

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AMSTERDAM (March 9 - 10, 1975)

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

AMSTERDAM, March 9 - 10, 1975

Present: MEMBERS

V. Pogacic, President
W. Klaue, Vice-President
J. Kuiper, Vice-President
J. Ledoux, Secretary-General
J. Stenklev, Treasurer
J. de Vaal, Deputy Secretary-General
R. Borde, Deputy Treasurer
E. Bowser
R. Daudelin
S. Yelin

RESERVE MEMBERS

I. Molnar

HONORARY MEMBERS

E. Lauritzen
H. Volkmann

OBSERVER

K. Jones

In attendance :

B. van der Elst, Executive Secretary

Apologies for absence had been received from Messrs V. Privato, P. Morris, and J. Toeplitz.

OPENING

The President, Mr Pogacic, greeted the attending members. The plane of Mr Daudelin having been delayed, his arrival was announced for the afternoon. Considering the absence of Mr Privato, Mr Pogacic gave the right of vote to Mr Molnar, reserve member.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda was approved :

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting
3. Report of the Documentation Commission
4. Reports of the Preservation, Cataloguing and Copyright Commissions
5. Report of the Treasurer
6. Revision of the FIAF Rules
7. Membership questions
8. Next General Meeting
9. Relations with archives in developing countries
10. Any other business.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Paris had been sent to all members. They were unanimously approved, save for a spelling mistake on p. 7, line 7, where one should read 'personnel' instead of 'personal'.

3. REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION

Mrs Bowser had distributed to all members a written report (annex 1) on the Commission's work since the Paris Meeting, together with a financial report on the Periodical Indexing Project.

Starting the discussion with the problems of the P.I.P., she first reminded the members of the letter which she had sent them and in which she explained the financial crisis which the Project had to face this year: the publisher Bowker had suddenly and at very short notice (two months before the cards were ready to be delivered) withdrawn its option to publish the 1974 volume.

Mrs Bowser added that Karen Jones would finish her work as editor at the end of April 1975. She had looked for a suitable editor in London to replace her and, amongst 3 or 4 applications, she recommended the appointment of Ms Frances Thorpe whom several members already knew. This nomination was accepted. It was also decided that it was the Secretary-General who would be responsible for the London office and its personnel.

Mrs Bowser then explained the search which she and Karen Jones had conducted for a new publisher for the annual volume of the International Index. The best offer had come from St James Press in London, for a 3-year contract. The Documentation Commission recommended the acceptance of this contract of which the E.C. members all had a copy.

Finally, Mrs Bowser reported that she had applied to the National Endowment for the Arts, in Washington, for a grant to the P.I.P., but she had not yet got an answer. If this failed, the P.I.P. would have to face a deficit of \pm 230.000 BF for 1975, following her latest estimate. She then gave the word to Karen Jones to comment on the financial report of the P.I.P. (annex 2

The accounts on p. 2-3-4 presented no problems but the "Revised estimate of receipts and expenses" on p. 6 and, at the bottom of p.4, the presentation of FIAF Contributions, gave rise to many comments.

Mr Ledoux said that the Executive Committee had, as far as he remembered, never agreed to consider part of the project's deficit as a FIAF contribution to the move of the project to London nor as "1972-1973-1974 subscriptions for 8 non-paying FIAF subscribers". Mr Klaue also protested against this presentation of the deficit. He said it was well known that, because of currency problems, the socialist countries were not able to pay a subscription to the Project, but that they contributed to it (and to many other FIAF projects) in other ways. He said that if his archive was seen as

having caused -even partly- the deficit of the project, he would immediately withdraw his participation.

Mr Stenklev replied that he understood the protest very well, but that this was only a question of wording since it had always been agreed that FIAF would advance the required funds to the P.I.P., and also subsidize it without guarantee of reimbursement, up to a certain amount.

Commenting on the accounts presented by Mrs Jones, he underlined that the financial situation of the P.I.P. was now very critical indeed. Thanks to the very good response with which members had met his appeal for an early payment of the 1975 subscriptions, we did not have to draw on the Reserve Fund this time, but it was now urgent to examine the situation seriously and see what measures must be taken to re-organize the project's finances. He knew that the majority of the Executive Committee definitely agreed on keeping the project going and therefore he saw only the following solutions :

- 1°) to accept St James' Press contract
 - 2°) to raise the members' subscriptions to the project (he proposed 2000 SF)
 - 3°) to agree on a FIAF subsidy of ± 350.000 Belgian francs for a few more years.
- But he insisted that the question of the P.I.P. finances be discussed within the framework of his general report as Treasurer.

The President agreed and Mr Stenklev then proceeded to present the :

5. REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The financial report of the Federation for the year 1974 had been distributed among the members. Mr Stenklev commented on it page by page and explained every item : Total funds of FIAF per December 31, 1974, the receipts and expenses of the year, the budget comparison which showed that, if Special Expenses amounted to less than foreseen, the Periodical Indexing had largely exceeded the amount foreseen in its budget and this, mainly because of the costs involved in the move to London and, of course, general inflation.

There being no special comments from the members on the FIAF accounts as such, the Treasurer proposed to come back to the Periodical Indexing Project.

3. REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION (Cont'd)

Mr Stenklev estimated that, if the members' subscriptions to the P.I.P. remained at their present level (1250 SF), FIAF would have to subsidize the project with ± 350.000,- BF in 1975.

Mr Ledoux underlined that this was true only if St James Press executed the contract. This was also a risk to measure, risk which could bring FIAF to a deficit of 500.000 BF per year.

