

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Canberra, 11 - 13 April, 1986

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

FINAL AGENDA

Item		Page
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Approval of the Minutes of the London EC Meeting	1
3	Report on preparations for the Canberra Congress	1
4	Membership Questions	
4.1	New Candidates for Observership	
	a Buenos Aires Museo Municipal del Cine	2
	b Bruxelles Centre du Film sur l'Art	3
4.2	Reconfirmation of Members	5
	a-j Montreal; Wien FA; Wien FM; Canberra; Bucharest; Frankfurt; Berlin (West); Helsinki; Rio de Janeiro; Torino	
4.3	Reconfirmation of Observers	9
4.4	Other Membership Questions	11
	a-e Hanoi:AFV; New York:AMMI; Amsterdam:AVA; Lima: CL; Paris: CF	
5	Modification of FIAF Statutes and Rules	14
	Statutes	15
	Rules	20
6	Examination of the main points on the Agenda of the General Assembly	
6.1	General (GA1-4, GA5, GA14)	24
6.2	Financial Report (GA6)	24
6.3	Reports of the Commissions (GA7, 9, 10)	25
6.4	Projects & Publications Underway (GA11)	31
6.5	Plans for the 50th Anniversary (GA12)	33
6.6	Relations with International Organisations (GA13)	35
6.7	Future Congresses (GA15)	37
	1989: Lisbon; 1990:Subsequent Years; 1987: Berlin	
7	Any Other Business	39
7.1	Invitation for EC Meeting	
7.2	Coordination of 1986 meetings	

MINUTES

Mr Graham GILMOUR, Director of the National Film & Sound Archive, host of the 42nd FIAF Congress, welcomed everyone to Australia.

Mrs WIBOM opened the meeting with a welcome to all present.

In the absence of MM GARCIA-MESA and NAIR (Members), Mr DE VAAL had the right to vote. As the other two Reserve Members, MM ALVES-NETTO and SPEHR were also absent, there would be only 10 votes. Mrs WIBOM reported Mr LAURITZEN regretted his inability to attend because of his wife's health.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was adopted.

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LONDON MEETING

The Minutes were approved.

3 PREPARATIONS FOR THE CANBERRA CONGRESS

Mrs WIBOM began by expressing thanks to the organisers of the Congress, especially David Watson, the Congress Coordinator, for the amount of advance information that had been supplied.

Mr Edmondson reviewed the detailed arrangements for the Congress, mentioning particularly their pleasure at the participation of 3 guests who were especially important to the NFSA, all from the Department of Arts, Heritage & Environment :

- Mr Barry Cohen, MP, Minister for Arts, Heritage & Environment
- Mr Pat Galvin, Secretary of the Dept
- Mr Alan Kerr, Deputy Secretary

Several social events, a press conference and a tree-planting ceremony had been organised to attract political, government, industry and media attention to the film archive movement in general and the work of the NFSA in Australia. Kodak, the Department of Arts, Heritage & Environment, the Australian Film Commission and Capital 7 television (who would be making a television series about the archive) were acting as hosts/sponsors for various events.

During the week, Professor Jerzy TOEPLITZ would be awarded the Order of Australia at Government House (an award made to only two other foreigners).

Mr Watson then reviewed the logistical arrangements, particularly the provision of transport for all events, and in response to Mr KLAUE, reported on the latest visa and travel situations of various delegates. They expected about 70 delegates from some 48 archives (34 Members). Mr KLAUE warmly thanked the NFSA for their generosity in assisting so many delegates with travel and staying costs.

Later in the meeting, the arrangements for the two Symposium were summarised by the respective Convenors:

- Restoration Mr Ray Edmondson, Mr Henning SCHOU
- Computer Applications Miss Ann Bayliss, Mr David Watson

Finally Mr FRANCIS, who had been asked by Mrs STAYKOVA to chair a meeting of the PIP Supporters, asked for the meeting to be scheduled.

4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

4.1 New Candidates for Observership

4.1a Buenos Aires: Museo Municipal del Cine

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the informal letter of application (24 September), from the Director, Mr Fernandez Jurado, whose wife is Curator of Cinemateca Argentina, Member of FIAF. The full dossier had not been submitted and no-one was clear about the relationship between the Cinemateca and the Museum.

Mr FRANCIS said that, although the application stated that the Museum had been in existence for 15 years, when he visited the Cinemateca there had been no mention of the Museum's existence. He had understood the newsreels he had seen belonged to the Cinemateca.

Mr KULA had met both the Fernandez Jurado's and discussed the situation at length in November. He had understood the City of Buenos Aires Museum existed solely to house an important collection of news-reels donated to the City. He was puzzled by the mention in the application of 600 features as he had understood there was no intention to expand or compete with the activities of the Cinemateca. He mentioned that in fact the real collection of Argentine feature production of the last 30 years was held for study purposes by a third organisation, the Film School.

Decision : No discussion until full dossier submitted; MM CINCOTTI, KULA and FRANCIS to meet with the FERNANDEZ JURADO in Canberra.

4.1b Bruxelles: Centre du Film sur l'Art

Mr CINCOTTI reported that a full, detailed dossier had been submitted on 25 March 1986. The Centre had been founded in 1980 under the presidency of Henri Storck and was funded by the Commission Française de la Culture de l'Agglomération de Bruxelles and the National Lottery, in order to collect the best films on art from the world's production. At the moment, they have some 50 films for preservation and additional copies for access.

The only thing missing was the formal letter promising the cooperation of any existing FIAF Member in the country. They had written to the Cinémathèque Royale on 6 March and sent them the full dossier on the 25 March: till now they had had no reply.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned Mr Ledoux had telephoned him to indicate his position which he preferred to make known confidentially to the EC rather than by letter to the candidate. Mr Ledoux felt unable to support the candidate as he feared that recognition of the Centre would cause his own preservation budget to be cut, as there was only a single source of funding in Belgium. He was also upset that there had been no contact with his archive at any time or suggestion that he should preserve films for them.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that the Centre had stated they only wanted to be Observers and would never apply to be Members. She was surprised at Mr Ledoux's statement as she had been told by both the Centre's President and the Secretary General that they had certainly discussed the matter with Mr Ledoux and had an oral promise from him that he would store films for them.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that there was talk of setting up a similar Centre in the UK and he assumed there would be in other countries. FIAF had to decide whether such Centres were in fact true archives.

Mr BORDE made several points: first, he was surprised at Mr Ledoux's statement that there had been no contact with the Cinémathèque Royale: Mr Storck was in fact one of the 3 founder members in 1938 and was still a member of the Board; he was a major authority on the cinema and had built a remarkable collection. Secondly, in his view this Centre, with its specialist collection, corresponded exactly to FIAF's definition of an Observer. He didn't feel there was any conflict of interest between this specialist collection and the Cinémathèque Royale. He felt Mr Ledoux's opposition was simply because he did not want other Belgian organisations in FIAF; he had even been against the application from neighbouring Luxembourg. However, this raised the more general problem for FIAF: what should be done in the event of a refusal by an existing Member without "good reason"? In this particular case, he felt Mr Ledoux should be encouraged to reply positively.

Mr KULA felt the existing Member certainly had an obligation to provide a formal reason for any refusal to endorse another application; the EC then surely had the right to decide whether the refusal was acceptable. The situation could certainly happen, either on these alleged grounds of competing for limited funding, or because of personality conflicts.

Mr KLAUE felt no decision could be made until the dossier was completed by the declaration of cooperation. He agreed with Mr KULA's proposal that Mr Ledoux should be asked to give his reasons for refusal but felt the EC had no authority to over-rule the existing Member. Perhaps the EC could meet with the candidate and the existing Member to negotiate the terms under which the candidate would be acceptable to the Member (perhaps a declaration that they will not apply to the Belgian government for funding, or will not apply for full membership). A compromise had been reached in this way in Vienna.

Mrs BOWSER agreed with Mr KLAUE in general but pointed out that Article 9 of the Rules did give the EC the right to overrule a Member; however, she did not feel it should be invoked at this stage.

Mr KLAUE mentioned that in a long discussion in February, Mr Ledoux had expressed his concern at certain trends in the Federation and, if Article 9 were invoked against him, he would certainly leave. He felt they should seek to find a compromise.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested the EC should simply advise the Centre that the dossier could not be reviewed until it was complete; it was up to them to put pressure on Mr Ledoux if they felt he was delaying his response unduly. The EC could decide later how to handle the situation if the Centre reported they could get no response.

Mr DE VAAL agreed with Mr Ledoux's concern that the more institutions there were in a country, the less money would be available to the national film archive. This was especially serious for small countries like Belgium, Holland and Denmark, and should perhaps be discussed in the future. To resolve this particular issue, he would like to suggest to Mr Ledoux that he offer to be responsible for the preservation activities of the Centre.

Mr KULA and Mr KLAUE agreed with Mr DAUDELIN's suggestion on timing and Mr KLAUE added that, in the event of an impasse, the Centre might consider becoming "supporters" of the Federation.

Mr FRANCIS agreed with Mr KLAUE's earlier suggestion that the EC should seek to intercede; he felt that Mr Ledoux would be reluctant to put his reasons in writing to the Centre but would respond to a letter from FIAF inviting him to state his position.

Mrs WIBOM felt Mr Ledoux's stated objection was irrelevant: affiliation to FIAF had nothing to do with one's rights to approach one's government for funding.

Mr DE VAAL disagreed: in his country, applicants for preservation funding would be referred directly to the national archive which would then apply for additional funding or try to do the extra work within its existing budget. He felt the situation was the same in Belgium.

Mr BORDE and Mr CINCOTTI agreed that no decision could be taken until the autumn when they would have seen how the situation developed. They both thought it was important however that, if an existing Member persisted in withholding his approval without good reason, the EC should exercise its right to make the final decision.

Mr CINCOTTI added that if a Member disapproved of the Federation's policies, it surely had a duty to attend the meetings and attempt to get the policies changed, rather than to simply keep away and make non-constructive criticism. Mrs WIBOM felt it would be helpful if Mr Ledoux were to express his complaints about the Federation more precisely so they could be discussed constructively: she felt they should try to find an occasion for him, and any others with complaints, to present them for open discussion.

Decision: Advise the Centre the dossier could not be discussed as it was incomplete; review the situation at the autumn meeting, if necessary invoking Article 9 or seeking to negotiate an agreement between the parties concerned.

4.2 Reconfirmation of Members

4.2a Montréal: Cinémathèque Québécoise

Mr CINCOTTI and Mrs WIBOM both commented that the dossier was a "model" one and Mr KULA, representing the other Canadian archive, added his enthusiastic endorsement.

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation.

4.2b Wien: Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that the dossier was complete and totally in accordance with FIAF requirements (see also 4.2c).

Decision: Unanimous reconfirmation

4.2c Wien: Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that the dossier was complete, including a copy in German and English of the Statutes revised 28 February 1984.

Mr KLAUE was concerned to know how much money was being spent on preservation and, although the FIAF Rules simply asked for a copy of the

"latest" balance sheet, suggested it would be helpful to ask for a copy of the 1985 balance sheet (which would be available in July 86).

