

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Glasgow, 25 - 27 November 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		
Honorary Members	Einar LAURITZEN		ABSENT
	Vladimir POGACIC		ABSENT
	Jerzy TOEPLITZ		ABSENT
Commission Members	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing	ABSENT
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation	
	Milka STAYKOVA	Documentation	(Resigned)
Executive Secretary		Brigitte VAN DER ELST	
Interpreter		Jill JOHNSON	

FINAL AGENDA

Item		Page
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Approval of Minutes of Canberra Meetings	1
3	Membership Questions	
3.1	Reconfirmation of Members	1
	a-k Bucharest, Rio de Janeiro, Frankfurt DIF, Buenos Aires FCA, London IWM, Jerusalem, Toulouse, Poona, Tirana, Washington LC, Other	
3.2	Reconfirmation of Observers	6
	a-l Alger, Dhaka, La Paz, Lima, Lyon, Managua, Manila FAP, Paris CF, Quito	
3.3	New Candidates for Membership	7
	a-c Los Angeles UCLA, Luxembourg, Hanoi	
3.4	New Candidates for Observership	9
	a-c Buenos Aires MC, Frankfurt DFM, Bruxelles CFA	
3.5	Miscellaneous	11
	a-f Bogota CD, Lima, FL, Jerusalem JFA, Paris CG, San Domingo, Montreal: Chinese retrospective	
3.6	Reconfirmation Questionnaire	13
4	Financial Report	14
5	Reports of the Specialised Commissions	
5.1	Cataloguing Commission	15
5.2	Documentation Commission	15
5.3	Preservation Commission	21
6	Projects & Publications Underway	24
7	Amendment of FIAF Statutes & Rules	27
8	Relations with International Organisations	
8.1	Unesco	31
8.2	Council of Europe	33
8.3	Regional Seminar in Mozambique	34
9	Future Congresses	
9.1	1989 and later	34
9.2	1987: Berlin	35
9.3	1988: Paris	37

MINUTES

Mr David Bruce, Director of the Scottish Film Council, hosts of the Executive Committee, welcomed everyone to Glasgow. Mrs WIBOM opened the meeting with a welcome to all present.

In the absence of MM GARCIA MESA and NAIR (Members) and Mr ALVES-NETTO (Reserve Member), both MM DE VAAL and Mr SPEHR had the right to vote.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was adopted.

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF CANBERRA MEETINGS

The Minutes were approved, subject to amendments as follows:

- a EC1 p10 Reconfirmation of Observers
Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Los Angeles should have been reconfirmed as they had in fact submitted their Annual Report on time.
- b EC1 p6 Reconfirmation of Canberra
Mr SCHOU reported they had in fact 2, not 3, contract staff
- c EC1 pp29 & 31 Preservation Commission
Mr SCHOU reported that the translations of the nitrate film handling paper were in fact not yet available. He mentioned that the \$5000 Unesco funding from their National Commission for the April seminar had in fact not been paid till mid November.
- d EC1 p4 (2nd para from bottom) Bruxelles: Centre du Film sur l'Art
In response to a query from Mrs ORBANZ, it was noted that "supporters" should in fact read "subscribers".
- e EC1 p24 (2nd para from bottom) Financial Report: postal increase
Mrs VAN DER ELST confirmed to Mrs ORBANZ that the increase was 500% as stated in the Minutes, but in fact there had been such an outcry that it had since been lowered to 200%.

In response to Mr SCHOU, it was agreed that outstanding decisions (signalled with a question mark in the Minutes) would be picked up when each item was discussed during the course of the Agenda.

Note: Decisions still outstanding were later followed up by Mrs VAN DER ELST.

3 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

3.1 Reconfirmation of Members

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that there were 13 dossiers to review, of which the first 3 were carried forward from Canberra.

3.1a Bucharest: Arhiva National de Filme

Mr CINCOTTI recalled they were not confirmed in Canberra as subscriptions were owing since 1983. Since then, they had been hit by the sudden death of Mr Paraianu and had sent a telegram asking for postponement until the Spring.

Mr KLAUE suggested they should be sent a further letter, stressing that unless they paid, they would have no right to vote in Berlin. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mrs Florea Ion had been named as the new Director.

Decision : Non-reconfirmation with firm letter as above.

3.1b Rio de Janeiro: Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that the outstanding subscriptions had finally been paid and a dossier was submitted in May which was satisfactory although it lacked the current balance sheet which would be ready in August. Of the 20 or so staff, 3 were concerned with preservation and 7 with documentation. He regretted the Archive itself did not have its own printed letterhead.

Mrs BOWSER was surprised that the dossier itself made no mention of the fact that the Archive was closed for building maintenance till March 1987.

Mr DE VAAL reported on his visit to the Archive which coincided with the time of Mr ALVES-NETTO's heart attack. Work was certainly seriously restricted because of the building works. However, the situation was improving and he counselled patience. On staff levels, he pointed out that although there were a number of people on the organisation chart, they were devoted people who were paid very little and had outside jobs. On preservation, they worked very closely with Sao Paulo.

Mr CINCOTTI was concerned about the lack of preservation activity as it raised the question of principle: there were a number of archives who for various reasons were in a similar position and unable to undertake as much preservation work as they would wish. FIAF needed to consider its attitude to such archives.

Mr FRANCIS felt that in this case the two archives should be considered together. As far as he could tell, Embrafilme was responsible directly or indirectly for virtually all the preservation funding and, while Sao Paulo had the facilities, Mr ALVES-NETTO in Rio had a very important role in obtaining the necessary finance.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1c Frankfurt: Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde

Mr CINCOTTI reported they had submitted the information requested, including translation of the Rules into English. Mrs ORBANZ explained that the balance sheet showed a small percentage for preservation work as it was mostly done in Koblenz at no charge. She added that the two Directors on the organisation chart should now read MM Albrecht and Franz. In response to Mr FRANCIS, she

explained that the link with the two state television companies was simply the provision of a subsidy for the collection.

Mr KLAUE suggested the letter of reconfirmation should stress the importance of film preservation as there was an imbalance in the budget and it could possibly help Mrs Gebauer who was responsible for the film collection.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1d Buenos Aires: Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the very complete dossier which confirmed their autonomy and noted they had received from government sources the equivalent of \$50,000 for equipment purchase and hoped for a similar sum this year. For preservation, they were hoping for further funding from the national film institute to enable them to copy some 400 films. He noted that some 50% of their income came from film screenings. About 7%, ie some \$70,000, was spent on conservation.

There was still some confusion among the EC regarding the respective holdings of the Fundacion and the Museo (see also item 3.4a). Mr FRANCIS recalled that, while the Fundacion had some nitrate newsreels, all the nitrate feature films had been destroyed by fire in 1968; he understood the 400 films mentioned were 16mm acetate, for many of which copies already existed in both the Fundacion and the Museo del Cine.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1e London: Dept of Film, Imperial War Museum

Mr CINCOTTI noted that there appeared to be no separate letterhead for the Dept of Film which was one of 4 departments headed by Mr Coultass, as Head of Audio-Visual Records. He was pleased to note that some 55% of the budget was devoted to preservation but concerned that the nitrate transfer programme would take a further 9 years above the original 18 year estimate.

Mr FRANCIS explained that the transfer programme at IWM as well as his own archive suffered from two factors:

- the government based its funding on an artificial rate of inflation of 3%, well below the actual rate
- film stock had to be obtained from Kodak Rochester at an increasingly unfavourable rate of exchange.

In addition, funds this year had had to be diverted to a rebuilding programme.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1f Jerusalem: Israel Film Archive

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier and noted there were some 30 staff and that some 60% of income came from film screenings and 15% was spent on "acquisition and preservation" combined.

In response to Mr KLAUE, Mr KULA reported that the Archive owned and ran the

cinematheques in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv; he believed they had a straight-forward programming arrangement with Haifa.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation, with letter to ask for clarification on relationship with cinematheques.

3.1g Toulouse: Cinémathèque de Toulouse

Mr CINCOTTI opened by noting that the dossier was a "model" response and, in addition, included a very detailed financial report for 1985. He was pleased to note that Article 3 of the Statutes contained a reference to the Unesco Recommendation.

Mr CINCOTTI recommended reconfirmation but asked for clarification on just two points:

- status of full-time administrator on terms agreed with CNC (Article 17) secondment from the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique) and his salary was provided for in the subsidy from CNC. His role vis-a-vis the Association and the President had been carefully defined to ensure the archive had full autonomy.

- % of budget spent on preservation

Mr BORDE explained that of the 50% spent on staff costs, 20% was for technicians engaged in film preservation. In addition, the archive had "free" access to the facilities at Bois d'Arcy for their copying needs.

Mr BORDE mentioned that the nitrate copying programme in France presented a major problem: Toulouse had some 8000 cans, Bois D'Arcy 80,000 and Cinémathèque Française 30,000, which together represented some 50 years work on the current schedule.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1h Poona: National Film Archive of India

Mr CINCOTTI reported the dossier was comprehensive. There were some 58 staff including 32 technicians and considerable sums were spent on preservation and purchase of equipment in accordance with an ambitious 7-year plan. They had their own letterhead but it had no mention of FIAF membership. There were no questions but it was regretted that once again Mr Nair could not obtain government clearance to travel to the EC meeting.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1i Tirana: Archive d'Etat du Film de la RPS d'Albanie

Mr CINCOTTI noted that the dossier reported no changes; the archive was entirely state-run and state-funded. There was no budget or organisation chart but there was an extensive description of their activities, including progress on the construction of new vaults.