Mrs Bowser said she had calculated that the P.I.P. budget could be met by asking 13 FIAF archives (which she was certain would be willing to pay more) to pay 2.500 SF per year instead of 1.250 SF for the project, and to make this a voluntary contribution. But Mr Ledoux, after repeating that the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique would certainly be willing even to double its subscriptions to the P.I.P. because he considered the project as vital for the archive, rather suggested to make it run as a cooperative project to which only the participants would subscribe, share the risks and be responsible for its working, under the aegis of FIAF and not excluding possibly a certain guarantee or subsidy from FIAF. He did not know, however, if this solution was feasible for the socialist countries. The members thought there would be practical obstacles (legal, administrative, etc...) to such a solution, but they did not reject it entirely.

Mr Pogacic asked whether all possibilities to reduce the cost of the project had been investigated and a discussion followed on various ways of diminishing its scope : to index less periodicals, to index only the periodicals in the major languages, to abandon the publication of the annual volume and publish the cards in a simpler way ; the Commission had examined all these alternatives but had rejected them because they would offer only a very slight reduction of the costs but would, on the other hand, very much diminish the interest of the project.

Mr de Vaal reminded the members that 1976 would also see a raise in the annual fee to the Federation and that this raise had of course priority.

Mr Ledoux said he could not agree on raising the FIAF members' subscriptions to the P.I.P. if the outside subscribers (non-FIAF) continued to pay much less, and in dollars. He also said it was unfair to ask some FIAF subscribers (the 13 archives) to pay more than other FIAF members, as Mrs Bowser had suggested. But Mrs Bowser and Mrs Jones said that this problem was purely practical : if we required a higher subscription from everyone, we would also lose many of the present subscribers from whom the cards did not present as much interest as for those 13 archives, and the price would then become prohibitive even for the archives possibly willing to pay 2.500 SF.

Mr Klaue and Mr Stenklev agreed with that argument for the non-FIAF subscribers but they did not agree to make a difference among FIAF members.

Mr Yelin having asked whether every means of promoting the project outside FIAF had been investigated, he suggested to urge all the FIAF members, and not only the Documentation Commission, to do some active promotion for it in their own sphere, to people which they knew personally. This would probably be more effective than the impersonal mailing which had been done until now. He thought we could not ask the members to pay higher subscriptions unless we could explain them that every other solution to raise more funds had been tried out.

The Executive Committee finally agreed to recommend that FIAF cover the deficit of the project in 1975 after deciding that it will not exceed an amount which would necessitate drawing upon the Reserve Fund. However, the new E.C. will have to examine whether the subscription prices for FIAF members must be raised in 1976 in order to reduce this deficit. Mr Borde, emphasizing again how important this project was for the small archives, said however that this subscription price could not exceed 2000 SF.

It was further decided that, from next year on, outside subscribers would have to pay their subscriptions also in Swiss francs and not in dollars, and that FIAF subscribers would have to pay the extra postage costs if they wished to receive the cards by air mail, as outside subscribers already did.

Speaking about the contract drafted by St James Press, Mr Kuiper said that he felt uneasy about it because it was too unprecise : How far were both partners bound by it? What penalty would there be if either of them failed to execute their engagement ? He wished to have the contract examined by a lawyer before FIAF signed it.

Mrs Bowser said that, of course, both parties must in good faith try to execute their part of the contract but that the word "undertakes" in the text of St James's draft was no guarantee on either side. She felt it was just a statement of intention. On the other hand, it would not help much to have the contract examined by a lawyer since this offer was the best we had received and St James Press could not wait any longer for our signature. Mr de Vaal then asked to have it stated in the Minutes that we were not signing a "contract" but well an "agreement" with St James Press.

Another obstacle for signing the agreement was that St James Press declined to offer free copies of the volume to all FIAF members. Mr Ledoux said we could not accept that clause since FIAF members were the co-authors of this volume and it was their fundamental right to receive a free copy. Mr Yelin and Mr Klau supported this argument. But Mrs Bowser explained that St James Press had calculated their profit margin very narrowly and felt that they could not offer 50 free copies of the book to FIAF. They would instead invest these copies in more promotion for the book. She was absolutely sure that they would not accept to reverse their decision on this point.

She also underlined that if the Executive Committee decided not to sign the agreement, the already very weak equilibrium of the project's budget would be destroyed and the project would collapse forever.

After some more discussion on the possibility to re-open the negotiations with St James Press on this particular clause, the President submitted to the votes the following motion : to sign the agreement proposed by St James Press without any more changes. Results were : 5 Yes and 5 No

At that point, Mr Daudelin joined the meeting and after Mrs Bowser and Mr Ledoux had explained him their different standpoints on the matter, the voting was renewed by secret ballot and gave the following results :
6 votes for signing the proposed agreement, and 5 votes against.

Mr Ledoux proposed to postpone until the next Executive meeting the discussion on a raise of prices for the outside subscriptions at the same level as that of FIAF members. He also wanted to state, as he did in the past, that he found abnormal that the P.I.P. accounts had been presented by the Documentation Commission and not by the Treasurer. Mr Stenklev replied that his accounts, as submitted under point 5 of the agenda, also included a chapter on the P.I.P. and that it was only for a matter of convenience, because she was more familiar with all the details, that Mrs Jones had presented her accounts. But he did personally endorse them.

There being no other comments on the P.I.P., the President on behalf of the whole FIAF, thanked Karen Jones for her excellent work in establishing the project and keeping it going in London in 1974.

Mrs Bowser then further commented the report of the Documentation Commission (annex 1).

