

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

RAPALLO, 30 April - 2 May 1981

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HELD IN

RAPALLO

April 30 - May 2 1981  
(Extended to May 3, 1981)

---

Present:

Members:

W. Klaue, President  
E. Bowser, Vice President  
D. Francis, Vice President  
V. Pogacic, Vice President  
R. Daudelin, Secretary General  
J. de Vaal, Treasurer

C. Alves Netto  
T. Andreykov  
R. Borde  
F. Buache xx  
J. Stenklev xx

Reserve members :

G. Comencini  
J. Kuiper  
V. Tikhonov (with interpreter) xx

Honorary Members

E. Lauritzen  
J. Toeplitz xx  
H. Volkmann

Conference Hosts :

G. Cincotti xx  
M. Gonzales Casanova xx

Commission Chairman

H. Harrison

Executive Secretary:

B. van der Elst

Interpreter :

J. Johnson

Absences : none

xx Arrived late or absent for some sessions

DRAFT AGENDA

	<u>Page</u>
1. Adoption of the agenda	
2. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting	14
3. Membership questions :	
- Candidatures for membership :	
Montevideo - Cinemateca Uruguaya	2
München - Filmmuseum	4
- Candidatures for observership :	
Wellington - New Zealand Film Archive	6
Alger - La cinémathèque algérienne	
Luanda - Cinemateca Nacional de Angola	
Bogota - Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana	
- Reconfirmation of members :	6
Lisboa - Washington AFI	
Pyong Yang - Istanbul	
- Reconfirmation of Observers :	7
Tehran - Caracas - Montevideo Sodre	
- Status of observers : draft declaration	8
- Miscellaneous	9
4. Financial report : Accounts for 1980	11
Interim report for January-April 1981	
Budget 1982	
5. Report on the organisation of the two Symposia in Rapallo	11
Report on the Venice meeting organised by the Biennale	
6. Examination of the main points on the agenda for the General Meeting	14-30
7. Relations with UNESCO :	
- contracts for the Preservation Manual	30
For the Documentation Center in London	
- Nomination of FIAF experts for developing countries	
8. Relations with other international organisations	32
9. Preparation for the 1982 Congress in Mexico	34
10. Miscellaneous	37

FIRST SESSION

April 30, 1981.

Mr Klaue opened the meeting with a welcome to everyone and warm thanks to Mr Cincotti for his organisation and hospitality.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Following two minor amendments to the Draft Agenda, the Agenda on the previous page was formally adopted.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

This item was postponed to give all members an opportunity to read the Minutes. (see p.14)

3. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONSA. CANDIDATURES FOR MEMBERSHIP

All the members had received in advance the full dossier of informations submitted by the candidates as requested by art. 2 of FIAF's Rules.

1. Montevideo: Cinemateca Uruguay

Mr Daudelin summarised the history of this Archive from its time as a Member in the early 1950's to 1972, its readmission as Observer in 1978, and the visit by David Francis in October 1979 (see Oslo Minutes for detailed report). In reviewing the requirements of Article 2, he referred to the 1978 file and other reports and discussions, noting in particular:

2d The list of films was impressive but did not distinguish between 16 and 35 mm.

Their activities included a high number of public showings.

2g They had no subsidies so their only source of income was from the public showings and subscriptions of their members.

With some 6000 members, compared with the 1½ million population of Montevideo, they were the principal cultural organisation in the country.

They had 5 projection rooms (from 80 to 480 seats) and showed about 140 different programmes a month.

2h As was known from the last FIAF Bulletin, the reconstruction of new purpose-built vaults was now under way.

Mr Francis had nothing to add to this report but considered his last two paragraphs contained the key to the situation:

- i FIAF should consider the possible reaction of the film producers regarding distribution of their film and use by archives here and in other Latin American countries.

- ii Perhaps ideally the two organisations in Montevideo (Sodre being on the Agenda for reconfirmation as Observer) should be considered together as equalling one full Member.

Mr ALves-Netto commented on the general situation in Latin America where most Cinémathèques started as screening organisations but in the last 6 to 7 years had become very concerned with preservation matters. The Cinemateca Uruguay was a particularly good example in its awareness of the need for film preservation: they had bought some very expensive land outside Montevideo and had embarked on a two-year construction project which would provide them with the most modern film preservation facilities in Latin America. As they had no official Government money, the only way to pay for this was through their screening activities. He understood they bought the non-commercial rights. He concluded by saying they were both competent technically and were committed by their love for their work.

Mr Klaue agreed that they were an excellent model for Latin American archives but was anxious about the emphasis on screenings: with a daily capacity of over 3700 seats they had a theoretical income over \$ 4 million. He would like to see a budget statement showing exactly what income came from screenings. Their situation was similar to that of the BFI and the NFA and he wondered if it would be possible to have a separation of the screenings and the archive organisations?

Mr Alves-Netto agreed it would be useful to discuss the possibility of splitting the two activities into separate organisations. He explained how 15 years ago the country had been a "paradise of film clubs" which had been closing for political reasons; the Cinemateca inherited their facilities and became the only cultural organisation to provide screenings, a role they could not refuse.

Mr Daudelin said the situation raised two important general questions on which FIAF was not clear in its policy:

- i the question of screenings
- ii the value of the Observer status

Mr Alves Netto said there had been no difficulties with the producers on the question of screenings: Latin America was the biggest market for North American films and there was close surveillance, formal agreements and no problems.

Mr Pogacic mentioned there was no mention in the Statutes regarding the number of viewing rooms but referred to FIAPF and the Unesco recommendation. He pointed out that after all the purpose of the preservation activity was to ensure that films would be available to show.

Mrs Bowser said she was not worried by the number of the seats but by the fact that they seemed to be paying for the rights to show films; this was worrying to other archives since it was going to set a precedent and cause the producers to ask for payment.

Mr de Vaal agreed that it would be a good idea to consider dividing the organisation. He asked for clarification on relations with distributors, not just with producers.

Mr Alves-Netto said he had been referring to the distributors as there were no producers in the country. He added that there might well be conflict between national legislation in different countries and FIAF regulations as a consequence of UNESCO recommendations regarding viewing facilities.

Regarding the possibility of co-operation and merger with SODRE, Mr Kuiper asked what the current situation and possibilities were. Mr Alves-Netto stressed that SODRE (Servicio Oficial de Difusion Radio Electrica), from the name itself, was primarily concerned with radio but had moved into TV and film. Mr Francis said they were not active in film preservation work but as they had the only air conditioned vaults in the country suitable for nitrate storage they were looking after film for the Cinemateca.

Mr Daudelin suggested it might be useful for him and perhaps Mr Francis and Mr Alves-Netto, to meet Mrs Cristina Ferrari from the Cinemateca on her arrival to see if such a split might be possible without endangering the preservation work. Mr Alves-Netto agreed but pointed out that delay would mean a different Executive Committee and it was important to decide at this congress if possible to avoid putting a brake on their work.

Mr Klaue summarised the agreement of the Committee that they would meet with Mrs Ferrari to discuss the possibility of separation and ask for details of projection income, while stressing sympathy and admiration for their achievements and development which are exceptional in Latin America. We should explain the problems of FIAF being criticised by the producers.

#### Decision:

At the last session of the E.C. on Sunday, 3 May, Mr Daudelin reported that he and Mr Alves Netto had had the proposed meeting with Mrs Ferrari to discuss the outstanding questions, and he was now completely satisfied that they should be accepted as Members.

The members therefore unanimously voted for the admission of Cinemateca Uruguay as full Member of FIAF, pending confirmation by the General Meeting.

## 2. Munich: Münchner Stadtmuseum/ Filmmuseum

In reviewing the submission, Mr Daudelin identified two points of concern:

- i the degree of autonomy, especially as regards staff recruiting, management and budgetary matters.
- ii the problem of the proliferation of archives in Federal Germany

Mr Pogacic mentioned that, although he admired the work of Mr Patalas, FIAF had already refused their candidature once to avoid proliferation of archives in a single country. FIAF had to decide on its policy and perhaps be more concerned with getting at least one archive in each country considering two thirds of UNESCO countries have no archive at all.



Mr Comencini also respected Mr Patalas' work but mentioned three examples of incidents where he had shown films in Italy or planned to do so (the last two occasions with the Goethe Institute in Milan) without advising the Cineteca Italiana. No harm had been done but he felt Mr Patalas should be reminded of the obligations in the Rules towards colleagues in FIAF.

Mr Francis raised three points in the Filmmuseum's dossier :

- the budget
- the list of films which did not distinguish between 35 and 16mm
- the strange suggestion on p5 of the 1961 document that films were only "acquired for exchange".

Mr Borde explained with reference to the last point that originally the Filmmuseum was set up for showings only but had moved into preservation through the remarkable efforts of Mr Patalas who had personally restored some German films very sensitively. The 1961 document was out of date in this respect and needed to be changed. Mr Borde noted that Mr Patalas made no reference to the existing association between the West German archives and felt he should be asked to explain his intentions.