1984 was the year the Archive and the Museum had jointly hosted the FIAF Congress so in this respect it would be non-typical (The Archive Budget for that year had in fact shown a deficit). He was concerned that the actual preservation budgets of both the Archive and the Museum seemed too low and perhaps FIAF could use the Reconfirmation procedure to stress the importance of preservation of the national heritage, perhaps writing a letter the Members could use in negotiation with their authorities.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that Mr Konlechner, of the Museum, had already spoken to her of considerable pressures and budget cuts and was preparing a draft document of points that it would be useful for FIAF to make to the authorities.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation. (Action on possible letters to authorities to be arranged directly with the two archives)

4.2d Canberra: National Film & Sound Archive

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier including the modification of the Statutes reflecting their increased autonomy from 5 April 1984. After some discussion, Mr SCHOU was invited to return to answer questions:

i Preservation staff levels

Mr FRANCIS asked for information on the number of personnel in the different departments of the new organisation. He felt in fact that, as the organisation had changed significantly, this was more than a simple reconfirmation.

Mr SCHOU explained that there was a staff limit of 18 people for film and television, of which 9 were allocated to preservation. In addition they had the services of 1 volunteer, 1 trainee, 3 contract staff paid for from the "Last Film Search Trust Fund" and, shortly, 13 people funded by the Community Employment Programme (who would undertake stability tests on the entire nitrate collection to be input to the computer to help establish preservation priorities). Next year, they hoped to increase their staff from 52 to 80.

ii FIAF representation

Mrs BOWSER noted that the NFSA organisation chart appeared to give equal status to "sound & radio"; it was important that the FIAF delegate should be seen to be truly representing the "film & television" side.

Mr SCHOU explained that Mr Gilmour, Director of NFSA, was its administrator, particularly concerned with seeking official funding and appropriate staff levels, and Mr Edmondson was the technical expert. He expected that in most cases Mr Edmondson would be the FIAF delegate although Mr Gilmour would be interested to keep himself informed.

After Mr SCHOU's re-withdrawal, Mr DAUDELIN agreed with Mrs BOWSER that this could present a problem. Mr KULA felt there would be no problem if the Director of the whole organisation chose to attend, representing that part of his organisation with which FIAF was concerned. It was clear from their statutes that the Director had a national responsibility for the moving image heritage. Mr CINCOTTI agreed and stressed this was not an example of a "figure-head" Director with other responsibilities within a larger organisation, who was ignorant of and remote from the archive's needs and problems.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

4.2e Bucharest: Arhiva Nationala de Filme

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier which complied with the requirements although it was noted the budget was almost entirely staff costs. Mr BORDE, as Treasurer, pointed out that no subscription had been received for the last 3 years (1983-15 inclusive) so they could not qualify for reconfirmation.

Decision : Non-reconfirmation with letter of explanation to the archive.

4.2f Frankfurt: Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde

Mr CINCOTTI reported the dossier was now complete except for the letters confirming relations with the authorities and the cinematographic organisations in the country. Unfortunately, they were not expected in Canberra so they would not be able to get any on-the-spot answers. Mrs WIBOM noted the income from two TV companies and wondered what services, if any, were being provided in exchange.

Mr KLAUE raised two points:

- i very little money was spent on preservation (14,000 DM compared with 31,000 DM on acquisition of films & publications); was this because preservation was undertaken by other archives in West Germany?
- ii The Statutes were labelled "11th draft" : were they in fact the final approved version ? and why was there no mention of preservation among the aims (article 2) ?

On point i, Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that the German archives tended to include preservation by copying under Acquisition (in this case 25,000 DM). Koblenz is responsible for preserving German films and Federal Government money is provided for this purpose: the other archives therefore send their nitrate to Koblenz and get prints back. Additional money was sometimes available for specific projects. On point ii, she felt it might have been a translation problem : "collect" should include the notion of "preserve".

Mr KLAUE pointed out that the German/English translation of the Austrian archives' texts was much more explicit and felt a formal request should be made to Frankfurt:

- for confirmation that the final version of the Statutes had been submitted,
- for clarification that the aims included preservation, and
- for information on how preservation was handled.

In response to Mrs WIBOM, Mr KLAUE recalled that the Institute had been set up in Frankfurt for the practical reason that they would get a high subsidy there. Frankfurt was the official headquarters of the archive and housed the Documentation Centre in the Museum building while the archive collections and the administration were in Wiesbaden.

Decision : Letter to archive, as above; reconfirmation to be reconsidered at the next meeting.

Break for Lunch hosted and prepared by NFSA staff
Immediately after lunch, the NFSA staff (Ms Bayliss, MM Watson & Schou) reviewed the status of the final plans for the two Symposia.

4.2g Berlin (West): Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier and asked for Mrs ORBANZ's return for clarification of two points:

- i creation of new "Film" department, headed by Mrs ORBANZ
He was surprised as he thought this was already the situation.

Mrs ORBANZ explained that the Archive was previously divided into 3 departments: Administration; Collections (films, apparatus, stills, posters); Publications (including distribution of films), so that film previously came under 2 departments. With the expansion of their work, it was decided to reorganise and create a new department for all aspects of film. As she had mentioned earlier, the national collection was preserved by Koblenz but her own archive held a substantial collection of foreign films. The new department was also responsible for a depository of negatives owned by private collectors: they hoped their involvement would mean that, should the owners at any time wish to dispose of their films, they would offer them to the archive.

- ii Information on preservation spending in budget

Mrs ORBANZ explained that, under budget items 4: Activities and 5: Purchases, 30,000 DM were available for buying or printing films. In addition, a further 90,000 DM had been provided for copying relating to preparations for the Berlin Anniversary.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation

4.2h Helsinki: Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier, noting in particular the new legal deposit law dated 27 July 1984 and the proportion of the budget spent on preservation (15%).

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation

4.2i Rio de Janeiro: Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna

Mr CINCOTTI reported that the dossier had still not been received in spite of numerous telephone promises. The Annual Report had been sent but they were still 2 years behind on subscriptions (1984 & 1985).

Mr DE VAAL felt the situation had been going on for too long and FIAF should write a very strong letter. Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that in this case, as with Bucharest, it was the authorities rather than the Heads of the Archive that were delaying payment. She thought it might help them get the money from the authorities if FIAF were to send a formal warning that they risked expulsion from FIAF.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed that the authorities were causing problems, but it was nevertheless the Head of the Archive who was responsible as far as FIAF was concerned. He had on numerous occasions offered to assist by paying the subscription in return for copying of films but Mr ALVES-NETTO had never taken up the offer. Mr BORDE agreed that it was time to send a final ultimatum.

Decision : Write formal ultimatum.

4.2j Torino: Museo Nazionale del Cinema

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the new Statutes reflecting internal changes. It was still a private association recognised by the Italian authorities and receiving funding from national and local sources while retaining its autonomy. The dossier was rather schematic, with no detailed balance sheet or organisation chart. From his personal knowledge, he mentioned that they were a small organisation with limited resources: preservation money was spent in recent years on the restoration of a single film.

The archive, founded and run by Mrs Prolo for many decades, was currently going through a crisis now she was retired but he felt the new Director, Mr Valperga would manage the situation. In reply to a question from Mrs WIBOM, he explained that it was not the whole Museum but only the projection theatre that had been closed for the last year (as it did not comply with building regulations).

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

4.3 Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr CINCOTTI reported that, of a total of 25 Observers, 2 were too new for reconfirmation and 10 could not be reconfirmed for technical reasons:

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| * | Non-submission of Annual Report & non-payment of subscription | |
| 1 | Dhaka | Bangladesh Film Archive |
| 2 | Lima | Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru |

- * Non-submission of Annual Report (subscription paid)
 - 1 Alger Cinémathèque Algérienne
 - 2 Los Angeles UCLA Film, Television & Radio Archives
 - 3 Lyon Comité de Fondation du Musée du Cinéma
 - 4 Managua Cinemateca de Nicaragua
 - 5 Manila Film Archives of the Philippines
 - 6 Paris Cinémathèque Française
 - 7 Quito Cinemateca Nacional del Ecuador
- * Non-payment of subscription (Annual Report submitted)
 - 1 La Paz Cinemateca Boliviana
 - 2 years unpaid: 1984/85; national inflation of 7000%;
 - proliferation of private TV companies showing pirated
 - films; hoping for help from Unesco but no govt help

Mr CINCOTTI then reviewed the key points from the Annual Reports of the 13 Observers who could be reconfirmed:

- 1 Bogota Cinemateca Distrital
- 2 Cairo Al-Archive Al-Kawmy Lil-Film
 - many acquisitions thanks to legal deposit law but
 - now running out of space
- 3 Hanoi Archives du Film du Vietnam
 - now building and working to 5-year plan
- 4 Jakarta Sinematek Indonesia
 - hoping for more government financing next year;
 - unable to accept subsidised invitation to Canberra;
 - [Mr KULA visited 2/86 & confirmed lack of resources; there was a
 - well-organised documentation programme but no money for
 - preservation of important collection of early Indonesian films.]
- 5 Luanda Cinemateca Nacional de Angola
 - no acquisitions in the year; building plan delayed;
 - 1 person to be trained in Cuba; concentrating on projections,
 - especially in cooperation with foreign embassies.
- 6 Luxembourg Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg
 - Substantial acquisitions but no change on preservation
 - Very active on projections (2000 films)
 - [Mr BORDE visited in 1984: municipality had provided new premises
 - for acetate storage (they have no nitrate)]
- 7 Madison Wisconsin Center for Film Research
 - Acquisitions of shorts; celebrated 25th Anniversary
- 8 Montivideo Cine Arte del Sodre
 - Major acquisitions from military regime & 1930 pioneers
- 9 München Filmmuseum/Münchner Stadtmuseum
 - Some acquisitions of recent films & major restorations
- 10 Paris Cinémathèque Universitaire
 - Useful acquisitions of 16mm via Assoc. French Ciné Clubs

- 11 Perth State Film Archives of Western Australia
Storage problems; acquired 300 reels of new films from TV
Active in presentation & preservation
- 12 Reykjavik Kvikmyndasafn Islands
Acquired 74 documentaries; transferred 2,600 m to acetate
Government funding reduced by 2/3
[Mrs WIBOM reported a new Director had been appointed]
- 13 Tehran Film-Khane-Ye Melli-E Iran
Acquisitions through new legal deposit law;
active in cataloguing and publications.

4.4 Other Membership Questions

4.4a Hanoi: Archives du Film du Vietnam

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that they had cabled to announce their wish to become full Members. Mrs WIBOM referred to their report and appeal to other members for material help (equipment, training, etc.) and recalled the extremely difficult conditions they were working under when she visited them in April 1985. Mr KLAUE suggested their best way to get help was to seek bi-lateral agreements rather than simply making a blanket appeal. He and Mr KULA mentioned there was little likelihood of help from Unesco with its continuing budget cuts.

Mrs WIBOM said they had already considered some bilateral arrangements but there were real problems: there was little point in supplying a FICA box as their electricity supply was not continuous; similarly, it would be difficult to take on a trainee unless he could speak Swedish or English. There were also problems of continuity in developing archives: of the 3 girls who had recently been given one month's training in basic film handling in Bangkok, one had already left to get another job.