The Executive Committee agreed to the payment by FIAF of the re-edition of the Guidelines for Indexing and List of Subject Headings. As for the publication of the FIAF Directory to Film and Television Documentation Sources, this would depend on the submission from other Commissions for special publications in this year. The publication of an International Directory of Set Designers was postponed, unless some outside funding could be found for it, because several members of the Executive did not see any immediate use for it.

Proposals made in points 4 & 5 of the report: "Working style of the Commission" and "Members" were accepted, except for the reinstatement of Brenda Davies as member of the Commission because it was felt that the question of FIAF's relationship towards the National Film Archive should be settled first.

4. REPORT OF THE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Mr Volkmann had nothing to report on the work of the Commission since the last Executive Meeting because the Commission was only going to meet shortly after Amsterdam, in Ostend (Belgium).

As there were delays in completing the English language version of the chapter on color preservation, it would probably be impossible to distribute it at the next General Meeting.

REPORT OF THE CATALOGUING COMMISSION

Mr Klaue reported that the sub-commission in charge of the final revision of the English language version of the Cataloguing Manual had completed its task. A foreword had been written by Paul Rotha. The manuscript was now ready for printing and the Commission would try to find a publisher to print it in a commercial way. Meanwhile a sufficient number of copies would be made for the FIAF members, in time for the General Meeting.

Mr Yelin proposed to have the Manual translated into Spanish in Habana. This was immediately agreed.

At the next meeting of the Commission to be held at the end of April in Belgium, the formulation of new tasks would be discussed. Mr Klaue also asked the Executive Committee to approve some changes in the Commission's membership : the departure of Dr Roads and the nomination of Fr Armatys. This was approved.

REPORT OF THE COPYRIGHT COMMISSION

Mr Kuiper reported that, since the Paris meeting of the Executive Committee, Mr Pogacic had renewed contacts with Mr Brisson, Secretary-General of FIAPF, whom he occasionally met at I.F.T.C. meetings and who seemed very anxious to have a meeting with FIAF representatives in order to elaborate a reciprocal FIAF-FIAPF agreement on the basis of the already existing FIAPF "agreement"; this meeting had been proposed to him by Mr Pogacic. Mr Kuiper had also made written comments to Mr Brisson on the FIAPF agreement (see Minutes of Paris).

As Mr Kuiper was absent at the Paris meeting, Mr Ledoux explained him now why he did not agree entirely with some points in this letter and repeated that he thought was not acceptable in the FIAPF text (e.g. the fact that FIAPF wants to be representative of all producers, even those who do not belong to the organization and those who no longer exist). He believed we had nothing to gain from negotiations with FIAPF which only wanted to obtain some concessions from FIAF members without offering any counterpart. But he thought also that the archives were now in a stronger position than a few years ago and should resist this pressure. Anyway, it was impossible for FIAF to sign an agreement that would meet the needs and requirements of all its members. Mr Yelin supported Mr Ledoux on that point.

Mr Stenklev and Mr de Vaal also said that such a meeting, with the purpose of making an agreement at the level of both Federations was useless. It implied too many international legalistic problems. They thought archives should first and foremost try to get along with their national producers' associations.

The only question now was : What shall we answer Mr Brisson who is pressing us to hold the proposed meeting ?

It was decided that Mr Ledoux would telephone him and agree to a meeting but would also ask him to reply to Mr Kuiper's letter before any meeting could take place.

5. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Cont'd)

Mr Stenklev had submitted his report as Treasurer in the framework of the discussion on the Periodical Indexing Project. He asked if there were any other comments to make.

Mr Ledoux said he was not entirely satisfied with the presentation of the accounts. He said these accounts were only a "Cash" account and not a real balance, and that they did not give a true picture of the financial situation of the Federation. The other members of the E.C. however said that they had found the submitted accounts easy to understand and clear enough.

Mr Stenklev agreed to have a professional accountant examine the accounts and possibly to ask him to prepare another balance.

The President proposed a vote on the approval of these accounts. It was unanimously carried less two abstentions.

Mr Ledoux then suggested that, in order to liberate the 130.000 Belgian Francs which were blocked as guarantee for the rent of the London office, one should ask the Bank to take the Reserve Fund instead as guarantee. He said there was also a possibility to transfer this Reserve Fund in Belgium, where we could obtain better interest rates, but to keep it in Swiss Francs. The Treasurer agreed to this transfer and so did all the other members save for Mr Ledoux who abstained.

8. NEXT GENERAL MEETING

The Secretary-General reported that he had been to Torino to see, with Prof. Prolo, what arrangements could be made for FIAF's next General Meeting. Unfortunately, it appeared that there was in Torino not one meeting room which met all the necessary technical and size requirements for such a meeting. Each of the rooms which Mr Ledoux visited had drawbacks. But it was now impossible to change the place of the General Meeting and therefore, it was decided that the Secretary-General would, if possible, return to Torino and try to organize the meeting as best as possible with the facilities which Prof. Prolo could offer.

The Executive Committee also discussed the invitations to send out to persons outside FIAF as "Visitors" to the General Meeting. Mr Ledoux suggested to ask, in the future, a registration fee from such Visitors. He said that this was common practice in many international organizations but all the members did not agree on this proposal and the decision was postponed until after the General Meeting.

7. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

a) Canadian Film Archives

The members all had in their files copy of the correspondence which had been exchanged since the Paris meeting between Mr Morris, Mr Daudelin, Mr Kula and Mr Ledoux and which explained the evolution of the situation between the C.F.A. and the Public Archives of Canada. There was also a copy of the Agreement passed between the Public Archives and the Canadian Film Institute for the transfer of C.F.A.'s collections to the new National Film Archives of Canada.