On the budget question, Mr Daudelin calculated that in 1980 more than half the budget was allocated to "conservation" but Mr Francis pointed out that this included "acquisitions": he wanted to know where the films came from (other archives, distributors ?) and why it was necessary to pay.

Mr Kuiper thought it might be difficult to get the basic charter document of 1961 updated, it would be complicated and take time; Mr Daudelin agreed but felt it was necessary to protect the preservation work in case anything should happen to Mr Patalas.

Mrs Bowser said, re the proliferation of archives in one country, that for her the key question was the opinion of the existing Members/Observers in that country. Mr Daudelin agreed and suggested a sub-committee should meet with their German colleagues or invite them to attend the Executive Committee to discuss the matter. Mr Klaue said that in cases where there was no central cultural body as in the Federal Republic of Germany, it was natural that each individual state should have its own archive; he expected other applications in later years. For him, the important question was still the need to get a statement from the archive on its autonomy, especially on budgetary matters.

It was agreed to postpone the decision, get the views of the other German archives, and that Mr Klaue and Mr Daudelin would discuss the difficulties with Mr Patalas before writing him a formal letter.

## B. CANDIDATURES FOR OBSERVERSHIP

### 1. Wellington: New Zealand Film Archive

Mr Daudelin reviewed the submission documents of this newly established archive and suggested they should be accepted as part of FIAF's policy to encourage the creation of archives in countries where there are none. Mr Francis strongly supported the application.  
Decision: Unanimous approval.

### 2. Algiers: La Cinémathèque algérienne.

Mr Klaue reported on his meeting with Mr Karèche in Leipzig when he asked 3 specific questions:

- i Autonomy of the archive within the Centre Algérien de la Cinématographie within the Ministry of Information and Culture.
- ii The legal basis of their screenings
- iii Preservation activities.

Mr Klaue and Mr Daudelin both expressed concern that the application had been outstanding for two years, principally because of reports of difficulties with the producers but it was important to be objective and not base decisions on rumours. It was agreed to await the arrival of Mr Buache who had visited them 18 months ago and then invite Mr Karèche to come to the Executive Committee.

### 3. Luanda: Cinemateca Nacional de Angola

The dossier was still incomplete although the subscription had been paid, so no decision could be made.

### 4. Bogota: Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana

The dossier was incomplete so no decision could be made.

## C. RECONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS

### 1. Lisbon: Cinemateca Portuguesa

Mr Daudelin reported that the revised statutes had now been submitted and everything seemed to be satisfactory although more financial information should be requested.

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation without further discussion.

### 2. Washington: The American Film Institute - Archives

Mr Daudelin reported that this reconfirmation had been held up pending submission of the financial statements which had now been received.

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation without further discussion.



3. Pyong Yang: Choson Minjujui Inmingonhwaguk Kugga Yongwha Munhongo

Mr Daudelin reported that the Secretariat had discovered only in March 81 that Pyong Yang had not received Mr Daudelin's letter of November 80 asking for the financial report and the organisation chart. They will bring these to Rapallo.

Decision: Postponed discussion till next Rapallo meeting.

4. Istanbul: Sinema Televizyon Enstitüsü

Mr Daudelin regretted the tone of Mr Sekeroglu's letter of April 9, 81 which indicated he had misunderstood the questions he had been asked in connection with the reconfirmation procedure. Mr Klaue expressed the opinion of the meeting that we should write again with more care to express appreciation of their work and explaining that FIAF does not wish to "inspect" or "interfere" but has introduced the procedure primarily for the protection of the archives themselves from criticisms of illegal use of films etc.

Decision: Postponed till missing information received (budget, organigram).  
Action: Secretary General to write.

D. RECONFIRMATION OF OBSERVERS

1. Tehran: Filmkanah Melli Iran

Mr Daudelin reported that it was impossible to make contact with this archive so, for purely practical reasons and without prejudice, he proposed to remove them from the list of Observers and put a notice in the Bulletin so that fellow members could save costs of mailing materials that would be lost or returned.

Decision: Remove from list of observers until we hear from them again.

2. Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela

Mr Daudelin reported that there are serious postal delays in this country and that the representatives would be bringing the relevant documents to Rapallo. They were two years late with their Reports and Subscriptions.

Decision: Await their arrival in Rapallo.

3. Montevideo Sodre: Cine Arte del Sodre

Mr Daudelin reported that the Annual Report had now been received and everything was in order.

Decision: confirmed (no vote necessary).

4. Brazzaville: Cinemathèque Nationale Populaire.

They had advised the Secretariat of their change in statutes as a separate department within ONACI. There was however no problem regarding their reconfirmation.

5. Lyon: Comité de Fondation du Musée et de la Cinémathèque de Lyon.

Mr Borde reported on a letter of 12.2.81 that he would pass to the Secretariat: the Director, Dr Genard, was responsible for two collections: his own collection of equipment and the Lumière family collection of films and equipment. The city of Lyon had recently bought from him his own collection (for about \$ 400,000) and were planning to buy the Lumière collection and set up an Institut Lumière under the chairmanship of the Mayor of Lyon. Considerable investments and changes were being made and there would of course be change in the legal status of the Observer. Decision: await further information at time for reconfirmation.

E. STATUS OF OBSERVERS & DRAFT DECLARATION ON ROLE OF FILM ARCHIVES

Mr Stenklev introduced the document which had been revised to incorporate amendments suggested in Vienna and particularly those of Mrs Bowser and Mr Borde.

Mr Pogacic was unhappy that the document claimed to be a "Declaration" but was simply a summary of the facts.

Mr Daudelin stressed that it was primarily a "working document" for discussion in the General Assembly.

Mr Kuiper felt it needed an extra paragraph to clarify that there were two categories of Observers:

- i organisations which support the aim of preservation but which, for instance like UNO, would never qualify, by the nature of their work and status, to become Members.
- ii organisations which would progress to becoming members in due course.

Mr Stenklev disagreed as such details would weaken the intention of the document which was aimed at the outside world as a tool to help fight against the proliferation of archives which could divert resources from the main task of preservation.

Mr Alves Netto was interested to know if FIAF had information on which countries had national legislation on film archives. In Brazil, where there was the beginnings of proliferation resembling Italy, they were working to get legislation enacted in line with FIAF aims.

Mr Klaue said he knew there was legislation in socialist countries, in Bolivia and Finland; it would be interesting to collate such information at FIAF Headquarters for reference purposes.

Mr de Vaal agreed with Mr Kuiper that more attention should be given to clarifying the role of observers.

Mr Kuiper, who had recently been personally engaged in film programming, felt that the proliferation of cinémathèques concentrating on making films accessible to the public, was an issue FIAF had to face up to. We had several options:

- i We could tell them to go away, with the possibility that they would set up their own Federation as the television organisations had done. FIAF would then be diminishing its chances of influencing them to acknowledge the importance of preservation for posterity.
- ii we could continue to try and strike a balance between dissemination and preservation in allocation of resources.
- iii we could become more active in helping with the dissemination activity by for instance running seminars on film programming.

Mr Francis, like the previous 3 speakers, liked the document but mentioned that the quotation from Article 3 of the Statutes had brought to his attention that the status of the words in brackets was unclear in the English text and this would need looking into.

(NB Translator's note: English text "for the benefit of officers/members" is quite different from French "à l'usage des.." In the French, they could choose to use the profits for preservation purposes which seems a strange reason for excluding them from FIAF. The English text implies they have no such good intentions.)

Mr Stenklev replied to Mr Kuiper recalling that the two of them had worked on the Subcommittee with Mr Klaue and agreed that in dropping the class "Associate" they had felt that the more detail was put in to describe an "Observer" the more difficulties they would create for themselves in future; ad hoc decisions on individual archives would be more pragmatic. In addition, he was surprised at the re-opening of the discussion on the document content and purpose as "defence document against proliferation" which he felt had been finally agreed at Vienna.

Mr Borde agreed with this last point and stressed that what was needed was a forceful document, quickly, that he could present to his Minister of Culture to help him in his definition of a real archive. As in Italy, the situation in France was getting worse very fast with a mad proliferation of so-called "cinémathèques".

Mr Kuiper then expressed the opinion of the Committee that the document was ready for presentation to the General Assembly for discussion.

Decision: Submit draft to the General Assembly.

Refer role of Observers to next Executive Committee.

#### F. MISCELLANEOUS

Mr Daudelin reported on contacts with a number of organisations, for information only, in the following towns: Rabat, Vancouver, Maputo (Mozambique), Quezon City (Philippines). And also:

##### Lima:

An enquiry had been received from a new cinémathèque in Lima which Mr Alves-Netto said was founded by a group of producers, critics and people interested in film preservation. He had advised them to get in touch and hopefully co-operate with the existing archive, already a FIAF Observer.

United Nations Audio-Visual Archive.

Mr Daudelin reported they had received a long, exploratory letter raising technical points in FIAF regulations which would make it difficult for them to join as observers which they hoped could be overcome.

Mrs Bowser had had several telephone conversations with them and hoped very much that we could find a way to admit this archive although there were many difficult legal problems.