Mr KLAUE stressed however that there was much more knowhow in Hanoi: 10 people had already spent 6 months training in Berlin; one person even had a German university degree in film technology. He felt the problem was not one of training but of material support.

Decision : Mr KLAUE to meet with Hanoi delegates to explore how they might get help.

4.4b New York: American Museum of the Moving Image

Interest in FIAF had been expressed by the AMMI which was planning to open in 1987 on the site of the Astoria Studios. Mr CINCOTTI reported they had visited him in Rome on a recent visit to Europe and seemed to have high ambitions though only just beginning.

5 MODIFICATION OF FIAF STATUTES & RULES

Mrs WIBOM began by thanking all those who had been working on the task of preparing modifications to the Statutes & Rules: MM CINCOTTI, BORDE, FRANCIS, Mrs VAN DER ELST and Ms JOHNSON. It was agreed to restrict discussion to a single language version, the official French, and Mr FRANCIS and Ms JOHNSON would edit the English version afterwards.

Mr CINCOTTI presented the proposed modifications for discussion, indicating that the overall intentions had been:

- to reconcile inconsistencies between the Statutes & Rules
- to shorten the Statutes by transferring detail to the Rules
- to reduce the work of the GA
- to clarify the distinction between Members & Observers
- to clarify the respective roles of the EC and GA in membership matters; in particular, to entrust all matters relating to Observers to the EC only
- to clarify the conditions and procedures relating to loss of status by Members and Observers (deletion, non-confirmation, expulsion, suspension)

They had not made specific proposals regarding:

- composition of the EC, with or without Reserve Members; (possibility of reducing numbers to reduce financial and logistical problems of meetings and increase the effectiveness of the discussions)
- procedures for election and possible limitation of tenure of EC members (in particular, to ensure regular "new blood")

In the Statutes, the main changes affected Articles 1, 13 and 18; the rest were minor or consequential changes.

The substantial changes were then examined in detail (leaving the final editing to the discretion of the Working Group)

The key changes and discussions are included below; details of editorial discussions have been transcribed for reference but are not included in these Minutes.

Statutes

- S1 Text as approved in London: elimination of term "international exchanges" which had previously worried the distributors
- S4 add "restoration" to duties of Members
add a reference to consultation of special copies (rather than preservation copies)
- S5/S6 Clear distinction between two kinds of Observers: those who want to become Members eventually and those who don't/can't.

Translation of French "proposition": "proposal" or "recommendation"

Decision : change to "recommendation" throughout because it is stronger (one can put forward several alternative, possibly conflicting "proposals" but only one "recommendation").

- S12 To shorten delay when no quorum as delegates will have travelled a long way and be unwilling/unable to hang around for formalities.
- S13 budgets only 1 year in advance, to accord with current practice; now 2 grounds for "deletion" which takes effect automatically
- S14 change 1 to 2 months for practical reasons

S16 **Composition of EC** : 11 Full or 9 + 2 Reserve ?

Mrs BOWSER felt there was a conflict between limiting the number of members and limiting tenure to 3 terms: with fewer places there was less chance for newcomers to be elected.

Mr KLAUE suggested 2 alternatives should be presented with reasons to the GA: he felt that with the Federation increasing in numbers, a proposal to reduce the EC would seem rather undemocratic.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed but pointed out that the initial proposal was to keep the same number of Members as before, ie 11, and simply eliminate the Reserve Members, "with a quorum of 6".

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that the "new blood" in the EC was generally via the Reserve Members and feared that this possibility might be lost. However, he recognised that with a large number the EC was seen as a "senate" that would go on unchanged for ever, and perhaps this could be avoided with a smaller number.

Mr FRANCIS asked if it was possible to make a distinction between the meetings at Congress time and those in between: for the latter, Reserve Members would only attend if required to replace an absent Member. This would help overcome the heavy costs for the hosts of "in-between" meetings. He thought the same convention might apply to the Honorary Members.

Mr DAUDELIN felt it would diminish the status of the Reserve Members if they were only on stand-by; Mr FRANCIS felt this was in fact the definition and appropriate role for Reserve Members.

Mr KULA agreed with Mr KLAUE's "undemocratic" point and the need to attract "new blood" but recognised the costs involved. Another alternative could be the creation of an inner group which was the Board of

Management, perhaps just the officers, with the full group, of perhaps 15 members, meeting just before the GA to consider proposals to be put to the full membership. He did not understand the function of Reserve Members: he felt if they incurred the expenses of attending they should at least have the right to vote. He pointed out that there was no mention of the minimum number of EC members required to consider issues to be put to the GA.

Mrs ORBANZ agreed with much of what Mr DAUDELIN said, in particular, the need to avoid 2 categories of Members but felt there should be 14 members as more voices would contribute to the discussion. She would also like different regions to be represented. She felt the EC should be a discussion forum, not just machinery for administration. The costs for host countries were partly due to the high standards set in the past: she would prefer to see the entertainment reduced.

Mrs BOWSER agreed and would be willing to stop having Reserve Members if there were a different election method; at present, the Reserve Members system allowed for the possibility of some geographical balancing after the main voting. This balance could be achieved through the use of an election committee.

Mr FRANCIS wondered if the discussion should really be, not about numbers, but about the possibility of subsidy to ensure that members could attend the EC. At the meeting in Canberra, for instance, the people missing were from those regions that found it difficult to get funding.

Mr CINCOTTI insisted there was no proposal to reduce the decision-making members of the EC. He found the existing system of Reserve Members rather strange: if it was to ensure there would always be 11 present, then logically there should be a reserve member for every EC member! If a quorum of 6 was enough for a vote, why were Reserve Members needed? On the question of voting, he felt there could be a system of limited voting for the EC to ensure that different regions were represented.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that it was rare that all 11 members were present so, without the Reserve Members, in practice there would be a reduction of voting members. In his country and he believed also in Scandinavia, it was very common to have permanent reserve members although he was not too happy with the category himself. He would recommend:

- * 13 full members, no reserves
- * guarantee regional representation, at present for Latin America and Asia
- * establish development fund to assist participation of these regional representatives at the EC and for other purposes in developing countries.

Mrs WIBOM summarised the various suggestions:

- i number of members: 11, 13, 14 ?
- ii Reserves should attend only the EC immediately before the GA
- iii create major group then inner working group of EC
- iv introduce new election system
- v development fund for members with travel difficulties
- vi 13 full Members and no Reserve members
- vii status quo
- viii simpler meetings

She felt one should link the discussion to the proposals for a new election system; Mrs BOWSER recommended the use of an election committee but felt the details should be discussed separately.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested one should also propose "limited voting" ie each delegate can only vote for 2/3 or 3/4 of members. Mr BORDE disagreed.

Expenses of being an EC member

Mrs WIBOM asked the Treasurer to point out to the GA that FIAF does not pay the travel and hotel costs of the EC as she felt many members thought this was subsidised.

Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that the expense was not only a problem for the developing countries: he had problems himself and it was reasonable to consider whether the EC members serving the Federation should have their basic expenses covered. Mr KLAUE agreed in principle but pointed out it would mean an increase in the membership fees which were already relatively high. The most urgent priority was to assist the developing countries to attend EC and perhaps Commission meetings.

Action: Mr BORDE, as Treasurer, to review the situation with Mrs VAN DER ELST.

Decision: Propose to the GA

- i Delete category of Reserve Members
- ii Increase to 13 full Members and q quorum of 7
- iii Ensure regional representation (by a method to be decided)
- iv Set up an Election Committee

Election procedures

Mrs BOWSER proposed that there should be a list of candidates, with wherever possible at least 2 candidates for each position, with a geographical balance of member archives. The balance should not be pre-defined as circumstances would change over the years. The Election Committee should ideally be composed of non-candidates.

Mr KLAUE read out the rules adopted by IASA to show how complicated the system could become but Mrs BOWSER felt it was not complicated in fact. Mr CINCOTTI feared the system with a "closed list" would appear less

democratic than the present system which was more open. Mrs BOWSER replied that it was in fact more democratic as it counteracted the "chance" elections of the unplanned system. With both systems, everyone had the opportunity to make nominations; the only differences with an advance list of nominations were advantages: you had time to think about it in advance, to ensure that your chosen candidate was free to stand and to ensure there was a good balance.

Mr KLAUE was against a system whereby if there was only one candidate he was automatically elected; this was not acceptable. Mrs BOWSER pointed out that this was done at every election but Mr KLAUE objected that there was always a secret ballot.

Mr CINCOTTI added another argument against an advance list of nominations: if there were suitable new members or delegates attending the GA for the first time, they would not be eligible. Mr BORDE was hostile to the idea of an election committee which he saw as bureaucratic and un-liberal. Perhaps at the time of the election, it would be possible for a list to be prepared the day before of all Members willing to stand as candidates.

Mrs WIBOM said she always felt uneasy during the FIAF elections as everything seemed very haphazard and she was embarrassed that there was so little turnover from year to year. She supported Mrs BOWSER's proposal for an election committee.

Mr FRANCIS suggested a totally different approach: after the election of the officers, all Members would become candidates for the EC, unless they specifically withdrew from the list or were disqualified through retirement in rotation.

Mr CINCOTTI warmly supported this approach but saw one difficulty: the Statutes indicate that members of the EC do not necessarily have to be the official representative of an archive, so there would be a need for archives to submit the names of all those eligible, both present and absent.

Mrs VAN DER ELST stressed that this would not meet the need for new blood: last year, individuals from almost all the Member archives had been nominated but the same people were re-elected.

Mrs WIBOM agreed it would certainly be useful to have a list of those who were eligible and had the financial backing to serve. Mr KULA suggested the list should be prepared in advance (perhaps 6 months ahead) so that those unable to attend the GA could indicate whether they were eligible.

Mrs WIBOM suggested it would be feasible to obtain this information in advance of the elections at the 1987 Berlin Congress. This would enable

individuals to obtain advance clearance (financial and time commitments).

Mr CINCOTTI feared that building the list through a circular could mean the decisions were taken by the bureaucrats at home rather than the archivists.

Mrs BOWSER felt the list could be a very practical first step in finding out who was available. Mr KULA pointed out that it had the further advantage that one could prepare the ballot slips in advance, which would save considerable time.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that the financial and time obligations for officers were much greater than for ordinary EC members and this could not be cleared in advance unless people were to nominate themselves.

Mr FRANCIS envisaged that the election committee system would be used for officers (finding out in advance whether the candidates could stand) and the general list for ordinary EC members.

Mrs ORBANZ and Mr FRANCIS asked that the list be addressed to the archive itself, with a request for the names of any staff "eligible to attend the GA" who would be prepared to serve on the EC. Mrs BOWSER proposed it would be more satisfactory if one stated that all eligible staff would be included in the list automatically unless the archive specifically stated they could not be supported.

Action: Mr FRANCIS and Mrs BOWSER to draft a preliminary version of the circular letter and a proposal on the election committee for the 3 officers, for discussion at the EC after the Congress.

S18a Observers: to be re-confirmed every 2 years.