Mr Daudelin who had brought with him a formal application from the National Film Archives (Mr Kula) to become Observer in FIAF, and who had very recently seen both Mr Morris and Mr Kula, made the following report :

For the moment, the C.F.A.'s collections have not yet been transferred and are still under the authority of Peter Morris because the Canadian Film Institute considers that some conditions (clause 5 & 6) of the merger are still not properly answered by the Public Archives. One of these issues is that there is still no permanent staff (except Mr Kula) with the N.F.A. Mr Morris will write very shortly to all FIAF archives which have films deposited with the C.F.A. to ask what destination they intend to give to those films. The Canadian Film Archives will probably be dissolved officially after the Congress of Torino where it was hoped that Mr Morris could go.

The Executive Committee unanimously decided that it was too late to consider the application of the N.F.A. of Canada as Observer at this meeting because the members had had no time to study the submitted documents. Mr Ledoux would inform Mr Kula that his application would be considered at the next E.C. meeting. It was agreed that Mr Kula should be invited to attend the General Meeting as 'Visitor', in a personal capacity.

b) Cineteca Italiana

The Secretary-General informed the members that Cineteca Italiana in Milano had paid to FIAF all its subscriptions the non-payment of which had caused its deletion from the Federation. Its directors were therefore asking for reintegration. A vote was taken on this matter and carried unanimously.

c) Cineteca Nacional (Mexico)

Mr Hiram Garcia Borja had sent a formal application to the Secretary-General asking that the new Mexican archive be admitted as Observer. All the necessary documents had already been received at the end of last year, and the fee had also been paid. There was no obstacle to their admittance and when the President introduced a vote on this matter, it was carried unanimously.

d) Cinemateca Distrital de Bogota (Colombia)

Mr Yelin reported that several months ago he had met the director of this film archive, Mrs Isadora de Norden, who had informed him of her wish to apply to FIAF and had given him a whole dossier regarding her archive to forward to the Secretariat of FIAF. Mr Yelin had sent it but unfortunately it never arrived at the Secretariat. He said he would ask Mrs de Norden to send it again and meanwhile, it was decided to invite her to attend the Torino General Meeting as Visitor.

e) Cinémathèque Universitaire (Paris)

Mr Borde reminded the members that the application of this archive to the status of Observer was still pendent. He asked when it would be examined. Considering that the notion of Observer had now been clarified by the preparation of the new Rules, the Executive Committee decided that this candidature could be examined at its next meeting provided that all the necessary documents and the provision for annual subscription had reached the Secretariat. Meanwhile, Mr Beylie would be invited to attend the General Meeting as Visitor.

To conclude, the Secretary-General reported that the following organisations had requested information on FIAF membership and the procedure to follow :

Korean Film Archive Inc. Foundation, in Seoul
Etablissement Cinématographique des Armées, in Fort d'Ivry - France.
Southern Methodist University, in Dallas, U.S.A.

The discussion about the National Film Archive in London was postponed until the next day, after the revision of the Rules.

6. REVISION OF THE FIAF RULES

At its meeting held the day before the E.C. meeting in Amsterdam, the sub-committee for the revision of the Statutes and Rules had prepared a draft for new Rules which everyone now had in its file.

The Secretary-General explained that, although the first intention of the Committee had been to reduce drastically the number of articles contained in the old Rules, it soon appeared that this would be difficult to realize. He proposed however to divide the new Rules in two parts which would be printed separately, one part containing all the articles regarding membership, procedure and conditions to apply, relations between members, etc... and the other part with all the articles which ruled FIAF meetings, arbitration procedure, etc... The first part could then be sent out alone to organizations which enquired about a possible affiliation to FIAF and the 2d part would be reserved for the accepted affiliates. An appendix to this second part would be the "Rules of procedure for conducting FIAF meetings" which Mr Stenklev and Mr Kuiper had prepared but which were difficult to include in the Rules as such.

Mr Stenklev proposed to proceed article by article in discussing the draft for new Rules but he already announced that the main points of discussion would probably be the definition of autonomy and of Observers, the increased role played by the Executive Committee and, in a lesser way, the suppression of the President's double vote.

Article 1 & 2 asked for no particular comments.

Article 3 was a new article based on the Zagreb Resolution. It tried to define the notion of autonomy. It read as follows :

"In judging the degree of autonomy within the framework of a larger organization required to enable an archive to qualify as a responsible and self-contained member of FIAF, consideration will be given to the following :

- 1) independance of action in all aspects of its own work, including the representation and dealing with FIAF affiliates by its own officers, control of personnel matters, and direct access to its official authorities;
- 2) distinctiveness of the title of the archive, including the position given this title on correspondence, publicity and other materials;
- 3) distinctiveness of its own Board and its own Rules;
- 4) control of its own budget and finances;
- 5) control over and responsibility for all the films in its collection, including those received from other FIAF affiliates, subject to the rights of copyright holders and donors.

Mr Kuiper explaining what he understood by this article, said that each organization that applied for membership necessarily had different strengths and weaknesses in these 5 points. What the Executive Committee would be looking for was whether the organization had a degree of autonomy that made it acceptable to FIAF. This article set up categories rather than requirements to furnish value judgments.

But Mr Ledoux would have preferred to keep the formulation used in the Zagreb Resolution : "In judging the degree of autonomy consideration will be given to the following requirements :" He knew that this was an ambiguous sentence but he thought it was stronger than the present phrasing. He underlined that this Rule had been drafted for a triple purpose, not only to accept new members but also to help and guide new archives and potential members which were in the process of getting established and could use this Rule as a model to show their official authorities, and 3°) to use as a weapon for some archives which might be menaced in their autonomy.

