in favour (11, 0, 0).

## 4.4 Confirmation of Members

### 4.4a Habana: Cinemateca de Cuba

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier was completely in order.

**Decision:** Unanimous confirmation.

### 4.4b Lausanne: La Cinémathèque Suisse

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier was similarly complete and included copy of their updated and improved statutes. The names of all the staff had been included on the organisation chart.

**Decision:** Unanimous confirmation.

### 4.4c Beijing: Zhongguo Dianyng Ziliaoguan (China Film Archive)

### 4.4d Pyongyang: Choson Minjujul Inmingonghwaguk Kugga Yonghwa Munhongo (National Film Archive of DPRK)

Mr CINCOTTI reported that in spite of reminders neither of these archives had responded. However, as they were both up-to-date with their subscription and Annual Reports, they would not lose their right to vote.

### 4.4e Bucuresti: Arhiva Nationala de Filme

Mr CINCOTTI reported that they were more than 4 years behind with their subscription, had not sent a Report and no longer attended FIAF events. They had sent two telegrams, the first promising a portion of their subscription and a letter, neither of which had appeared, the second regretting they could not attend the Congress.

Mr KLAUE reported they were fully aware of the situation and he had spoken to them since Glasgow, saying a decision would be taken in Berlin. They had told him by phone some 3 weeks ago that they had authority to pay part of the money in time for Berlin. He had encouraged them to put some explanation in writing. The former Curator's illness and death had been a problem but the main problem now seemed to be that, since the subscription increase, the government had been unwilling to pay.

Mr TOEPLITZ spoke as Chairman of the Polish Film Archives and reported that his colleagues felt that any further delay in making a decision would be a dangerous precedent and have a negative effect in several other Eastern European countries. They felt they should change status and reduce their subscription by becoming Observers, losing only the right to vote.

The Treasurer felt the decision was inevitable and Mr CINCOTTI agreed but, although with the revised Statutes their deletion would be automatic, for the present, it was necessary to take a vote (Statutes 9b and Rule 14).

**Decision:** Unanimously in favour of recommending deletion to the GA.

#### **4.4f Montevideo: Cinemateca Uruguaya**

The archive reported that FIAF's January letter, asking them to supply the information required, had only arrived on April 22. It would therefore be reasonable to give them more time to respond.

**Decision:** Postpone consideration till autumn EC meeting.

#### **4.4g Lisboa: Cinemateca Portuguesa**

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier was complete and they had been the first to use the Reconfirmation Questionnaire.

**Decision:** Unanimous confirmation.

#### **4.4h Los Angeles: The National Center for Film & Video Preservation**

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that two days before leaving Brussels Susan Dalton had phoned explaining that their Director had left, she didn't know what was needed, but offering to prepare a dossier that Mr SPEHR might bring with him. Mrs BOWSER had advised her to explain by letter and ask for a postponement.

**Decision:** Postpone till a future EC meeting.

### **4.5 Confirmation of Observers**

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that all Observers except the following 6 had paid their subscription and submitted an Annual Report:

#### **4.5a Lima: Cinemateca Universitaria**

No report; no subscription for 2 years.

**Decision:** Deletion by unanimous show of hands (1 abstention)

#### **4.5b Madison: Wisconsin Center for Film & Theater Research**

They had paid their subscription and it was thought that perhaps, as new Observers, they had not understood the need to send in an Annual Report.

Mrs BOWSER supported this view and mentioned that, as there had been a change of Director, they perhaps simply needed a reminder.

**Decision:** Reminder and postponement of confirmation.

#### **4.5c Managua: Cinemateca de Nicaragua**

Mr GARCIA MESA reported he had met the Director by chance at the International Film School in Havana where he had been attending a 6-week training course. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported there were often problems with the mail and it was felt this was probably the trouble as he said in Havana:

- he had not received an invitation to the Congress (from Berlin)
- he had sent in his Report.

FIAF mail was now sent via the Embassy.

**Decision :** Postpone until contact re-established.

#### 4.5d Manila: Film Archives of the Philippines

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported they had paid nothing since their initial admission and sent no Reports.

Mr KLAUE reported that Mr Arnaldo had advised in March that Mr De Pedro had been forced to leave the archive because of his close links with the Marcos family. There had been virtually no government money for archive activities in 1986 and a number of staff had had to leave. The post of Director was open for nominations and a decision expected in April but the post was still vacant.

**Decision :** Formal letter advising non-confirmation.

#### 4.5e Washington: Human Studies Film Archive

They had paid for 1986 but not submitted a Report. Perhaps they too did not appreciate what was expected but they would be represented at the Congress and would be reminded then.

**Decision :** Postpone.

#### 4.5f Reykjavik: Kvikmyndasafn Islands

They had paid for 1986 but not submitted a Report. A new Director had been appointed 6 months previously who perhaps did not appreciate what was expected.

**Decision :** Postpone.

#### 4.5g Other Observers

Mrs WIBOM asked Mr CINCOTTI to read out the full list of Observers so that EC members had the chance to contribute any further comments.

##### - Alger: Cinémathèque Algérienne

Mr DAUDELIN regretted that yet again their Report was very brief even though they were large and very active. He would be interested to have more information on their activities and, in particular, the effect of the recent fire in their main cinema in Alger. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that they seemed to believe that Reports were not necessary if they were not at the Congress.

**Decision :** Discuss with Mr Karèche in Berlin.

##### - Lyon: Musée du Cinéma de Lyon (new title)

Mr BORDE reported he had finally obtained information on their collection and had recommended that they establish themselves formally as a museum. He said they had 800 of the 1300 Lumière films listed in the 1905 catalogue and some 2000 separate items (positive or negative). They also had a valuable collection of old posters and some early equipment.

He would be raising in Open Forum the question of the Lumière rights which was very complex. Apparently, Mr Bernard Chardère of the Institut Lumière claimed they had obtained the rights from Ilford and would be offering them to television worldwide against very high royalties, especially in connection with the Centenary of the invention of cinema. However, the French archives (Cinémathèque Française, Bois d'Arcy and his own archive) believed the films were now in the public domain.

- **Bogota: Cinemateca Distrital**

This archive was confirmed following the discussion under 4.2 above.

- **Paris: Cinémathèque Française**

Later in the meeting, Mr NAIR pointed out that they had not been confirmed at Glasgow because their Report had not arrived. Mr CINCOTTI reported the Report did in fact arrive so they were automatically confirmed.

## 4.6 Other Membership Questions

### 4.6a Ottawa

Mr KULA reported a change of name to "Moving Image & Sound Archives" or, in French, "Les archives audio-visuelles", and some organisational changes at his archive following changes in the parent body, the Public Archives, soon to be known as the National Archives of Canada". The previous 4 sections were reduced to two:

- Technical Operations (15 people) had been transferred to the parent Conservation Branch but with no impact on the operating funds or autonomy of work (effect from 12.86). He compared the new situation to that of having all the work done by a private laboratory which was under their total control.
- Cataloguing and Acquisitions were merged.

In addition from 8 September 1987, he himself would be on leave of absence for two years: Jana Vosikovska, in charge of Documentation, would be Acting Director for the first year and Ernie Dick, in charge of Acquisitions, for the second.

As a side effect of the reorganisation, he regretted that, although they could continue to compile and prepare the FIAF Bibliography on a word processor, they could no longer print it, as printing funding and authorisations had been moved elsewhere.

In response to Mr KLAUE, he confirmed that that he expected no further changes and there was no change in their autonomy or status vis-à-vis FIAF.

At this point the EC discussed the possibility of a Symposium on Archive Management, see 6.1

Day 1, afternoon:

After a small break, Mrs WIBOM welcomed Mr SPEHR who had just arrived.



#### 4.6b Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum

Mr DE VAAL commented on the Report he had prepared on the present situation now that he was reaching 65 and obliged to retire. There had been conflict between the Ministry of Culture and the Board members, some of whom had in consequence retired. The Ministry noted that in the past emphasis had been placed on acquisition and preservation but now wanted "a broader approach to the general public".

The archive had been reorganised so that there were 2 main departments, (Staff Bureau, Preservation) responsible for all the Filmmuseum's tasks. In addition there would be 4 service sections: Study Centre, Distribution Centre, Theatre (3 halls), Centre for the Public. They were still looking for a new Director and it was clear that his Deputy, Mr Maks, would not get the job. There was a budget of 7 million Dutch guilders, of which 2m had to be earned, although Mr DE VAAL felt the country was too small for the archive to be able to earn so much.

Mr Banks, Professor of History, one of the Board Members, would be in Berlin for the Congress, as voting Member, accompanied by Mr Maks and a technical specialist.

In response to Mrs VAN DER ELST, he was pleased to report that the National Archives would not be taking over the film collections, as at one time envisaged. In response to Mr POGACIC, he explained that the rebuilding plan included 3 500-seat cinemas within the same site. In response to Mr KLAUE, he confirmed that preservation as one of the two main departments would continue to have priority; acquisition and cataloguing would remain with the Study Centre/Library.

Speaking as someone who was himself member of a larger organisation, Mr FRANCIS was concerned that voting was being taken over by a Board Member rather than the Acting Director. He felt this might be setting a dangerous precedent within FIAF for voting to pass to an administrator rather than the Acting Director of the archive, especially when the latter was present. Mr DE VAAL supported the situation because the Board of 3 were acting as Directors, responsible for all policy matters and meeting every week both as a Board and getting actively involved with the Museum's work. Mr DAUDELIN shared Mr FRANCIS' concern. Mr KLAUE referred to Article 23 which said the voting member must be "Director, Curator or employee" with no other possibilities. Mr TOEPLITZ said it was a question of interpretation: he understood there was a body of Directors, functioning as Director, so he saw no reason to oppose the presence of one of them as a voting member. Mr FRANCIS said the Acting Director, by definition, was the one who had the vote. He stressed however his concern was not so much the situation in Holland but the precedent that might be set: the biggest problem for many of them was the task of retaining autonomy within large organisations. Mr NAIR said that Boards normally functioned in advisory capacity, not

executive. Mr DE VAAL said that Mr Banks was in fact the Director for the archive and was currently leading the preservation section.

Mr CINCOTTI and Mr DE VAAL mentioned the case of Berlin where the senior administrator tended to vote when he was present rather than the official Curator. Mrs ORBANZ stressed the situation was not similar as Dr Rathsack voted as Director of the Kinemathek.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt it was important to respect the internal situation and allow one of the members of the body that was acting as a Director to vote. They should however have officially advised FIAF of the situation. Mrs WIBOM agreed, especially as Mr DE VAAL, the retiring Curator, supported the arrangement.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed with MM KLAUE and FRANCIS on the importance of voting by those who were involved in the daily work of the archive but felt the present case was exceptional and they should take the advice of the retiring Curator on who was the most suitable person to vote.