Rules

Mr BORDE began with the change of style: to avoid confusion with Articles in the Statutes, the Article numbers in the Rules would be referred to as Rule numbers.

The main points of the discussion concerned:

R12 Mr CINCOTTI suggested the existing member should be obliged to give his reasons in writing so that the EC and not the Member was the final arbiter (as in old A9). Mr FRANCIS felt the written reasons should be addressed to the EC and not to the candidate. Mr DAUDELIN, Mr DE VAAL and Mrs WIBOM felt the existing Rule was sufficient to cope with such a case and allowed the EC to dispense with the existing member's consent.
Decision : No change

R13 Add need for Report; greater precision but same intent as A15:
Radiation : Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that radiation was simply automatic, given certain circumstances, not a matter for decision, but Mr KLAUE felt the GA should have the power to recognise that circumstances were sometimes outside the power of the defaulting member and extend the period as they had already done in the past. He would therefore prefer to simply say "present the case to the GA".

Mr CINCOTTI noted that this would mean changing the Statutes (S13g): this could be done if the Federation wanted the GA to have power to change the situation rather than simply take note that an automatic radiation had occurred. Mr DAUDELIN felt that the GA should be able to recognise "circumstances beyond the member's control" and postpone the radiation accordingly.

After some informal discussion over a tea break, Mrs WIBOM pointed out that the present procedures covered an interim period of practically 5 years so the situation should surely be resolved by then. However, it was agreed to make a decision by formal vote: whether one held to the existing Statutes and the decision was automatic; or whether the GA could over-ride the Statutes.

Mr CINCOTTI clarified that all measures regarding Observers are in the jurisdiction of the EC, those regarding Members the GA. That was why the EC had to "prendre acte/prononcer" on Observers but ask the GA to formally do so on Members. The intention was to simply to formally recognise that the Member had disqualified himself. Mr FRANCIS felt "presenting the case" implied discussion was possible so was misleading if the procedure was intended to be automatic.

Decision : Discuss at the GA.

R33 The right to vote dependent on delivery of Annual Report as well.

R35 add EC "qui tranchera/who will decide".

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that this meant the EC now had additional powers to make decisions on matters where it usually did not have that power; this was to avoid a permanent impasse where the GA was unable to come to a decision.

Commission Heads at EC meetings

Mrs WIBOM thought there should be mention of the presence of Heads of Commissions at the EC meetings.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was anomalous that they could attend but they were not allowed to contribute to other items. Mrs ORBANZ felt their presence and role should be officially defined. She was in favour of their presence and contribution to the meeting.

Mrs WIBOM agreed and, if it was agreed they should be entitled to participate in EC meetings, then it should be made clear at the time of appointment that their presence would be expected. She acknowledged that many Heads found difficulty in obtaining travel money and time to attend the Commission meetings and the EC meetings posed yet another burden. She added later that it might help if the need for their presence at EC meetings was formally required in the Statutes & Rules.

Mrs BOWSER had always supported their presence but felt, as they were not elected, they could not have a more active role. In her experience as a Commission Head, she found attendance at the EC invaluable in determining how the EC thought and, therefore, how best to serve FIAF through the Commission work.

Mr CINCOTTI also supported their presence but felt they should be full members with a right to vote. If that were accepted, he would be happy to see the number of other members reduced to 11 to allow for 3 Commission Heads, making 14 in all. (Several members expressed reluctance to reopen the discussion on numbers, even though this was a new issue) There was a problem in that the Heads are appointed rather than elected, but this could be overcome if the Commission Heads could be elected by the GA.

Mrs BOWSER suggested attendance could be required at the meeting associated with the GA but optional for the interim meetings. Mrs ORBANZ felt "participation" was stronger than "attend" and did not imply the right to vote. Mr SCHOU said they would welcome the opportunity to participate as they found it frustrating not to be able to contribute to the discussion. He and Mrs HARRISON supported the proposed change.

Decision: Define the requirement for their presence at EC meetings, but without right to vote (R77)

Mention of Bulletin

Mr DE VAAL suggested the Bulletin should be mentioned somewhere.

Mr KULA felt there should also be some clarification re the Editor: if a non-member of the EC, should he also be invited to attend EC meetings?

Mr DE VAAL felt the situation should not arise as in fact the Secretariat should officially be responsible for the Bulletin.

Mr CINCOTTI recognised the importance of the Bulletin as one of the Federation's activities but saw no reason to mention it in the Statutes & Rules: it was an activity, not a statutory task. Mrs BOWSER agreed.

Mr DE VAAL felt that the aims of the Federation should also include the right to publish but Mr CINCOTTI and Mr DAUDELIN felt that publication was simply a tool to further the overall aims. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that there were many other valuable activities but there was no need for them to be mentioned. Their purpose was covered in Paragraph 2 of the Statutes (promouvoir et encourager..)

Decision : No need for change.

R49 Change from 6 weeks to 3 months as some countries needed longer to work through the bureaucracy.

R79 Commissions: duties made more precise + addition of phrase discussed above about participation at EC meetings

On the question whether Vice-Presidents were named by the Head or elected by the Commission, the two Heads present said they didn't actually have a Vice-President. Mr SCHOU suggested the Chair should nominate as necessary.

Arbitration Jury

Mr BORDE pointed out this was rather academic as in his 23 years on the EC there had not been a single Jury. They had rationalised the wording but changed nothing except eliminate the apparent possibility of using the Jury to resolve a conflict between the EC and a Member.

After the discussion of the changes suggested by the Working Group, Mr KLAUE raised 4 points:

- i old R8 phrase about exchange through Observers.
- ii need to anticipate questions in the GA regarding the introduction of national instead of individual membership, as at the UN
- iii possible interest in the regionalisation of FIAF; as example, he mentioned the ICA which was much more regionally structured.
- iv handling of discussion in Berlin. He thought it could take 2 extra days unless they planned it very carefully. It was important that all members felt they were free to contribute to the discussion.

On point iv, Mr KULA suggested members should receive proposals in advance and be asked to submit questions for discussion. Other issues would be voted on without discussion. Mrs WIBOM hoped that the revisions could be distributed within 2 months of Canberra and members

should be asked for oral or written comments in time for discussion at the EC at the end of 1986.

Mrs BOWSER asked there should be an accompanying explanation of the principal changes. Mr FRANCIS felt it was particularly helpful to have the changes underlined.

Mr CINCOTTI felt at least one full day would be needed for discussion in Berlin which, with time needed for elections, could cause problems.

On point i, Mr FRANCIS pointed out that Observers had no formal rights to exchange so the paragraph should never have been there. Mrs BOWSER agreed but said that Observers assumed they had rights. Mr DAUDELIN and others pointed out that as long as Observers thought they had the rights, then there was no incentive to become Members. Mr KULA suggested it would be simpler to head the section with a statement "This Section refers to Members only" (Chapter IX, section 2)

Decision: Agreed to make it clear that Observers do not have exchange rights.

Mrs WIBOM once more thanked everyone for their work on the proposals and in particular those who had been working on them during the year.

Action: The proposed changes would be circulated to Members at least 6 months before the next GA where they would be voted. The President's Report would contain a mention of the work done on the Statutes & Rules but no details would be given at this stage.

Delegation of Tasks

Mrs WIBOM mentioned delegation of tasks by the President to Vice-Presidents. Mr KLAUE had been asked to take responsibility for representing the Federation in relations with other International Organisations but not in writing. It was agreed that the verbal agreement at the EC and the subsequent record in the written Minutes was sufficient.

End of Day 2

6 EXAMINATION OF THE MAIN POINTS OF THE AGENDA OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Items 6.1 & 6.2 were discussed out of sequence after item 4 on Day 1; the remainder was discussed on Day 3)

6.1 General (GA 1-4, 5, 14)

The EC reviewed the arrangements for the Official Opening, registration of delegates, agreed on Chairmen for each session and identified individuals associated with FIAF who should be formally remembered in the President's Report: Mr R. Witek, Mr Ove Brusendorf & Mr Willard van Dyke. Later in the proceedings, they reviewed the draft of the President's Report on behalf of the EC and some questions for Open Forum.

6.2 Financial Report (GA 6)

Mr BORDE expressed appreciation to Mrs VAN DER ELST for her admirable work on preparation of the Accounts. The EC reviewed in detail and approved the audited 1985 Accounts and the draft 1987 Budget.

In presenting the 1985 Accounts, Mr BORDE congratulated the former Treasurer on the fact that, for both income and expenditure, there was a difference of only 1% between budgeted and actual. There had been a slight over-spend (17,610 BF) but a disappointing result on income from FIAF Publications (115,229 compared with 237,000 BF). It was hoped that the Publications would sell better in the future, thanks to joint publicity with its own publications kindly offered by the National Film Archive in London.

The Auditor's Report drew attention to two items that were not shown in the Accounts: profit and loss on currency exchanges and a valuation of publications in stock.

For the 1987 Budget, Mr BORDE noted that there was an anticipated deficit of 270,000 BF, which would be met from the accumulated balance of previous years. Part of the deficit was caused by the build-up of the special 50th Anniversary Fund but, with the continuing effect of inflation, it was likely that, in say 1988, the Federation would have to review the level of subscriptions which had been last raised 5 years ago in 1981. Mrs VAN DER ELST warned there would be a substantial increase in postage as the Belgian rates for printed matter and books had just been increased by 500%.

On Congress expenses, Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that in recent years the whole of the budget allocation had been passed to the host country. This meant that no formal provision was made for her own attendance expenses. Decision on the budget for the Berlin Congress was held over till point GM15: Future Congresses.

On Special Missions, Mrs WIBOM noted that FIAF received no money from Unesco for its own expenses. Mr KLAUE explained that "B Status" organisations received money only for Special Projects but no general subsidy; "A Status" organisations used to receive a subsidy but, at a March meeting in Paris, it was decided that this would be discontinued.

On Publicity for FIAF publications, Mrs VAN DER ELST reported there had been little success but perhaps little activity. Mr FRANCIS suggested there was no point in continuing with Frances Thorpe's services and Mr KLAUE suggested that alternative channels of publicity should be sought, in particular, via individual members seeking possibilities for cooperation with specialised publications and bookshops. Mr FRANCIS reported that through arrangements with the BFI Publications, a modified version of the FIAF leaflet was being mailed to 1500 academic institutions and an article listing the publications had been inserted without charge in the BFI Yearbook which was mailed to 50,000 addresses worldwide. He hoped that other members would be able to organise something similar.

6.3 Reports of the Commissions (GA7, 9 & 10)

6.3a Cataloguing Commission (GA9)

Mrs HARRISON commented on her written Reports to the EC and for the GA.

Union List: She reported there had again been requests from members who did not qualify for access as they had no relevant films in their own holdings to contribute to the List but would like to have access.

Mrs BOWSER suggested there might be some middle position as she recognised that the List might well contain films relevant to them and held by others, which should surely not be kept a secret from them. The first step of course would be to ask permission of those supplying the information. Mr KULA felt the present situation, whereby an archive with one film had access which was denied to an archive with none, was difficult to justify but agreed that permission would have to be sought. Mr FRANCIS felt it was important not to make any approaches until the initial List was assembled and the service operational.