Mr Kuiper, Mrs Bowser and Mr Stenklev however, were against having ambiguous phrases in the Rules. The purpose of Rules was to clarify the Statutes and not the reverse. They also remarked that the word "required" was already in that phrase. Mr Ledoux therefore agreed not to change it, but he asked to add the following words (underlined): "In judging the degree of autonomy within the framework of a larger organization (and especially a larger film organization) required to" because he felt that the position of

those archives needed more guarantees than when they were part of a non-film organization. This was accepted.

Mr Yelin having asked whether the Executive Committee, in judging the autonomy of an applicant to membership, would require that all 5 points of this Rule are fulfilled, Mr Kuiper explained that this would be left to the appreciation of the Executive Committee. Their decisions would vary from case to case, but the applicant would anyway have something to answer in all 5 categories, although not equally.

Mr Lauritzen had examined this article from the point of view of the Swedish Film Archive and, from what he knew, they only fulfilled point 2. Was that sufficient? Mr Pogacic replied that this article would only apply to old members in cases of crisis or if they modified their former structure. Mr Ledoux therefore asked to add the word "structure" at the end of point 4: "control of its own budget, finances and structure". This was agreed.

Articles 4 to 9 presented no special difficulties.

Article 10 : definition of Observers. Mr Ledoux reminded the members that in transcribing the Statutes in Ottawa, just before the General Meeting, the wording adopted by the Executive Committee for the definition of Observers had been accidentally left out. He therefore proposed to put it in the Rules. This was agreed.

Concerning the whole chapter of Admission to the Federation, Mr Klaue raised several questions : How would the members be informed of the Executive's decisions on these matters ? How, when they had to confirm the decisions of the E.C., would the General Meeting be informed ? Would they receive a verbal or a written report on the activities of the new Member ? Nothing was foreseen in the Rules. To the first question, Mr Ledoux answered that the Secretariat would, immediately after each meeting where some changes in affiliation had occurred, send out a new list of members. To the second question, it was decided that the Secretary-General would, as usual, make a verbal report on the new members awaiting confirmation by the General Meeting.

A long discussion followed on the formulation of article 5 which said : "The decision of the E.C. must be confirmed by the General Meeting next following. Only then does it become definitive." The majority of the E.C. found this formulation unclear. It was not evident from what moment the applicant did become a member of FIAF. Mr Ledoux said that it was made clear in the Statutes in the Statutes (art. 9) that the applicant became a member from the moment of his acceptance by the Executive, but the other members of the E.C. did not understand it so. Finally it was decided to suppress the words : "only then does it become definitive", and to explain clearly the whole process of affiliation to the next General Meeting. It was also decided that on each new list of members sent by the Secretariat to the affiliates of FIAF, there would be a special category : "Members awaiting confirmation by the General Meeting", if necessary.

Articles 11 to 24: no special comments.

Article 25 : Mr Ledoux underlined that this was an important article which answered a lot of concern we had in the past. It read: The person representing an Archive at a General Meeting and having the right to vote shall belong to one of the following categories : a) Director or Curator of the Archive; b) Employees of the Archive holding a responsible post.

Article 26: New rule to allow a limited delegation from each archive to the General Meeting. This rule was related to Mr Ledoux' proposal from yesterday to ask a registration fee from 'visitors' to the General Meeting. The reason therefore was that the organization of the General Meeting was very costly and this article would allow the possible introduction of payment sometime in the future.

Articles 27-28-29 : no special comments.

Article 30: It was decided to change the "reports of the President, of the Secretary-General and of the Treasurer" into "the annual report of the Federation" because the deliverance of such reports to the General Meeting had become from year to year more formal and meaningless. However, the problem of who would prepare the report of the Federation remained unsolved.

Articles 32 to 35 : no special comments.

After article 35 came a document prepared by Mr Kuiper and Mr Stenklev on "Meeting and voting procedures in general." The principle of including these rules of procedure as an annex to the FIAF Rules being admitted, the following words (underlined) were added to art. 33: The General Meeting shall open its discussion by voting on the agenda presented on behalf of the E.C. by the Secretary-General and by adopting rules of procedure."

Articles 36 to 103 gave rise to no special discussions. The Executive Committee accepted the draft prepared by the sub-committee, except for some words which were changed here and there.

Article 104 on Exclusivity rights. The sub-committee had added to the old rule the phrase: In the case a member is requested by the copyright owners to send a film in which they hold the rights in a country where a fellow member exists, he should inform this fellow member with all the relevant details".

Mr Ledoux asked the Executive Committee to carefully examine the whole article as it was very important and had already given rise to many interventions both at E.C. meetings and at the General Meeting. Mr Klaue asked whether the last paragraph (here above) also concerned cases where archives in the Socialist countries, in a way copyright holders for their national production, were asked to send copies all over the world and found it difficult to always inform their fellow members in the receiver's country. The answer was "Yes", but this question would be rediscussed at the G.M.

Many other examples of exclusivity cases were cited and studied to see if the Rule was complete and, on the other hand, not too constraining, and finally it was accepted as it was in the former Rules with the addition of the above mentioned paragraph.

Articles 105 to 108 were accepted unanimously.

Regarding the chapter "Acquisition and Loan of Films between members", Mr Pogacic was of the opinion that it was far too detailed. He thought that only the basic principles which ruled the exchange of films between the members should be mentioned here. He also feared some misunderstanding by the producers. Mr Ledoux explained that these articles had been written to avoid any kind of blackmailing from powerful members towards weaker members, or any commercial dealings between members. He proposed to examine these articles one by one to see which could be crossed out and those which should be kept.