**Decision :** By common consent, agree to accept Mr Banks as official representative, subject to the Secretary General meeting with him and minuting the exceptional circumstances.

#### 4.6c Article 102: Canada and the Chinese Archive

Mr DAUDELIN reported that, as agreed in Glasgow, he and Mr KULA had written to the Chinese archive on February 13 about their screenings in Canadian cities, without reference to the FIAF archives. Their had been no reply but Mr Losick in Montreal had written on April 13 to Mr KULA's boss, the Minister, to complain about this "attack" on the Chinese. Mr KULA had responded to his boss on April 30 explaining the background, and that there was no hostile intent.

They would of course meet with the Chinese in Berlin to clarify the situation.

## 5 REVIEW OF AGENDA FOR GENERAL ASSEMBLY

### 5.1 General: GA1-5

Mrs ORBANZ reviewed some organisational arrangements, including those for the registration of delegates before the GA itself. The GA would be formally opened with a welcome by Dr Rathsack and a short speech from a member of the Senate of Cultural Affairs.

It was noted that some Observers unable to come had not bothered to inform the Congress organisers.

Mr FRANCIS noted for the record that Mrs Bridget Kinally was in fact on the BFI staff, not the NFA as listed.

Mrs WIBOM had drafted the President's Report and would be thanking the members for their responses to the many questionnaires they had had this year. In studying the Annual Reports, she had found the responses to the statistics questionnaire particularly interesting.

At the beginning of Day 3

Mrs WIBOM read out her draft report and invited comments. Mr TOEPLITZ thought it was an excellent report but felt that, alongside the achievements, there should also be mention of projects not completed. Mr FRANCIS suggested the vinegar syndrome should be mentioned as it was of such significance for the archive movement and they should make sure everyone was aware of it.

Decision : Report approved.

### *End of Day 1*

At the invitation of Mr KLAUE, the EC then crossed the border for the evening to visit the DDR Staatliches Filmarchiv and to meet the participants of this year's FIAF Summer School

### Day 2

Mr KLAUE sent apologies for missing the morning session which clashed with the Summer School final evaluation session.

### 5.2 50th Anniversary: GA6

MM BORDE and DAUDELIN reported on the status of the various aspects of the Anniversary planning. A further meeting with CNC would be held on June 12.

#### Joint French/FIAF activities

##### - L'Association FIAF 50

The official body had now been created, comprising FIAF, CNC including Bois d'Arcy, and the Cinémathèque de Toulouse. This would simplify the financial management and operational decision-making. Officers were as follows:

President	President of FIAF
Vice President	President of Cinémathèque de Toulouse
Secretary General	Executive Secretary of FIAF
Treasurer	Director, CNC
Assistant Treasurer	Head of Bois d'Arcy

##### - Locations

Musée d'Orsay, former station now museum on French Art 1850-1920.

Meeting room for 300 seats with full interpreting facilities for the GA and Symposia. Exhibitions would be in the same Museum (total 500 sq. metres).

##### - Exhibitions

##### i Posters of the Silent Cinema, 1895 - 1930

The dates had been changed at the request of the Musée d'Orsay. Mr BORDE was pleased at the change as he had noted from the poster slides submitted that the silent film posters were much more interesting than the later ones which were much more uniform across the world. They already had about 80 excellent posters.

## ii Dreams and Fantasies of the Pioneers, 1890-1906

Mr FRANCIS wanted to use the occasion to illustrate the treasures and achievements of FIAF members. [In passing, he mentioned that Domitor, the newly established film history group, wanted to organise a Round Table discussion of researchers, "Brighton 10 years after".]

He outlined his initial ideas which were in 4 categories: personalities, pioneers, technical development themes (film stock, gauges, lighting, colour, panoramic image, slow motion, sound, etc), equipment (original equipment or documentation from key stages, before and after 1895). In addition, as centrepieces, he would like something like a recreation of Hales' Tours, a fairground Biograph, or a studio (Black Maria ?). There would be two further sections: references to film preservation and public access before 1906 (using Mr BORDE's research); a fantasy section of preposterous ideas that were taken seriously at the time. His report would be circulated and he invited comments and suggestions.

Mr DE VAAL asked if it would be possible to have the travelling cinema outside the main building in order to attract the public. Mr FRANCIS liked the idea but feared vandalism unless it could be locked up at night. The possibilities would depend primarily on the support available from the Museum. Mrs WIBOM reported that the Museum people were very enthusiastic and would provide assistance in design and construction as well as with the catalogue. They hoped the exhibitions could remain during the summer.

Mr FRANCIS reminded the EC that his own Museum in London had to be opened in June 1988 and, that while he could provide ideas, he could not personally be responsible for the implementation of the project. Mrs WIBOM felt the Museum would be the active partner. Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that their own exhibition opening May 22 had taken 18 months of preparation and 6 weeks for the physical construction so it was urgent to get started immediately.

Mr KULA endorsed this view in the light of his own new exhibition in association with the Museum of Science & Technology in Ottawa; he warned that working with another museum would require a coordinator. He thought they would need at least one full-time person. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that they would be employing a half-time person, Florence de Beughem, in Paris but Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that she had no experience in the field. Mr FRANCIS confirmed to Mr BORDE that he liked the title and would like to keep it, even though it wasn't particularly relevant to all they had in mind.

## iii Film Restoration Exhibition

Mr SCHMITT would be talking about this. It had been formally agreed by CNC that Bois d'Arcy, under the responsibility of Mr SCHMITT, would receive the exhibits for all the exhibitions, pending transfer to the Museum.

### - Exhibition Catalogues

The Musée d'Orsay planned to produce a high quality catalogue in cooperation with the Réunion des Musées Nationaux for the Dreams & Fantasies Exhibition.

Decision: ?? on other two exhibitions ??

In the subsequent discussions, it was asked if the Poster Exhibition and the Dreams & Fantasies Exhibition could travel to other countries. Mr FRANCIS felt it would be too difficult for his exhibition and Mr SPEHR felt the posters would suffer too much from exposure to light and changing atmosphere. Mrs WIBOM felt it was too late to tackle such a problem as contributors had not been asked; in any case, it would be very difficult when dealing with unique artefacts.

### FIAF Projects

#### - Symposium

Mr DAUDELIN said that for the 3 days they had planned some 24 20-minute communications, 14 by French specialists on foreign influences in France and the remainder by foreign specialists on French influence abroad. This gave approximately 8 hours of talk and 8 hours of film. He gave information on the speakers and countries represented.

#### - Livre d'Or

The provisional plan was to produce to A4 landscape format. He would welcome suggestions for the final title.

Texts were planned as follows:

- MM TOEPLITZ and POGAGIC: major articles on FIAF history illustrated with photos assembled by Mr DE VAAL and the Secretariat;
  - They hoped Mr LAURITZEN would write on the creation of the Stockholm archive with reference to early archives but were without news from him; Mrs WIBOM said material existed because of their recent 50th Anniversary.
- Action: Mrs WIBOM to talk with Mr LAURITZEN.

- Mr BORDE: update FIAF Chronology

For the Directory Section, they were still awaiting replies from 17 Members or Observers; 8 had not sent photos. The aim was to have the entries as uniform as possible, regardless of the size or importance of the archive. To make it more visually attractive, they envisaged the entries as "fiches", in ruled boxes, rather than continuous text.

Articles would be in French or English with a summary in the other language. The Chronology would be translated in full in both languages. The Directory entries would be in French or English without translation. The texts would be edited to standardise the language and they hoped Jill Johnson could work on the English.

The list of members would be arranged alphabetically by country, members followed by observers; using the French alphabet as the Congress was in Paris.

In addition, there would be information on FIAF itself and its publications.

Action: Mr BORDE and Mrs VAN DER ELST.

They hoped all texts would be assembled by July so design work could be done

to allow production to start in the autumn. In response to Mr CINCOTTI, it was suggested the cut-off date for archives to qualify for inclusion in the Directory should be the end of the Berlin Congress.

Mr BORDE said the Livre d'Or, which would be available in specialist booksops, would be stressing the worldwide aspect of FIAF's preservation activities. Mr POGACIC mentioned that the format was not very practical for libraries.

- Touring Show

Mrs BOWSER reviewed her written report; it had been difficult to decide on the films to go in each programme but there was nothing to stop archives taking both programmes eventually. She had tried to ensure as many different countries were represented as possible.

Mr FRANCIS was concerned about whether to risk asking for rights for showing anywhere, in case showings were wanted outside archives. Mrs BOWSER thought the most practical way was to assume showings would be within archives only and ask special permissions if films were wanted for Festivals or elsewhere. Mrs WIBOM asked about languages: if prints existed with sub-titles or inter-titles in a widely used language, then this would be preferable. Perhaps in any case the list of titles could be sent with the film to assist in translation.

In response to Mr CINCOTTI, Mrs BOWSER said she might be able to consider extra contributions offered at the Congress but no later. Bookings could be made through the Secretariat.

- EIAF Poster & Trailer

Mr DAUDELIN reported that the French designer/typographer's work had not been acceptable. Meanwhile, Don McWilliams, McClaren's assistant, had volunteered to complete the poster, possibly using McClaren out-takes. It had been decided to have it than originally planned. For the trailer, McWilliams had found some out-takes using the same birds and the work was underway.

- Additional posters for Anniversary & poster exhibition

Mr GARCIA MESA reported that he had asked 6 Latin American poster designers to produce posters to commemorate FIAF's 50th Anniversary, which they had agreed to do free of charge. He hoped to have them to exhibit in Paris with copies for sale. He had brought a collection of 50 Latin American posters to Berlin to give the EC an idea of the quality of their work in the hope that there could be an exhibition of them somewhere in Paris in 1988.

Mr BORDE suggested the Musée de l'Affiche in Paris.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST

### Additional non-FIAF Projects

Mr BORDE recalled some of the projects envisaged:

- Cinema reviews:

special articles on FIAF, preservation, etc, in May or June 1988 to mark the Anniversary.

Action: ?? who makes hit list ?

- 1988 Film Festivals

Mr CINCOTTI recalled there had been several proposals: to show restored films, to have a FIAF press conference, to have a FIAF archive representative on the Festival juries.

Mrs ORBANZ confirmed that they already had agreement to have a FIAF retrospective on colour films at the 1988 Berlin Festival.

Mr BORDE confirmed the French proposals for Festivals as follows:

- Avignon Theatre Festival, July 15-31

An exhibition and screening programme was proposed on the theme of the passage from silent films to talkies. This could be linked to the Anniversary.