Mrs BOWSER felt that, rather than seeking blanket permission, it might be more effective if Mrs VAN DER ELST sought specific permission on receiving a request from a non-contributor.

Mr KULA mentioned that FIAF might follow the practice of international bibliographic projects, where a "nil" return was often accepted as "participation".

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Moscow had refused to participate "for internal reasons".

Commission Members: In response to a question from Mrs WIBOM, Mrs HARRISON said they found a group of 9 very practical for sharing out the work but it was important, in replacing Mrs Lutor, to find a good team member. The number indicated in the Statutes was 7 but there was no real limitation.

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that his deputy might be able to contribute at a later stage, if needed. Mrs HARRISON welcomed this idea as they were particularly lacking representation from Latin-speaking archives where there was a different cataloguing tradition.

Free computer program from Unesco, MinISIS: In response to Mr KLAUE, she felt it would be useful to accept the program and investigate how it would help the Secretariat. Negotiations were already in progress to have it modified to meet international standards.

Brochure on Cataloguing: Mrs HARRISON asked for the EC's confirmation that they should proceed with this.

New Projects:

She asked for the EC's comments on two new projects:

- i Publication in conjunction with the Preservation Commission on film restoration (Mr Schultz)
- ii Standard list of early production company names, & possibly logos, to save considerable time in individual archives (Mr Lindfors)

On ii, Mrs BOWSER felt that historians should be able to help to avoid repetition of work already done. Mrs HARRISON agreed and mentioned that the Library of Congress also had a "name authority data base" and the project would start with a review of existing work. Mr CINCOTTI also welcomed this project and suggested date limits. Mr FRANCIS mentioned that both Mr Harold Brown and the Gaudreault team had found that internal evidence on the film itself helped to identify the production companies; he would like to find some way of combining information from these various sources.

In response to Mr KLAUE, Mr FRANCIS understood Mr SCHOU planned a publication on the Restoration presentations in both Canberra and London. Mr KLAUE felt the first project should consider coordination of that work, the Round Table in Berlin and possible contributions from other sources, to avoid overlap but without delaying publication of whatever was readily available. Mr FRANCIS suggested a looseleaf publication might be appropriate for continuing updating.

Decision : Mrs HARRISON to discuss with Mr SCHOU.

Mrs WIBOM said they might have a possibility to host a Commission meeting in Stockholm in 1987.

6.3b Documentation Commission (GA10)

The EC reviewed Mrs STAYKOVA's Report which would be presented at the GA in her absence by the Chairman of that session. Mr KULA felt the Chairman should in particular point out the importance of PIP, stress that the project was looking for additional support and invite additional members to join the scheduled meeting of PIP supporters.

On the PIP, Mr FRANCIS was uncertain at what stage to raise questions relating to it and asked if the PIP Supporters Group or the EC meeting itself was the appropriate forum. Mrs ORBANZ also had questions to ask as it was time to review the overall policy: after 5 years, there was still no sign of the project being self-supporting so she planned to raise this in the Supporters' Group initially and, probably, in the GA as well. Mrs BOWSER felt questions should be raised within the Supporters' Group as they had been made responsible for managing the budget.

Mr FRANCIS nevertheless asked the EC to take note of the fact that there was a possibility that the project could be usefully assimilated within the BFI who were indexing the same publications just 200 yards away! This could not be resolved at national level or via an informal grouping of the Supporters but, if the FIAF President were to write to the Director of the BFI, then perhaps progress could be made. Such a merger would benefit all parties as the PIP could be more self-supporting and the BFI could probably save a post. Mr KLAUE felt Mrs STAYKOVA, as Head of the Commission, should be involved; Mr FRANCIS agreed but felt agreement would not be achieved if Commission members were involved.

Mr KULA felt that meanwhile the project was in danger of collapsing as the supporters realised like Mrs ORBANZ that there were still not signs of it becoming self-supporting. He felt the Supporters should be told there was a new initiative to try and resolve the situation so that at least they were ready to go on for another year. Mr FRANCIS was reluctant to give information on the BFI idea to the Supporters.

Status of PIP as FIAF project

Mr FRANCIS felt it strange that PIP was included in the Documentation Commission Report as if it were just another FIAF project, when it had been denied that status. He felt it should be in a separate report for delivery to the Supporters only. Mrs ORBANZ strongly disagreed as they wanted it to be a FIAF project. Mr KULA felt it was definitely a FIAF project which could not exist without FIAF members. In his view, the Supporters' Group should simply be considered as an "external sponsor" providing additional funding for a FIAF publication.

Mr DE VAAL disagreed and thought PIP was definitely not a FIAF project in the financial sense.

Mr CINCOTTI agreed it was a FIAF project, probably the most important, prestigious and widely-known project of the Federation; it involved all the FIAF archives, through subscribers and indexers. He felt it should be part of the Documentation Commission Report but in a separate section.

Mr FRANCIS said that in that case he felt he could raise further points about it within the present EC meeting.

Break for coffee

Mrs WIBOM resumed by expressing her surprise that there was any doubt about the status of PIP as a FIAF project, especially as more than 30 members were providing information for it. Her own archive would be willing to augment its contribution if that was the only way to save the project as they considered it so important.

Mr FRANCIS then spoke, not as member of the Documentation Commission, but as someone who understood the concerns of the Editor, Michael Moulds:

i At present, he was just surviving but there is no way he can develop the project. He cannot publish the Annual Volumes at the ideal time but only when he has succeeded in raising money from an external source eg ITCA or borrowing from FIAF the money for printing. The Annual Volume is the actual "money-earner" for PIP and keeps it going, so not to invest in the printing as soon as possible is effectively reducing the value of that asset; every month that goes by diminishes its value.

ii For the new "fiches" system, there is a charge of some £550 for film and television but it only costs £15 to produce each additional set, which offers a huge profit margin. However, it would be difficult to sell it for less than what FIAF members are charged, a price based on the costs for the previous card system. Mr Moulds feel there would be many more subscribers at a lower rate. It seems the only way of selling at a lower rate would be to offer a different service than that provided at the full rate to existing subscribers and supporters, eg.

- a single language version, French or English
- one year or two years in arrears, at a "remaindered" price

Mr Moulds was convinced there was a market that would provide a real market at the "run-on" cost if a satisfactory formula could be found.

Mr FRANCIS felt he could not talk about these two areas to the Supporters' Group but was pointing out to the EC that they could make a substantial difference to the viability of the project.

Mrs WIBOM couldn't understand his point; she could see no reason why the Supporters would object to selling "remainders" at another price to get more money. FIAF members had made a commitment to the project and its base costs because they needed the service. Mrs BOWSER agreed that the Supporters would probably think that way, though not necessarily all the

Subscribers. Mrs ORBANZ agreed but felt it was important to make available a detailed analysis of costs and revenue for each year in the past with projections for the future, so that they had information with which to assess the project. Mr KULA, as a fourth Supporter, agreed and would welcome the possibility of generating extra income so that hopefully the costs would not further increase and might actually decrease.

Regarding the Annual Volumes on TV Periodicals, Mr FRANCIS said ITCA had refused its grant this year and he felt that, in view of the EC/Supporters' responses above, FIAF could at least fund the printing costs so that there was no delay. Mrs WIBOM thought this should be provided for in their Yearly Accounts as this was a foreseeable expense. What distressed the Supporters were the sudden cries for help and loans at short notice.

Mr FRANCIS said they would like to prepare a realistic 5-year forecast (based on actual sales for the last 3 years) for discussion within the EC or a smaller group within the EC. He felt this was a more appropriate forum than the Supporters' Group.

On marketing, one of the problems had been the belief that FIAF should use outside marketing organisations and they had been somewhat unlucky in their choices, which was a contributory factor. He felt Mr Moulds had lots of creative ideas. The most important factor was the current price level. There was also a possibility of selling the data.

Decision : On proposal to discuss 5-year forecast within the EC, no decision !!!

Revised edition of film & TV subject headings: Mr KLAUE asked if this was a FIAF publication; if so, members should get their free copy.

6.3c Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU began by reviewing the Membership of the Commission: they had 7 Members, with 4 Members each in the North American and East European Sub-Commissions.

He reviewed his Report for the GA, including the latest status of the "Volkmann" document, papers in preparation for the Technical Manual and the Restoration Symposium, and various ongoing test programmes. At the Congress, they would be distributing a 20-page paper on handling nitrate film, with translations in French, German and Spanish.

Regarding Mr DE VAAL's comments on the Technical Column of the Bulletin, he mentioned they were disappointed at the lack of response they received to what was published but more articles were in the pipeline. There was

an encouraging 40% response to the questionnaire but no response at all to the Technical Papers sent direct or published in the Bulletin. Mrs WIBOM explained that there was a language barrier for many archives, especially among the technicians.

In general, he was pleased with the collaboration with various outside organisations, both academic and industrial. As an example, he was pleased to report that John Kuiper had managed to secure restricted access to Kodak research files from the nitrate era and Kodak had formally requested information on the Commission's test programmes.

He closed by paying tribute to Mrs BOWSER and Mr FRANCIS for hosting meetings in New York and London respectively and to Paul De Burgh for the printing tests used to assess picture quality.

In the discussion, Mr FRANCIS confirmed that the National Film Archive could no longer pay for Mr Brown's Commission expenses now that he had retired from the archive. (He was already paying the expenses of two people for FIAF Commissions.) He would like to continue to provide access to facilities for Mr Brown to continue with Commission work but would have to review what could be provided without interfering with the archive's own needs. Mrs WIBOM recognised the difficulty and felt everyone appreciated the major contribution made by the archive over the years. Mr SCHOU was very keen to retain him on the Commission as he was even more active now he had retired.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that in fact he could no longer be a Commission Member, only an invited expert. The same situation applied to Larry Karr who was not attached to an archive. Mr FRANCIS mentioned that this also applied to people like Frances Thorpe who was not employed by a member organisation († see note below).

Reverting to the question of the Bulletin, Mr SCHOU had understood that he would have sight of technical papers before they were published. He referred to the recent paper from Pyong Yang on average density measurements: he felt at least technical papers should be attributed to an author, otherwise people would assume they originated from the Commission or at least had Commission approval. Mr DE VAAL agreed in principle but mentioned that the paper in question had been sent in very late by the Koreans.

As Mr SCHOU had been absent during the earlier discussion, Mr FRANCIS asked him to confirm that they would publish the Canberra Restoration Symposium papers, together with some from London. Mrs VAN DER ELST asked for a deadline so that it could be put in the FIAF budget.

Unesco funding for Canberra seminar for developing countries

In response to Mrs WIBOM, Mr SCHOU reported they had obtained US\$5000 from Paris via their national Commission which would be used to run a small seminar for developing archives, lasting some 7-10 days after the Congress. They were expecting someone from Vietnam and someone from Thailand. The latter (Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication in a University in Bangkok) was unknown to the members of the Bangkok archive and there was some mystery as to how he knew about the Congress in the first place.

Stockholm 1983 Proceedings

At this point, Mr KULA apologised for the fact that the cover had been changed and did not emphasise, as planned, that it was a joint FIAF/FIAT Symposium, published as a special issue of the FIAT Bulletin. Printing had been done in Rio and he was not sent a final proof before printing so neither he nor any other member of the FIAT Executive was aware of the change until it was too late.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that in addition to the 200 copies supplied to FIAF, there were many more copies available if required.