The Executive Committee unanimously decided to keep articles 141-142-143-144-148-150-151 and 152 (former numbers) and to delete the other articles which they considered as useless.

The following chapter: "Use of the members' collections", was also carefully examined. It was unanimously decided to keep articles 155-156-157 and 158 as they were before, but the section "Use in Television" was suppressed because, as it was drafted here, it was more a recommendation than a rule. Mr Klaus rather suggested to draft a new Resolution regarding the relations between Archives and Television, and to make art. 158 'Commercial Use' also apply to 'Use in Television'. This was agreed.

Along the same line, the Executive Committee decided that a Resolution should also be drafted regarding the relations between Archives and Film Festivals. Finally, it was agreed that the chapter on Exclusivity Rights should only apply to Members, but that the chapters "Acquisition and Loan of Films" and "Use of the collections" should also apply to Associates.

In chapter XI, Specialized Commissions, the Executive Committee decided that the Chairman of each Commission should not automatically be a member of the E.C. but that he could be invited to attend E.C. meetings whenever necessary.

The President then proposed to take a vote on the acceptance of the Revised Rules by the Executive Committee. They were unanimously accepted.

7. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

f) National Film Archive (London)

In order to renew with this matter which had already been discussed once in Paris, the Secretary-General read aloud the letter of Keith Lucas by which he undertook to respond to the questions put to him in Ottawa by the Executive.

Mr Lucas had been asked to unfold his views regarding the position of the N.F.A. within the B.F.I. in the light of the principles laid down in the Zagreb Resolution. He had chosen not to comment on this but to say that there had been no changes in the status or role of the Archive since the adoption of the Zagreb Resolution.

However, Mr Ledoux was told from different sources that many interior changes had been operated recently in the structure of the N.F.A., changes which could not be seen from the outside but reduced considerably the autonomy of the Archive.

Finally, Mr Ledoux reminded the members that some years ago, the N.F.A. was administered by an Archive Committee appointed by the Board of Governors and responsible directly to them. Now it seemed that this Committee no longer existed. When had this change occurred? Ernest Lindgren never mentioned this to FIAF although he had himself informed FIAF of the Committee's creation around 1956. Mr Lauritzen said that he also was very surprised that Ernest Lindgren never told him of the disappearance of the Committee, although they were very close friends.

Mr Ledoux asked what should be done now. The Executive Committee felt it should receive a more precise answer to its questions and not a "loop-hole" such as Mr Lucas's letter. It was not only in the interest of FIAF that the Executive Committee laid down these requirements but mainly to help the N.F.A. Of course, the B.F.I. could do whatever pleased it with the N.F.A. but then the Archive could no longer remain a member of FIAF. The Secretary-General therefore suggested either to go to London to explain FIAF's point of view to the B.F.I.'s Board or to write them a letter.

Mr Stenklev, Mr de Vaal and Mr Kuiper also thought that the Board of the B.F.I. should be contacted and informed about all the implications of Mr Lucas's policy towards the Archive.

Mr Kuiper moreover proposed to use another line of approach as argument: the increasing necessity for the N.F.A. to benefit of a maximum support for the preservation of many British films from the teens, twenties, thirties and forties which were in great danger of disappearing.

Mr Klaus thought that a visit of Mr Ledoux to the Governors of the B.F.I. would be useless as he would receive verbally no clearer answer from them than from Mr Lucas. He much more believed in a written declaration from the B.F.I. commenting point by point FIAF's requirements of autonomy (new art. 3 of the Rules) as regarded the National Film Archive. Mr Daudelin supported this argument.

Mr Pogacic then summarized the discussion and said that there remained two solutions: either to accept Mr Lucas's statement and leave the matter as it was now, or to re-examine the whole position of the N.F.A. within the B.F.I. in the light of our new Statutes and Rules and to follow the conclusions which would result from such re-evaluation. The first alternative being rejected by the Executive, it was decided that Mr Ledoux would write again to Mr Lucas and ask him for the opinion of the B.F.I.'s Board of Governors. The E.C. would then examine its answer and draw from it the necessary conclusions on the possibility for the N.F.A. to remain in FIAF, whatever they may be.

9. RELATIONS WITH ARCHIVES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr Yelin had distributed to all members a written report on the recent activities and of the last General of UCAL in Caracas. He said that Mr Chaskell had been re-elected Secretary-General of UCAL.

He also described the Filmoteca de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, another Mexican archive directed by Mr Manuel Gonzalez Casanova which, he said, would unceasingly apply to FIAF as Observer.

Mr Yelin then explained that, the last 2 or 3 years, great progress had been made in the foundation and organization of film archives in Latin America. There was amongst others a new official archive in Colombia directed by Mrs Isadora de Norden.

Mr Yelin had also distributed a report by Mr Chaskell on the present situation of the Chilean cinema. He proposed to invite Mr Chaskell to the next FIAF Congress in Torino. Mr Klaue having suggested that FIAF pay his stay in Torino on that occasion, it was unanimously accepted. Mr Yelin added that the Secretary-General of FIAF was also invited to attend UCAL's next General Meeting in Mexico.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Secretary-General reported that a meeting organized by UNESCO and I.F.T.C. was going to be held in a few days in Paris for the organization of a general conference regarding problems of film preservation which would be held next autumn in the D.D.R. Several members of the E.C. were invited to that meeting in Paris but at such short notice that none of them was free to attend it. It was decided to ask Mrs Harari, secretary of I.F.T.C., to postpone the meeting one month, if possible.