- Perpignan Festival, April 1988

The theme was to be Europe in the 1920's, including silent films of the period and recent films covering the period. This too could be linked to FIAF.

Action: ?? who is coordinating the hit list ?

In the subsequent discussion, the following points were covered:

- Publicity

In reply to Mr POGACIC, Mr BORDE felt it was appropriate to use the services of Claude Beylie who in addition to running a FIAF Observer archive was Editor of "L'Avant-Scène du Cinéma" and well acquainted with the French press. Mrs WIBOM added that CNC's own Press Department was eager to ensure publicity.

- Archives as providers of film education

Mr POGACIC felt it would be useful to at least write an article on this aspect of archives' work in addition to the preservation side. He suggested Mr DAUDELIN as author.

Action: ?

- FIAPF and FIAD

Mrs WIBOM confirmed that the producers' and distributors' associations had been approached and were considering what they might do to mark the occasion. There seemed to be no problem for FIAF to be officially invited to a screening somewhere.

- European Film & Television Year, Council of Europe, 25 nations

Mrs WIBOM reported that the Ministers of Culture had met in December 1986 in Vienna and declared 1988 the European Film & Television Year. This was to promote (West) European images, primarily to counteract American images, which in her country at least accounted for 75% of screen time.

She was President of the Swedish National Committee and was angered to discover at meetings that, in addition to the Council of Europe nations, there were a number of international organisations, including FIAPF and FIAD, but

FIAF had not been invited. She had pointed out that if they wanted to promote the European film heritage internationally, they would need the help of the archives, so they should at least involve FIAF from the beginning. As a result, FIAF had now received an official invitation to attend the next meetings in Hamburg (June 11) and Brussels (July 10).

Mrs WIBOM asked the EC for their views. On the one hand, she felt it important that FIAF should be visible alongside the other international organisations; on the other hand, she was against the breaking up of FIAF activities into regional groupings under the auspices of others.

Mr KULA felt FIAF itself should be involved in the Council of Europe programme but was opposed to individual FIAF archives collaborating to work outside the auspices of FIAF itself.

Neither Mr BORDE nor Mrs ORBANZ had any information about the plans. Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that in 1988 Berlin was the Cultural City of Europe and they had put forward 3 projects for that programme. Mr FRANCIS reported he had put forward a submission for restoration of films in his own archive but understood this was nothing to do with the global programme described by Mrs WIBOM.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned some of the CE plans for 1988 including:

- acquisition of 52 European films for showing on European television in the same week
- European Cinema Day with free screenings
- harmonising legislation to facilitate production, distribution, exchange of staff, etc.

She knew they would love to be associated with the FIAF Anniversary Congress but she had not mentioned it so far.

Perhaps they could be involved in return for some contribution, for example, subtitling prints, making prints for touring shows, etc. Mrs ORBANZ felt they could be asked to do the sub-titling for the Touring Show as the programme was already ready.

**Decisions :**

- i Mrs ORBANZ and Mrs VAN DER ELST to attend CE meetings in Hamburg and Brussels respectively.
- ii Individual archives to cooperate as they saw fit.

- Media Year, EEC, 12 nations

Mrs WIBOM clarified that the EEC nations had a separate programme for 1988. Mr FRANCIS mentioned that, at the meeting in Luxembourg organised by Mr Junck, one of the proposals had been that funds might be available to purchase large private collections of European classics which were outside the reach of individual archives. He had sent a list of suggestions to Mr Junck and believed others were doing likewise.



Mr BORDE had attended the Luxembourg meeting but was somewhat suspicious even though there had been a declaration that the proposed union of EEC archives would not tread on FIAF's territory and would only accept FIAF members or observers. A provisional office had been created. While he was keen for FIAF archives to have access to any funds available, he was nevertheless fearful that it was the beginning of a political split.

In response to Mr CINCOTTI, he confirmed that a committee of 4 had been named (MM BORDE, DE VAAL, FRANCIS, JUNCK), but nothing had been done since.

**Transcriber's Note**

During the discussion, the separate initiatives by the Council of Europe and the EEC were often confused.

At this point, the EC discussed item 6.2.

**5.3 Documentation Commission Report: GA7**

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mrs Karen Jones had prepared a report for the GA which was similar to that of Glasgow but contained no mention of PIP. No candidate for the new Commission President had emerged.

Mr FRANCIS had discussed the matter further with Mrs Michelle Snapes and they both thought there were members of the Commission who would in the longer term be suitable as President. They were both willing therefore for her to accept as an interim measure for two years; however, she would not be able to leave the archive to attend the inter-Congress EC meetings if he was also attending. Mrs BOWSER warmly supported this solution.

Mrs VAN DER ELST and Mrs WIBOM suggested this was a favourable opportunity to dissolve the Commission and allow the new President to take on new blood. Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that the Rules provided for the President to propose Commission members for approval by the EC.

**Decision :**

- Dissolve existing Commission; invite Mrs Snapes to be new President and present suggestions for new programme and Commission members for discussion at next EC meeting.
- EC members (MM FRANCIS, KULA, CINCOTTI, MS WIBOM, BOWSER) to have informal meeting the next day with Ms Jones about the Commission and then a separate meeting about the PIP where Mr Moulds would join them.

**5.4 Cataloguing Commission Report: GA8**

Mrs HARRISON commented her reports for the GA and the EC.

**- Commission Membership**

With the recent resignation of Roger Holman, there were two vacancies. The Commission would therefore be looking for a second candidate during the year. Mr POGACIC suggested a capable 30-year old Yugoslav who had attended a FIAF Summer School.

Mrs WIBOM asked if it would be helpful to the Commission Heads to invite archives to identify possible candidates to serve on Commissions, as had been done for candidates for the EC. Mrs HARRISON reported that it had been very helpful in Canberra to have archives identify individual(s) responsible for cataloguing and these had now been compiled into a list. Mr SCHOU had already suggested something similar in Glasgow. Mr SPEHR felt it would be useful to have a description of the qualifications and experience required and a note of the obligations of the archives to support the costs of their Commission member. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that the experience required depended on which projects were current.

Mr KLAUE felt the active participation of developing countries was very important and reverted to the question of a FIAF fund to bring such delegates to meetings. Mrs HARRISON mentioned that at this year's Summer School there was more interest in Cataloguing and Documentation than Preservation and the participants were interested in how FIAF chose Commission members. Mr SCHOU felt they needed experts on the Commissions rather than inexperienced people with the problems. He was particularly disappointed that, when the experts retired and therefore had more time to serve the Commissions, they were obliged to resign. Mrs WIBOM recognised there was a problem but felt there was nothing FIAF could do about it.

#### Decisions:

- The EC approved the nomination of Vladimir Opela, of Czech Film Archive.
- Mrs HARRISON and Mr SCHOU to liaise with Mrs VAN DER ELST to draft a questionnaire inviting candidates for Commissions.

#### - Union Catalog

There was no mention of the Union Catalog in the Report but they proposed to put an article in the Bulletin, documenting the progress so far, which was due to the marvellous work by Mrs VAN DER ELST. The Secretariat now had about 6,000 titles stored on the computer and could generate lists showing number of cards by title, by keyword, by archive, by national production, by co-productions, by date, etc. The submissions included mistakes in titles and country and archive codes and it was agreed that where appropriate cards should be sent back for correction. To overcome the problems of inconsistent Russian transliteration systems, Mrs BOWSER suggested they should contact Mr Moulds who had already found a solution. Mrs HARRISON would give reminders about the project at the GA, express warm thanks to Mrs VAN DER ELST for making the project a reality, and remind members that the catalog could now be interrogated.

#### - FIAF Cataloguing Rules

They hoped to have an autumn meeting in Brussels to review and finalise the draft text but the two American members would have difficulty getting travel costs. They asked for permission to use their budget for this purpose.

Decision: Use of budget approved.

- Improved communication on proposed symposium topics  
Mrs HARRISON asked if topics could automatically be referred to the Commissions in advance.

- ISIS  
Mrs HARRISON referred to the Unesco request to FIAF to take a position on ISIS software. Although they were available to archives at no or low cost, some versions were hardware dependent (Hewlett Packard) and were often limited to fixed fields. They were studying a report on it from Cinemateca Brasileira.

Mr KLAUE reported Unesco was offering contracts for all its audio-visual money to FIAF but the money might be withdrawn if not taken up. In addition to Berlin and various missions, they had budgeted for some \$6,000 for a training seminar on ISIS. The money would probably be available for the training without the obligation for the trainees to actually use the software afterwards. They should therefore investigate in Berlin who might be interested to attend such a course (eg Spain).

Mr KULA said they had been using MINISIS for several years and from the experience endorsed Mrs HARRISON's reservations. He suggested the course could be an enquiry into its suitability for archive work rather than a recommendation. His own staff member would be a logical person to be involved in such a symposium.

Mr NAIR reported they had just been offered the software by Unesco free of charge and thought the Cataloguing Commission should be in a position to advise archives on the choice of software. Archives could not postpone computerisation indefinitely while waiting for the "ideal" software. Mrs HARRISON confirmed that they would investigate but at present they were not sufficiently informed about it. Mrs ORBANZ said Mr Arnaldo had asked if there was time in the Technical Symposium for him to present ISIS.

Mrs BOWSER was not happy that FIAF should even consider recommending a commercial product. Mr SPEHR felt FIAF would be doing a real service if they could collate members' experiences of different products, with pros and cons.

Mr KULA reported that the International Development Research Centre, a Canadian government-supported agency, had been instrumental in developing MINISIS which they had then donated to Unesco. Unesco had since been promoting and offering it free for non-commercial use, essentially for bibliographic control. It does not adapt readily to film archive work and has severe limitations. He stressed that it was not ready for use off-the-shelf and needed considerable adaptation to individual needs.

Mr NAIR asked for a study of the pros and cons of software that was available. It was pointed out that a study had already been made of systems in use in

archives but, in such a fast-changing field and with so many different requirements, it had very limited use.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to stress for the benefit of those without experience of computers that, even though software is labelled "free", there would always be considerable costs for implementation.

Mrs HARRISON reported that they hoped at least to prepare a checklist of questions for archives to use in evaluating hardware and software products.  
**Action:** Mr KLAUE and Mrs HARRISON to meet with Mr Arnaldo to explore the possibilities of using the seminar money in the most useful way.

- Standard names and logos for early Production Companies

After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Ms Gebauer would do some preliminary research in Germany and the new Commission member would consider possible methodologies.