Mr Pogacic thought it would be useful to have them in FIAF and they should be seen as a very special case. Perhaps we should consult with all members rather than just the Executive Committee.

Mr Kuiper checked that it was the Visual Materials Library and not UNO itself who was interested and said there would be problems of autonomy.

Mr Stenklev thought it was very interesting but we should consider it not as just one unique case: many other international organisations and United Nations Organisations had impressive film sections (eg ILO and the International Red Cross in Geneva, perhaps also FAO and WHO). We should also be pragmatic and consider how their presence could help us vis à vis UNO/UNESCO.

Mr Francis felt we should welcome their achievements in preservation (vaults, copying of nitrate) which were well in line with FIAF aims.

Mr Comencini saw it as a very important opportunity for FIAF; a special case like other special cases (eg Imperial War Museum).

Mr Klaue emphasised that it was a question of the general policy of FIAF. Our regulations had not foreseen applications from international organisations and we had to decide what our attitude was and how we should amend our regulations accordingly. He had already had verbal enquiries from other international organisations like ICA (International Council of Archives) and IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations). He is personally in favour of opening the Federation but we needed to decide whether we were opening it to:

- i the international organisation itself
- ii the archive portion only

Mr Daudelin stressed that we needed to decide soon on our attitude as he had to reply to UNO indicating whether there were any chances of being admitted. If the statutes are to be changed, then we need to discuss it at the General Assembly and set up a schedule for future discussions/decisions.

We needed to identify which items needed amendment.

Mr Klaue summarised the decision that:

- i Mr Daudelin would raise the issue at the General Assembly
- ii A friendly reply should be sent to UNO explaining that the general problems of regulations were being examined.

Mr Pogacic agreed with the suggested procedure but asked what danger there was in accepting this type of organisation as Observer.

Several members then referred to particular Articles which would cause difficulties: Articles 4,6,10 and 1. Mr Borde, with the support of Mr Andreykov, expressed strongly that we shouldn't play about with special interpretations of the regulations but specifically set about modifying them to spell out the rights and duties of this kind of organisation.

Decision: Raise at General Assembly, under Members Questions or Open Forum.



#### 4. FINANCIAL REPORT

##### A. Accounts for 1980.

All the members had before them the financial accounts and balance of FIAF for the year 1980.

Mr de Vaal pointed out that some explanatory notes had been added which would save time in the Meeting and provide additional information. He was pleased to report that the final situation was less alarming than had been thought at Vienna.

Mr Stenklev felt that it was important to comment at the General Assembly on the differences between the Budgeted and Actual figures for 1980 as many people couldn't read accounts easily. He felt the general situation was satisfactory and particularly praised the Executive Secretary for efficiently containing the current expenses at the Secretariat.

Mrs van der Elst pointed out that the excess under Special Publications (124.000 BF) was primarily due to the printing of the Handbook which was now selling very well and had already brought in 80.000 BF.

Decision: accounts for 1980 unanimously approved.

report

##### B. Interim for January-April 1981

Decision: after a few minor clarifications, unanimously approved.

##### C. Budget for 1982 (PIP not included)

Mr de Vaal said there had not been any significant changes to last year's budget and, in reply to a question from Mr Stenklev, said they had allowed for 10% inflation in Belgium.

There was a number of open questions including the future of PIP which would be discussed with the Documentation Commission Report; decisions still had to be made about Special Publications (Rapallo?, Statutes?, Brighton symposium?). It was confirmed that the figures were based on a single Executive Committee Meeting in 1982 and a total budget for the Mexico congress of 315.000 BF

Decision: Budget for 1982 unanimously approved subject to open questions.

#### 5. REPORTS ON: - ORGANISATION OF TWO SYMPOSIA IN RAPALLO - MEETING ORGANISED BY THE BIENNALE IN VENICE

##### A. The two symposia

###### 1. Technical Symposium

Mr Francis read out the document describing the Theme and Purpose of the Symposium and the proposed Programme. He stressed that there was much to cover but he hoped it would be the start and prepare the way for the future, including a larger conference open to all interested parties.



For this Symposium we would have two technical experts from BFI: the Preservation Officer and the Laboratory Supervisor. The practical details of the day would be organised outside the Executive Committee by Mr Cincotti, Mr Francis and Mrs van der Elst.

2. Historical Symposium: White Telephone Comedy 1935 - 1940

Mr Cincotti described the arrangements for the Symposium which his Cineteca Nazionale had organised in association with the Italian Association for Historical Research in the Cinema. A number of Italian historians, journalists and critics would be present. Mr Toeplitz was proposed as chairman as he speaks the three languages used. The proceedings will be published in a special number of Bianco & Nero in the original language and in Italian.

B. Meeting organised by the Biennale in Venice.

Mr Pogacic who represented FIAF at the meeting confirmed the substance of the Report which he had already submitted to the Committee: it was useful for FIAF to be there and make known to a wider audience, including a large number of academics, the objectives and activities of FIAF.

He regretted that the Conference had been organised in such a way that it was not possible to have a real dialogue at any stage.

Mr Francis agreed and felt that the planning was very poor: it would have been more fruitful with only a third of the participants and with better scheduling of sessions to avoid repetition. Mr Francis was interested in two points that he felt FIAF should take note of:

i an art historian had drawn attention to the substantial amount of research that had already been done in their field on colour fading, including preparation of colour density scales, effect of light on colour, etc. He felt that FIAF should investigate and follow up relevant research that was being done in other disciplines besides film.

ii he was appalled that a large number of critics and historians were of the opinion that it was not necessary to view films as a member of an audience. He felt a lot of work of FIAF was concerned with the recreation of the audience experience and this was essential.

Mr Comencini was not present at the meeting but was asked to comment: he had heard that it was unsatisfactory in many ways but was glad of the occasion to enhance public awareness of the problems of conservation and archives' roles.

Mr Klaué therefore expressed the Committee's thanks to Mr Pogacic and confirmed the view that it was useful to have participated. He felt FIAF should try to ensure there was better preparation if there were a second conference; for the moment, he understood the Biennale had no money to hold the proposed conference on colour preservation talked of for 1981.

Mr Daudelin confirmed that the press cuttings and list of participants were available for consultation at the Secretariat and Mr Pogacic confirmed that he understood the Proceedings were going to be published.

Administrative difficulties of Pyong Yang Delegation

Mr Daudelin and Mr Cincotti spoke of the telegram asking for help that had been received from the Korean delegation who were stranded in Moscow because they had been unable to get visas for Italy. Numerous approaches had been made to the various authorities to try and resolve the situation, but without success.

Mr Klaue said it was important for FIAF members to know that the Federation, through its Executive Committee, had done everything possible to help any member in such a difficult situation. He therefore proposed to send a telegram on behalf of FIAF to the Italian Foreign Affairs Ministry to try and unblock the situation; he also proposed to cable the Korean delegation expressing sympathy and confirming that the Cineteca Nazionale had done everything possible and that FIAF was also intervening officially.

Mr Volkmann recalled that 20 years ago he had had the same difficulty and been refused a visa for the Annual Conference in Rome; at the time, there had been a resolution that, in future, conferences could not be held in countries which refused visas to any FIAF representatives.

Mr de Vaal said that such a resolution would not ensure that the host country issued visas for everybody. Mr Pogacic thought nevertheless that the host should be formally reminded of their obligation.

Mr Stenklev felt it was not enforceable but nevertheless the FIAF headquarters should send a letter to the host for submission to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stressing the international standing of the Conference.

Mrs Bowser pointed out this would have to be done more than one year in advance to give FIAF time to find an alternative host in case of difficulty. But Mr Cincotti pointed out that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would take no action guaranteeing visas to members from a list of countries submitted so far in advance.

Mr Klaue thanked Mr Cincotti for his efforts and put to the meeting the actions below which were approved.

- Decisions: i send cable of sympathy and encouragement to Korean delegation  
 ii send 2 cables from FIAF to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, one to the Minister, one to the person responsible, setting out situation and urging positive action.  
 iii Mr Cincotti to make daily contact with the Ministry as long as necessary throughout the Congress.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE VIENNA EC MEETING

Mr Klaue next asked if everyone had now had time to review the Minutes of the last Executive Committee Meeting. There were no comments or queries and they were unanimously approved.

## 6. EXAMINATION OF THE MAIN POINTS OF THE AGENDA FOR THE GENERAL MEETING

A draft agenda for the General Meeting had been prepared by the President and the Secretary General on which Members were asked for their comments. A lengthy discussion was held with respect to Item 4 which was retitled "Report by the President on the work of the Executive Committee"; many contributions were made clarifying details and wording of the text drafted by Mr Klaue. It was agreed that the Report would be distributed but also read out by the President during the General Assembly.

For Item 5 (Financial report), Mr Klaue asked Mr de Vaal to comment on the figures so that the delegates would know what had been done to improve the situation reported on last year.