Basic Manual for Film Archives : Mr Pogacic declared that Jugoslovenska Kinoteka was not able any more to prepare this Manual for FIAF. It was therefore decided that all the material already collected for the Basic Manual in Belgrade would be handed over to the FIAF Secretariat which would try to complete it.

There being no other item to discuss, the President thanked all the participants of the Meeting and particularly its guests, the Nederlands Film Museum whose generosity had permitted the E.C. to work in the best possible conditions. He then declared the meeting closed.

Annex 1

REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION

March 9 - 10, 1975

The commission met at Bautzen on October 30 - November 1, 1974, as guests of the Staatliches Filmarchiv and the Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen. The following points discussed need to be considered by the Executive Committee:

1. International Index to Film Periodicals. A separate report has been sent to you in advance of this meeting.
2. Classification of Film Literature. The commission has decided to send out the two draft schemes under consideration to the experts in FIAF archives, asking for opinions as to which is preferable, before the commission makes a final decision on a recommendation. This survey will be made during 1975.
3. Publications:
 - A) FIAF Directory of Film and Television Documentation Sources. This project is now ready for publication. The commission asks the Executive Committee whether FIAF can pay the costs. To produce 100 copies, stenciled, 60 pages, with printed cover, will cost approximately BF 6,000 plus postage to distribute it. The Netherlands Filmmuseum will contribute the labor. A "dummy" copy will be presented.
 - B) Guidelines for Filing and List of Subject Headings, for the International Index to Film Periodicals. The first edition of these publications is now out of print, we have no copies to send new subscribers, and revisions are needed. We propose to combine them in one loose-leaf publication, to shorten and revise them, and it is urgent to issue them within the next few months. The cost for 100 copies, 50 pages each, with cover and postage, is approximately BF 5,400. The editorial office will provide the labor. The commission asks if FIAF can pay the costs out of Special Publications.
 - C) International Directory of Set Designers. The commission believes this project should be carried out in a series of annual publications, each issue to be devoted to the set designers of one large national production or several smaller ones. Sufficient information has been collected for a first issue devoted to Poland, Romania, the DDR, and Spain. As a first stage, the series would be produced very cheaply, without illustrations, for FIAF members only. It is foreseen that when enough annual publications had appeared, we would approach a commercial publisher with the idea of a cumulated edition, with illustrations. The subcommission dealing with the project meets in Amsterdam in the next few days, and will prepare a budget for the consideration of the Executive Committee at a later meeting. It is hoped that it might be possible to do a first publication in 1976.
4. Working style of the commission. We believe it would be better to have fewer meetings of the commission, not more than once a year. We have divided up into smaller working parties, or subcommissions, responsible for on-going projects, which will meet as often as needed between commission meetings, and may include outside experts who will not be commission members. The working parties include International Index to Film Periodicals, Classification of Film Literature, and International Directory of Set Designers. Other projects are in the hands of individual commission members. The next meeting of the Documentation Commission will be either in the fall of 1975 or in 1976, and it is probable that we will be able to have a host for that meeting.

5. Members. The commission accepted with regret the resignation of Anne Schlosser of the American Film Institute. We would like to ask the Executive Committee to consider the reinstatement of Brenda Davies, as we need her work for the commission very much.
- Bujor Ripeanu has informed us that he is no longer working in the documentation department of the Romanian film archive, and we would like to propose that he be replaced on the commission with the new head of Documentation, Aura Puran. We have asked the director of the archive whether this change is possible, but have not yet had a reply. If he agrees, we ask for the approval of the Executive Committee.

- Eileen Bowser

P.I.P.
COMPLETE ACCOUNTS 1974 (Brussels + London)

RECEIPTS

Subscriptions:

1) 1973 subscriptions:

a) FIAP members:

Museo Nazionale	11.191	
Österreichisches Filmarchiv	11.191	
Turk Film arsivi	<u>3.691</u>	26.073

b) non-FIAP subscr.:

Australian Film & TV School	13.000	
Los Angeles Public Library	12.147	
Nat. Film Theatre of Australia	17.889	
Ontario Film Institute	<u>13.946</u>	56.982

2) 1974 subscriptions:

a) FIAP members:

American Film Institute	11.392	
Archion Israeli Leseratim	12.654	
Canadian Film Archives	12.791	
Cinémathèque de Toulouse	14.398	
Cinémathèque Québécoise	12.772	
Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	13.320	
Cinémathèque Suisse	12.759	
Cineteca Nazionale	12.592	
Det Danske Filmmuseum	12.989	
Deutsches Institut f. Filmkunde	12.914	
Filmkhaneh Melli Iran	12.707	
Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	13.073	
Museo Nazionale del Cinema	2.941	
Museum of Modern Art	12.817	
National Film Archive	12.746	
National Library of Australia	12.670	
Nederlands Filmmuseum	12.746	
Norsk Filminstitutt	12.874	
Österreichisches Filmmuseum	12.766	
Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	12.766	
Suomen Elokuva Arkisto	12.916	
Svenska Filminstitutet, Cinemateket	12.746	
Turk Film Arsivi	13.212	
UCLA	<u>12.772</u>	298.333 ✓

b) SERIES A subscr.:

Association pour...., Toulouse	11.991	
Australian Film & TV School	12.219	
Direccion General de Cinem., Mexico	12.198	
Hochschule f. Film und Ferns. Münch.	11.062	
Los Angeles Public Library	12.115	
Lund Studenters Filmstudio	11.509	
Nat. Film Board of Canada	12.580	
Nat. Film Theatre of Austr.	12.385	
Radio Canada	12.588	
Universitätsbibliothek, Bochum	11.686	
University of Southern California	12.537	
York University Libraries	<u>12.804</u>	145.674 ✓

c) SERIES B subscr.:

Academy of MPAAS, Hollywood	6.472	
Detroit Public Library	6.785	

B.F.