- Meeting in Toulouse

They had gratefully accepted an invitation to have a meeting in Toulouse around the time of the next Congress.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Mrs HARRISON and the Commission members for their work during the year.

## 5.5 PIP

- PIP Management

Mr FRANCIS asked that although special financial arrangements had been made for PIP he would like to see at least some of FIAF's financial resources made available to the project. Some were available through the Documentation Commission although he believed Mrs Jones found it difficult to provide advice on the project and would be asking if the two could be dissociated. Even if the financial side of PIP is dealt with elsewhere, he would like the Editor to feel that management and product advice was readily available, together with FIAF support for the project.

He felt the Editor was working in a vacuum without feedback and the EC should define not just the financial aspects but also the practical assistance they could provide. It was such a major project that he would like to see the project routinely discussed at EC meetings and an opportunity provided for the Editor at least once a year to be given face-to-face guidance on policy in the same way that Commission Heads presented their projects for discussion.

Mrs WIBOM was not sure that the EC members had the relevant expertise. Mrs BOWSER felt the Documentation Commission expertise had been needed in setting up the project but it had always been difficult for them to help on project management as it was outside their experience. She felt it was a good suggestion as EC members had more management experience.

Mr KLAUE asked who was now in charge of Mr Mould's work and stressed it should be one individual. Mr CINCOTTI felt contractually he was responsible to the Secretary General but to the President of the Documentation Commission for the content of the day to day work. In his view, PIP was FIAF's most important project in the last 15 years and he found it strange that it should always be treated as a problem project. FIAF spent a lot of money on other projects without so much discussion; PIP always raised a lot of discussion yet it cost FIAF virtually nothing.

Mr BORDE referred to the loans outstanding totalling £9,920 (£5,500 and £4,420) or 700,000 Belgian francs and said he was considering suggesting that they should be written off so that PIP could balance the books and start clean. Budgets for the next few years forecast an eventual profit but it was impossible for FIAF to know how realistic these were without anyone within FIAF being responsible for reviewing the figures in detail.

Mrs VAN DER ELST supported what MM FRANCIS and CINCOTTI had said about Mr Mould's sense of isolation. He was totally dedicated to the project. She drew attention to the fact that FIAF set aside 500,000 Belgian Francs for Special Publications each year. PIP had accumulated a debt of 700,000 Belgian francs over 5 years. If one divided this total by 5, it came to only 140,000 Belgian francs per year, which was the sort of sum FIAF was quite willing to pay for other Special Publications.

Mr FRANCIS wanted to discuss the financial aspects separately. His present concern was with the management and future direction of the project. He cited as example the fact that the computer could produce the fiches in a different way at a much cheaper price (£200 instead of £1240); however, some recipients would not be able to afford the very modest cost of a new type of lens for the microfiche reader (£50 new or £35 secondhand). The EC might decide that it would be better to pay for the lens for the poorer archives so that the project itself could be operated more economically. At present, Mr Moulds had no means of getting a decision on such a situation.

Reverting to the question of reporting responsibility, he agreed that contractually Mr Moulds was responsible to the Secretary General. What he sought, was the advice of the EC as a group for management support and advice. Mr KLAUE suggested the new EC might consider whether one EC member should be particularly responsible for regular contact throughout the year. Mrs WIBOM said he should refer to the Secretary General and Treasurer direct on legal and financial matters respectively and the new Head of the Documentation Commission who was in London on other matters. Mr FRANCIS said he was already providing advice in London on practical matters but he was not in a position to decide on the type of policy matter he had just described. However, as long as PIP was on the Agenda at every EC meeting and Mr Moulds could attend at least one meeting a year, he felt the problem would be largely solved.

Mr KULA felt PIP could not be divorced from the Documentation Commission. The major question was not about the lenses but how to find indexers to reduce the costs (The May 1987 report listed 26 publications for which indexers were needed). Mr SPEHR noted that over the years half of the reporting was on managerial problems rather than documentation issues and felt the Documentation Commission should not be responsible for the managerial issues.

Mr KULA felt it was irresponsible of the Editor to ask the EC for advice on the lenses question without apparently having first circularised the subscribers to get information on how many needed to buy a new lens and how many could not afford it. Mr FRANCIS said the survey was being done; he had cited the issue as an example of the sort of questions that would come up.

#### Decisions :

- PIP to be on EC agenda and the Editor to meet the EC once a year.
- If there was an EC member from London, that person to provide liaison.
- Documentation issues to continue to be referred to the Commission.

#### - PIP Promotion

Mr KLAUE mentioned that IFLA and ICA were happy for PIP to advertise itself in their Bulletins without charge.

#### - PIP Financial Situation

Mr BORDE referred to the figures Mrs VAN DER ELST had given on the annual budget for Special Publications and the size of the PIP debt and repeated the suggestion he had made earlier that the cumulative debt should be written off by attributing it to Special Publications.

Mr KLAUE opposed this proposal as the decision had been made that it should be a strictly self-supporting project. He therefore considered the forecast surplus should be refunded to FIAF and there should be no regular subsidy.

Mrs ORBANZ noted that Supporters still figured in the budget up to 1990 and wondered if they were expected to go on indefinitely. This simply meant that some archives were paying a higher subscription. Mrs WIBOM understood 16 supporters had now agreed to continue for a further 5 years.

Mr BORDE said he was extremely embarrassed. He had made the proposal to find a solution but recognised that it was not normal for the supporters to go on for so long or to write off debts. The crux of the problem was to decide whether the project should continue or not but he didn't know how to answer.

Mr DAUDELIN regretted that Mr KLAUE was insisting on the point of principle that had been agreed so many years before, when it was evident from the history of the project that it could never be self-financing, especially as there was now a competitive product available from America which had access to a captive market.

Mr KULA suggested they should carry on as before for at least another year. He believed the project was extremely useful and was willing to pay a higher subscription to ensure it continued, which he thought was probably true of the other supporters. In addition, he thought it was important as an indication of what FIAF could do collectively for its members and the world outside, which was an important psychological factor.

Mr KLAUE pointed out firstly that they could not at the same time approve a PIP budget which involved a surplus and at the same time declare the project will never be self-financing. Secondly, if it was included in the Federation's budget, they should consider how to make it available to the whole membership and not just one-half\* of the membership (excluding Observers).

\* !! Editor's Correction to one half, from one third.

(28 subscribers, including 16 supporters)

Mr FRANCIS accepted the first point but remarked that they had not yet discussed the budget. Two of the recent problems had been solved by computerisation and a cheaper office but they had still not solved the distribution problem. The surplus assumed it would be solved but he was not at all sure this would happen. Mrs BOWSER recalled that there would be no surplus as long as the supporters were paying extra money.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked if a professional could help in the financial presentation and Mr FRANCIS confirmed that the senior BFI accountant would be doing this.

In response to Mr TOEPLITZ who wanted to know if the competitor was providing a service that would be acceptable to the PIP subscribers, Mr KULA explained that the American competitor covered most of the English-speaking world and included film articles in non-specialist periodicals. It did not have the same international range as PIP but was selling primarily to the rich North American academic market.

Mr TOEPLITZ thought however that, if after many years it was still not profitable, FIAF should face the truth and reassess its attitude towards the project in the light of experience and not feel bound to a principle that was agreed in different circumstances. If they thought it was still a useful project not just to the subscribers but to FIAF as whole, then it should be included in the FIAF budget, with or without the extra help from the supporters. Mr CINCOTTI agreed totally with Mr TOEPLITZ and thought it would be best to include it in the FIAF budget but wondered if there were alternatives. He wondered how much of the deficit was due to television and if PIP could more profitably revert to film only ?

In response to Mr FRANCIS, Mrs WIBOM confirmed that Unesco were hoping to take out 3 subscriptions with back issues to place in different regions. Meanwhile, the Unesco Paris office subscribed to the book only.

Reverting to the point that only a proportion of members could afford to subscribe to a service that was made possible by the joint efforts of many more archives, Mr KULA suggested there should be some investigation into setting up a new pricing structure to enable more members to subscribe according to their means. Mrs WIBOM thought this would make the project much more acceptable. Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the run-on unit cost was very cheap now the system was computerised.

After a coffee break for more informal discussion, Mrs WIBOM reopened the discussion by saying that those meeting with Mrs Karen Jones would try to explore ways to make PIP available to a wider group within the Federation. Meanwhile, they needed to take a decision on whether to write off the cumulative debt of 700,000 Belgian francs (£9,920), an average of £2,000 per year.

Decision: 8 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

Mr GARCIA MESA reported on the enthusiasm with which every issue of PIP was received in his archive by his staff and their users. He was horrified at the thought that it might be dropped and felt it should be a FIAF project. He will try to ensure his archive becomes full subscribers, will advertise it in his own publications, promote it among other Latin American archives and encourage them to advertise it also.

Mrs WIBOM asked Mr FRANCIS to assist Mr Moulds to prepare a report for the GA, taking into account the EC discussion and the PIP meetings the next day.

## 5.6 Preservation Commission Report

Mr SCHOU said his Report for the GA was substantially the same as discussed in Glasgow with the addition of notes on the East <sup>European</sup> German Sub-Commission's meeting in Berlin. He made the following additional comments:

### - Volkman Document

This would be offered for sale at the Symposium. The errata list had expanded to some 10 pages including technical comments and updating.

### - Handbook for Film Archives

The updated Preservation chapter was now very comprehensive and expanded to some 100 pages.

### - Technical Manual

Although they now had translations into French of papers already issued, he regretted that papers in the pipeline were not yet ready for distribution.

### - Vinegar Syndrome

He was pleased at the amount of research activity on this problem and had visited Dr Allen who was working at Manchester Polytechnic.

### - Colour stability after rewashing

Recent tests have shown that rewashing affects Orwo but not Kodak stock.



They had a schedule of some 34 working projects, details of which were being regularly circulated to curators and technical staff in archives in the hope of soliciting interest and additional collaboration.

Bob Gitt of UCLA Archives had joined the North American Sub-Commission. His main interests were sound and colour preservation.

Following an administrative hiccup, difficulties in attendance and delays on projects due to pressure of work, the next meeting scheduled for May in Koblenz might be postponed for a further six months. Mrs WIBOM was concerned for the meeting hosts that a meeting should be cancelled at short notice and Mrs VAN DER ELST offered the services of the Secretariat to assist with issuing circulars about meetings for any of the Commissions.

Mr SCHOU spoke of the amount of work involved in Commission projects and again raised the problem of how to get new blood into the Commissions. Perhaps archives could be advised that the normal period of service was two years, with possible extensions by agreement. He was reminded that the Rules already required that Commission Heads and members be reviewed every two years so no-one had permanent tenure.