### Item 7: Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann's draft contained some personal comments based on the proceedings of the Washington Cold Storage conference in April 1980, organised for the North American archives and to which some members of the Executive Committee went as guests following the EC meeting in New York. He felt that the work of the Commission had been ignored but it was pointed out that participants had been asked to describe their personal experiences, not to make suggestions or talk about theory. Mr Volkmann was asked to make his personal comments in the Bulletin or indeed to discuss the proceedings with the Preservation Commission and make a Commission response; it was considered inappropriate however for his personal reactions to be included as an integral part of the Commission's Report.

Mr Francis would like to have seen mention of:

- i a progress report on the Philips videodisc experiments which were of interest to many members.
- ii the offer from BKSTS to publish the Manual on Magnetic Tapes, prepared by the Preservation Commission.

In one year, we had offers from UNESCO and two other organisations to publish work of the Preservation Commission, which reflected very well on the work they were doing and should certainly be mentioned.

On the other hand, Mr Francis was not happy with the mention of Kodak in Mr Volkmann's report because the issue was not covered precisely enough: Mr Scorsese had been talking about release prints; in addition, the stock film suppliers were not the only villains in the piece as suitable stock was available, but at a higher price, and the producers were just not using it.

Mr Daudelin mentioned that Mr Scorsese's points had been attacked on strictly technical grounds by a French inventor in the October 80 issue of Les Cahiers du Cinema; he agreed that we should be very careful in our comments.

When asked by Mr Klaue about the future programme of the Commission, Mr Volkmann said that he would be retiring, because of old age, once the manuscript had been delivered to UNESCO, and was not therefore in a position to comment.

Mr Klaue reiterated an earlier comment by Mr Daudelin that the names of the members of the Commission and the experts should be listed on the Report so that at least once a year FIAF could be made aware of the individuals who were doing this important work for the Federation.

Decision: Mr Volkmann to amend the draft Report along the lines suggested.

#### Item 8: Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Mrs Harrison mentioned a number of points for the Executive Committee which had not been detailed in her written Report, as follows:

##### i Film Cataloguing Manual

On the question of royalties for FIAF, they had had no success in getting a response from Mr Franklin, the publisher. While sales seem to be going well, they had no access to his figures so were unable to prove these and claim the due royalties.

After discussion, it was agreed that Mrs Harrison should draft a formal letter to the publisher to be signed by the treasurer.

##### ii Spanish translation of above

The publishers had the first rights but had again made no response to two letters enquiring whether they wanted to exercise these rights (the second letter being recorded delivery, with a deadline for reply).

Mrs Bowser suggested that she or Mrs Harrison should get legal advice from within their own institutions before proceeding further.

##### iii Bulgarian member

Mrs Harrison expressed her thanks to the Bulgarian Archive for making available the new member of the Commission (A. Velchevska) who was already making an active contribution.

##### iv Five-Language Glossary

Mrs Harrison thanked Mr Borde for the French contribution she had recently received; the German version was also ready. The Spanish and Russian were still outstanding and there would then be a lot of work collating and rationalising. It was hoped to have it printed in Brussels, possibly in two years from now.

##### v FIAF funding

The Commission had not previously had to draw on FIAF funding for their meetings as there had been volunteer hosts but help would be needed in 1982. It was pointed out that money was in the Budget for this purpose.

Mr Klaue asked that the presentation of the Report to the General Assembly should be in the form of a lively and informative summary designed to encourage discussion and get members' advice and opinions.

#### Item 9: Report of the Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser asked for comments on the Report which had been distributed previously and made some additional points that were discussed, as follows:

- i Commission Meeting in Madrid, autumn 1980  
The sum of 20,000 Belgian francs was requested and granted. It covers the stay for 3 people and lunches for all.
- ii Workshop in Madrid  
The Workshop on the Classification of film Literature has 13 firm bookings and 6 possibles; it will be led by Michael Mould and Karen Jones whose costs will be paid. The Spanish archive is paying for transportation, paper and xeroxing, reception. The fee for participants of \$ 300 (about 12,000 Belg francs) covers hotel, breakfast, lunch, excursion but not evening meal.  
FIAF had agreed in principle to subsidise a delegate from Poona (fee but not travel expenses).  
The programme was discussed in Copenhagen and Mrs Bowser had notes for anyone interested, together with further details on the Budget which was currently presenting no problems.  
Mr Klaue spoke for the Committee in wishing the Workshop every success.
- iii New Commission Member  
Mrs Bowser pointed out that Frances Thorpe had had to withdraw from the Commission when she ceased being Editor of the PIP but they would like to co-opt her back. As she is not a member of FIAF, she needs permission from Mr Francis as she is employed by BFI.  
Mr Francis readily agreed and the Committee approved the proposal.
- iv New President  
Mrs Bowser said she had been a Member of the Commission since its formation in 1968 and the longest service President of any FIAF Commission; she would like to retire shortly though would be willing to serve as an ordinary member to assure continuity for a couple of years.  
There was now a good candidate as successor, Milka Staykova (Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka) who had many years experience both in the Commission and at international meetings and had the advantage of fluency in many languages.  
Mrs Bowser suggested she herself should remain as President until the future of the PIP project, which had been her big interest, was resolved in Madrid.  
Mr Klaue felt the appointment of a new President was the responsibility of the incoming Executive Committee.
- v Translation of Classification Schema  
The Spanish version had been carried out by the Spanish Archive.



The Commission would like to have a French version and suggested this might be added to the list of possible projects to be funded by UNESCO. Mr Klaue agreed but pointed out it was not likely to be of interest to the Cultural Heritage Division who were not involved in documentation or cataloguing projects.

vi Meeting of PIP Indexers.

Mrs Bowser felt it would be useful to have a meeting of the 35 indexers working on the PIP project as they had no direct contact with the project or each other. She asked if one of the Eastern Bloc countries would be able to host such a meeting, for say 5 to 7 days.

Mr Klaue pointed out it would be necessary to plan for this by budgeting at least one year in advance. Mrs Bowser hoped that one country might be able to consider this.

vii Discussion of Future of PIP

Mrs Bowser outlined the various alternatives discussed by the Commission at Copenhagen where they had the benefit of the presence of all 3 Editors of the project over the years (Karen Jones, Michael Moulds and Frances Thorpe) who were aware of all the practical day-to-day problems.

Their guidelines for the discussions had been:

- i the need for economy
- ii security for the survival of the project
- iii maintenance of FIAF control for the benefit of its user members
- iv avoiding disruption of the service

There were 4 alternatives and two temporary solutions relating to accommodation in London. The Commission unanimously favoured the first solution, the Cooperative. The problem was complex and would be difficult to discuss in the General Assembly if people were not familiar with the project.

a) Solution 1: the Co-operative

The Secretariat had distributed a document outlining the proposals. With this scheme, those FIAF members who were most interested in the continuation of the PIP project could be guarantors to the project if there should be any deficit, thus protecting FIAF from any further losses.

The Commission felt this was the best solution because:

- there would be no disruption to the service
- FIAF would retain control and gain prestige from the project
- the active users of the project within FIAF would retain control together with the possibility of improving the service and the income.
- It was expected that the project was on a self-sustaining basis and the members of the cooperative would not need to pay out any additional monies beyond the agreed subscription rates. Four users had already committed themselves as guarantors (New York, Copenhagen, Oslo and Stockholm) and there were several other likely possibilities.

The only disadvantage was that even the most enthusiastic "guarantors" could not guarantee that they could stay with the project, simply because of reasons outside their own control in their archives; this meant that ultimately FIAF would still be the final guarantor. The Commission felt that although this point should be mentioned it was not likely that any of the guarantors (whether Cooperative members or FIAF) would be called upon to pay anything more.

#### b) Solution 2: Ottawa

A proposal, as yet unconfirmed, had been received to house the project free of charge in Ottawa (Public Archives), which would save the project the current £7,000 rental costs, (an amount well above any anticipated deficits). As well as this saving, this solution had the additional advantage of maintaining FIAF control as Mr Kula had stressed that they had no interest in the running of the project.

The disadvantages were:

- disruption of the project for at least 3 months during transfer from London to Ottawa.
- high start up costs recruiting a new editor and staff, including 3 months overlap for the editor to work and train in London (travel and staying costs)
- decision about whether to ship printing machine over or buy a new one (estimated at £4,000).
- difficulty of finding suitable editor in Ottawa, with necessary abilities and dedication.
- increase in the annual travel costs
- increase in postage costs for airmail to subscribers
- confusion over address change with possible delays

In short, the initial saving of accommodation costs while attractive was offset by other additional costs as well as danger to the service through change of personnel and possible difficulties of finding suitable staff.

#### c) Solution 3: British Film Institute

The BFI - Documentation Department had offered to take over the whole project from FIAF and this would have the advantage that the same offices could be used.

The disadvantages were:

- It would no longer be a FIAF project as it would be run by the BFI Documentation Department, not the Archive.
- The present Editor and the BFI would probably not want to work together.
- The BFI proposal suggests that if the deficit should ever exceed £5,000 they would have the right to abandon the project which means there is loss of security
- There is insufficient control of the project by the users.
- The BFI Documentation Department are subscribers to PIP but not users because they have their own system. It is possible that they will

want to change both systems to produce a single system which would mean in effect that the 37 subscribers would have to introduce changes for the benefit of a single user.