Mrs WIBOM regretted they so seldom came to FIAF Congresses but Mr CINCOTTI stressed they had attended those in Rapallo and Vienna where the

travel costs were not too high. He had found the delegates competent and devoted to their work.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation, with letter expressing hope they would be able to attend the next Congress.

3.1j Washington: Library of Congress

Mr CINCOTTI again regretted that the archive made no mention of FIAF membership on its letterhead. Mr SPEHR explained that in total there were some 70 staff. There was no separate budget as all building, staff costs and operating expenses were included in the Library of Congress general budget. The appropriation of \$400,000 for film preservation was spent almost entirely on film stock. In addition, they administered preservation appropriations of \$500,000 for television and \$100,000 for sound.

In response to Mr DAUDELIN's interest in the relative proportions allowed for film and television, he explained that this reflected a recent shift in acquisitions. Most commercial television had to register for copyright and there was now so much output that they were acquiring twice as many television titles as film titles. They were in fact modifying their acquisition policy to put a limit on certain categories (certain industrial and promotional films, TV soap operas).

Mr KLAUE asked that FIAF should attempt once more to encourage more budgetary support for staff members attending FIAF meetings. MM DAUDELIN and FRANCIS felt that this matter should not be associated with the reconfirmation procedure. FIAF should in fact thank the Library of Congress for their past support of FIAF through the funding of travel for Mr SPEHR and Mrs HARRISON and hope that this would be continued.

Decision : Unanimous reconfirmation.

3.1k Other Members due for Reconfirmation

Mr CINCOTTI reported that dossiers had not been received from Beijing, *Pyeong Yang* Habana or Lausanne so these would be reviewed in Berlin.

(Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mr GARCIA MESA\$ (Habana) said he had sent the dossier and intended bringing a further copy with him but was finally prevented by workload and family illness from attending the meeting in Glasgow; there was no news of the other two.)

3.2 Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that to qualify for reconfirmation this year Observers should have both submitted an Annual Report and paid their Subscription for the year 1985. Mr BORDE reported that all except Lima had paid for 1985.

3.2a Alger: Cinémathèque Algérienne

They had submitted neither their 1985 Report nor the 1986 Subscription and Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that each year she typically had to send them at least 3 reminders. Mr DAUDELIN suggested a personal letter asking them to try to meet their annual obligations more promptly without causing so much extra work for the Secretariat.

Decision : Not confirmed; Mr CINCOTTI to write as suggested.

3.2b Dhaka: Bangladesh Film Archive

The 1985 Report had been sent indicating that they were very poor (total budget only \$8,000), lacked technicians but had 4 air-conditioned vaults.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.2c La Paz: Cinemateca Boliviana

A Report had been sent indicating they had considerable difficulties but they had nevertheless been able to pay their 1984 & 1985 subscriptions.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.2d Lima: Cinemateca Universitaria

No 1985 Report and 1985 subscription still outstanding.

Decision : Not confirmed; Mr CINCOTTI to write.

3.2e Lyon: Comité de Fondation du Musée du Cinéma de Lyon

They had sent a brief Report saying there was little activity but since then Mr BORDE, as one of the 8 members of the Comité de Fondation had called a meeting at which it had been decided to complete the formalities to turn the Comité into a Museum. Mr BORDE would be writing formally to FIAF on behalf of the new Museum on his return.

He mentioned that they already had a considerable collection: 2000 Lumière films, covering 900 titles which were being restored at Bois D'Arcy at CNC expense and a further 500 titles which had already been restored; plus the scientific and technical library and rare apparatus which had belonged to the Lumière Brothers. They had hopes of making further valuable acquisitions.
Decision : Confirmed under existing status. Await Mr BORDE's letter.

3.2f Managua: Cinemateca de Nicaragua

Their fairly detailed Report indicated considerable progress in setting up technical installations, described extensive cultural activities and plans for working on cataloguing next year.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.2g Manila: Film Archives of the Philippines

No Report and no response to the Secretariat's reminder of July.

Mrs WIBOM reported that Mr Arnaldo (Unesco) had spent July in Manila and reported that Mr De Pedro was having a difficult time, had had to sack staff because of budget cuts but was expected to survive.

Decision : Not confirmed; Secretariat to write.

3.2h Paris: Cinémathèque Française

In spite of numerous reminders by letter and phone and numerous promises, they had still not submitted their Annual Reports for 1984 & 1985, although their subscriptions were paid up, including that for 1986. As agreed at Canberra, Mr CINCOTTI had written (12 May) to the President Mr Costa Gavras to remind him of the annual obligations binding on Observers and also of their obligations towards other FIAF members, but there had been no reply.

Mrs VAN DER ELST regretted that there was currently no sanction against defaulters, a situation which Mr CINCOTTI noted he had tried to overcome with the proposed amendments to the Statutes and Rules. Mr DAUDELIN suggested that all defaulting Observers should be sent a strong letter demanding they comply with their obligations before the Berlin Congress. In this case, it was particularly distressing as they had numerous contacts with FIAF Members and would of course be important collaborators in the preparations for the 50th Anniversary.

Decision : Not confirmed; Mr CINCOTTI to send formal reminder of obligations to M Latarjet, as the Director responsible.

3.2i Quito: Cinemateca Nacional de Ecuador

They had sent their Report which indicated that their activities were primarily cultural although they were looking after the collection as far as possible with limited technical facilities.

Decision : Confirmed.

3.3 New Candidates for Membership**3.3a Los Angeles: UCLA**

Mr CINCOTTI reported that they had expressed interest in becoming Members but had not replied to Mrs VAN DER ELST's September 5 letter. Mrs BOWSER heard from Mr Rosen in October of his continued interest and reminded him that, if the application was to be considered in Berlin, the documents should be submitted well in advance.

3.3b Luxembourg: Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned they had been Observers for 3 years and reviewed the dossier, including their late submission of November 19.

There was no organisation chart (although this was not required by the Statutes) and he noted in passing a minor error of fact concerning alleged deposit of films with the 3 Italian archives.

Mr BORDE knew the archive well and had a good impression of them, although he had not visited them for two years. As they were founded in 1977, they did not have significant preservation problems and were concerned primarily with cultural activities (2 or 3 screenings an evening). They were of considerable help to the French-speaking archives as they had 16mm copies of pre-war films that had been lost in 35mm.

Mr KLAUE asked for some more budget information and Mr DAUDELIN wanted more information on the "restoration" activities of the two technicians.

It was suggested consideration of the dossier should be postponed till after the report on the visit of inspection. Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned Mr Junck was organising a meeting of European archives for the Council of Europe in February 1987, which could be a suitable occasion for the visit. Mr BORDE volunteered to go but felt it was important there should be time for a more extended visit, including a detailed examination of their holdings list.

Mrs ORBANZ was interested in their policy towards their collection, especially the copies where no negative was known to exist. Mr CINCOTTI had previously raised this point with Mr Junck who said they were not concerned with duplication at this stage as for most of their collection negatives and/or copies existed elsewhere; Mr CINCOTTI was concerned that irreplaceable copies were being spoilt through repeated use.

Mr DE VAAL reported on an unsatisfactory exchange when Mr Junck had initially supplied a very worn-out print and, despite a promise, not yet supplied anything better. He feared they were not able to function as a real archive. Mrs BOWSER was also not clear on their archive role, in particular how they differed from the hundreds of organisations in the USA who had projection only copies of films. In addition, she would like a report on their relationships with producers and their attitude to producers' rights.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that this was an archive in a country with no national production so inevitably they had access to very few negatives. Mr CINCOTTI agreed but pointed out that it was the role of the archive to restore and to make its own preservation negatives where appropriate.

Decision : Mr BORDE to make formal visit.

3.3c Hanoi: Archives du Film du Vietnam

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that some time ago they had cabled their request to become Members but, in spite of Mr KLAUE's letter reminding them of the necessary procedure, they had not replied.

Decision : Secretariat to write again.

3.4 New candidates for Observership

3.4a Buenos Aires: Museo del Cine "Pablo C Ducrós Hicken"

It was pointed out that the documentation was in Spanish which was not one of the official languages of the Federation. Mrs VAN DER ELST regretted she had not previously noticed this but asked that this should not be a reason for refusing the dossier as it had been submitted back in April and they had not asked for a translation. She offered to prepare a translation for the EC.

Mr FRANCIS suggested that in future dossiers should be requested in French or English for practical reasons rather than as a question of principle. He pointed out that Russian was an official language of the Federation but they had no facilities to translate it at EC meetings.

Decision: Secretariat to ask all applicants to make submission in English or French, indicating this is for practical reasons.

Subsequent review of dossier (after discussion of 3.6)

Mr CINCOTTI reviewed the dossier pointing out that, although the Museo del Cine was founded some 15 years ago by the municipality of Buenos Aires, it was in fact the only body in Argentina responsible for safeguarding the national film heritage. He found it strange that, of the \$80,000 budget, some 94% was spent on staff costs, the remainder on operating expenses and there was no mention of expenditure on acquisition or preservation, the "real" activities of an archive. The organisation chart was impressive but there was no indication of the number of people working in the different departments and no sign of a film preservation department.

The collection consisted of some 600 reels of feature films and 12,600 news-reels; only the newsreels and 200 of the feature films had been identified (list supplied). They had an active cultural and educational programme of screenings and courses.