Action: Commission Heads to define their needs and Mrs VAN DER ELST to incorporate these in a circular soliciting potential Commission candidates.

#### Participation of Commission Heads at EC meetings

Mr SCHOU noted that, although Commission Heads were invited to attend the EC meetings, they had not been receiving the papers so were not able to participate fully.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to supply copies to them.

Mrs WIBOM closed the discussion by thanking Mr SCHOU and his Commission for their work and Unesco for meeting Mr SCHOU's travel costs to Berlin, taking some of the burden from his own archive.

#### 5.7 Financial Report: GA11

Mr BORDE briefly reviewed the accounts for 1986 and the budget for 1988. As the Federation had healthy reserves, he suggested that the forecast deficit for 1988 of 400,000 Belgian francs should be drawn from reserves and there should be no increase in subscription for 1988.

For the 50th Anniversary, FIAF had built up a reserve of 1 million Belgian francs which would be supplemented by at least 12 million Belgian francs (2,569, 000FF) committed by CNC from the French state budgets of 1987 and 1988. Mrs WIBOM commented that the French had been wonderfully generous in their support of the Anniversary.

Decision: No increase in subscription for 1988.

### 5.8 Elections: GA14

Mrs WIBOM asked for comments on how to handle the elections under the new system. It was agreed that voting papers would be prepared in advance but it would be stressed that the lists were open until the last minute and delegates would be asked to add any additional names by hand on their own voting papers.

It was felt Mr Varga, of the Hungarian archive, had submitted his name for President in error. Mrs BOWSER explained that she had withheld her name to ensure new blood entered the EC but, as there were 3 retiring members, she would be standing.

### 5.9 Projects and Publications underway: GA10

#### - Embryo or "Treasures from the Film Archives"

Mrs BOWSER confirmed that the project was completed from the FIAF side and a contract arranged with an outside publisher, Scarecrow Press, on standard terms (15% royalty on full price sales, etc) plus "free copies" at cost price to be deducted from royalties. Mr CINCOTTI thanked Mrs BOWSER for this arrangement as he thought Scarecrow an excellent publisher.

- Silent Film Catalogue Mr LEDOUX would be reporting personally.
- Historical Symposium in Vienna No news
- Slapstick Symposium in New York Written report from Mrs BOWSER.
- Restoration Symposium in Canberra

Mr SCHOU reported for Mr Edmondson that they would continue work on the Restoration Code after the Berlin discussion on the ethics of restoration and the possibility of combining in a joint publication. They would work on it in the second half of 1987 and would be approaching Australian Film Commission for sponsorship once they had determined contents.

#### - Annual Bibliography of FIAF Members' Publications

Mr KULA reported for Ms Vosikovska that it would be a little later this year because of internal reorganisation. For 1988, they had talked of combining with a filmography covering film and television programmes relating to the work of archives. They were willing to edit (but not print) if FIAF wanted it.  
Decision: Suggest to GA as part of 1988 Celebration programme.

#### - International Bibliography of early equipment

Mr DAUDELIN stressed this was an on-going project. During the year there were a few additions and some members had started asking for information.

#### - Revised edition of Handbook for Film Archives

Mrs BOWSER reported everything was in hand and Mr Kuiper was ready to continue to edit, even if he left his archive.

#### - Glossary of laboratory terms

Mr SPEHR had passed a preliminary list to Mr SCHOU which they would review together. In addition, there was a training course at the Library of Congress this summer which would cause them to work on it more actively.

Mr KLAUE mentioned there was a strong demand for the glossary: from participants at the FIAF Summer School and from the Spanish archive

following difficulties experienced in translating the film handling leaflet. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that the existing glossary of filmographic terms was very widely used in her archive. The existing Scandinavian one was inaccurate. It was agreed that the important task was to get a good glossary in one language first (American English).

- FIAF Bulletin

Mr DE VAAL reported contributions had arrived late so the 34th Edition would be distributed in June. Two of the four members of the Editorial Board would be leaving (himself and Mr Kuiper) but he was pleased that Mr DAUDELIN was willing to become Editor and Mrs BOWSER was willing to continue.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Mr DE VAAL for all the work he had devoted to the Bulletin over so many years.

**Decision:** Deadline for 34th Edition end of May. Decision on new Editor dependent on result of elections to new EC.

- Statistics on Film archive activities

This project title should be amended to "Revision.." Mr KLAUE was willing to continue subject to advice from the EC.

- Summer School 1987

Mr KLAUE would give a verbal report.

### 5.10 Modification of FIAF Statutes and Rules: GA13

Mr CINCOTTI reported they would be introducing the proposals agreed at Glasgow. Members had had plenty of time in advance to submit comments in advance so he hoped the discussion would be brief.

Voting could be for one article at a time. There was no requirement for a global vote. Mr TOEPLITZ suggested it would be preferable to limit the discussion by allowing one person to speak for and one against each article.

### 5.11 Future Congresses: GA15

- 1987: Berlin

Congress sessions are normally chaired by the President (opening and closing session), Vice Presidents and the host. It was pointed out that hosts very often had insufficient background on FIAF to chair successfully: in this case, Mrs ORBANZ preferred not to serve as she was busy preparing the Symposium and she felt Dr Rathsack would prefer not to. Mr GARCIA MESA, Vice President, said he would prefer not to.

Chairs for the 5 sessions were agreed as follows: Mrs WIBOM, Mr KLAUE, Mr KULA, Mr FRANCIS, Mrs WIBOM.

- 1988: Paris

see item 5.2 above

- 1989: Lisbon

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Jose Manuel Costa and Luis de Pina would present detailed proposals to the GA. For the symposia, they would prefer not to take up the "colonial" topic.

They proposed instead one and a half days on the "Cultural role of archives: the relationship between archiving and diffusion programming" for which they would involve internationally recognised historians, critics and scholars, etc. as well as archives. Mr DAUDELIN thought it was a very interesting topic and suggested one or more members of the EC should meet with them for a brainstorming planning session. Mr KLAUE thought the topic needed handling with care and should not direct attention away from preservation.

For the other symposium, they were happy to cooperate in organising one day on the agreed topic "Evolution of Film Editing 1900-1906, a corpus analysis" in association with André Gaudréault and his team. Mr FRANCIS, Mr DAUDELIN and Mrs HARRISON noted there was little reference in the new proposal to cataloguing which had previously been seen as a major element.

Mr SPEHR pointed out that the Canadian team had a methodological approach which was not necessarily shared by scholars in the States and elsewhere and he felt, if FIAF was giving them a forum in Paris as well, they should take care to avoid the impression they were endorsing their particular approach.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was logical that the project should be featured in Paris as it had developed from work initiated within FIAF. He admired them because they were making something happen and was impressed they had been able to raise another \$83,000 to extend the project to other countries. Mrs BOWSER agreed and Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that many FIAF archives were associated with the day-to-day work of the project.

Decision : Ask the next EC to clarify the position with Lisbon, particularly the contribution of the Cataloguing Commission.

- 1990: Cuba ?

Mr GARCIA MESA said they would be very happy if their candidature were accepted and quoted at length from a detailed document he had prepared, based on the checklist for Congress candidates and confirming that they would provide all the usual facilities. They proposed it should be held late April or early May, in any case before the Cannes Festival and had allowed 9 working days (EC3, GA2 and Symposium 4).

In response to "Why Habana?", he said the Cuban Film Archive would be celebrating its 30th Anniversary in 1990 and the Congress would bring much support to the archive vis-à-vis the authorities and public opinion regarding their numerous projects for film preservation and film culture. Habana had become an important film centre for the region through the annual Latin American Film Festivals and the International Film & TV School for third world students. As a result of the creation of the Foundation for the New Latin American Film, the archive might incorporate a regional centre for the preservation of the audio-visual heritage of the region, particularly the Caribbean and Central America where there were very few archives.

## - Symposia

He suggested two symposia, both concerned with the third world, the first on film production and the second on the situation, problems and progress of moving image archives in Latin America, Africa and Asia. For the latter, they felt it would be useful to review the results of the guidance and financial help third world archives had been receiving from FIAF and Unesco, and assess the extent of the implementation of the Unesco Recommendation in those countries. The Cuban Film Archive would publish the proceedings in Spanish and provide a rough English translation for editing by the Secretariat.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested the EC should formally accept the invitation from Cuba for 1990 and recommend it to the GA in Berlin but postpone discussion of the Symposia for the next EC. Mr GARCIA MESA agreed to have his report translated into English for the next EC. Mr KLAUE asked that a preliminary draft budget be prepared for Paris, including the Symposia which would probably require additional funding.

**Decision :** Formal approval by the EC to be recommended to the GA.

At this point the EC discussed item 6.3.

## - 1991+

Discussion was not needed at this stage as the GA had only to decide 3 years in advance.

## 5.12 Relations with International organisations: GA17

Mr KLAUE would report on Unesco. Relations were excellent and virtually the whole of the Unesco budget for archives was allotted to FIAF.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said Mr Arnaldo had asked to speak to the GA. Mr KLAUE thought IASA and FIAT might also want to address the GA.

**Decision :** Invite contributions from them.

Mr GARCIA MESA asked if Unesco could consider contributing to the Cuba Symposium but Mr KLAUE thought it was probably too late.

Mr KULA mentioned that the Chairman of the ICA audio-visual Committee, Robert Egeter Van Kuyck, would be attending and it would be useful to meet with him to coordinate possible cooperation with their forthcoming meetings on audio-visual archives (Paris 1988 on "New Materials and Archives" and Ottawa 1990).

**Action:** Who ????

## 5.13 Open Forum: GA 16

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that she had only one topic so far: the rights of the Lumière films, presented by Mr BORDE. Mr TOEPLITZ suggested FIAF should take a stand against the practice of colouring black and white films. Mrs WIBOM would mention some of the suggested ideas for future Symposia.

Mr GARCIA MESA referred to the international Film and TV School in Habana which was a private organisation supported by the Foundation for the New Latin American Film (President: Gabriel Garcia Marquez) and the Committee of Latin American Film-Makers. They were considering incorporating seminars on film archive work for film archives. He would like to talk about this in Open Forum. (Mr CINCOTTI warmly supported this, especially as the two Directors of the School were former pupils of his !)

## **6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Some of the following points were discussed in the course of other Agenda items but are reported here for ease of retrieval.

### **6.1 Symposium on archive management**

During point 4.6a, Mrs WIBOM picked up a former suggestion of Mr KULA's that FIAF should have a Symposium on archive management, particularly from the political point of view, including relationships with government and other bodies and legislative matters.