- If there were a change of policy or Director at BFI the project would also be at risk.

d) Solution 4: Cooperation with Film Literature Index, USA

Mrs Bowser had had discussion with the Editor of the FLI, Vince Aceto (?) who was interested in possible collaboration instead of the existing competition. He had made a written proposal which was not really practical and had asked if he could come to Copenhagen to present his ideas. They would continue the cards but would publish their own Annual Volume, not the PIP one, at cost, including the cost of use of the University computer. His proposed figures showed a substantial deficit in year 1 and an increase in costs, without any possibility of adding to the project income.

e) Temporary Solution

Another solution was that the lease on the present premises should not be renewed: it was for 5 years and was costing £7,000pa, renewable from September 81 but decision was needed in May. Mr Francis had offered a temporary solution as he had office accommodation attached to his home; however he wanted to be free to ask the project to move, should he wish or need to sell the house. The use of his home would thus take away the pressure regarding renewal of the lease and give a breathing while they sorted out a long term solution.

In the extensive general discussion which followed, the following main points emerged.

i) Financial liability for Cooperative and FIAF

To underwrite the deficit which could arise in the worst possible case, there would need to be a minimum of 8 members of the Co-operative who would guarantee to pay 38,500 Belg francs each (ie about \$ 1000) in addition to their normal PIP subscription. Mrs Bowser and Mr Stenklev stressed that the calculations had been based on the worst possible case and it was very unlikely that the members of the Cooperative would be called upon to pay this sum.

ii) Legal liability of Cooperative and FIAF

Mrs Bowser and Mr Stenklev both pointed out that most of the members were state institutions which were officially unable to budget for more than a year at a time and so could make no formal guarantee over a longer period as was strictly required to underwrite the 5-year offices lease. They could however express their formal intention to apply for the reserve sum to be held available in case of a deficit in the PIP project. To this extent, FIAF would be still legally but not morally liable.

iii Balance of extra staff v extra money

Mr Stenkley stressed that, for small archives who were keen to belong to the Cooperative, the extra sum they were prepared to set aside as a reserve in case of possible deficit on the project was a small amount to pay for the security of guaranteeing the continuation of the project. Without PIP, they would have to find another  $\frac{1}{2}$  job in each archive and for most of them it was more difficult to get extra staff than to get extra money. The PIP subscription and the PIP "Cooperative guarantee reserve sum" would both come from the library acquisition budget. He stressed that the extra sum involved was in fact no more than the cost of copying one and a half black and white film; "on the verge of being petty cash".

iv Responsibility of FIAF in case of disaster

Mr de Vaal raised the question of the possibility of inflation in the next two years running away to such an extent that the project was broke: would the Cooperative or FIAF be responsible.

Mrs Bowser agreed that FIAF would inevitably have to stand behind the project because there was no way the Cooperative could be a legal entity because:

- it would be very expensive to set it up as such
- the project would then no longer be a FIAF project
- the Cooperative members would not be in a position to give the necessary guarantees because, as we all knew, disasters can happen to individual archives.

v Status of Cooperative and FIAF

Mr Klaue stressed that it would be important for the Cooperative to have formal internal rules and principles of operation and that there should be a formal agreement between the Cooperative and FIAF setting out the Cooperative's obligations and clarifying that FIAF should not be responsible for the financial risks. A lawyer's advice would be needed to limit the risks to FIAF.

vi Cash Flow problems and opportunities

Mrs Bowser suggested that the Cooperative should meet every year at the Congress to assess the continuing financial status of the project. For the next year, the Museum of Modern Art had agreed to fund the printing of the Annual Volume on the understanding that this cost would be the first claim on sales revenue. She hoped the Cooperative would be willing to underwrite the cash flow of the printing in subsequent years.

There was the possibility of issuing a two-year TV Volume which could generate more income and help with cash flow.

vii Administrative responsibility

In reply to Mr Daudelin, Mrs Bowser suggested that the Editor should take on responsibility for all the Administration of the Cooperative. The present editor, Michael Moulds, was enthusiastic for the idea of the Cooperative and, she felt, could handle it.

#### viii Need for FIAF support to developing archives

Mr. STENKLEV stressed that the PIP project brought a lot of prestige to FIAF. It was the smaller archives who could not afford to do the work for themselves who needed it most and who paid for the service while the larger ones were not joining. He would like to see a movement of solidarity within FIAF with the larger archives supporting not just developing countries, but what he called "developing archives" in industrial countries. He urged the larger archives to consider making a gesture of solidarity by joining the Cooperative.

In addition, he felt that FIAF itself could perhaps take up one place on the Cooperative as a gesture of support to it. Mr. KLAUE said this would be contrary to the decision at Vienna that there should be no further risk for FIAF after January 1, 1982.

On the other hand, Mr. DAUDELIN felt it would be difficult for him to put in his budget a request for the Cooperative reserve guarantee in addition to the normal PIP subscription, while other, larger archives were getting the same service and paying simply the normal subscription.

#### ix Other alternatives

Mr. DAUDELIN pointed out that the Cooperative proposal assumed the project would stay in London; if it had to relocate, then there would be additional expenses and the Cooperative figures would need amendment.

Mr. KUIPER asked whether the PIP still had to leave FIAF umbrella now that the financial situation was not so black as at Vienna. Mr. de VAAL said we still had to be very careful.

Mr. BUACHE reported that Mr. LEDOUX had suggested reverting to a cheaper system as many archives had to rework the cards anyway for their own needs and formats (eg in Belgium they needed Flemish titles). It would be cheaper for the searching to be shared and lists to be sent to the Secretariat for photocopying and distribution.

Mrs. BOWSER said that in a survey of members, everyone except Brussels had wanted the card system: the whole point of the PIP project was to save the effort the archives would otherwise have to spend on making their own cards.

#### x BFI proposal

Mr. FRANCIS was asked to add his comments to the BFI proposal and he read out the memo of 16.3.81 sent to him by Gillian Hartnell, Head of the Information and Documentation Department, together with the Accountant's comments.



He was not willing to make any interpretation of this document but he did explain why he thought the proposal was attractive to the BFI ; namely, that they were planning computerisation of records which would make it fairly easy for them to reformat information as required, to meet PIP's needs as well as their own, in two separate runs if necessary. The advantage for them of taking on the project would be that they would acquire the "right" to additional indexers on the establishment and there was no other way they could get more staff in the present economic climate.

In considering the Accountant's comment that the BFI would provide a subsidy up to £ 5,000 in the first year, he pointed out that this allowed for staff salaries to be increased to bring them in the line with BFI rates.

In reply to a question from Mr. DAUDELIN regarding room for manoeuvre regarding FIAF control, he felt this might be achieved through the balance of power in Committee structure and by having, perhaps, a 5-year review system.

Mrs. BOWSER reported that whatever concessions were made, FIAF would have no power to enforce them and the Commission preferred the Ottawa solution to the BFI one because it housed the project for nothing and this saving would exceed any possible deficit; most important, FIAF control would be secure. The anxiety about change of the man on the top, expressed regarding BFI, did not apply in the case of Ottawa who were incurring no costs on their budget and thus no power over the project.

#### xi Plans for activity in preparation for General Meeting discussion

Mrs. BOWSER was asked to provide a very clear document setting out for the GM how the Cooperative would function. The Commission were also encouraged to do everything in their power to lobby for the maximum number of Cooperative members before the Meeting if they wanted this solution to prevail. Mr. KLAUE said that if they could provide written commitment from the Members of the Cooperative that they were prepared to underwrite any possible deficit, then it would be possible for FIAF to sign the lease on the property and ensure continuity to the project.

As the issues are so complex, it was agreed to present the alternative solutions to the GM only if the Cooperative solution favoured by the Commission was defeated.

On Sunday, May 3, the discussion on PIP was continued for a further 2 hours following the additional financial information and proposals that Mrs. BOWSER prepared overnight.

Mr. KLAUE opened the session by introducing Michael Moulds, current Editor of the project and welcoming Prof. Toeplitz who had now joined the Meeting.

Mrs. BOWSER presented to the meeting :

- i 1981 budget under FIAF
- ii 1982 budget under the cooperative, with 81 comparison & allowance for inflation
- iii draft letter to the subscribers
- iv introduction to the cooperative
- v draft agreement between FIAF and the cooperative

The following points were raised :

i Minimum number required in cooperative

In reply to Mr. DAUDELIN, Mrs. BOWSER confirmed that the minimum number for viability was still 8

ii Terminology and legal status

Mr. Toeplitz pointed out that the draft agreement could have no legal status because the " cooperative" did not exist as a legal entity. He was against the use of the word "cooperative" as it had very specific connotations. Mrs. Bowser and Mr. Stenklev both said that they were not particularly attached to the term "cooperative" and would seek an alternative if it was likely to cause difficulties; they repeated what had been said the day before about the expense and impossibility for the archives to set up as a separate legal body.

iii Presentation of financial information

Mr. Francis felt it was not sufficient simply to indicate the anticipated rate of inflation over the next five years. There should be a detailed calculation of actual amounts for each year. With current inflation, everyone expected services to cost more and there should therefore be an appropriate increase in charges for the subscriptions and the Annual Volumes so that the commitment to underwrite any deficit remained at the same proportion over the 5 years. In other words, the " cooperative" should not be expected to subsidise future inflation for the other subscribers.

iv Possibilities for increasing revenue

Mr. Kuiper thought there were still possibilities to increase the revenue with additional subscriptions and annual volume sales; and encouraging the European archives who were getting the service free to start paying.