Mr KLAUE raised 3 questions:

- was there a letter of agreement with the other Argentinian archive ?
- what was the acquisition policy ? was it purely a historical collection (the latest film mentioned was from the 1960's) ? did they have any legal deposit responsibilities ?
- what information was available on the preservation facilities ?

There was no letter of agreement and, in response to the other 2 questions, Mr KULA and Mr FRANCIS referred to their discussions with the Jurados in Canberra about the two archives and their inter-relationship (see Minutes of EC2, Canberra). Mr FRANCIS suggested that now the political climate in Argentina was changing there was more hope of obtaining national funds for preservation activities. With reference to the organisation chart, Mr KULA suggested the 22 boxes represented not 22 people but the proposed organisation for the future.

Mr FRANCIS suggested that, as so much was still unclear, a decision should be postponed until after a further discussion with the people concerned. Mr KULA however pointed out that, even though there were questions to be asked, it was clear that the archive met the basic requirements to qualify as a FIAF Observer. Mr KLAUE was however unhappy about the documents presented and felt they described an archive on paper rather than a reality; he wanted clarification on what really existed and would prefer a further discussion with the Argentinians before a decision was made.

Mr DE VAAL suggested there might be a parallel with the situation in Uruguay and the effect on them of a changed political situation. Mr FRANCIS agreed and recalled that when he visited the other archive (the Foundation) in Argentina officially, at the time of the military regime, there had not even been a mention of the existence of the municipal Museo and its collection and the 16mm copies he had been shown were said to be part of the Foundation's collection.

Decision: Secretariat to write saying the EC had examined the dossier and found it difficult to understand so would like a meeting with them in Berlin, preferably before the GM.

3.4b Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum

Mr CINCOTTI reported that they had asked in October to become Observers and the dossier was expected in time for discussion in Berlin. Mr DAUDELIN suggested they should be invited to attend the Congress.

Decision: Mrs ORBANZ to invite them to Congress.

3.4c Bruxelles: Centre du Film d'Art

Mr CINCOTTI reported that no response had been received to the request for the letter of agreement with the existing Member in the country.

Several members of the EC had had informal discussions with Mr Ledoux who obviously hoped the application would lapse. He did not want to reply directly to Mr Storck who was an old friend but had given two reasons for not accepting the candidature:

- fear that government subsidies for conservation would have to be shared between the two archives
- belief that the Centre was not a true archive (he claimed it was primarily a collection of Mr Storck's own films)

Some felt that Mr Ledoux wanted FIAF, as a matter of courtesy, to formally notify him of the application and were willing to write to him accordingly. However, as far as progressing the application was concerned, it was up to the candidate to write again to the national Member and/or to formally advise FIAF they could obtain no reply.

Many thought the two objections were not valid and the Centre appeared to

qualify as an Observer. It was felt however that Mr Ledoux should be encouraged to put his objections in writing if they were to be taken into consideration.

Mr KLAUE reminded the EC that they had the power to make exceptions and admit an Observer even though the existing Member had not given his agreement to cooperate. However, they should only invoke this exception if it was clear that the application was being deliberately blocked for subjective reasons. Mrs BOWSER and many others agreed.

Decision :

EC to postpone decision until candidate sends required letter of agreement or reports an impasse.

Mrs VAN DER ELST to formally send copy of application to Mr Ledoux.
(This was not done immediately because of subsequent developments)

At this point the meeting broke for lunch and a tour of the Scottish Film Archive.
Arrangements were made

- to distribute the portions of the film from London to be copied by various archives for comparison at the Berlin Congress
- to show the video of the award-winning film from Rome on their new vaults

3.5 Miscellaneous

3.5a Bogota: Cinemateca Distrital

They had reported 2 months ago that the Cinemateca was to be absorbed in a new Foundation for Colombian Film Heritage to be set up in November 1986 under the direction of Mrs Claudia Triana, currently director of the Cinemateca. They asked whether the FIAF Membership should be simply transferred to the Foundation or whether a new application was necessary.

Mrs VAN DER ELST had asked for the relevant documentation so a decision could be made.

3.5b Lima: Filмотека de Lima

They had written to Mr Borde, former Secretary General, to advise that a private foundation had been set up in July 1986 to encompass the former cineclub of the Museo de Arte and the Fundacion Ubanca (?). They were concerned with film preservation, diffusion and research and were interested in exchanges with other film archives.

Mr BORDE had replied with relevant FIAF information.

3.5c Jerusalem: Jewish Film Archive

They had contacted Mrs ORBANZ to report their existence and request information on the possibilities of joining FIAF. Mrs VAN DER ELST had sent application procedure information and informed Archion Israeli Leseratim.

3.5d Paris: Cinémathèque Gaumont

They had telephoned to enquire about becoming Observers. Mrs VAN DER ELST had sent information and informed the French Members.

Mr BORDE recalled that Mrs Laure Forrestier had attended the Congress in Vienna and he and Mr DAUDELIN had explained that as a commercial organisation they could not be admitted to the Federation. At the time, she had spoken of setting up a separate organisation but had made no further contact.

3.5e San Domingo: Cinemateca Nacional

Mr DAUDELIN had received press cuttings and the visiting card of the Director, Hildebrando Hidalgo, and had made copies for the Secretariat.

3.5f Montréal: Chinese retrospective 1932 - 1985

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned yet another case of a FIAF Member arranging an event in another country without consulting or informing the FIAF Member.

In this case, there were numerous posters throughout Montréal advertising that the Chinese Film Archive were showing a retrospective of some 35 films at the Conservatoire d'Art Cinématographique, attached to the University. This seemed to confirm the frequently and publicly stated view of the Conservatoire's Director, Mr Lausik, that he can arrange what he likes with other FIAF archives, without reference to FIAF or the Montréal Member. In fact the show was put together by many Chinese organisations but he felt they had deliberately mentioned only the Archive on the poster to make their point. It appeared the same show was planned for Toronto but Mr KULA had had no contact from them so far.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested FIAF should write to the Chinese Archive but Mrs BOWSER felt the matter should first be handled on a bilateral and hopefully friendly basis and only referred to FIAF itself if it could not be resolved otherwise.

Mrs WIBOM pointed out that many foreign archives had problems reading the many documents from the Federation, including the Statutes and Rules, and suggested the various staff members were simply not aware of their obligations to other Members. She suggested Members should be encouraged to translate or at least explain the Statutes & Rules to their own staff.

Mr KLAUE said that even in large archives there were only a few people who were involved in decisions that might affect FIAF (eg technicians involved in shipment and programming staff); it was the FIAF representative's job to ensure they were kept informed

Decision : MM DAUDELIN & KULA to write joint letter to the Chinese Archive.

3.6 Reconfirmation Questionnaire

Mr DAUDELIN had revised the Questionnaire in the light of previous discussions and, although it contained questions that were not strictly related to the Reconfirmation requirements (eg an updated organisation chart), he suggested they could be included provided there was an opening paragraph which stressed that they were "for information only". He had not taken into account any of the proposed changes to the Statutes and Rules.

Mr BORDE felt it should be made very clear that there was no obligation to complete the questionnaire but that it would be useful for FIAF to have an overall picture of their progress over the previous 5 years in their different activities. Mr CINCOTTI suggested they should review the questionnaire and afterwards consider whether they wanted to suggest that all or part of it be made obligatory in the new Statutes & Rules.

Mr KLAUE recalled that the original idea of the questionnaire was to simplify the business of Reconfirmation for the Members and he would like this reflected in the new Statutes & Rules. As now presented, the questionnaire simply gave them more work to do.

Mr FRANCIS felt there were too many questions and felt it could be made less formidable by combining several in one question, with the wording

"Has there been any change in any of the following?"

If so, give details."

He suggested there should be a maximum of 15 questions to ensure they were answered seriously.

Mr CINCOTTI was not happy that some of the questions were more precise than those asked for initial admission. In addition, some questions were relevant for admission only. The meeting then began to discuss the possibility of having two separate but related Questionnaires, one for admission and one for reconfirmation, both designed to simplify the procedure for all concerned. The one for admission would be more detailed, that for reconfirmation could then be simplified by asking primarily for information on changes.

Mr FRANCIS suggested it would be useful to invite archives to include the answers to the questionnaire in their Annual Reports. If the information was forthcoming annually, then the Reconfirmation procedure itself would be easier. Mrs BOWSER thought it was essential to have some kind of Questionnaire that was filled in systematically, to provide comparative reference points every five years on the evolution of an archive.

Mr SPEHR pointed out that the only effective way to assess a questionnaire was to use it and see if the form of the questions elicited the information required. He envisaged a Reconfirmation process where one only needed to

answer the questionnaire and attach copies of certain existing documents; in that case, the existing burden of writing one's own report would be eliminated.

The EC then reviewed the draft Questionnaire and determined what would be needed for Admission only and what for Reconfirmation.

Decisions :

Mr DAUDELIN agreed to supply new drafts to the Secretariat within a week
Mrs VAN DER ELST to use it for the next batch of Reconfirmations:

- carried fwd: Bucarest, Beijing, Lausanne, Havana.
- new: Lisbonne, Los Angeles (AFI), Pyong Yang, Montevideo (CU)

4 FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr BORDE presented the Interim Accounts for the year 1986 and anticipated that for the whole year there would be no significant imbalance between income and expenditure.

Reviewing the payment of subscriptions, he noted that Bucarest, which owed for the years 1983 - 1986 inclusive, was the only archive with payments outstanding from before 1986. For 1986, 6 Members and 14 Observers had still not paid, although several traditionally paid at the end of the year. The budgeted income from Publications (nearly 3 times the income for 1985) had turned out to be too optimistic but income so far exceeded last year's total. The final payment from Unesco had been received and was on target after taking into account the changing dollar exchange rate.