*** Note on Commission Membership**

At a later stage in the meeting, Mrs BOWSER recalled that Frances Thorpe and Alfred Krautz had been recognised as the official representatives of two member archives which did not have their own Documentation Departments. This was recorded in the Minutes of the relevant Commission meeting. (Mr KLAUE reported that Dr Krautz had since become a member of the DDR archive)

6.4 Projects & Publications Underway (GAI I)

PP1 Embryo (New York)

Mrs BOWSER would be distributing a Report.

PP2 Silent Films Catalogue (Brussels)

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Ledoux expected to deliver the manuscript to FIAF in October 1986 for printing. If it was ready, he would come to Berlin to present it personally. Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested the deadline should not be further extended as there had been so many reminders already.

PP3 Proceedings of the Historical Symposium in Vienna

Mrs ORBANZ reported that Mr Fritz had telephoned to say they were doing the final editing of the manuscript before sending it to the Secretariat. He claimed the Secretariat had agreed to pay for translation into English, French and German as well as printing.

Mr KLAUE said this was new: there was no talk of a French version and it had been agreed that he would do a rough translation into English which the Secretariat would revise but no talk of translation expenses. There was certainly no need for a translation in French.

Action: Mr KLAUE or Mrs ORBANZ to clarify with Dr Fritz.

PP4 Proceedings of the New York Slapstick Symposium

Mrs BOWSER would be presenting an oral report: the proceedings of the Identification Seminar had been distributed to the participants and would be incorporated with the rest of the symposium. The tapes had not yet been transcribed.

PP5 Annual Bibliography of FIAF Members' Publications

Mr KULA reported a single-page Report would be available on the arrangements for this year's issue. They would make a filmography of member archives' films and TV on the work of archives as a special for the 1988 Anniversary.

PP6 International Bibliography of Ancient Cinematographic Equipment

Mr DAUDELIN said a status report had been provided by Mr Veronneau. He would comment briefly on it, mentioning the contribution of New York and Brussels. Mr Verronneau had done a test print of the data already collected and had some 20 additional copies for those who had contributed. The disc was also available for any who wanted to use it, at \$10.

PP7 Revised Edition of the "Handbook for Film Archives"

Mrs BOWSER would make an oral report that they were waiting for Mr SCHOU to complete his chapter before beginning the Revision.

PP8 Glossary of Laboratory Terms

Mrs HARRISON reported that she had been given no information by Mr SPEHR on the status of this project. She knew the person working on it would be away from the archive for at least 4 months and she believed there had been no progress.

PP9 FIAF Bulletin

Mr DE VAAL referred first to the new format with a red cover. He had three points to make:

- i he was disappointed there was not much news to report in the Technical Column
- ii for 1988, he had found difficulty in extracting articles covering 50 years of FIAF. The Anniversary Committee had been set up two years previously yet nothing had been done about collecting articles, photos, etc. His own plan had been to include at least one or two articles in the Bulletin but he had not been successful in getting material.

Mr DAUDELIN stressed that till now the Anniversary planning had been concerned with major practical issues. Mrs WIBOM recalled that Mr BORDE had been charged with preparing the historical material and he would presumably be calling on the Honorary Members. Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that they had talked the project over with Mr POGACIC and Mr LAURITZEN and he was glad Mr TOEPLITZ was available in Australia for consultation.

PP10 Statistics on Film Archives' Activities

Mr KLAUE and Mr KULA would report progress.

6.5 Plans for the 50th Anniversary (GA12)

Mr DAUDELIN referred to the dossier prepared by Mrs VAN DER ELST, including Mrs WIBOM's correspondence with Jack Lang, the outgoing French Minister of Culture, and reports on progress meetings of the French archives in the autumn and the FIAF Working Group in Bruxelles in January.

Mr BORDE reviewed the current situation, updating the dossier with information from his visit to the CNC in Paris on his way to Canberra. The following points were covered in discussion:

i Main Location & Administration:

Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires (MATP): The booking had been made and included free use of meeting room with projection facilities and exhibition area.

The Assistant Director at the CNC had confirmed that they would be assigning a staff member to be responsible for all administrative aspects of the project. Mr Franz Schmitt would be responsible for all relations with MATP and CNC, and including the preparation of the Exhibition.

ii Exhibition at MATP: "Techniques of film restoration", to be based on Mr Schmitt's existing material but with contributions from other archives.

iii Symposium at MATP: The original plan to cover "Unknown French cinema 1920-30" was judged too academic and specialist for the occasion. To provide international interest, the Symposium would now cover "French silent cinema in its relations with the world", exploring both the impact of foreigners in France and that of French cinema on production in other countries, permitting contributions from specialists in different countries as well as the French historians.

Mrs WIBOM intervened at this point to thank Mr BORDE for his willingness to amend the original plan and for his creative approach.

iv Exhibitions at Musée des Arts Décoratifs, in the Louvre:
Mrs WIBOM reported that the Museum's Board of Management had met in March and suggested they should house the two exhibitions in their main exhibition area near the entrance:

- "The Art of the Cinema Poster, 1920-1940" (Mrs WIBOM)
- Early Cinema apparatus, 1895-1910 (Mr FRANCIS)

They too would assign someone to work with FIAF on the preparations and they would pay for the catalogue(s).

For the posters, a circular letter to members inviting contributions had been drafted and could now be distributed. For the equipment exhibition, Mr FRANCIS said they would like to move away from the traditional historical presentation combining the 3 elements (persistence of vision, photography, projection). There had been an explosion of activity in the first 15 years, with many inventions and dreams which came to nothing, so they thought it would be exciting to draw on the resources of the world's archives to explore these early dreams and provide an exhibition that would be really unique. This idea was enthusiastically welcomed.

v Golden Book

Mr BORDE would certainly seek the cooperation of Mr TOEPLITZ while in Australia. He suggested they should seek to define the project more closely while they were together in Canberra.

vi Project Coordinators

Mr BORDE listed the coordinators for individual projects:

CNC/MATP	Mr Schmitt
Restoration Exhibition	Mr Schmitt
Symposium	Mr DAUDELIN, with French help via Mr BORDE
Poster Exhibition	Mrs WIBOM + Secretariat
Equipment Exhibition	Mr FRANCIS

It was stressed that it was also necessary to have an overall FIAF coordinator and Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Schmitt had recently telephoned anxiously to ask what was happening on the implementation side to involve the members. He was willing to host a coordinators' meeting in Bois d'Arcy in June 86, if required.

Decision: Overall FIAF Coordinator: Mr Borde (with Secretariat)

It was suggested that all requests to members should be prepared by the Coordinators and distributed by the Secretariat, with separate documents for each item so that nothing got overlooked.

Actions:

- i Drafts for the initial circulars to be in the Secretariat by 15 May.
- ii Draft letter to CNC confirming that Mr BORDE is official FIAF coordinator, representing the EC
- iii Mr BORDE to make contact with new Minister of Culture

vii Unesco Round Table

Mr KLAUE felt one should consider this as an integrated part of the Congress activities. There had been some misunderstanding about the Technical Symposium and the Round Table discussion in Berlin. Unesco were relying on our advice to define the aims (summarise the development of the past 10 years and define tasks for the next 10 years). There would be a possibility to obtain Unesco money to bring people to the Round Table (and thus the Congress) as in Vienna.

Decision: Coordinator = Mr KLAUE ??

**viii International Panorama & Diorama Exhibition,
Musée d'Orsay**

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that this exhibition was coincidentally being held in Paris for six months in the same year. He was on the organising committee. It would include a retrospective of all wide-screen processes and he would be seeking help from members. It would be possible to consider this as part of the FIAF anniversary if FIAF were interested. The exhibition was separately funded and would require no extra FIAF work but it could be advertised as part of the FIAF celebrations.

Decision: Agreed

ix Anniversary design/logo

It was agreed that it would be useful to have a logo, poster, letter-head, etc designed as soon as possible. Mrs BOWSER would like it for use with the travelling exhibition she was responsible for organising. Mr FRANCIS suggested it would be ideal if one could find some famous person connected with the cinema willing to donate the design for the 50th Anniversary poster, perhaps an animator.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested Norman McLaren would be willing to design and he could contact him the next week. They would need to find a typographer as well.

Action: Mr DAUDELIN & Mrs VAN DER ELST

x Celebrated film restorations: travelling programme

Mrs BOWSER said she would be mentioning this at the Congress and would have a questionnaire ready to sent out later in the year, probably June.

6.6 Relations with international organisations (GA13)**6.6a Unesco**

Mr KLAUE suggested the 10-page draft contract concerning the survey of implementation of the Unesco Recommendation should be discussed at the EC2 meeting after the Congress when there would be more time. He mentioned certain problems in relations with Unesco relating to their diminished funds and staff changes

He quoted from a document which stated that as B Status members, NGO's were obliged to invite Unesco to be represented at meetings whose agendas were of interest to Unesco programmes. It had not been worthwhile inviting them all the way to Canberra for a small item on the agenda but it might be useful to invite them when discussing preparations for Berlin and Paris. They still hoped to get a subsidy of \$30,000 for the technical symposium and other purposes in Berlin, which was the highest allocation to moving image archives in the next 2 years.

Other monies foreseen were:

- \$10,000 for Asian film archives
- \$12,000 for the film archive in Brazil
- \$3,000 for missions to Caribbean countries
- \$2,000 for FIAF's computer in Brussels

The contract for the much-postponed regional seminar in Mozambique might be cancelled because of the lack of response from Mr Pimenta.

Note: The seminar actually took place in June 1986

FIAF was invited to submit proposals for the next 2-year programme. He suggested they should refer to the Vienna proposals and stress the importance of the Round Table in Paris in 1988.

Action: Mr KLAUE to respond without introducing any new proposals at this stage.

6.6b Annual Round Table Meeting with NGO's, Paris

Mr KLAUE would report at the GA in more detail but mentioned that it was the most effective meeting so far: up till now they had been simply exchanging information about activities but now they were also planning joint projects: Berlin Symposium, Unesco Recommendation Survey, curriculum for training archivists.

Mr KULA suggested members should be informed that Dr Roads had re-titled his Cataloguing Commission for the IFTC as the "Commission on Archives". It still seemed to be concerned only with the establishment of an international cataloguing standard for audio-visual materials, which was being pursued without any reference to other organisations working to the same end.

6.7 Future Congresses (GA15)

6.7a 1989: Lisbon

At the request of MM Gaudreault and Gunning, Mr DAUDELIN introduced a document outlining their project "Evolution du montage cinématographique (1899-1907): analyse de corpus", which they suggest as subject for the Symposium in Lisbon in 1989. This would of course also have to be discussed by Mr CINCOTTI with the Lisbon archive.

Mr FRANCIS reported that he had received Mr Gaudreault and his group in the last year and he had been extremely impressed by their work and enthusiasm. The project seemed to be on rather a grand scale but he would certainly recommend it.