Mr. Klaue felt it was unrealistic to talk about hopes which had been unrealised over the last ten years. The Working Group in Brussels had acknowledged there was little chance to increase the number of subscriptions.

Mr. Alves Netto felt however that there certainly was a possibility to increase sales, even outside the Federation, as many developing countries would be interested if they would find a way to pay. They cannot export money so we should seek another way for them to pay, perhaps by selling actively at the annual congresses. He personally wanted to buy the last two Annual Volumes and he felt there was scope for some 10/20% increase in Annual Volume sales.

Mr. Stenklev agreed with Mr. Klaue that we should not seek to increase sales. He wanted the meeting to concentrate on the deficit and realise it was a very small amount for the individual sponsors compared with the benefits they were getting from the continuation of the project.

v Alternative solutions

Mr. de Vaal was appreciative of Mrs. Bowser's efforts but was still unhappy that there were risks for FIAF; he felt we should actively welcome the excellent offer from BFI.

Mr. Toeplitz (who was not at the meeting the day before ) wanted to consider and compare the alternatives, as well.

Mrs. Bowser was asked to repeat the Commission's view of the other alternatives : Ottawa which was not a firm offer, and BFI which appeared generous but meant losing control of the project, with the risk of its being altered or even abandoned.

Mr. Klaue felt nevertheless we should try to define under what conditions the BFI proposal could be made acceptable.

Mr. Francis felt the BFI disadvantages were not necessarily insurmountable :

- The organisation works on rolling budgets, 2 years ahead, so it would be almost impossible to abandon a project inside two years.
- The previous PIP Editor, still attached to the project emotionally, is in a powerful position in BFI (Deputy Head of Documentation Dept.)
- David Francis himself is one of the 5 men management team of BFI.
- A Steering Committee with FIAF participation is envisaged.
- An option to pass the project back to FIAF could be easily negotiated.

vi Solution 1 : importance of trust

During the discussions, Mrs. Bowser and Mr. Stenklev repeatedly asked the Committee to understand that the sponsoring group was prepared to underwrite the deficit in their own self interests because :

- they wanted the service to continue uninterrupted
- there was no way they could obtain the same information and the ready-made cards by relying on their own resources, because it would need extra personnel that they could not get permission for.
- even if they could get staff to do the work, it would be a lot more costly to them than the PIP subscription and the now envisaged guarantee
- the extra amount envisaged for the deficit guarantee was a trivial amount in any archive's budget and could present no problems.

- all the estimates were based on the worst possible estimates, with a minimum of only 8 guarantors. Already there were 11 committed guarantors and they expected additional ones. The individual contributions to the deficit would therefore be even smaller.

They regretted that for administrative reasons it was not possible to give FIAF any legally binding guarantee but they felt FIAF should be prepared to trust the sponsoring group, who included some of the most established and respected archives in the Federation.

Mr. Francis was wholeheartedly in support of the need for trust and, in the course of the discussions, Mr. Toeplitz and Mr. Klaue agreed.

Mrs. Bowser said the sponsoring group did not find the commitment frightening in any way and Mr. Francis thought it would be useful if members of the group could each give their verbal support to the project during the General Assembly discussion, to reassure those members who were not involved in the project that there would be no risk for FIAF itself.

#### vii Presentation to the General Assembly

The rest of the discussion was concerned with deciding how to present such a complex issue to the General Assembly without confusing those members who were not familiar with the background.

Decision : Mr. Daudelin to introduce the background.

Mrs. Bowser to say two major alternatives of which the Commission favoured the "Sponsoring group" approach

At the end of the EC meeting on Sunday 3 May, Mr. Klaue asked that the PIP sponsoring group should make a written declaration of their support before leaving Rapallo to provide solid grounds for signing the new ease.

Mrs. Bowser agreed and said they already had 11 members in the group.

The Secretary-General now asked to come back to the examination of the points of the agenda for the General Meeting.

#### Item 10: FIAF projects & publications underway

The 8 items on the list were reviewed briefly and commented as follows :

##### no 4 : Handbook for Film Archives : Spanish version

Mrs. Bowser reported that she had received information from Mr. Gonzales Casanova regarding the planned Spanish version which was to be published as a self-contained issue of the CIDUCAL Bulletin, with appropriate acknowledgments to the authors and to FIAF, with 500 copies for free distribution to Latin American archives.

Mr. Klaue felt FIAF should be grateful that another organisation was willing to pay for publication (just as UNESCO was paying for the French

version) and that it was perfectly satisfactory as long as appropriate acknowledgments were made to FIAF and that there was a formalised exchange of letters setting out that there should be no changes, and the rights and conditions had been agreed.

Since FILMOTECA DE LA UNAM was planning to distribute the copies free of charge to Latin American (and other Spanish readers?), it was felt that FIAF would only need a few token copies for central reference.

Decision - The terms need to be discussed and agreed with Mr. Gonzales Casanova for this publication, as for that on film cataloguing and the Spanish version of the FIAF Brochure.

no 5 : Trighton proceedings

This project had been put in abeyance because of the financial crisis in FIAF. Mr. Francis reported that Mr. Andre Caudrault of Quebec was correlating the information on the 600+ films which had been screened so that there would be a valuable record of film details, credits, etc. Mr. Francis was perturbed to hear however that some 15 experts had been drafted onto the project and he wanted to discuss with Mr. Daudelin to see what was going on!

No 6 : AFI Summer School

Mrs. Bowser reported informally that she suspected Mr. Karr would have to report a postponement of this project as the funders, the National Endowment for the Arts, had been asked by the ex-film star President Reagan to cut their activities by 50%.

no 9 : additional item : BKSTS / Magnetic tape manual

Mr. Francis was surprised this item had been omitted as he understood that the Executive Committee meeting at Karlovy Vary had accepted the BKSTS offer and authorised him to negotiate. An Editor had been appointed and the manuscript had been expected by the end of March 81; this was now urgent if publication was to be secured for July 1 the start of the Film 81 meeting of technical experts in London. If this date was missed, BKSTS were unlikely to be interested to publish before 1983, if at all, as the meetings were only held every two years.

Mr. Volkmann felt a decision should be delayed until the matter could be raised with Mrs. van Vliet of UNESCO as he did not want to endanger the recent contract with UNESCO. Mr. Klaue felt that the UNESCO contract was for popular versions whereas the BKSTS offer concerned the scientific version for experts; he agreed with Mr. Francis that there should not be a problem.

Decision : It was agreed to mention it to Mrs. van Vliet in Rapallo so that Mr. Francis had instructions as soon as possible.



Item 11 : Proposals for new projects

Under this heading, the General Assembly will be asked to consider the proposal from the Cinemathèque Royale de Belgique to update the 1977 edition of the Silent Film catalogue, together with a list of postponed projects, to see if any members were interested in taking responsibility for any of them.

Mr. Borde said that Toulouse would be extremely interested in Project 8, the questionnaire on the programming of archive cinemas.

Item 12 : Report on the World Film History project

Mr. Klaue introduced this item by noting that a decision had to be made on who should represent FIAF at the next meeting and what requests were to be made for FIAF help.

Mr. Andreykov then brought the meeting up to date on the progress of the project, reviewing the items in his written report. In particular, he mentioned that UNESCO involvement in the project, especially in the support of a regional conference in Africa, might be usefully linked with FIAF's other involvements with UNESCO, as its two departments, Cultural Heritage and Cultural Development were both in the overall Cultural Division.

Mr. Pogacic opened the discussion by referring to his letter of 26 March to Mr. Andreykov, setting out some of his anxieties about the organisation of the project and the plans for the arrangement of the material ( especially in view of numerous political changes in the twentieth century ).

Mr. Klaue asked Mr. Andreykov to respond to these criticisms but stressed that, although any members of FIAF were participating in the project, it was not the role of the Executive Committee of FIAF to get involved with questions concerning the methodology of the project. FIAF as such was only concerned in the question of the support that should be given to the project. If, however, it was felt that FIAF should be more actively involved in the methodology, then a decision would have to be taken to that effect and a working party set up.

Mr. ANDREYKOV explained that it had already been agreed to discuss Mr. Pogacic's points at the next meeting in Varna; he then clarified the composition of the various Committees on the project.

In a discussion on the role of the FIAF representatives, Mr. Daudelin said he felt it was important for a FIAF representative to attend the meetings to explain the role of FIAF and the archives generally and ensure that workers on the project should understand what support was available to them. He felt it would be preferable for the FIAF representative not to be also a participant as a national team representative. Other members, including Mr. Stenklev, disagreed with this view.