On expenditure, they were comfortably on course except that the figure for Office Supplies & Equipment was way over budget as they had invested 142,000 Belgian francs on a new photocopier with improved facilities. Under Special Expenses, he noted the publication of the Volkmann document under Special Publications, training of the Secretariat staff in the use of the new word processor under Training, and work on the Unesco Recommendation survey under Unesco Contracts Underway. Mrs VAN DER ELST later added that the total outgoings on Salaries would be less than budgeted because salaries were still blocked by the government.

5 REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

5.1 Cataloguing Commission

The Commission had not met since Canberra and no Report had been submitted. Mr KLAUE reported that the next meeting would be held in GDR immediately before the Berlin Congress.

On the survey of nitrate films of the sound period, Mrs VAN DER ELST reported the response had been good: many archives had asked for cards and over 6,000 had already been returned.

5.2 Documentation Commission

5.2a New Commission Head

Mrs WIBOM referred to the letter from Mrs STAYKOVA regretting that she had to resign as Head of the Commission for health reasons and proposing, after consultation with Karen Jones, Vice President of the Commission, the appointment of Ms Michelle Snapes of the National Film Archive London as her successor. Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Karen Jones had said she was too busy and would probably soon have to resign from the Commission herself.

Mr FRANCIS regretted that, because Ms Snapes was his deputy, as long as he was a member of the EC himself he could not allow her to accept a post which required her attendance at the EC. This was because under the terms of her appointment it was agreed that they would not both be away from the Archive at the same time for more than a day or so at a time. Mrs BOWSER suggested the problem might be overcome by having the Head of the Commission delegate attendance at the EC to another Commission member. From her knowledge of the Commission members, she saw no other solution as the only possible candidates were too new. As there seemed to be no alternative candidates, Mr FRANCIS said he could authorise Ms Snapes' appointment if someone else could stand in for her at EC meetings; alternatively, as he himself had served on the EC for many years, he would be willing to stand down at the elections in Berlin. As a final possibility, Mr FRANCIS suggested he might arrange for Ms Snapes to attend the EC on the single day when Commission matters were discussed but this would be expensive and probably impractical for distant meetings; however, he would probably have to ask for some financial assistance from FIAF for that.

In the discussion, he and others felt the "one-day visit" would not be satisfactory for her, the EC or the Commission. Mr SPEHR pointed out that she would also need to present the Report to the GA and it was important for the Head to be around long enough to have contact with the members.

Mr KLAUE stressed it was important to have an acting Chairman at least for the period up to Berlin and it was agreed to ask Ms Jones, as Vice President, to take over.

The EC considered other possibilities including that of finding someone who would act for an interim period of, say, two years until someone had a chance to build up experience. When asked, Mrs BOWSER felt she could not accept such a role. In considering possibilities from outside the existing Commission, Mr CINCOTTI suggested Mrs Dolores Devesa from Madrid would be an effective Commission Head but she would first need experience of Commission work. Mr SCHOU pointed out that he had no experience of Commission work at the time of his appointment but it was felt that his circumstances were different. It was agreed that there was no reason why individuals from Observer archives should not be invited to serve on Commissions.

Decisions :

- EC to acknowledge resignation and express appreciation for Mrs STAYKOVA's contributions.
- Consider alternatives in informal discussion and make a decision later in the EC meeting.

Discussion on Day 3

Mrs VAN DER ELST had telephoned Mrs Jones who agreed to continue as Vice President and come to Berlin provided a solution was found then.

Action: EC Members to search for a longterm solution meanwhile.

5.2b Commission Report

The EC then reviewed the Report prepared by Karen Jones.

Point 2: Directory of Cinematographers, Set and Costume Designers

Mrs WIBOM reported that her staff were so unhappy at the number of errors in the Swedish section of Volume 6 that they felt it should be withdrawn. This was especially disappointing as the archive staff had provided considerable help and cooperation to the editing team when they were in Sweden. Mr KLAUE was surprised as he understood the manuscripts were normally sent to the archive in question for final comments and corrections before being sent to the publishers. Mr KULA felt it was important to establish whether the vetting procedure by the national archive had occurred and in addition to obtain some objective estimate of the magnitude of the errors: was it professional paranoia or was there really an inadmissible percentage of errors? He felt 10% was acceptable in a work of this kind. Mrs WIBOM confirmed that they were already preparing a list of errors.

Mr KLAUE mentioned during the discussion that negotiations were in progress for the whole series to be prepared on computer to simplify subsequent updating.

Point 9: Bibliography on Film Archives

In response to Mr KULA, Mr KLAUE explained that, in addition to the Unesco Survey, it would be useful to use the Secretariat's new equipment to maintain an up-to-date bibliography of current publications relating to archive work. There was no intention to include historical material. He hoped the Documentation Commission would define the categories of publications to be included.

5.2c Periodicals Indexing Project (PIP)

Mr FRANCIS suggested a brief informal review within the EC before the arrival of the Editor, Mr Moulds, the next day and gave the background to the present situation, in particular the crisis over premises and the fact that Mr Moulds had been asking the Secretariat for various unscheduled loans.

i Premises

The lease had run out in September and the rent was to be doubled (which was reasonable given the time period). In the summer, Mr Moulds had asked him for advice and he had suggested he continue to sit tight after expiry of the lease, without formally renewing, so that they could decide what to do at the EC meeting. At the same time they had both started to search for alternative accommodation. The urgency depended on the landlords' attitude. They would probably not attempt to evict before Christmas, perhaps by the end of January. PIP might have to pay at the increased rate for the months following the expiry of the old lease.

ii Financial Situation

As he could not reach any EC members at the time, he suggested to Ms Snapes that she act as Chairperson to a special discussion on PIP at the meeting of the Documentation Commission in Pordenone and asked her to prepare her own view of the last 5 years and a projection for the next 5 years. She estimated about £13,000 was needed to clear all debts. For the future, based on past experience and the new rent, there would be a probable shortfall of £5,000 per year, after allowing for continued supporter contributions over the next 5 years and some increase in sales.

There were two factors which could change the situation and actually eliminate the shortfall in the future: better distribution and decrease in rent.

iii Other Factors

Meanwhile other factors were complicating the situation:

- *staff*: the full-time staff member would be leaving to join the BFI: when and how should she be replaced ?
- *computer situation*: should they purchase, negotiate new arrangement with Infodoc, hope for 'gift' via Mrs WIBOM's contacts or decide only after decision on Saur ?
- *alternative distributors*: St James's Press were unsatisfactory.

Mr Spiess and Mr Moulds had had a preliminary meeting with Saur (see below)

and Mr FRANCIS recalled that there was still the long-term (2 years?) possibility of working with the BFI but this could not be done before computerisation because of the differences in their requirements.

- *alternative funding*: Mrs WIBOM had tried to find outside international funding. She had contacted SIDA (?), IBM (for a computer), the Volkswagen Foundation and Unesco and she felt at least two would come forward, if only through the purchase of subscriptions for their offices.

Discussion of Saur

Mr KLAUE reported that the publisher Saur had shown interest in the project, (both the annual volume and the microfiche index) as it fitted their activities. They were not so happy about the efficiency of having an office in London with publication in Munich but would examine more carefully. They felt the project could be self-financing and possibly even profitable, as they have sufficient clients who place blanket standing orders for all their publications, including clients from parts of the world which FIAF was hardly touching. Spiess was ready to continue negotiations with Saur in cooperation with Mr Moulds; they still have to consider the details of financing and the return for FIAF (eg free copies only or royalties).

Mr DAUDELIN noted that Saur's catalogue indicated they specialised in very expensive publications of the directory type, addressed primarily to universities and institutions. According to Mr Moulds, they were very successful worldwide. Mr KLAUE mentioned they did all publications for IFLA who had a large publishing programme; this of course gave them standing with their several thousand library members worldwide. They use the most modern printing technology and would need the data preparation to be on a computer that was compatible.

The Set Designers' Directory should be very profitable for them as they had no costs: FIAF was doing all the work in return for some 100 free copies. For PIP, it would have to be on a different basis: for a start there would be office and staff costs.

Mr KLAUE stressed that it was important someone from the EC should stay in touch with the negotiations.

Action: Mr FRANCIS suggested that Mr Moulds should be asked to present the PIP report and answer the detailed questions himself. He was willing to participate in the negotiations with Saur but he felt the formal case should be prepared by Mr Moulds and formally presented first to himself and someone else on the EC (perhaps the Treasurer).

End of Day 1

Mrs WIBOM opened Day 2 with a welcome to Mr Moulds, PIP Editor, who had travelled overnight from London to join the meeting.

PIP Editor's Report

Mr Mould presented his November 86 Report under the following headings: office, annual volumes, computer, staff and future prospects, including comments on pricing. Annexes showed interim budget for 1986, draft budgets for the years 1987-1990, based on move to cheaper premises and with annual price increases, and the names of the 16 supporters, 48 subscribers and 4 non-paying users.

At the present rate of sales, the yearly deficit would continue to be about £5,000 but it was felt sales could be increased with better marketing and a more attractive pricing policy.

An arrangement with Saur looked potentially attractive, both financially and technically. The computer firm they used (Computaprint in London, part of Reed International) were already doing the same kind of work on a large scale and in particular had experience of multi-lingual accents and symbols. They had a large customer base so sales should increase although no estimates had been made at this stage. Instead of only paying royalties on cash received, they were willing to pay an agreed fixed sum monthly, which should overcome the cash flow problems.