Mr KLAUE supported this idea, especially as it was a permanent problem of discussion at Summer Schools; he mentioned questions of health protection, norms for archive work (time needed for film inspection, cataloguing, etc). Mr GARCIA MESA supported it especially on behalf of less developed countries. Mr NAIR also supported it on behalf of new archives who should have the opportunity to benefit from the experience of others.

Mr KULA picked up the point on Occupational Health and Safety and mentioned that in 1986 their laboratory was found to have an asbestos ceiling which was a hazard to the workers. They had been forced to move at a cost of some \$600,000 and had a list of some 120 problem areas to attend to. He felt the information and experiences would be very useful to other archives. They also had considerable experience in drafting legislation; they had a clause requiring producers or distributors to make copies available to the archive on demand, provided the archive could pay the laboratory costs (this was "mandatory compliance" rather than full "legal deposit"). He felt many archives would have useful experience to exchange in these areas.

**Decision:** Consider further under "Future Congresses".

### **6.2 Tribute to Mr DE VAAL & Rules concerning Honorary Members**

As it was Mr DE VAAL's last attendance at a FIAF Congress as an official delegate, there was an off-the-record discussion of how best to pay tribute to him.

There were still some doubts about the most practical rules governing Honorary Members. The new proposal limited them to 5 to ensure it was a very special award and there were not too many people to accommodate at meetings. At the same time, it was pointed out that as FIAF grew larger and older, they would inevitably have more Members they wished to honour.

Perhaps it would be better to remove the restriction on the number of Honorary Members but introduce more flexibility in arrangements for their attendance at meetings, EC and/or GA. While their experience was especially useful for the detailed EC discussions, the presence of a large number of Honorary Members placed a heavy extra burden on the meeting hosts. Perhaps there could be a time limit on the number of years they could serve and attend meetings, to make it possible to honour new people as Honorary Members beyond the envisaged limit of 5.

### 6.3 Invitations for future EC Meetings

#### - Cuba

Mr GARCIA MESA was pleased to be able to invite the EC to hold their next meeting in Habana, in connection with the 9th International Cuban Film Festival of New Latin American Film, December 3-17. He had provided 3 documents, about the Festival, the hotels (with special reductions for the Festival) and flights to Habana. It had been suggested that they might like to have the EC meetings in the mornings only so they could attend more films. Mr ALVES NETTO said it would be better if they could all stay in the same hotel and have their meeting there. The Film Festival visitors would be in the same hotels. Mr GARCIA MESA mentioned that alternatively they could meet in the Convention Hall to experience it for themselves before 1990.

Mrs WIBOM asked that the Cuban authorities be thanked for their generous invitation.

**Decision:** Refer the invitation to the new EC.

#### - Other invitations

Mr CINCOTTI said there might be two invitations from Italy for 1988 and Mr DAUDELIN said the autumn 1988 meeting could be in Montreal as part of their 25th Anniversary celebrations.

### 6.4 Tribute to Mr KULA

Mr KLAUE suggested they should honour Mr KULA's contribution to the archive movement in general which had been remarkable. He had been one of the initiators of missions and had been of great help to many developing countries. He had also played an important role and chaired the most important meeting in the preparation of the Unesco Recommendation. He suggested he should be invited as Honorary Guest to the Paris Congress as he would not be representing an archive. Mrs WIBOM said they all joined Mr KLAUE in his appreciation.

**Decision:** Unanimous recommendation.

Mrs WIBOM then formally closed the meeting with thanks to all the EC, the interpreter Jill Johnson and the technical staff.

The EC then had an informal meeting with Mr Ledoux.





# MEETING OF THE FIAF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Berlin, 19 May, 1987

Members	Anna-Lena WIBOM	President	
	Guido CINCOTTI	Secretary-General	
	Raymond BORDE	Treasurer	
	Wolfgang KLAUE	Vice President	
	Hector GARCIA MESA	Vice President	
	Eva ORBANZ	Vice President	
	<i>P.K. Naair</i>		
	Eileen BOWSER		
	Robert DAUDELIN	Deputy Secretary General	
	David FRANCIS		
Maria Rita GALVAO			
Luis de PINA	Deputy Treasurer		
Bob ROSEN			
Honorary Members	Einar LAURITZEN		ABSENT
	Vladimir POGACIC		ABSENT
	Jerzy TOEPLITZ		ABSENT
Commission Members	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing	ABSENT
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation	
	Michelle SNAPES	Documentation	ABSENT
Executive Secretary	Brigitte VAN DER ELST		
Interpreter	Jill JOHNSON		

# FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page	
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Appointment of new Officers	1
3	Membership Questions	
	3.1 Luxembourg (Cinémathèque Municipale)	1
	3.2 Bogota	7
	3.3 Reconfirmations to be discussed in Habana	9
*	a-f Beijing, Montevideo (CU), Pyongyang, Los Angeles (AFI)	9
4	50th Anniversary	9
5	New Editorial Board for the Bulletin	9
6 *	PIP: Financial Analysis	10
7	Budget	
*	7.1 Membership fees	10
*	7.2 Fund for Developing Countries	10
8	Other International Organisations	
	8.1 IASA	11
	8.2 ICA	11
	8.3 European Film & Television Year	11
9	FIAF Berlin Declaration on Colourisation	11
10 *	Proposal to nominate a new Honorary Member	11
11 *	Evaluation of Berlin GA and Open Forum	12
12	Next EC Meeting	13
13	Any Other Business	
	- 1992 Congress	13

In addition to items marked \* above, the following items were held over for discussion at the next meeting in Habana:

- H1 FIAF and Film Museums (FRANCIS/KLAUE paper)
- H2 Exchange of staff

# MINUTES

The first Meeting of the newly elected Executive Committee was held on Tuesday evening, 19 May, after the General Assembly and before the Berlin Symposia.

Mrs WIBOM welcomed the new Committee, in particular the new members, Mrs Maria Rita GALVAO, Mr Luis de PINA, and Mr Bob ROSEN.

*The meeting began with discussion of 3.1 and then reverted to normal sequence.*

## 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

An informal agenda was agreed. Items that were carried over to the next meeting without discussion are listed on the Final Agenda/Contents Page.

## 2 APPOINTMENT OF NEW OFFICERS

After informal discussion, the following officers were designated:

Vice Presidents	Wolfgang KLAUE, Eva ORBANZ, Hector GARCIA MESA
Deputy Secretary General	Robert DAUDELIN
Deputy Treasurer	Luis de PINA

## 3 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

3.1 Luxembourg: Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg  
Mrs WIBOM summarised the situation to date: Luxembourg had been Observers since 1979 and had applied this year to become full Members. Mr BORDE had made an official visit on behalf of the EC and made a very favourable positive report but, following discussion, the EC had voted by secret ballot to recommend rejection. The GA had voted against the EC recommendation and asked the EC to reconsider. She regretted the way the situation had been handled and explained that Mr Junck was standing by to join the EC meeting and answer questions.

Mrs ORBANZ felt it was important to distinguish two aspects of the situation: first, whether the EC felt the candidate was qualified to be a Member of the Federation and some EC members might want to discuss points with Mr Junck before voting; secondly, whichever way the vote went, it was important that the reasons should be clear so that the EC could report back to the GA giving the specific grounds for acceptance or refusal.

Mrs BOWSER felt there was an error in announcing the rejection to the GA; she felt this was a private matter and the reasons should have been discussed

privately with Mr Junck so that he had a chance to answer questions, resubmit or withdraw. Mrs VAN DER ELST referred to the candidature of South Africa which had been discussed and refused by the EC but not reported to the GA; in that case, there was severe criticism from the GA when they discovered years later that they had not been told of the rejection.

Mr NAIR also felt there was a procedural lapse and if, as he understood, the criticism was that the archive was not sufficiently concerned with preservation, then this should have been discussed with the candidate before putting the matter before the GA. He later added that they should have accepted the positive Report made by the EC Member responsible for the official visit or, if they refused it, they should have given their reasons.

Mr FRANCIS said membership applications did not have to go to a vote at the first discussion; if there was doubt, they should seek more information before making a decision. Mr CINCOTTI felt the procedures had in fact been strictly observed. If the EC made a decision, then they were obliged to tell the GA. However, although as Mr NAIR and Mr FRANCIS suggested, they had the possibility of not making a decision and of consulting the candidate in case of doubt, neither of these options was required by the Rules.

Mrs WIBOM said they all very much regretted the situation that developed at the GA which could have been avoided. They should certainly have referred the matter first to Mr Junck and not mentioned it at the GA, except perhaps to say the application was being examined. It was important now to re-consider the application. Several people had had doubts on the preservation policy or apparent lack of it and this needed sorting out. She would also like to ask Mr Junck about various rumours circulating about his activities. Mrs BOWSER felt mention of such rumours could be misinterpreted as an accusation.

Mr FRANCIS felt there was no harm in expressing concern and simply asking for information but they should avoid an "inquisition" atmosphere.

Mr DAUDELIN noted that although the final decision would have to be made by the next GA, it might be possible if the EC now voted in favour to find a formula to enable the archive not to go home empty-handed.

#### Discussion with Mr Junck

Mrs WIBOM welcomed Mr Junck and first expressed the EC's apologies for the way it had handled his application and regretted any embarrassment to him. She mentioned there had been doubts and questions and was sorry they had not invited him to discuss them before passing to a vote at the GA.

Mr FRANCIS opened by asking a question that he had already asked Mr Junck in private, namely, that he had seen no mention of "preservation" in any of the reports submitted and this concerned him greatly. Mr KLAUE added on the same point that "preservation" did not figure in the budget and asked first, if preservation work was being done under other budget headings and, secondly, for information on their preservation plans.

Mr Junck replied that, before preservation, the first task was to actually find films and then to find out whether copies held by the archive were unique or in better condition than copies held elsewhere in the world. Although he had many French films, it was difficult to find out if other and better copies existed in French archives or elsewhere, which was why he and Mr BORDE had been so keen to launch the idea of an inventory of Francophone films. There was such a shortage of money worldwide for preservation it was foolish to duplicate effort.

They were very much engaged in preservation: films they found were repaired and stored in optimal conditions and, for this purpose, new vaults were being constructed which would house some 100,000 cans. They were a small country, with small production, yet were preserving their own national heritage, even though they had no laboratory facilities of their own. They had recently found 2 nitrate shorts believed lost, and sent them immediately to a Swiss laboratory chosen because of their reputation for good quality work.