In a discussion on the need for more information about the project, Mr. Andreykov was reminded of his commitment to send information on progress for inclusion in each FIAF Bulletin. Mr. Andreykov accepted the criticism but said there had been nothing to report lately. Mr. Stenklev said it was important to send out a progress report at least every 3 months just to keep people interested, even if the report simply said there was nothing new to report.

Expenses of FIAF representatives. Mr. Daudelin asked if FIAF could pay the travel costs of the FIAF representative attending each meeting; there was no way he could ask his own archive to pay when it was purely FIAF business. Mr. Buache said he didn't have that problem because he was attending also as a National Team Leader. Mr. Stenklev said we could not expect individual archives to pay for travel on FIAF business.

The question was not resolved but for the next meeting Mr. Andreykov kindly volunteered that the Bulgarian Archive would pay for the 2 travel tickets for the June meeting in addition to the staying costs.

#### Selection of FIAF representatives

Mr. Daudelin felt that he and Mr. Buache had not been chosen to represent the project indefinitely and as it was difficult and expensive for him to go in June, he would like to withdraw. Mr. Buache had been unable to attend any meetings so far so it was agreed to seek two alternatives.

Mr. Borde suggested the representatives should be geographically close to Bulgaria and also highly motivated and interested in the project; he proposed Mr. Pogacic as meeting these criteria. Mr. Daudelin proposed Mr. Borde on the same criteria. Both agreed to serve.

#### Level of FIAF support to the project

It was agreed to keep to the Brighton resolution for the time being but to adopt the suggestion of Mr. Stenklev that the level of support (including possible travel subsidy) should be redefined each year in the light of progress.

#### Item 14 : Relations with archives in developing countries

Mr. Klaue outlined what he would include in his Report to the CN summarising activities during the year :

- information on FIAF had been sent to potential archives offering help;
- a new request had been sent to those in the Federation asking for more detail on help needed. All had mentioned printing, raw stock documentation and library ;
- the regional conference in Asia was being discussed.

For the future he would mention .

- the Berlin summer school could not be held till 1983 or 84
- FIAF was ready to give moral help in negotiations with national authorities (a FIAF letter had helped Indonesia)
- FIAF was prepared to support the pilot project for a model archive building (Cuba-UNESCO project)

He would give the floor to the representative archive in developing countries to express their problems and expectations from FIAF.

#### Item 18 Membership Questions

Mr. Daudelin read out the names of 16 Observers who would be reconfirmed and 3 ( Teheran, Lyon, Caracas ) where the dossier was incomplete for the reasons reviewed in Item 3 of the EC Agenda above.

On the question of Algeria, Mr. Daudelin asked Mr. Buache (who was not at the meeting earlier) if he had anything to add since his meeting with Mr. Kareche a few weeks previously. His main comment was that Mr. Kareche was very surprised at the long delays.

#### Japan

Mr. Buache reported on the Film Centre in Tokyo which he had recently visited in connection with their week on Swiss cinema. It was organised in a way similar to the Museum of Modern Art, New York, the two directors were excellent; he saw their storage facilities, viewed some old films, inspected their two cinemas (75 and 180 seats). Their major problems were TV and legal deposit.

They were interested to get closer to FIAF and would be in touch shortly.

Decision No action till they write to the Secretariat.

#### Item 21 Open Forum

The only item for this session so far was the Bulletin . Mr. de Vaal said the Editorial Board ( Mrs. Gowser, Mr. de Vaal & Daudelin ) wanted to include stronger contributions on the technical side and would like approval to invite Mr. Kuiper to join the Editorial Board for this purpose.

Decision : Approved by the EC.

Mr. Klaue took the opportunity to thank Mr. de Vaal for the marvellous work being done on the Bulletin.

#### FIAF Propaganda ( Item not on the agenda )

Mr. Daudelin reported on two opportunities for FIAF's activities to reach a wider public

i Imane et Son

He had met the Chief Editor in Paris who was interested in devoting a special edition to conservation. Mr. Daudelin referred him to Mr. Borde and the other French archives but the Editor was especially keen to have FIAF involvement.

ii Movies British part-work

Mr. Daudelin had discussed with them the idea of a feature on archives, following or in connection with the issue on the restoration of "Napoleon"

7 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO

7.1 Belgrade conference

Mr. Pogacic had distributed a written report on the meetings of the Belgrade General Assembly which he had attended and where the Recommendation on the preservation of moving images had been adopted. He had little to add to this report.

Mr. Klauß said the task now was to consider what we could do to help with implementation. UNESCO were looking to receive comments in the medium term say by 1987/88. He listed some possibilities :

- Symposium in Mexico : UNESCO should be invited to attend and perhaps contribute to the symposium on the recommendation in Mexico, 6/82.
- Survey of Members in connection with i above.
- Proposals for regional conferences :  
These could encourage formation of archives in countries where there are none. Mr. Klauß reminded the meeting of the finding of Mr. Pogacic's enquiry that two thirds of the countries in the world had no archives.
- Support for training : via summer schools, symposia.
- Pilot projects : eg model archives in undeveloped areas, like Cuba project in Caribbean.
- Documentation Centre for Moving Images : to be discussed later under 7.3
- Cataloguing Commission proposal : on rules for cataloguing audio visual and film material

Mr. Pogacic felt it would be useful to make a precise analysis of the document for ourselves, especially paragraphs 11 and 12 which had been the subject of such problems, and volunteered to do this, in time for October or Mexico.

Mr. Duache said it was important to ensure the document was not simply filed away. FIAF members should endeavour to publicise it in their own countries with the relevant authorities and in countries where there were no members. Mr. Pogacic agreed and said it would probably be published in a larger volume with other unrelated material so no-one would find it unless it was drawn to their attention.

#### Meeting with Mrs. Van Vliet

It was agreed that the following should participate in the working session with her : Mr. Klaue, Pogacic, Volkmann, Francis and Mrs. Van der Elst.

#### 7.2 Contracts for the Preservation Manual

Mr. Volkmann mentioned some terms in the contract were unacceptable

- i all rights had to be surrendered to UNESCO for text and diagrams:
- ii the material must not have been previously published.

The fee of \$ 5,000 represented perhaps 5% of what FIAF and the separate archives had spent on the project.

Mr. Klaue said they would try to negotiate changes to the contract with Mrs. Van Vliet.

#### 7.2a Attendance at NGO Standing Committee meeting, June 15-19, Paris

This item was not on the agenda.

Mr. Klaue thought it was important for political reasons for FIAF to be seen to be present at this meeting for members with A and B status, especially in view of I.F.T.C. opposition.

Decision Mrs. Van der Elst would attend the first session in order to be registered as the FIAF delegate.

#### 7.3 Recommendations from FIAF re proposed Moving Image Documentation Centre at BFI, London

Mr. Klaue asked Mr. Francis to comment on what the British Film Institute expected from FIAF : Mr. Francis said he understood BFI were submitting their proposal to UNESCO only via FIAF but, as the Director represents the UK in UNESCO, he may well mention it himself. Mr. Francis and Mr. Klaue felt we should talk informally to Mrs. Van Vliet before making a formal reply.

Mrs. Bowser said the Documentation Committee were not happy that the Centre should be within BFI; it should be truly independent if it is to serve international needs. Mr. Francis pointed out that in the original document (item 3) they had been asked to consider both alternatives : a centre based in BFI and one integrated with BFI. Mrs. Bowser replied that



Karen Jones had understood from Tony Smith, (Director BFI) that they did not envisage autonomy outside BFI.

Decision : Discuss informally with Mrs. Van Vliet and resume this discussion at the EC meeting immediately following the General Meeting.

#### 7.4 Nomination of FIAF experts for developing countries

UNESCO asked for names of experts who might be available to help in different aspects of archival work in specific countries. No terms of reference were given but Mr. Klaue suggested as a first step sending names, location, speciality, languages.

Mr. Kuiper suggested we should start with the Chairmen of the Commissions and then ask them to make recommendations.

Mr. Pogacic recalled the replies to the questionnaire to developing countries : the most urgent requirement had not been for particular technical skills but for general competence and advice in setting up an archive (formulating terms of reference, organisation, choice of location, etc.)

Mr. Klaue and Mr. Andreykov (citing his African experience), both agreed.

Mr. Klaue asked Commission Chairmen to submit nominations by the end of September 81 for discussion at Lausanne. Mr. Daudelin suggested the General Meeting should be asked to submit suggestions; Mr. Pogacic agreed but added the EC should make the final decision, bearing in mind which might be acceptable politically. Mr. Toeplitz warned we would be creating trouble by inviting names which might then not be accepted. The General Meeting should be asked for advice but the EC should choose.

Decision : Commission Chairmen to make nominations.

#### 7.4a Development of models for new archives

Mrs. Van der Elst said she was very often asked for models of archive statutes, organisation charts, basic regulations, etc. and was at a loss to know what to choose. Could the EC as a whole or some members give advice?

Decision : Mr. Klaue suggested it should be a task for the new EC

### 8 RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

#### 8.1 Contact with I.C.A. etc.

Mr. Klaue reported on the meeting in Brussels, 6/7 April 81, to establish closer cooperation between ICA, FIAF, FIAT, IFLA and IASA. The meeting was on the initiative of ICA supported by FIAT.