Mr KLAUE suggested the only solution was to make a deal with Saur but subject to the following:

- it remained known as a FIAF project
- it was edited from a London office
- all FIAF expenses should be reimbursed
- the supporters system should be discontinued
- contract staff should be employed by FIAF, not Saur.

Until a deal was made, FIAF would need to meet any deficits but they should set a time limit for the negotiations. He suggested the EC should appoint a small team to negotiate with Saur and hope to arrive at a deal which would enable the project to survive and Saur to make an acceptable profit. FIAF should negotiate to cover all its costs but he felt it was not realistic to expect any profit on top.

Mr FRANCIS suggested Saur might want to increase the price to bring it more in line with their other products. It was important to ensure that FIAF members, who did the work, should continue to get copies at around current levels. Mrs BOWSER felt this would not be a problem as for other publications Saur provided FIAF with free copies for their members. In considering potential sales, Mr SPEHR felt the very small number of USA sales bore witness to the inadequate efforts of St James Press; he could think of some half dozen institutions in Baltimore alone who he would expect to be interested. At this point, Mr MOULDS reported that he thought a competitive product, the Film Literature Index, had already creamed off the best of the US market.

The EC pooled its knowledge of the Film Literature Index as follows:

- covers 120 publications, compared with 170 by PIP
- includes more non-film publications, including US newspapers
- mostly English, with some French and Italian, not truly international
- provides author and title only, with no synopses
- much more limited use of subject headings
- produced by New York State University at Albany
- cheaper at \$225 (produced on University computer with student labour)
- were nearly 2 years out of date but now plan to publish first 1986 issue in December so have almost caught up
- only the few specialised film libraries would consider buying both publications

Mr Moulds was not too hopeful of a successful deal with Saur. Unless they could sell many more copies, he could not see why they would be interested in a project which had been running at a loss for so long and was already being bought by everyone who wanted it.

In trying to establish the current position and liabilities, it was suggested:

- the departing staff member should not be replaced for the moment; Infodoc should be paid to do the inputting needed to complete the year.
- FIAF should write off the deficit of approximately £10,000 that had accumulated over the 15-year life of the project.
- FIAF should attempt to negotiate with Saur for reimbursement of part or all of the deficits for 1986 and 1987, depending on the date of the deal
- FIAF members and supporters should not be asked for any more increases, either through their PIP or their FIAF subscription, except perhaps as appropriate to inflation.
- a deal with Saur was one alternative to the present deficit-incurring situation but they should also continue to explore other alternatives, eg subsidies from outside bodies
- any final decision, especially any deal with Saur, would need the approval of the GA
- even if they decided to terminate the project altogether, they would have to meet commitments at least for 1986 and 1987, so essential decisions had to be made about the office, staff and computer processing, to enable work to continue at least until the Berlin Congress in May and probably till end 1987.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that there were many possible options which depended on the time scale adopted:

- office

They could stay put for a few months more and risk legal proceedings rather than enter into a commitment of some 3 to 5 years on new premises; or find short term accommodation with the inconvenience of changing addresses for all the publications and the moving costs; or accept a deal that involved availability of a computer. The Imperial War Museum might be able to help.

- staff and computer decisions

They had to compare costs and benefits of replacing assistant (with attendant costs of recruiting and training) versus continued use of Infodoc computer at new rates; or purchase of own computer.

A working group comprising Mrs WIBOM, Mr FRANCIS, Mr KLAUE, MR SPIESS and Mrs VAN DER ELST was then appointed to work in association with Mr Moulds to negotiate with Saur and at the same time to find a satisfactory way of working till the Berlin Congress in May and in particular to decide on the following:

- immediate solutions to office, staff and computer problems
 - search for suitable property with commitment for 3 - 4 years
 - engage 1 staff member on temporary basis only.
- subsidy: continue to explore other possibilities.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out the negotiations would be complex and to avoid delays they would need clear, written guidelines from the EC.

Decision: Guidelines were agreed as follows:

- lease Duration: say 3 - 4 years. Annual rental: say £4,500
- staffing With subscriptions already in for 1987, they would need staffing at least to mid-1988 for the 1987 microfiches and the annual volume. Replace staff member on temporary contract with option for renewal.

In answer to a query from Mrs ORBANZ, Mr Moulds confirmed that the subscriptions had been increased for everyone except the supporters, as follows:

Film from £385 to £405

Television from £165 to £180.

The supporters were still paying £480 but any additional contributions less than that would of course be welcome.

5.3 Preservation Commission

Dr SCHOU presented his Report and thanked Mr KLAUE for providing hospitality for recent Commission and Sub-Commission meetings. The next meeting would be hosted by Koblenz (May 25-27, after the Berlin Congress).

Membership

Mr KARR had had to resign owing to pressure of work but was interested to keep in touch with the work of the Commission. He had recommended Peter Williamson as Chairman of the North American Sub-Commission and Mrs BOWSER confirmed that they would be delighted for him to accept. There was an error on the recent Sub-Commission members' list: Mr Robert Gitt worked for UCLA and had not yet formally accepted.

Mr SCHOU wanted to collect information from EC and other personal contacts

on individuals who might form a "reserve pool" of qualified and active people who might be able to contribute to preservation projects.

Financial problems

As always a major problem was budgeting for travel and staying costs for meetings, in particular the travel costs which inevitably fell unfairly on the remoter archives. They were grateful to the archives who were bearing these costs and he asked that FIAF should write a letter of appreciation to Mr Gilmour of his own archive for his significant contributions (including \$11,000 for his present trip) and for agreeing to support one trip per year. There would however be a problem if another representative from the NFSA was elected to the EC.

Action: FIAF (Mrs WIBOM ?) to write to Mr Gilmour.

Project Information

Dr SCHOU introduced their new Project Progress Reports which they thought would be more useful for EC members and others than the detailed Minutes of technical meetings. They were still trying to find ways to ensure that information actually reached the technicians instead of staying on the bookshelves of Curators.

There were some 29 projects in progress but he reported to the EC primarily on those which had reached the stage where reports were being circulated to the membership.

i Volkman document

He was now happy to defend its contents but there were some glaring errata; he was encouraging all users to assist in compiling the list and was eager to receive user comments whether for or against. Mr SPEHR felt that in view of the long gestation of the book it might be useful to make some comment to the members on the validity of its present contents.

ii "Handbook for film archives"

He hoped to have his text ready by end December.

iii PC Technical Manual

Mrs Devesa had offered to provide Spanish translation of the two existing papers; Mrs VAN DER ELST was coordinating French version with Mr Schmitt; Mr Karnstadt had already completed the German version.

Mr Schmitt was producing the next 3 papers, together with accompanying slides, and they should be ready for distribution in Berlin. The East Europeans had prepared a paper on keeping films clean in archive laboratories. The Czechs were reporting on some 2000 tests on treatment against bacteria and fungi. Mr Karnstadt from the Preservation Commission and Mr Schultz from Cataloguing were cooperating on "Guidelines for the description of technical data on film and video material in film archives" (19pp incl bibliography) and

Mr KULA was asked if he could contribute to the video section.

They planned to publish an update of Harold Brown's 1967 paper on identification of early film stock illustrated with quality photographs. Mrs BOWSER volunteered to review the manuscript and make possible contributions in the light of her own recent research and Mr FRANCIS suggested Mr Alan Lacasse from the Godereau project might have additional information.

From Kodak they had received a recent research paper on film restoration by tri-separation printing and would be publishing information on this in the Bulletin. He asked Mr DE VAAL if they could agree some way of cooperation for technical papers to be automatically notified to the Commission so they could give their comments in the same or a subsequent issue. He recalled a previous article which had been published anonymously in the Technical Column and could have misled readers into thinking it was by or at least approved by the Preservation Commission. They would also like to have had the opportunity to comment on the paper on the "freeze-thaw cycle" in the last issue.

iv Black and white safety stock

Dr SCHOU referred to the shocking discovery that this stock could no longer be considered satisfactory archival material. He was pleased to report that several organisations were interested to do research and they had prepared a questionnaire for initial data collection:

- Image Permanence Institute

This newly-formed part of the Rochester Institute of Technology (funded by George Eastman, National Geographic, National Archives, the Smithsonian and the Society of Photographic Scientists & Engineers) had asked him to suggest projects for their 4 staff.

- University of Manchester

Professor Jim Allan, a leading international polymer expert, claimed one could now stop decomposition of nitrate film without putting it in cold storage. The NFA had put up £1500 for 3 years research and Kodak were willing to contribute provided the research also considered the "vinegar syndrome".

- Agfa in Antwerp, Belgium

They were also interested in researching the problem and had been in touch with Mrs ORBANZ.

v colour stability research

The EEPSC had done washing and artificial ageing tests with some striking results but they were uncertain whether or how to publish results because of the political implications within the industry.

vi Proceedings of Technicolor Symposium, New York 1985

He understood Peter Williamson would not be publishing the proceedings as

the material was too sensitive. He pointed out that the report on Becky Sharp had already appeared in the American Cinematographer, although admittedly without technical detail.

vii Multiple generation printing tests

They were compiling an assessment of the Bois d'Arcy results shown in Canberra and would be preparing slides for distribution.

viii Cold storage

As a follow-on from the 1978 symposium, the North American Sub-Commission had not met separately but, as members of FAAC, had reported on a cold storage discussion of the Film and Television Archives Advisory Committees.

ix Joint FIAT/FIAF Stockholm Proceedings

Dr SCHOU reported considerable interest in some of these papers and was assured by Mr KULA that there should be no objection from FIAT or the authors to have translations made (eg from French to English). Mr FRANCIS reported FIAT still had some 600 copies and it was agreed efforts should be made to distribute them as widely as possible. Mrs ORBANZ said it was planned to make them available at the Berlin Congress.