6.7b 1990 & Subsequent Years

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that a firm invitation had been received from Cuba for 1990 on the occasion of their 30th Anniversary. Mr BORDE warmly welcomed this proposal as they had dreamed of a congress in Cuba for many years.

Mr CINCOTTI recalled the draft proposals prepared to give geographical balance from year to year and in the subsequent discussion, Mrs VAN DER ELST read from previous Minutes (London, item 11.6) the adjustments made so far:

1989	Europe	Lisbon	invitation accepted
1990	America	Cuba	invitation received
1991	India	Poona	invitation received
1992	Europe	Madrid	invitation received
1993	North America		invitation from Cineteca Nacional, Mexico
1994	Central/Eastern Europe		
1995	China/N Africa		

The invitation from Madrid for 1992 was to celebrate the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America; India had preferred 1990 but would accept 1991 to celebrate their 25th anniversary.

Mr KULA pointed out that sometime in the period 1994-1996, the world would be celebrating the invention of cinematography and FIAF would presumably be keen to do so in the same year.

Mr KLAUE confirmed that the Chinese were willing in principle to host a congress sometime in the 1990's although perhaps it would not be the best place for the 100th anniversary year. He suggested Mrs WIBOM and Mr CINCOTTI should talk to them further.

Mr DAUDELIN recalled that in New York they were anxious not to simply accept invitations proffered but to attempt balance in view of the developing needs of the Federation. Mr CINCOTTI agreed and suggested that this year they need only decide up to and including 1992.

6.7d 1987: Berlin

Mrs ORBANZ first warmly thanked the committee members for the work done in preparing the Technical Symposium. She then reviewed her written status report, adding the following points:

- Koblenz were hoping to invite the Preservation Commission
- a secretariat would be available in the ICC from 17-24 inclusive, with capacity for small meetings
- the proposed Visitors' Fee was necessary to supplement FIAF and government funding. In setting the fee, she had consulted FIAT and IASA who themselves normally charged \$100 and \$75 respectively. At present they could not pay for meals and, even if they did secure extra funding, they would prefer to use the money to pay staying costs and perhaps travel of people who could not otherwise attend.

Mr FRANCIS explained that he was providing a copy of a feature film which could be cut up and different sections (say 1 reel each) sent for printing to archives with laboratory facilities. These would then be rejoined and compared with the original nitrate. Mr SCHOU would be providing detailed instructions.

On point 9, in response to Mrs BOWSER, Mrs ORBANZ explained that they had no cinema of their own but would choose a public cinema where they could trust the projectionist and they would of course clear the rights. She envisaged public showings to offer the opportunity to see restored films to a wider public. She would prefer to charge but acknowledged the point made by Mr CINCOTTI that it might be easier vis-à-vis rights if there was no charge.

Mr KLAUE asked if Commission Members were counted as part of their archive delegation. He further suggested that calculations should be made in DM as the \$ was so volatile. In reply to the first point, Mrs ORBANZ felt that Commission members made such substantial contributions to the different Federations, they should be allowed to come without charge, in addition to their archive quota.

Mr CINCOTTI asked for clarification on hotel costs and was advised that double rooms would cost less than twice the single rate. In response to Mr DE VAAL, she mentioned there was a hotel near the ICC but it was some 20 minutes from the city. Mr KULA asked for some notes about the different hotels, on location and special facilities, etc. Mrs WIBOM asked also for information on credit cards accepted. Mr CINCOTTI suggested delegates

could stay in East Berlin: Mr KLAUE would respond to individual requests both as regards hotels and visits to his archive.

Mrs ORBANZ closed by saying that she planned to mail information to the delegates after the congress rather than distribute it in Canberra.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Invitation for EC meeting

Mr FRANCIS reported that an invitation had been received from the Scottish Film Archive in Glasgow, to host the EC in the autumn of 1987. He appreciated it was not normal to plan so far in advance but they would like to plan ahead. He thought it would be interesting for the EC to visit a regional film archive.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested a decision should be made at the EC meeting in Canberra after the Congress.

7.2 Coordination of 1986 meetings

Mr KLAUE reported that he had been trying to coordinate the autumn meetings with various members concerned as follows:

1987 Berlin Working Party	November 16/17, Berlin (arr 15)
Preservation Commission	November 19/20, East Berlin (arr 18)
East Europe Preservation Sub-Commission	November 21/22 East Berlin
EC	December 2/4, Amsterdam (arr 1; leave 5)

His archive would be pleased to host any EC members wishing to attend the Leipzig Festival, 21-27 November.

Mr DE VAAL confirmed that he was quite happy to change the date from November to December as suggested.

Note: In June 1986, Mr DE VAAL regretfully had to withdraw the invitation as he was unable to obtain adequate funding. Arrangements were made to hold the autumn meeting in Glasgow.

Mrs WIBOM then closed the meeting, thanking Jill Johnson for interpreting, the technical staff for their assistance and all the EC members for their contributions.

End of EC1

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Canberra, 18 April, 1986

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

FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page	
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Membership Questions	
2.1	Next Reconfirmation of Members	1
2.2	Buenos Aires: Museo del Cinema	1
3	New Election System for Berlin	2
4	New Project: International Catalogue of Newsreels	4
5	Future Congresses	
5.1	1988: Paris	5
5.2	1989: Lisbon	6
5.3 *	Suggestions for Future Symposia	8
6	Unesco: Survey on 1980 Recommendation	9
7	Evaluation of the Canberra Congress	
7.1	Organisation	9
7.2 *	Absence of EC Members	10
8	Next EC Meetings	11
9	Any Other Business	
9.1 *	Invitations to Congresses	11
9.2	Council of Europe	12
9.3	IASA Congress	12
9.4	FIAT Congress	12
9.5 *	Statutes & Rules	12
9.6 *	Adoption of the Budget	13

MINUTES

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft Agenda was approved, subject to the addition of items requested by Mrs WIBOM (asterisked on Final Agenda).

2 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

2.1 Next Reconfirmation of Members

Mr CINCOTTI explained that there would be 13 Members to consider at the next EC meeting: first, the three Members they had been unable to reconfirm in Canberra:

Rio de Janeiro	Cinematca do Museu de Arte Moderna
Bucuresti	Arhiva Nationala de Filme
Frankfurt	Deitsches Institut für Filmkunde

and then, 10 more Members, all of whom were already overdue, having been last reconfirmed 6 years ago:

Buenos Aires	Fundacion Cinematca Argentina
London	Imperial War Museum
Beijing	Zhongguo Dianyíng Ziliaoguan
Habana	Cinematca de Cuba
Jerusalem	Archion Israeli Leseratim
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse
Poona	National Film Archive of India
Tirana	Arkivi Shtetëror i Filmit i Republikës Popullore Socialiste të Shqipërisë
Washington	Library of Congress
Lausanne	La Cinémathèque Suisse

Action: Letters to be sent to the archives concerned.

2.2 Buenos Aires: Museo del Cinema

Mr FRANCIS reported that he and Mr KULA had had a long meeting with Mr & Mrs Fernandez Jurado when they described the ways the two organisations were funded and their separate responsibilities.

The Museum, founded 1971, has a huge collection of newsreels (12,000 reels) covering the whole history of the newsreel in Argentina as well as

16mm prints of Argentinian films. Almost the entire Argentinian production was destroyed in a major fire in 1968, so in many cases these 16mm represent the only surviving prints in existence. In some cases, there are similar titles in the two collections but for the most part they are different.

The Museum is funded by the municipality rather than the country; the Archive is a private Foundation. The municipality had been willing to purchase the newsreels for the Museum for the asking price of \$1million, a sum which the Foundation could not have afforded. This is an example of how, with two different kinds of organisation, they are able to maximise potential resources from different sources. Preservation is undertaken by both. They obviously work closely together, as a husband and wife team, and with Mr Fernandez-Jurado being Head of the Museum but also a Vice-President of the Archive.

However, seeing them as unrelated archives, the situation is similar to that in Montevideo where there is both a public and a private organisation. He and Mr KULA both felt that, if there were no personal connections, it would be reasonable for the Museum to be considered as a suitable candidate for Observership, given the importance of their collections and their preservation role; and there seemed no reason to disqualify them because of the personal connections.

Mr CINCOTTI welcomed their comments but pointed out that the case could not be further considered until the formal dossier was submitted.

3 NEW ELECTION SYSTEM FOR BERLIN

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the proposals presented to the GA by Mrs BOWSER and the ensuing discussion. He understood almost everyone would be willing to accept the idea of a general list of candidates which could be presented at the beginning of the GA, but very few seemed to support the idea of an election committee.

He suggested that, without any change in the Statutes, it would be possible to prepare a list of candidates, omitting only those who had formally stated they could not stand. However, there was a problem to know how to identify the eligible individuals in each archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested the following procedure:

- two or three months before the Congress (six months was too far ahead), the Secretariat would write to each archive asking for the names of eligible candidates, whether or not they were able to attend the next Congress. Inevitably some archives would not reply.

- at the beginning of the Congress, complete the list with the names of any additional delegates to the Congress, unless of course they specifically withdrew.
- before the actual elections, there could be a call for any further candidates.

Mrs ORBANZ understood this to be similar to Mrs BOWSER's proposal. Mr FRANCIS felt it missed one important factor, namely that the list sent to the archives should be one from which they had to withdraw rather than one which they agreed to be added to. Archives which might not trouble to reply when asked to put forward a candidate, would be far more likely to respond if they knew that an individual from their archive would automatically become a candidate unless they took some action. Such a procedure had the additional advantage that it would provide useful feedback on the attitudes of individual archives towards serving the Federation through membership of the EC.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked how one could identify the names of individual candidates and it emerged that Mr FRANCIS was referring only to candidate archives. Mr CINCOTTI suggested that this changed the whole concept that individuals were elected as individuals, not as representatives of their archive.

Mrs BOWSER thought it would be suitable to send the request to the Head of the Archive, who would remove the Archive's name from the list if they did not want to submit any candidate, or give the name of any individual they were willing to put forward. It was the Head of the Archive who would be responsible for authorising the funding of the time and expenses involved so he should get the letter and decide on the nomination. There would thus be not more than one candidate per archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested it might be better to ask the Head of the Archive, not whether he was willing to be a candidate himself or, if not, to nominate one of his staff, but whether the Archive wished to nominate a candidate and, if so, whom.

Mrs WIBOM felt there should be more specific information about the costs involved eg travel, hotels, meals; absences from work twice or three times a year, with up to 10 days at the time of the GA; time spent on EC work between meetings.

Mr CINCOTTI felt too much stress on the costs, which should be self-evident, would discourage participation. He felt the emphasis should be on ensuring they are able to attend the EC meetings.

Action: Secretariat to prepare draft.

16mm prints of Argentinian films. Almost the entire Argentinian production was destroyed in a major fire in 1968, so in many cases these 16mm represent the only surviving prints in existence. In some cases, there are similar titles in the two collections but for the most part they are different.

The Museum is funded by the municipality rather than the country; the Archive is a private Foundation. The municipality had been willing to purchase the newsreels for the Museum for the asking price of \$1million, a sum which the Foundation could not have afforded. This is an example of how, with two different kinds of organisation, they are able to maximise potential resources from different sources. Preservation is undertaken by both. They obviously work closely together, as a husband and wife team, and with Mr Fernandez-Jurado being Head of the Museum but also a Vice-President of the Archive.