(ICA = International Council of Archives)

(IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations)

(IASA = International Association of Sound Archives)

Most of the time was spent exchanging information about the different organisations and the following suggestions were made :

i increase the level of information exchange

They volunteered to supply copies of their Bulletins; as ours is internal only, Mr. Klaue offered to send other items (President's report, Commission Reports, lists of members etc.)

ii contribute articles to their Bulletins

They were interested to spread information on film archive activities to their members. Mr. Klaue asked, unsuccessfully, for volunteers.

iii meet again in the Autumn to discuss projects to be submitted to UNESCO

Projects mentioned included :

- archive situation in different countries - survey
- preservation of audio visual material . legal conditions, institutions, etc for orientation of younger countries
- model for training archivists in developing countries. (IFLA and ICA both have Regional Centres which FIAF could use)
- support establishment of international cataloguing rules for audio-visual material (we will submit the Commission's draft)
- views on selection problems, usage of archives, etc. etc.
- international directory of sources on A/V material (not realistic yet)

FIAT are expected to call a meeting on the 'New electronic facilities and their influence on archival work'.

IFTC were not invited as all had experience of their lack of cooperativeness

There was a lively discussion about making the FIAF Bulletin available to outsiders but it was agreed that authorisation was required from the contributors. Mr. Kuiper suggested some contributors would be less lively if writers knew they were to reach a wider audience. Mr. Toeplitz suggested one copy only should be given to the Secretary General of each of the organisations for their personal use only, with the reminder that it was strictly internal to FIAF.

Decision : Seek advice from members for each item submitted.

Review in one year.

## 8.2 Relations with FIAT

Mr. Francis reported that Mr. Kula had been selected to the Executive Committee of FIAT so suggested that he should be invited to report to FIAF on FIAT activities, including their congress in Ottawa

9 CONGRESS IN MEXICO ( 1982 )

Mr. Gonzales Casanova outlined his proposals for the organisation of the congress in Mexico based on the following dates :

June 3/4	Arrival and transfers of EC
June 5/6	Meeting of EC
June 7-9	Symposia
June 10/11	General Assembly
June 12	Excursion
June 13	Meeting of new EC ( 9 - 14 h )

He suggested the symposia should precede the General Assembly to allow the Latin Americans who had already had a meeting about archive organisation in Latin America to stay on for the FIAF symposia.

Symposia topics

- i Forgotten cinema in Latin America
- ii Basic technical elements for an archive

Costs had been based on 100 people and would be \$ 550 per person.

Mr. Daudelin then opened the general discussion, asking particularly for comments on the proposed sequence. The following points were discussed :

i Sequence

Mr. Gonzales Casanova felt the situation was different for many delegates in Latin America compared with Europe where many delegates had short distance to travel and stayed only 3 days. He felt many would plan to stay a long time in Mexico having travelled such a distance. Although Mr. Klaue asked for comments, no further reference was made to the sequence.

ii Participation of Latin Americans

Mr. Klaue stressed that those attending the earlier seminar would be welcome to attend the General Assembly meeting as guests and participate (though of course not vote). Only one session was private to FIAF.

iii Participation in Forgotten Cinema symposium

Mr. Klaue asked what interest there would be for the non-Latin American archives in this topic. Mr. Gonzales Casanova pointed out that at other congresses they had been spectators, but interested, in European subjects. In addition, he hoped all archives might be able to help in finding material from the silent period. He also suggested some FIAF members might be interested in research on the influences of their own cinema on Latin America.

Mr. Klaue emphasised that the historical symposium was in the hands of the host country so simply asked for the EC to be kept informed.

iv

#### Technical Symposium

Mr. Klaue asked what was meant by "Basic Technical Elements". Mr. Gonzales Casanova felt many people in FIAF had experience on how to develop an archive and the mistakes to be avoided, the equipment to avoid, which would be useful not only for developing countries but for new archives anywhere. He felt it would be useful for all to make such an evaluation. Mr. STENKLEV felt it would be a useful topic as there were always new people coming to the meetings.

Mr. de Vaal had doubts about such a technical topic in the very beautiful but not necessarily technically equipped setting. Mr. Daudelin also had doubts and felt the idea should be to express the preoccupations of a large number of members, not just beginners.

The following alternative topics were put forward :

- colour preservation ( Mr. Klaue )

Mr Francis opposed this as there were plans for a major conference outside the FIAF congress context.

- Basic Printing Techniques (Mr Francis )

Mr. Francis felt it would be useful to show what could be achieved with a very simple printing machine (not even processing) but he didn't know what equipment might be available at the Congress Centre for such a practical symposium.

- Author's rights

- International legislation ( Mr. Alves Netto )

Mr. Alves Netto thought the first topic was more appropriate for a Latin American seminar but that we should seek a topic that did not require technical facilities or showing of nitrate films.

- Legal aspects of archive work ( Mr. Klaue )

Mr. Klaue agreed we could usefully seek a general archive topic, not necessarily technical. He suggested there were many legal aspects of archive work, including screenings on which members could exchange experiences and encourage promotion of legislation.

- Access policies ( Mr. Kuiper )

Mr. Kuiper suggested a session on access policies which Mrs. Bowser had done some work on. This could include the questions of distribution, facilities for scholars, costs, etc which were important issues in many large archives. Mrs. Bowser felt one could cover the wider issues of access not only to scholars but to commercial companies.

Mr. Klaue said that access was a possible topic for the Stockholm congress.

- Analysis of the UNESCO recommendation ( Mr. Pogacic )

Mr. Pogacic pointed out we had been battling five years for this recommendation and felt that, though it was an excellent document and more than we had hoped for, it was time now to analyse it and decide how it could be used to advantage. This idea was welcomed by Mr. Gonzales Casanova, Mr. Kuiper and Mr. Klaue.

Decision - This last topic was adopted; the next EC to work on details.

v Finance

It was agreed that the rate of \$ 550 per person (+ \$ 100 for the EC) was very reasonable. The effect of inflation was difficult to assess but many of the items (eg the hotels) had already been contracted for. Mr. Stenklev pointed out that it was the exchange rate that was important, not simply the local inflation. He asked whether there would be any reduction for people wanting to stay less than the 10 days but this would be difficult as it had all been negotiated as a package. In reply to a question from Mr. Francis, the EC were informed that UNAM would pay the difference if fewer than 100 people attended.

vi Participation of the other Mexican Archive

Mr. Alves Netto was advised that they had been invited but he didn't know what their situation would be next year.

vii Contribution from FIAF

Mr. de Vaal asked what contribution was expected from FIAF. Mr. Gonzales Casanova said they were trying to meet all costs themselves but perhaps FIAF could help with travel for special guests or experts for the symposium. The simultaneous translation had been budgeted for. The estimate for the Executive Committee meeting was \$ 2,000 for 2 days (for equipment and interpreters).

ix African & Asian Archives

Mr. Alves Netto asked if the African and Asian archives would be invited to the Latin American archives seminar. It was agreed that only UNAM could decide that.

x Progressing the Congress preparations

Mr. Klaue asked that Mr. Gonzales Casanova should have documents ready for the GI and introduce the arrangements there.

The congress would not be discussed by the next EC in Rapallo but he should try to attend the October meeting or at least send very precise written report, with budget details and the contribution expected from FIAF.



## 10 MISCELLANEOUS

10.1 Briefing on status of Abel Gance's "Napoleon"

Mr. Daudelin asked Mr. Francis to advise the EC what had been happening, as several members had enquired to know whether they could screen the new version.

FIAF had originally been happy that "Images" had the rights because they were willing to pay Kevin Brownlow for his work on the reconstruction. "Images" gave an undertaking that :

- i all contributors could have a fine grain copy
- ii all FIAF members could show it

After the New York success, Lelouch had challenged Images for the rights which they had surrendered; Images had asked Mr. Francis (as FIAF) to sign undertaking cancelling the two concessions above.

Apparently Lelouch intends to issue worldwide a cut American version, with music at 24 fps, but retaining FIAF credits on the front even though this is a bastardised version.

Mr. Francis had taken no action that would imply acknowledgment of Lelouch's rights until taking the advice of the EC at this meeting. With FIAF support he will approach Lelouch to try negotiating to retain FIAF rights. Meanwhile, Kevin Brownlow believes he has found the original copyright owner (now retired from organisation called Societe Generale) and is hoping to find where Lelouch got his "rights".

Mr. Klauz asked about the legal position but Mr. Francis pointed out that no advice could be sought until the facts had been established.

Decision : Mr. Francis to report to the General Meeting

Mr. Francis to negotiate with Lelouch.

10.2 Next Fall Meeting of the Executive Committee

Mr. Buache formally invited the EC to attend the inauguration of the Swiss Archive's new premises on Monday, 19 October. They would provide hospitality from Thursday October 15, EC meeting 16-18 and possible overrun Monday am, departure Tuesday 20.

Decision : Invitation accepted on behalf of new EC