Future Action

- His final Commission Report would be submitted for the next Bulletin.
- Updated Project Reports would be sent individually to EC members, Curators and Senior Technicians.
- He had obtained funding to fly Harold Brown (and his wife) to Canberra for 3 months to work on preservation projects, including making educational videos of Harold demonstrating laboratory techniques.

Mrs WIBOM thanked Dr SCHOU and asked him to express the thanks of the EC to all his associates.

6 PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

In the reports below, "Target" indicates estimated date for "printer-ready copy".

6.1 Embryo 3 (New York)

Mrs BOWSER distributed a report from Mr Magliozzi, including the proposed draft layout which had been vetted by the Documentation Commission. She thought it would be a very marketable product and, now it was on a computer, future editions would be easier to handle.

Target: January 1, 1987.

6.2 Silent Film Catalogue (Brussels)

Mrs VAN DER ELST read Mr Ledoux's progress report of November 18 indicating

that the number of titles had increased from 4264 to 5899. She hoped it would be ready for distribution at Berlin.

It was thought it would be interesting to include some estimate of the percentage of total production for the period covered. Mr KLAUE mentioned that in Germany production was running at 300 titles a year.

Action: On % estimates ...who ????

Target: Early 1987.

6.3 Vienna Historical Symposium Papers (Wien FA)

Mrs ORBANZ reported that because of "internal problems" she had been advised the manuscripts would not be ready before December. They would then be sent to Brussels for translation and publication.

Mr KLAUS recalled that the original agreement had been that Vienna would publish the German version themselves and provide a rough translation into English so FIAF could edit and publish the English version. He suggested they should wait for the manuscripts before deciding whether and how much to translate: perhaps those who were really interested in the subject, would do their own translations and/or be able to read the German.

From their experience on this occasion, he suggested that for future symposia the EC should have a very clear written agreement with the host archive on who was to be responsible for what, defining responsibility for different language versions (if any), and agreeing deadlines.

Decision:

Add to Congress Guidelines reminder to agree in writing arrangements for publication of Symposium Papers.

Target: Early 1987.

6.4 New York Slapstick Symposium Papers (New York)

Mrs BOWSER reported the project should be finished in 1987 (probably the latter half); contributors had a deadline of December 1986 to complete their revisions.

Target: Early/mid 1987, for distribution by end of year.

6.5 Bibliography of Catalogues of Old Cinematographic Equipment (Montreal)

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that the project was continuing but there was nothing special to report.

6.6 Revision of "Handbook for Film Archives" (E Bowser/J Kuiper)

Mrs BOWSER reported she and Mr Kuiper had had a preliminary planning meeting pending the arrival of the chapters from the Commissions due in December. It could probably be published in 1987 subject to appropriate provision in the FIAF Publications budget; she would liaise with Mrs VAN DER

ELST on printing requirements (quality, number of copies, etc).

Target : ? Mid 1987 for publication by end of year

6.7 Glossary of Laboratory Terms (P Spehr)

Mr SPEHR mentioned that the staff member concerned had just returned from a 6-month sabbatical and was making a final revision; meanwhile, he had brought the existing draft for Dr SCHOU to examine.

Target : 1988 ?

6.8 FIAF Bulletin (J de Vaal)

Mr DE VAAL asked for comments from the EC on the Bulletin and noted the main problem as always was lack of contributions. Mrs WIBOM confirmed how much she appreciated the Bulletin and felt it was difficult for many to write in a foreign language. Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that the Editorial Committee were very willing to help with language problems.

Mr SPEHR also appreciated the Bulletin content but mentioned that the use of coloured paper, which improved the appearance, made it difficult to xerox successfully for distribution among the staff. Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned they printed 200 and distributed 2 to Members, 1 to Observers, but could distribute more if wanted.

Action : Additional copies to Mr SPEHR & Mr SCHOU; 3 copies to Member archives represented on the EC.

6.9 Statistics on Film Archive Activities (W Klaue/S Kula)

Mr KLAUE confirmed he agreed with the final version produced by Mr KULA but they recommended no further action yet as the membership was being snowed under with questionnaires. He suggested however that the questions should be used when the request for Annual Reports went out, to enable them to formalise statistical data on acquisitions, preservation work etc.

Mrs WIBOM asked that in future questionnaires should be dated (not just the accompanying letter) to make it easier to keep track of information and changes.

Action : Mrs VAN DER ELST to include relevant questions with Annual Report letter to be sent out in December.

6.10 Catalogue of Silent Newsreels (F Kahlenberg/Koblenz)

Mrs ORBANZ reported that she had obtained no further information on the project from Dr Kahlenberg and had not been able to reach Mr ALHO who had also been interested. Mr KLAUE felt it should be dropped as after 3 years they had still not even seen a project description. Mr FRANCIS was reluctant to drop it as the basic idea had merit and he would first like the views of the Cataloguing Commission on what might be attempted.

Action : Mr SPEHR to ask Mrs HARRISON to report on Cataloguing Commission's views and/or bring specific project proposal to Berlin.

6.11 Summer School 1987 (W Klaue)

Mr KLAUE summarised his report confirming that the Summer School would be held in Berlin from April 26 to May 16, ie immediately before the Congress. They had taken the advice of previous participants and were offering a more specialised programme in the second week, with a choice of 2 working groups (preservation or cataloguing/documentation). It would be offered in English and German with the possibility of other languages if needed.

The fee to participants would be \$400, the remaining costs being borne by his archive and a subsidy of US\$15,000 from Unesco, most of which would go on travelling costs from developing countries.

The other non-governmental organisations (IASA, IFLA, ICA, FIAT) had expressed an interest in publicising the School to their members but he thought they would have more than enough candidates through their own contacts from regional seminars in Africa and Asia, missions and recommendations from Unesco. Mrs BOWSER asked that the National Film Centre, Tokyo, should also be invited.

Action: Circular letter to Members. Selection of candidates, if necessary, by Mr KLAUE in consultation with the President and Secretariat.

6.12 Canberra Restoration Symposium Papers (NFSA/FIAF)

Mr EDMONDSON had written they would be working on them early in 1987 and hoped to get some additional funding from the Australian Film Commission.

During the break for lunch, EC members had the opportunity to see the video of the archive film made for the Cineteca Nazionale, Roma, which was greatly appreciated.

Non-agenda item:**Circular letter to members about the next EC election**

After lunch, Mrs VAN DER ELST asked for approval of the French and English texts to be sent to members asking them to nominate candidates, as agreed at the last GM.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to distribute, subject to minor changes agreed.

7 AMENDMENT OF FIAF STATUTES & RULES
(including new election system)

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that the complete texts, highlighting the proposed changes, had been circulated. Of the 10 archives who replied, 5 had indicated their approval virtually without comment: Prague, Budapest, Cineteca Nacional Mexico, Frankfurt and Oslo. He then reported on the various suggestions, as below.

Articles are identified by number, preceded by S (Statutes) or R (Rules).

S4: Mr Stenklev of Oslo queried the use of "indeed" but Mr FRANCIS pointed out that it was an appropriate translation of "même". No change.

S16: Moscow suggested the Federation was getting larger so the EC members should be increased from 13 to 15. No change.

S13f: Lisbon suggested Commissions should be mentioned earlier, perhaps in S3. No change.

R106: Lisbon felt this was too much of a burden but text only says "ask"! No change.

R77: Commission Membership

Stockholm wanted to limit the period of service of Commission Heads and Members to, for example, 2 x 5 years or 3 x 2 years. Mr CINCOTTI recalled this matter had already been discussed and, though the idea of a time limit was rejected, the EC had to reconsider the Heads every year.

Mr KLAUE felt Commission projects needed continuity and members should be able to remain as long as they are active on specific projects. However, he cited the example of Mr Krautz who was committed to a life-long project and acknowledged that one could work on a Commission project without necessarily remaining a member of the Commission.

Mr KULA referred to common public service practice and suggested the existence of each Commission should be reviewed periodically, say every 5 years, and all members discharged. One could then nominate a new Commission which may or may not include previous members. Mr SCHOU felt 5 years was too long to carry deadweight. He would prefer to negotiate with individual members on their proposed contribution, asking them to set their own deadlines and targets, on the understanding that if they did not meet such commitments and had no legitimate excuse, they would stand down.

Mr FRANCIS suggested Commission members should be reconfirmed annually like Observer archives. In addition to the Commission activity report for the EC and the GA, the Head should be asked to prepare a private report, for the EC only, on the Commission membership. On the basis of this, the EC would formally reconfirm each individual, or not, as the case might be. If it felt unable to reconfirm, then the Commission Head should be first asked to discuss the situation with the member concerned. As members were neither employed nor paid by the Commission Head, it might be easier in difficult situations if the reconfirmation decision was seen to be taken by the EC rather than the Head.

Mrs ORBANZ stressed that Commission members all had other jobs so it was difficult to eliminate them for not meeting deadlines. She would like some compromise allowing members to stay on to complete a project even if their theoretical term of service had elapsed. Mr KLAUE supported Mr KULA's recommendation that one should adopt the total review system at longer time intervals. Only in this way would one achieve the injection of new blood.