B.F.

V

3) Back sets

39.499

4) 1975 subscriptions:

Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique

17.938

624.342

Bowker

1) Editorial fee 1972 volume

133.060

2) Royalties 1.1.74-30.6.74

20.840

153.900

FIAT main account

1) Contribution move to London

300.000

2) Advance

230.560

530.560

Balance forward of account in Brussels 31.12.73

15.987

1.324.789 B.F.

=====

EXPENSES

Wages:

1) Staff salaries

413.097

2) Tax, Grad.Pens., N.I.S.

158.347

3) External work fees

44.459

615.903

Office costs:

1) Premium

185.607

2) Rent & service charges

74.169

3) Insurance

2.508

4) Telephone

8.376

5) Electricity

3.028

6) Cleaning

4.475

7) Water charges

362

8) Solicitors' fees

25.333

9) Bank charges

5.550

309.408

Supplies:

1) Cards

136.757

2) Masters + Off-set products

34.075

3) Stationery

9.690

180.522

Postage

134.998

Sundries & travel:

1) Travel

19.857

2) Maintenance machinery

6.215

3) Equipment office

7.140

4) Moving & transport expenses

38.798

5) Advertisements

4.526

6) Dispatch of cards to Bowker

2.883

7) Other sundries

4.539

83.958

1.324.789 B.F.

=====

42.855

1367.644

(Exchange rate used: 1£ = 90.4 B.F.)

DEBTORS per December 31, 1974

	B.F.
	190.114
Bowker (editorial fee 1973 annual = \$5.505)	[215.000]
Library of Congress (1974 = SF 1.000)	[12.800]
Libreria Cientifica General, Madrid (1973 = \$300)	[11.100]
	<hr/>
	[238.900]
	=====

CREDITORS per December 31, 1974

FIAF main account (loan 1973 + 1974)	110.597
Karen Jones (reg. of salary 1.5-31.12.74 = £243.04)	[21.967]
City of Westminster (rates 1.5.74-31.5.75=£189.64)	[17.143]
London Electricity Board (el. 9.10.74-8.1.75=£37.15)	[3.358]
Thames Water Authority (water 1.10.74-31.3.75=£4.28)	[387]
	<hr/>
	[153.452]
	=====

BALANCE 1974

RECEIPTS

Receipts for 1974	+ 1.324.789	
Debtors from 1973 paid	+ 216.115	
Subscription for 1975	+ <u>17.938</u>	+ 1.090.736

EXPENSES

Expenses for 1974	+ 1.324.789	
Creditors from 1973 paid	+ <u>21.942</u>	+ 1.302.847

DEBTORS per 31.12.1974 + [238.900]

CREDITORS per 31.12.1974 + [153.452]

DEFICIT 1974 + [126.663]

=====

TOTAL COSTS FOR FIAF 1.1.1972 - 31.12.1974

CONTRIBUTIONS:

Move of project to London	300.000	
1972, 1973, 1974 subscriptions for 8 non-paying FIAF subscribers	<u>321.600</u>	621.000

INVESTMENTS:

Off-set duplicator 100.000

LOAN:

Advance to cover deficit 1973 + 1974 110.597

Total

210 822 807

REVISED ESTIMATE OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES FOR 1975

RECEIPTS

B.F.

B.F.

Subscriptions

1) 24 FIAF subscr. at SF 1.250	402.000	
2) 13 Series A subscr. at \$375	190.125	
3) 6 Series B subscr. at \$190	45.460	
4) 1 Back set subscr. at \$200	<u>7.800</u>	645.385

Annual volumes

1) Royalties from Bowker 1972 + 1973 volumes (appr. 1000 copies = \$3.000)	108.000	
2) Editorial fee from St. James Press for 1974 volume (£2.000)	186.000	
3) Payment from St. James Press for appr. 500 extra copies sold (£500)	<u>46.500</u>	340.500

FIAF main account

1) 1975 subscriptions for 8 non-paying FIAF subscribers	134.000	
2) Loan to cover expected deficit in 1975	<u>102.515</u>	236.515

1.222.400 B.F.
=====

EXPENSES

£

£

B.F.

Salaries

1) Editor	4.300	
2) Typist	2.200	
3) Printer (500 hours)	700	
4) N.I.S. contributions	<u>530</u>	7.730
		718.900

Office costs

1) Rent	700	
2) Rates	250	
3) Service charges	100	
4) Telephone	175	
5) Electricity	150	
6) Cleaning	125	
7) Insurance	50	
8) Water charges	<u>15</u>	1.565
		145.500

Supplies

1) Cards (200.000)	1.300	
2) Masters + off-set products	405	
3) Indexing forms	50	
4) Envelopes	200	
5) Other stationery	<u>145</u>	2.100
		195.300

Postage

(does not include air-mail postage for non-FIAF subscr.)		1.100	102.300
--	--	-------	---------

Sundries & travel

1) Travel	300	
2) Maintenance machinery	75	
3) Card cabinets	50	
4) Other sundries	<u>225</u>	650
		60.400

13.145£ 1.222.400 B.F.
=====

(exchange rates used: 1£=93BF, 1\$=39BF, 1SF=13.40BF)