However, seeing them as unrelated archives, the situation is similar to that in Montevideo where there is both a public and a private organisation. He and Mr KULA both felt that, if there were no personal connections, it would be reasonable for the Museum to be considered as a suitable candidate for Observership, given the importance of their collections and their preservation role; and there seemed no reason to disqualify them because of the personal connections.

Mr CINCOTTI welcomed their comments but pointed out that the case could not be further considered until the formal dossier was submitted.

3 NEW ELECTION SYSTEM FOR BERLIN

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the proposals presented to the GA by Mrs BOWSER and the ensuing discussion. He understood almost everyone would be willing to accept the idea of a general list of candidates which could be presented at the beginning of the GA, but very few seemed to support the idea of an election committee.

He suggested that, without any change in the Statutes, it would be possible to prepare a list of candidates, omitting only those who had formally stated they could not stand. However, there was a problem to know how to identify the eligible individuals in each archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested the following procedure:

- two or three months before the Congress (six months was too far ahead), the Secretariat would write to each archive asking for the names of eligible candidates, whether or not they were able to attend the next Congress. Inevitably some archives would not reply.

- at the beginning of the Congress, complete the list with the names of any additional delegates to the Congress, unless of course they specifically withdrew.
- before the actual elections, there could be a call for any further candidates.

Mrs ORBANZ understood this to be similar to Mrs BOWSER's proposal. Mr FRANCIS felt it missed one important factor, namely that the list sent to the archives should be one from which they had to withdraw rather than one which they agreed to be added to. Archives which might not trouble to reply when asked to put forward a candidate, would be far more likely to respond if they knew that an individual from their archive would automatically become a candidate unless they took some action. Such a procedure had the additional advantage that it would provide useful feedback on the attitudes of individual archives towards serving the Federation through membership of the EC.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked how one could identify the names of individual candidates and it emerged that Mr FRANCIS was referring only to candidate archives. Mr CINCOTTI suggested that this changed the whole concept that individuals were elected as individuals, not as representatives of their archive.

Mrs BOWSER thought it would be suitable to send the request to the Head of the Archive, who would remove the Archive's name from the list if they did not want to submit any candidate, or give the name of any individual they were willing to put forward. It was the Head of the Archive who would be responsible for authorising the funding of the time and expenses involved so he should get the letter and decide on the nomination. There would thus be not more than one candidate per archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested it might be better to ask the Head of the Archive, not whether he was willing to be a candidate himself or, if not, to nominate one of his staff, but whether the Archive wished to nominate a candidate and, if so, whom.

Mrs WIBOM felt there should be more specific information about the costs involved eg travel, hotels, meals; absences from work twice or three times a year, with up to 10 days at the time of the GA; time spent on EC work between meetings.

Mr CINCOTTI felt too much stress on the costs, which should be self-evident, would discourage participation. He felt the emphasis should be on ensuring they are able to attend the EC meetings.

Action: Secretariat to prepare draft.

5.2 1989: Lisbon

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that the Portuguese archive had brought a report on their Congress plans but there had been no time to present it to the GA.

They proposed to hold it, in April, at the Gulbenkian Foundation which was housed in a marvellous, modern building, with large well-equipped meeting rooms and 3 viewing theatres.

They were willing to accept the Gaudreault/Gunning project ("Evolution du montage cinématographique, 1899-1907: analyse du corpus") for the Symposium but would also like to propose a second historical Symposium on cinema and colonialism, or "The cinema of Europe and its former colonies". Mr CINCOTTI commented that archives in a number of countries had holdings of films made about their former colonies and it was a subject with vast possibilities.

Mr CINCOTTI asked the EC if it would be appropriate to have two historical symposia and initially the idea was rejected but Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that in Canberra there had been two technical symposia and he saw no reason why the position should not be reversed.

He suggested there might be a negative reaction to the word "colonialism" but this could be avoided by choosing the title more carefully : either "The Colonial Cinema" or "The Cinema of the Colonies", the latter covering the colony's own production. He pointed out that the theme was particularly interesting for the Portuguese and when representatives from Angola and Mozambique had first attended a FIAF Congress, their prime interest had been to establish contact with the Portuguese Archive to negotiate access to films made in and about their respective countries. The Portuguese were very serious and he thought it was a very valid project.

Mrs HARRISON pointed out that the outline of the Gaudreault/Gunning project seemed to indicate that they were primarily interested in discussing problems of methodology in the classification and description of films, and meeting with people working on standards in this area. She understood it to be a Technical Symposium and suggested it should rightfully be organised by the Cataloguing Commission.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the Group were already two years into a 10-year project. They could presumably share it with FIAF at a Symposium some other year but establish contact with the Cataloguing Commission in the meantime. He understood they were developing their methodological approach in parallel with their historical research.

Mr FRANCIS understood they were interested in the year 1989 as they expected by then to have amassed substantial data and be ready to discuss

in open forum how it could be best utilised. He had the feeling that they were seeking help from FIAF in how to handle the data. Mrs BOWSER agreed it was part of Cataloguing but of a more specialised kind than what they normally handled.

Mr TOEPLITZ was confused and uncertain how one could hold a symposium on a subject that was so specialised and with such a narrow time-band. He suggested a very interesting symposium could be held about editing but covering a much wider time scale. He agreed that, in any case, this did not seem to be a historical subject. He felt the idea of a symposium covering the colonies could be a vast subject, if one included India and the French and Italian colonies as well as the Portuguese. He had always thought it would be satisfactory to have a balance between technical and historical subjects but perhaps it was not necessary to maintain that balance within each congress. There had been no technical symposium in Vienna either.

In the discussion of 5.3 below, the following points were made about the two Symposia proposals:

Mr KLAUE felt the Gaudreault/Gunning topic would only attract the few archives which were also centres of historical research; most of the specialists worked outside the archives.

Mr DAUDELIN disagreed: the group of young historians would by then have worked on the project for some 6 years and had simply suggested that one day should be devoted to 4 or 5 presentations and some 50 1- or 2-minute films to illustrate their views. From their work so far, they were finding that editing techniques which were considered "novel" later, were in fact already in use during this early period. He did not feel members would be put off by such a proposal and there would be plenty of time for other topics as well.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested that, as it was rather a presentation on a specific research project rather than a real symposium, then they should certainly seriously consider including the second topic. Rather than using the word "colonialism" in the title, it could be called "Cinema of, in or about the colonies" and concentrate on showing and discussing films, rather than concepts of colonialism. Mr BORDE felt it might be called "Les constantes du cinéma de l'époque coloniale". There would probably be the same stereotypes and themes appearing in films in the colonies of the different European nations. In parallel, they should consider ways and means to provide copies of these films for the new archives in the colonies themselves, as a record of their own heritage.

Action: Mrs HARRISON to contact Gaudreault/Gunning to explore how Cataloguing Commission might help and, hopefully, report with more information for discussion at next EC.

5.3 Suggestions for future Symposia

Mr FRANCIS addressed the problem that most of the delegates attending a Congress were Heads of the Archive whereas, when it came to the specialist and technical symposia, it would generally have been more useful if their specialist technical staff had been able to attend and/or contribute.

Now that elections were held every two years, he suggested it was possible to consider a radical change in approach. In the Election Year, when Heads of Archives would be attending, one of the symposia could be about an aspect of archive management, the other about a more "interesting" topic to make sure that people actually turned up. In the alternate years, they could address the more specialist subjects. The idea would be that the relevant specialists could come from the archives to participate in the symposia, or rather Workshops, which concerned them and the Head of the Archive need not feel obliged to attend. This would assist many archives who had financial problems: at present the Head of the Archive felt bound to attend and found it very difficult to fund the presence of a second person. This meant that the Head of the Archive might come to the GA but decide not to attend the Symposium or attended the Symposium but lacked the knowledge to benefit from it, both of which were unsatisfactory. He mentioned that FIAT had already experimented with this approach.

Mr CINCOTTI and Mr KLAUE both welcomed the idea and recalled it had been part of the intention behind the decision to hold elections every two years. However, they would need to amend the Statutes & Rules as there were still numerous administrative decisions (Reports, Membership questions, etc) that at present had to be taken annually. Mr KLAUE mentioned that the ICA had elections only every 4 years. He stressed that it would be important to choose the topics for symposia/workshops very carefully. Mr CINCOTTI felt it might be difficult to handle budgets on a two-year rather than an annual cycle.

Mr BORDE acknowledged that over the years there had been a trend from management by the GA towards that of the EC. However, as the Federation increased in size, it was important that members should continue to feel they had a voice and there should be a general meeting every year, even if only for one day, as was planned for example for Paris.

Mr SCHOU asked that in discussing future changes they should also consider alternative ways of handling Commission Reports. For the Preservation Commission, in addition to the formal general Report, he would welcome the opportunity to have perhaps a 1-hour Workshop to present with more technical detail the results of their on-going projects to an informed audience.

Decision : Further discussion at the next EC meeting.

6 UNESCO: SURVEY ON 1980 RECOMMENDATION

Mr KLAUE reported that the text of the questionnaire had been agreed with FIAT; they had hoped for Unesco's comments before the GA but they had not been received.

He was concerned about the execution of the 8 Appendices inserted by Unesco as part of the contract and, while willing to do some preliminary planning and seek members' cooperation, he was in need of some guidelines from the EC. Mrs WIBOM and Mr FRANCIS felt it required a lot of work, perhaps disproportionate to the value of the contract : \$13,500 with \$5000 committed to FIAT and word processing equipment to be paid for from the \$8,500 for FIAF. Mr KLAUE felt it would not be too much of a load if the tasks were distributed. Unesco would be paying for the final publication costs although it didn't at the moment figure in their future budgets. The approach could be further discussed at the next EC but they should really not lose more time as the project should be completed by the end of 1987 to form the basis of the 1988 Round Table.

Mrs ORBANZ, Mrs BOWSER and Mr KULA supported Mr KLAUE's proposed approach to the work and suggested he should be authorised to seek whatever help was needed from the Commissions and individual archives. Mr KLAUE agreed to continue on the lines proposed, provided it could be further discussed at the next EC meeting.

Decision : Put on Agenda for next EC meeting.

7 EVALUATION OF THE CANBERRA CONGRESS

7.1 Organisation

Mrs WIBOM made 3 comments:

- first, she felt the arrangements for all aspects of the Congress had been excellent.
- referring to the discussion under 5.3 above, she felt the Symposia had been a bit too specialised for the Heads of Archives: in this case, it would have been necessary to bring along both Preservation and Cataloguing specialists but they could not have afforded it. She was not yet in a position to evaluate the content of the Symposia, whether in fact they had met the needs of the actual participants.
- she felt the programme had perhaps been a bit too ambitious as they had been on the go for very long hours throughout.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that, without the generous contribution of the Australian archive, 15 archives would not have been able to attend. This situation worried him if FIAF was to arrange further "long-distance" congresses where the host was not able to offer such support.

Mr KULA recognised this was a problem but it was important that the