Mr KULA pointed out the subjective and political element that crept in to the appointments, even though members were meant to be serving as individuals, not as representatives of different parts of the world.

Mrs WIBOM felt the present system, even with frequent reconfirmation, encouraged the view that, once on a Commission, one stayed there for ever. She felt archives would be more willing to let their staff serve on Commissions if it was known to be for a specific time period only and not a permanent burden.

Mrs BOWSER stressed that there were so few people who had both the talent and the resources in the archive behind them to undertake Commission work that one couldn't afford to let them go. She felt the present annual approval was sufficient. There were certainly people who it would be difficult to dislodge but each case was different and she saw no way a change in legislation could help.

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the text of Rule 77, objecting to "list..considered.. every year"; he mentioned that in his years on the EC the Commission members had never been "considered" as required by the present Rule; he would like to extend to 2 years in line with the new proposal for reconfirming Observers. He suggested amending the text to:

"The Head and Members of the Commission must be confirmed by the EC every two years."

Mrs ORBANZ suggested one should say "named" instead of "confirmed", stressing the option to introduce totally new names. Mr SCHOU suggested the text should say "the Head presents nominations for membership and recommendations for changes of membership". It was agreed, however, that the text proposed by Mr CINCOTTI provided sufficient flexibility. Mr FRANCIS pointed out, in addition, that there was nothing in the rules to limit the size of the Commission or to prevent members being co-opted, perhaps for a probationary period.

Decision: Recommend Mr CINCOTTI's amendment; start the reconfirmation procedure in Berlin.

Comments sent by Mrs ORBANZ, Berlin, FRG

R17: Mrs ORBANZ thought it would be difficult to expect deleted members to pay for the deleted years; it was pointed out that this would only apply for one year, since after two years they could re-apply as if new applicants.

R72: Mrs ORBANZ felt the extension was harsher than before but in fact the "next" General Assembly applied to the GA in the following calendar year.

Comments sent by Mr Schmitt, Bois d'Arcy

S1a/b: He suggested one should say in French "collectes"(= action) rather than "collections" (= things collected)

S1d: He suggests "assurer" is beyond their competence and would prefer

"encourager" or "promouvoir". Mr CINCOTTI, Mr BORDE and others preferred to keep "assurer" as it was part of an aim, not an obligation to achieve.

S2: "At present" should precede "in Belgium".

S4: He suggested the change from "cinémathèque" to "archive" was a change of policy and implied exclusion of those organisations which survived thanks to their projections. Mr BORDE thought the word "cinémathèque" was widely misused and applied to many organisations which had no collection at all.

Action: Mr BORDE to explain to Mr Schmitt the reason for the change.

S16: Mr Schmitt felt the "il/elle" option was too cumbersome and the Francophones agreed. Mr FRANCIS and Mr SPEHR felt it was important to keep the option in the English at least. Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that official documents in Canada bore witness to the problem, some even using the feminine form only. Some Anglophones thought that, if the options were removed from the French as the official text, this would provide a rationalisation to omit them in English, but Mr KULA felt the English text should nevertheless reflect the sensibilities of the present climate.

Decision: Later it was agreed to precede the whole text with a relevant note.

S22d & f: He suggested it would be prudent to add "with the consent of the EC or officers.." but it was felt they would be glad to take the money with or without prior consent!

S26: He suggested "audio-visuel" as it would be difficult to find another international film organisation to take over. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that S1 contained a wide definition of "film" which would cover this point.

R77/78: He claims not indicated who or how members are chosen but see R77.

R95/2.2: He wanted advance agreement on each occasion but Mr CINCOTTI felt this would be a step backwards and recalled that the text had been agreed after long discussions among the archives most affected.

R101-6: He suggests changing "copie" (and occasionally "film") to "matériel filmique" throughout. Mrs WIBOM felt this was again covered by the definition of film in S1.

Mr FRANCIS drew attention to:

R2: Applications have to be "in one of the official languages": he suggested it would be more practical to ask for this to be "in English or French" as they had no facilities to handle applications in Russian.

Decision: Agreed.

Mr CINCOTTI drew attention to:

R12 & 14: He said that if new candidates came from a country where there was an Observer, the EC had to ask the Observer's opinion but nothing similar is required where there is a Member; the candidate simply has to present the countersigned promise of collaboration.

Decision: Include note that EC to ask opinion of existing Member.

8 RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

8.1 Unesco

8.1a Unesco Survey

Mr KLAUE reported on progress so far and asked for comments on the Appendices, the Report Outline and in particular invited suggestions for Unesco's new long term programme for 1990-1996.

FIAT had sent out 212 questionnaires, received 66 replies (about 31%) and issued a further 100 reminders. He urged the EC members to ensure their own archives responded. FIAT had also sent out questionnaires to their own contacts and they would coordinate the analyses of responses.

About 85% of the work on the Appendices had been completed. They knew without waiting for the replies that much of what had been recommended in Vienna had already been implemented so they should now pool their experience to make suggestions for consideration at the Experts' Meeting in Paris 1988 and for incorporation into the 1990-96 programme. They should not be concerned with budgeting implications at this stage.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said Unesco had already paid the money promised for the project. The original deadline was December 1986 but they had flexibility till June 1987. She paid tribute to Mr KLAUE who had done all the work so far.

Suggestions for long-term programme

Mr KLAUE summarised the problems of developing regions, especially parts of Africa and the Middle East where there were often no archives at all. There was therefore a need:

- for propaganda to have archives created
- for training
- for regional centres with technical facilities for preservation

Mrs BOWSER mentioned the importance of distributing FIAT publications in developing countries and Mrs VAN DER ELST spoke of the difficulty of knowing how to ensure they reached the right hands. Mr KULA said this could be overcome if the 1980 Recommendation was fully implemented as it called for the establishment in every region of some organisation responsible for, and capable of carrying out, conservation of the moving image heritage.

Mrs ORBANZ suggested there should be a smaller working group to develop proposals, including Mr KLAUE, Mr NAIR and people who had relevant experience. Mrs WIBOM recommended enlisting the help of Members and Observers from developing countries.

Mr FRANCIS felt there were two continually recurring problems which should

take priority, both concerning difficulties of obtaining supplies:

- film stock: was Mr Arnaldo pursuing this already ?
- apparatus: some method was needed to overcome local import regulations and inflated prices of central importers. If the "Unesco voucher system" was a viable solution, then people needed more information about it. He felt these problems were not primarily financial and could both be solved by an international initiative that Unesco could bring about if it chose to. Mr SPEHR referred to the related problem that, even if they obtained the equipment, institutions had no trained staff capable of ensuring it was properly maintained or repaired.

Mr KLAUE said Mr Arnaldo envisaged a meeting with film stock manufacturers in connection with the Experts' Meeting in Paris. This would give FIAF time to collect figures about archives' potential needs of different kinds of film stock, the particular customs and technical problems encountered. It had been decided it would be too early to discuss it in Berlin. He suggested that at the next EC meeting they should start thinking about planning for the Experts' Meeting in 1988 as nothing had been decided yet about how it should be handled as Unesco would certainly be asking questions about it in Berlin.

Decision : Mr KLAUE to continue work on the documents for June deadline. Parts to be discussed at the next EC meeting, especially sections on proposed future activities and innovations in the archive world since 1980.

8.1b Solomon Islands material

Unesco had provided a grant of \$6,500 and asked the Library of Congress in coordination with FIAF for help in obtaining further funding for copying historical footage from nitrate to safety stock and/or video. Mr SPEHR mentioned it was footage held by the Library of Congress and shot by Martin Johnson, 1918-1920. Unfortunately, it was mixed with footage from other countries and the main problem was not the copying but the identification. The present plan was to bring over someone from the Solomon Islands to view the film together with ethnologists who might be able to identify footage from other countries. The Library of Congress would pay for the actual copying and FIAF would not need to get involved.

8.1c Venezuelan Government request for expert

Unesco had forwarded a request for a Spanish-speaking expert to visit the Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela (former FIAF member) in 1987 to evaluate it and make recommendations for development of a laboratory for conservation and restoration.

Decision : Mr KLAUE to ask Sao Paolo if Joao Socrates de Oliveira could go and to liaise with Unesco.

8.1d Centre Cinématographique Marocain

As requested by Unesco, Mrs VAN DER ELST had already made contact with them and Mr KLAUE suggested they should be invited to the Berlin Symposium.

8.1e Unesco contracts

Contracts had been signed for

- preparations for the meetings in Berlin (\$7,000 & \$30,000 in 1986 & 87)
- for \$2,000 with request to establish database on film archives, including bibliography, annual statistics, equipment and manufacturer lists, etc. most of which would be available as a result of the Survey.

8.1f Thailand/Sweden

Mrs WIBOM was pleased to report that further Unesco funding (\$5,000) had been found for Sweden to provide further training and equipment for Thailand. She had been there twice within a 6-month period and had been very impressed with their rate of progress. (Mr SCHOU said he was visiting them on the way back from Glasgow and Harold Brown was spending two weeks there). The official opening of the archive was scheduled for June 11, 1987.

In addition, Mr Arnaldo had said they could pay for someone to spend 4 weeks training in Stockholm on cataloguing, documentation and administration.

8.2 Council of Europe

Mrs WIBOM referred to meetings held in Athens and more recently in Rimini which had been attended by many from FIAF. She had explained that as an international organisation, FIAF, could not get involved with an organisation that represented so few countries (25 from Western Europe in Council of Europe). The Council wanted a meeting with all the European archives, including those outside the EEC, but had no money to invite them. The objective was to harmonise statutes, customs and import licences, and obtain the same status for film archives as art museums.