Although they believed all films should be preserved, regardless of quality, they were not able to take responsibility for preservation of non-national production. However, when they found film from other countries, they certainly took action to ensure its preservation. For instance, they recently found 30 or 40 nitrate prints of second-rate 1930's French films which they passed direct to the French archives; similarly, some 1914-15 German films had been made available to the East German archive. They had quite a large collection of 1930's French film on 16mm but felt these were not in immediate danger as they existed on safety stock. In addition they had 17.5mm prints and the machines to screen them; as example, he mentioned that his print of Grémillon's *Patte de Mouche* had been very useful to the French archive in making a restoration. Similarly, they were also trying to save 70mm prints as no-one else seemed interested in preserving or showing them; they already had 30 to 40 prints and the facilities for screening them.

Mr KLAUE, as "devil's advocate", mentioned that Mr Ledoux was always complaining that Luxembourg was regularly infringing Article 102 in acquisition of material outside its own country, by approaching Belgian distributors without seeking consent of the Belgian archive. He himself was ready to defend Luxembourg but felt it was necessary for Mr Junck to clarify the relations and responsibilities of Belgian companies for the territory of Luxembourg.

Mr Junck appreciated the question and acknowledged that there were many unfounded rumours. Since 1945, Belgian companies nearly always had the rights for both Belgium and Luxembourg; however, Luxembourg was a key city and had films simultaneously with Brussels, not after showing throughout Belgium as had been alleged. In the 1960's, he had spent 6 years in Paris going to the Cinémathèque every night, and been on frequent trips to Brussels to see films and organise cinephile weekends; he had got to know and been

greatly influenced by people like Langlois and Ledoux so was particularly disappointed at Mr Ledoux's irrational antagonism when he came to set up the Luxembourg archive in 1979. Mr Ledoux refused to speak to him, would not take telephone calls or answer letters. To avoid aggravating the situation, he had avoided taking any films from Belgium but recently a distributor had approached him, commended the archive on its work, and offered him "Apocalypse Now" and "Fedora". In addition, as example of their wish to cooperate, they had replied very thoroughly to Mr Ledoux's questionnaire about their silent film holdings. For other countries, he always informed the FIAF archives and never hid anything. Sometimes, they were offered a collection by private collectors who were often despised by the bigger archives but they always informed the countries concerned. He understood Mr Ledoux had described him as "marginal, outlaw, a producers' or copyright man"; when Mr Ledoux stocked sometimes up to 15 prints of the same film and made not a single foot available to Luxembourg, he had to find other ways to find film.

He felt Mr Ledoux was trying to kill an archive before it was born; surely FIAF was in the business of saving film and the more archives, the more films saved.

Mrs BOWSER asked if he envisaged changes and had plans for future growth of the archive, particularly with reference to preservation. He confirmed that they had no nitrate and, when they found any, made arrangements with larger, better equipped archives; in addition, their own national heritage was already preserved. They had bought an expensive machine to compare 35 and 16 mm prints and had one person full-time checking prints to complete them. He asked what else they should be doing within such a small archive. He added that he was active in trying to create an association within the European Community that could campaign for funding on a large scale to ensure nitrate film preservation. Mrs BOWSER stressed that she was not implying criticism of their present activities but preservation extended beyond the copying of nitrate, to for example copying acetate, or colour, or providing cold storage.

He replied that they certainly had great ambitions but were very pleased to have survived to their 10th anniversary. When they moved to their new vaults in 18 months, they would be able to do more. They were in constant contact with other European archives, attended FIAF meetings and were very happy to work on joint projects with other archives. As an example of his own role as a catalyst for preservation by others, he mentioned his fight for the restoration of Michael Curtis' Sodom & Gomorrha and the part he had played both in identifying archives (Vienna, Budapest, etc) which had portions of this 4-hour "lost" film and in working for it to become a restoration project of the East Berlin archive. Similarly, they had found a tinted Italian film Julius Ceasar by Enrico Guarzone (??), which they had sent to East Berlin for restoration. Returning to his own country, he said they had done all they could and perhaps a lot more than could be expected from so small a country.

Mr NAIR understood from Mr BORDE's report that they had some unique prints from other countries' production which were being constantly projected. Mr Junck said this was totally untrue. They were not "screening like crazy": they had 2 shows a night, Monday to Friday, and had over 5000 feature films of which they may have screened 1500, perhaps once or twice. In fact, they were bothered by requests from other archives, say 15 requests a week, which they found difficult to refuse as, after all, a film not shown was as "dead" as a film destroyed by decomposition. However, they were well aware of the importance of not screening unique prints and a large part of their collection was not available for screening; in other cases, they had taken a second security print. He added that it was nevertheless very difficult to know what was a unique print as there was no central, worldwide inventory. For instance, how could he find out whether and where all the American talkies were held? French films were easier since the Francophone group had started its inventory, a process which he had been instrumental in setting up.

Mrs BOWSER explained that the American archives were cooperating very closely and any of them would be responsible for finding out from the others the position on any single film. Mr Junck felt it was not quite so simple as films might well be held outside official archives, by a production company or in some other collection. He mentioned that he had just supplied to the Secretariat 500 cards on their holdings of films originally on nitrate and more were to follow. They were very open to suggestions of collaboration.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned they were also interested in 70mm and its special problems. Mr Junck mentioned the problems of weight affecting both transport and handling; the Eastmancolor tended to fade and needed very cold storage. They were very enthusiastic about Technicolor and had done some comparative studies. Max Ophuls' son had said their print of Lola Montes was the nicest he had seen in 20 years and it was very depressing to see that the colour was beginning to go. They could only hope to stop them from further deterioration. Mrs WIBOM mentioned her archive had recently installed special shelving in the low temperature vaults and a winding table for inspection, both of which had been very expensive because of the size. Mr Junck said a major problem was finding cans to put them in and would ask the Russians if they could help.

Mrs WIBOM expressed her appreciation of the archive and the help they had given others but invited him to comment on certain rumours which he said were untrue. She further understood that some screening and lending of prints had not had the approval of the copyright owners. Mr Junck thought they had perhaps been too helpful but had always asked people to clear copyright themselves. He mentioned one occasion where he had written to Brussels about a 1930's Warner Bros film and eventually gave up, confronted with "plain stupidity". Their own screenings were on archive premises, in a small cinema, for members only and no-one had ever complained in 10 years.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Mr Junck for his contribution.

#### Discussion after Mr Junck's departure

In the ensuing discussion, Mr GARCIA MESA felt the Cinémathèque Municipale was in a very difficult position as there was no distributor established in Luxembourg itself but they nevertheless had to be registered and pay taxes in Luxembourg. As far as he could understand, Mr Junck and Mr Ledoux had equal rights regarding distributors which operated in the two countries.

Mr BORDE felt this was an excellent point and regretted he had not clarified it in his Report. He had since found out that when a Belgian distributor bought the rights of a film from a producer the distribution contract covered the two countries. In addition, he would like to add to the Report a note that it was Mr Junck who had visited the Director General of the CNC, been the instigator of the very valuable inventory of French films and persuaded the Francophone archives to cooperate. In addition, as an Observer with limited means, he had nevertheless produced the inventory covering 1940-50, which was an erudite contribution to the history of cinema that one could only reasonably expect from a full Member.

Mr FRANCIS said he was completely satisfied except for one point: what action was going to be taken when films were found to be "unique" ? were they going to be stored or copied ? Mr BORDE said that for 1929-39 they had identified various elements for 950 of the 1300 films produced; having identified what was "unique" within the 7 francophone archives, they would next be asking all archives if they had any material on those same films. Mr FRANCIS explained that he was not happy at the definition of "unique" used by Mr Junck which embraced holdings outside registered archives. Mr GARCIA MESA felt Mr FRANCIS' point was important, especially for small archives with limited budgets and would like it to be discussed on another occasion.

Mr NAIR felt there was also confusion about the definition of "preservation"; as he understood it, Mr Junck felt saving a film from destruction by someone else was "preservation", which was a very limited view.

In terms of investment in preservation, Mr BORDE pointed out that the Luxembourg archive had already set aside in 1987 alone some 4 million Belgian francs to start the construction of new vaults, which, to put it in perspective, was 4 times the FIAF subsidy for the 50th Anniversary.

Mrs WIBOM felt the discussion should be closed and asked if the EC were willing to vote or would prefer to postpone to a further meeting.

**Decision :** By secret ballot, recommendation in favour of admission as full Members: 10 votes in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions.



### 3.2 Bogota: Cinemateca Distrital & Fundación Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano

Mr DAUDELIN reported on the meeting he, Mr CINCOTTI, Mr KLAUE and Mrs VAN DER ELST had had with Mr Jorge Nieto from the Fundación from which they understood that Cinemateca Distrital was now primarily a projection organisation, with a documentation centre and a small holding of films for projection, and that the main archive collection had now passed to the newly-created Fundación.

This meant that the Cinemateca Distrital, which they had just confirmed as an Observer on the basis of its last Annual Report, in fact no longer qualified as an Observer. As an interim measure, he suggested a compromise solution was perhaps to admit the Fundación also as an Observer on the basis of their recently arrived dossier. This would mean that for one year there would be two recognised Observers in Colombia but they could correct the situation next year. Meanwhile, in the letter of Reconfirmation to Distrital, they should ask for information on any changes in statutes following the creation of the Fundación of which they were a founder member.

Mr CINCOTTI felt the situation was still confused and was not happy that the representative from the Fundación had implied that, if the EC did not admit them as Observers at this meeting, his Director might reconsider its relations with FIAF.

For the benefit of new EC members, he reviewed the situation to date. On the formation of the Fundación (uniting 5 existing bodies, including the Instituto Distrital de Cultura, parent body of Cinemateca Distrital), the new Director (who had formerly been director of the Cinemateca Distrital) wrote in October 1986 to enquire if the Observership should be transferred automatically to the new organisation or if they should re-apply. The Secretary-General's reply last April had been that if Distrital was simply now part of a larger organisation, continuing the same activities with the same autonomy, it could remain as Observer and there was no need for change. The Fundación had replied to the Secretary-General on April 25 to try to clarify the matter with a new dossier to Rome which arrived only on May 12.

Meanwhile, in communications from the new Director of Cinemateca Distrital, Mrs Elvira Talero, there was no mention of this or of any change in their activities and, as the new Director seemed to assume they would still remain as a FIAF Observer and as they had submitted their Annual Report, FIAF had routinely reconfirmed Distrital as Observers. It was only since the Reconfirmation that they had learnt from the Fundación that Distrital's activities had changed and that all preservation activities were transferred to the Fundación. In any case, before deciding whether to change or withdraw status from one of its Observers, FIAF should first hear the story from them. Meanwhile, he felt the new Fundación dossier should be considered on its merits at the next EC meeting.

Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that the Fundación had sent their first dossier in October 1986 and had done everything possible to find out from FIAF what procedure they should follow to become Observers. They were very keen to be in FIAF and, having had considerable difficulty to convince their authorities of its importance, would find it particularly embarrassing if the decision to admit them was not made this time.

Mr DAUDELIN said it was not a question of saying no. Because of the time scale the dossier could not be discussed before the Havana meeting, especially as the information in their April 25 letter was quite different from what had been understood previously. However, the Secretary General could write a very courteous letter explaining this, congratulating them on the quality of the dossier and explaining that they would hear immediately the decision was made in Havana.

Mrs GALVAO was puzzled as she, and presumably other Latin American archives, had been in frequent correspondence with the new Director of Distrital and there had been no mention of any change in their activities. It was essential to find out from Distrital themselves, as the existing Observer, what was happening.

Mr ROSEN agreed the situation was very confusing but stressed that through his personal dealings with "this archive" ( Transcriber: presumably the Fundación ?) over material sent to the States for laboratory work and storage, he found they were extraordinarily responsible, rigorous and systematic, and totally committed to the ideals of preservation and building a collection. He felt that even if the decision was not made now, it would help them back home if FIAF sent a letter positively reinforcing everything they are doing.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was similar to the relationship between the BFI and the NFA in the UK. He quoted from the early pages of the Fundación dossier sent in October 1986 which indicated one of the founding partners was: "Cine Colombiana SA, the largest film distributor and exhibitor in the country". The Fundación was simply a larger organisation and there was nothing to suggest that the Cinemateca Distrital was not the true archive.

Mr KLAUE felt the Fundación should be told no decision could be made until the meeting in Habana and drew attention to the fact that Rule 14 required that where a candidate came from a country where there was an existing Observer/Member, their written views should be sought. However, he also thought the Secretary General should formally advise Cinemateca Distrital they had received information they were no longer operating as an archive responsible for preservation, and ask for clarification of its situation.

**Decision :** Secretary General to write  
i to Cinemateca Distrital: confirming they have been reconfirmed as Observers and also asking if and how their activities have been changed as a result of the creation of the Fundación.

ii to Fundación: congratulating them on the quality of their dossier; regretting that it could not be decided on in Berlin as it arrived too late and FIAF Rules obliged them first to take written views from any existing Observer/Member in a country; confirming the decision will be made at the December meeting and they will be notified immediately. They could agree with the representative in Berlin on whether it would be more helpful for that letter to be formal or informal.

#### **At the end of the EC meeting**

Mrs GALVAO mentioned she was very interested to have information on what was happening in Bogota and asked if it was in order for her to investigate the situation personally. Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that she was of course free to make contact, archive to archive, and any information she could obtain would be welcomed by the EC.

#### **3.3 Next Reconfirmation of Members**

The reconfirmations to be discussed in Habana would be:

Beijing; Montevideo (CU); Pyongyang; Los Angeles (AFI)

### **4 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

Mrs WIBOM confirmed they were still hoping to have a meeting with Mr Schmitt in Berlin and there would be a further planning meeting in Paris in June.

There was a brief discussion of possibilities to help certain individuals attend the Congress.

### **5 NEW EDITORIAL BOARD FOR THE BULLETIN**

Following the retirement of Mr DE VAAL, it was agreed that the new Editor should be Mr Robert DAUDELIN. Mrs Eileen BOWSER was willing to stay on the Board and the two of them would seek further collaborators.

Mr Luis DE PINA suggested it would be useful to have the collaboration of people with journalistic experience, perhaps writers for cinema review publications.

!! At the end of the meeting, Mr GARCIA MESA suggested there might be a special edition of the Bulletin to be released in Paris to coincide with the 50th Anniversary.

## **6 PIP : FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

Mr KLAUE thought it was important to look at what FIAF had spent on the PIP project throughout its history, identifying subsidies, contributions to running costs and loans. It was only on this basis that they could make intelligent forecasts for the future. Mr FRANCIS felt such an exercise would not be useful because of the change-over to help from the Supporters. He was more interested in planning for the future and attempts to estimate revenue from sales of the volumes.

Mr BORDE pointed out they had agreed to write off the past debts of PIP towards FIAF. He would prepare a statement for Havana.

## **7 BUDGET**

### **7.1 Membership fees**

Mr BORDE recalled that they had already decided not to increase the fees for 1988 and he hoped that it would not be necessary in 1989. They should perhaps decide in Havana on the rate for 1990.

In response to a later comment from Mrs WIBOM, he explained that he would prefer to hold 1989 at present rates for the sake of young archives or those with weak currencies but was of course ready to follow the advice of the EC.

### **7.2 Fund for Developing Countries**

Mr BORDE mentioned the idea of a fund to assist representatives from developing countries to attend FIAF meetings, Congresses, the EC, Commissions, etc. and suggested this should be discussed in Habana.

Mrs WIBOM hoped that FIAF would be able to set up such a fund to help its poorer members. She asked for ideas on what other ways they could find to help, apart from relying on Unesco and trying to enlist the support of the national representatives and Ministers of Culture.

Mr FRANCIS put forward what he called a "crazy idea": every Film Festival for which a FIAF member provided a retrospective should be asked to pay for one delegate to attend the FIAF Congress.

Mrs WIBOM felt they should write to the members they knew had problems, for example those with weak or non-convertible currencies, and ask if FIAF can help, perhaps by writing to their Minister of Culture or government officials. Mr KLAUE felt they should wait till after Havana and not approach members until they had a better idea of the future financial possibilities of the Federation.

## **8 OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

### **8.1 IASA**

Mr KLAUE reported they had been invited to their 1987 Congress in the Netherlands (June 21-26, Amsterdam).

### **8.2 ICA**

Mr KLAUE noted that a participation fee was payable for their 1988 Congress which was lower for delegates nominated this year. He was invited as a speaker and was probably going as his national representative so could represent FIAF without incurring extra travel or staying costs. He would however ask FIAF to meet the participation fee if it was required.

Mrs ORBANZ understood that reciprocal participation without payment had been agreed with all the NGO's in the Round Table.

Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that Mr CINCOTTI would be representing FIAF at the ICA Table Ronde on Audio-Visual Archives, to be held on Lake Maggiore, September 21-24.

### **8.3 European Film & Television Year**

Mrs ORBANZ would represent FIAF at their meeting in Hamburg. Mrs WIBOM would supply her with the papers and some background.

## **9 FIAF BERLIN DECLARATION ON COLORISATION**

Mrs ORBANZ would distribute to the press the text drafted by Mr KULA and approved by the General Meeting.

## **10 PROPOSAL TO NOMINATE A NEW HONORARY MEMBER**

Mr BORDE proposed Mr DE VAAL as Honorary Member. For the new EC members, Mrs ORBANZ confirmed that they wished to honour his long record of work both for FIAF and as an archivist.

Mrs WIBOM said she was very unclear about the role of the Honorary Members. There seemed to be a number of reasons for appointing them:

- in gratitude and for sentimental reasons,
- personalities of great practical use to the Federation, not necessarily members of FIAF but interested in helping to promote its cause; perhaps able to make contributions in fields where FIAF were not experts, eg legal advisers, member of the Producers' Association etc.

Mr ROSEN pointed out that, if Honorary Members were appointed for life, then there was certainly a problem. For those who had served the field and the

Federation for a long time, it was a question of giving them their due; if one wanted to bring in outsiders for short term contributions, then the present system of lifelong appointment was inappropriate. Perhaps they could have instead a Council of Advisers who served for short periods to meet current needs.

Mrs BOWSER would prefer to postpone the discussion to give time for reflexion. Mr NAIR was not clear whether having too many Honorary Members would cause financial burden to hosts of meetings; apart from that he felt it useful to have their experience and advice.

Mrs GALVAO referred to the need to have Honorary Members who were able to do effective work for the Federation: she felt Mr DE VAAL could still help a lot and go on helping even though he was retired. The other proposition was a different, unrelated point altogether but she saw no reason to mix the two issues and postpone the decision on Mr DE VAAL.

Mr BORDE felt there were several criteria: it was an appointment for life, his past loyalty was a guarantee of his future loyalty. Mr DE VAAL had been member of EC during some dramatic periods, and like Mr TOEPLITZ would be able to provide valuable advice from his past experience.

Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled that the former EC had made a formal recommendation to the new EC to propose Mr DE VAAL as Honorary Member.

Mr SCHOU asked for some equality, saying that the contributions of administrators were often over-rated compared to those of technicians. Last year, the honouring of Harold Brown in this way had been turned down because of the need to limit Honorary Members to 5. If there was now a proposal to appoint the 5th Honorary Member, then he would like to see Mr Brown reconsidered. As a follow-on, he would also like to see Honorary Members eligible as Commission Members.

Mrs WIBOM confirmed that there were already 4 out of the possible maximum of 5. There were now 3 suggestions on the floor:

- the recommendation from the outgoing EC re Mr DE VAAL
- the proposal from Mrs BOWSER to postpone a decision till later
- Mr SCHOU's suggestion re Mr BROWN.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that it would make no difference whether they decided now or in Habana so suggested it was held over.

Decision : Decide in Habana.

## 11 EVALUATION OF BERLIN GA AND OPEN FORUM

Mrs WIBOM suggested they should once more thank Mrs ORBANZ and her staff and postpone the actual evaluation until Habana.

## 12 NEXT EC MEETING

Mr GARCIA MESA said they were not a rich country but they would be very happy to pay for the travel and staying expenses of Mr NAIR to enable him to participate, and in addition the staying expenses for Jill Johnson, the EC interpreter.

As there would be many journalists present for the Film Festival from December 3 - 17, he suggested they should hold a Press Conference to get advance publicity for FIAF's 50th Anniversary and supply advance copies of the Anniversary poster to illustrate their articles. In any event, he had ordered 100 copies of the poster for display at the Festival.

He would like the working agenda as soon as possible to assist with the advance planning. He was willing to consider spreading the EC meetings over mornings or afternoons only to allow participation at the Festival.

Mrs WIBOM felt it would be better to keep to the 3 full working days, perhaps Wednesday - Friday, December 9-11.

!! EC Dates subsequently changed to Saturday-Monday, December 5-7.

## 13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### 1992 Congress

Mr DE PINA mentioned that in 1992 there would be two main events in Spain, the Olympic Games in Barcelona and the Anniversary Celebrations of Columbus reaching America in 1492. He wondered if the FIAF Congress could be linked to early films relevant to these two topics.

Mrs WIBOM then formally closed the meeting and thanked the interpreter and the technicians for their help, inviting them to join the EC for champagne and for toasts to Mrs ORBANZ and the success of the Joint Technical Symposium.