Mr BORDE and Mr CINCOTTI were uneasy about the selective composition of the group and compared it with FIAF's own groupings on regional or linguistic basis which were open to all.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that he had attended the Rimini meeting to find out if there was any possibility of funding for preservation for Council member countries. There was a substantial allocation for administration but none for preservation. He was interested however in their proposal to prepare annual statistics of archive budgets for presentation to the Council of Ministers, showing the extent to which they were keeping pace with inflation. He thought this would be a very useful idea for FIAF to adopt.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned she had attended in a personal capacity at the urgent encouragement of OIhi Alho, hoping she might get some funding for PIP.

Decision: Advise them of the beginning and end dates of FIAF activities in Berlin and suggesting they might like to contact the Europeans to suggest a meeting before or after. (Mrs WIBOM to telephone Charles Zegel)

8.3 Regional Seminar in Mozambique

Mr KLAUE reported that the seminar had provided a useful occasion to get to know representatives from small archives in the region in the early stages of setting up, including Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe and Zambia. It had not been a good idea to cover both film and television as there were fundamental points of disagreement on things like cataloguing and preservation.

He suggested the recommendations and list of participants should be published in the Bulletin. The papers were available in Brussels.

9 FUTURE CONGRESSES

9.1 1989 and later

For 1989, Mrs VAN DER ELST recalled that the Canberra minutes said the Lisbon symposium/symposia would have to be rediscussed at this meeting. In addition, the Lisbon invitation of 1985 was never actually accepted. Mr DAUDELIN said it was voted in New York and a letter should have been sent. **Decision** : Mr CINCOTTI to write to Luis de Pina to reconfirm and saying that the symposia would have to be finalised in Berlin.

For 1990, Mrs VAN DER ELST reminded the EC they would need to take a decision at Berlin: they had an invitation from Cuba to celebrate their 30th anniversary which had never been replied to. Mr DAUDELIN said that before accepting they should review the EC proposals made in London to ensure that regional equilibrium was being maintained. Montevideo was the only alternative possibility for 1990 but Mr DE VAAL pointed out the building was unlikely to be ready.

Mr DAUDELIN said a formal letter should be written to Cuba asking them to prepare a detailed dossier for discussion and decision in Berlin. Mr CINCOTTI said in view of our silence we should first ask them if they are still willing to be hosts in 1990. For the following years, it was suggested they should send courtesy letters but not preempt the decision of the GA which could only be taken 3 years in advance.

MRS VAN DER ELST asked if one should write to all the archives which had issued an invitation asking them to prepare a dossier saying why the congress should be held in their country, the dates and arrangements proposed and whatever would help in making a choice.

Action : Mrs VAN DER ELST to coordinate with Mr CINCOTTI.

9.2 1987: Berlin

Mrs ORBANZ reviewed the arrangements as follows:

- EC1 May 14-16 (arranged in quiet room)
 EC2 May 19, 7.30 pm (after the excursion) was the only possible time.
 She assumed Jill Johnson would interpret as usual
 GA Invitations had been sent to all Members and Observers with request for reply by February 15.
 250 hotel rooms had been reserved in total in 3 categories: at 78DM (Platze, 25rooms only) 92DM (Hotel Mark, opening November 86, recommended for the EC) and 134 DM (Excelsior), incl breakfast.
 All in the centre of the city within walking distance.
 There was a further possibility of rooms in private houses at 25DM per night which could be booked up to 8 weeks before the Congress, but they would be scattered throughout Berlin so less convenient.

- GA meeting room Room for only 150 people so might be crowded.
 Symposium room No problem as seats for 400 or 800.
 GA May 17 to May 19 midday (2 1/2 days)
 Excursion May 19 afternoon: symposium delegates also invited.

Symposium

There had been a very fruitful 2-day planning meeting in Berlin when they had agreed the draft programme (red sheet) and had a demonstration of the technical facilities in the meeting room. Mr SCHOU was coordinating the FIAF input. Translation would be provided for Spanish and German as well as English and French. A joint FIAF/FIAT/IASA letterhead had been prepared.

Publication

The Kinemathek would be responsible for transcribing the papers and parts of the discussion; the first draft would be circulated to FIAF, FIAT and IASA technical people for any necessary editing. They wanted to publish in 1988 so it was still up-to-date. She was not sure what help would be needed from FIAF for translation and/or printing. They needed to decide whether to publish in English only or in English and French. Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that translations were expensive and Mrs ORBANZ was happier at the idea of publishing in the language used by each speaker (French or English) instead of one language only.

They proposed a paper introducing the 3 Federations to the industry, stating how many members in each and including an estimate of their buying power (expenditure on building, equipment and copying film) so they would be more interested. IASA have 400 members and thought it might be difficult to get any useful financial data.

She mentioned in passing that Mr Schuler (?) of IASA mentioned that on some future occasion they would like to host another joint symposium, on "Carriers: quality, performance, etc"

Industry exhibition

They contacted companies at Photokina in Cologne in September and found there was considerable interest. They only have room for 18. She hoped to make the decisions before the end of the year. She thought it would be best if the exhibitors could be invited for 6 days.

End of Day 2

Unesco consultation: May 23/24, also at ICC

Mr KLAUE, Mrs VAN DER ELST and she had met Mr Arnaldo in Paris and discussed details of consultation of "users and manufacturers of equipment for television, film and sound archives". During this it became evident they should try to use the presence of so many experts in Berlin to have a parallel session on "curriculum development for the training of personnel in moving image and recorded sound archives", as discussed at the NGO Round Table. Unesco had offered FIAF \$30,000 for the first and hoped to find \$7,000 for the second (final decision January 1987), so they could help with staying costs but not travel costs.

For the first, there would be English/French translation. The format would be 2 days, starting with a general assembly and then divided into 3 working groups (FIAF, FIAT, IASA). In addition to archive experts, they planned to invite the exhibiting companies but keep a balance between industry and archives, with ideally a maximum of 30 people. They would also invite observers from organisations like SMPTE, BKSTS, AES, ICA, IFTC and possibly Uniatec and IFLA.

They had to nominate their own consultants (2) and experts (4) and suggested:

- Consultants: MM SCHOU and Socrates de Oliveira
- Experts: MM F Schmitt, D Francis, Gosfilmofond; NAIR or P Williamson

In the discussion, Mr KLAUE pointed out that as the UK and USA were no longer members of Unesco, it was especially important to give the names of experts from those countries well in advance to give time for clearance. Mr FRANCIS was hoping to bring members of his technical staff and, if so, would suggest one of these should replace him. Mr DAUDELIN asked if an invitation from Unesco would help Mr NAIR to get travel clearance from his government. Mr KLAUE said if Gosfilmofond were unable to supply anyone, they should keep a political balance by inviting someone from an Eastern European country.

For the 2-day curriculum consultation, the language would be English only. They envisaged a total of 15 (3 consultants, 10 experts and 1 representative from Unesco). The consultants (FIAF, FIAT/IASA, ICA) should present a basic paper and experts would be drawn from those 4 organisations plus CILECT and IFLA. They hoped to produce some recommendations. They suggested Mr KLAUE should be the FIAF consultant but had no suggestions for experts.

Invitations

She asked for advice on what additional invitations should be issued for the GA, besides Honorary Members, Unesco, etc. It was confirmed that for the Symposium, she was free to make her own decisions. For the GA, Mr KLAUE suggested the Secretariat should invite Unesco, ICA, IASA, FIAT, possibly IAMHIST and IFLA.

PIP Supporters Meeting

It was agreed this should be held during an extended lunch hour but they should eat elsewhere first.

Administration

Lunch would be provided in the Congress Centre and would cost around DM8-12 excluding drinks. They hoped to obtain tickets for public transportation with options for bus/underground. A further edition of the newsletter would be sent out in January/February and a final one later. In October, she had hired a multi-lingual assistant, Marie Hagen, to help with the planning.

Fees

The fees agreed with the other Federations were

- \$100 for members of FIAT, IASA and extra FIAF member representatives
- \$150 for non-members

This included provision of the Symposium publication.

There would be a charge of \$50 for companions.

Mrs ORBANZ closed her report with thanks to the Working Group and Mrs VAN DER ELST for their continuing support.

After a coffee break, Mr SCHOU mentioned the difficulty of finding travel and staying costs for Mr Brown from the Preservation Commission budget now that he was no longer funded by his former archive. Mrs ORBANZ confirmed that, if necessary, she could pay for Mr Brown's travel and staying costs so he could speak at the Symposium.

9.3 1988: Paris

Mrs WIBOM welcomed Mr Schmitt from Bois d'Arcy, responsible for relations with the French funding authorities and the on-site administration.

i The "Livre d'Or"

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr BORDE envisaged two main parts, about 40 pages each:

- the directory of FIAF members, in alphabetical order, based on questionnaires and photos submitted by each archive and edited to provide standardised format. Three-quarters of the questionnaires had already been returned.
- historical texts from MM Lauritzen, Pogacic and Toeplitz accompanied by photos edited and captioned by Mr DE VAAL and a chronology prepared by Mr BORDE.

Decisions were required on the language, the format, the number of copies and the selling price. They would then need someone to take charge of page make-up and publishing.

In the discussion on language, it was suggested directory entries, which would be "guessable", could appear in English or French; the texts should be in both languages, perhaps with one in a smaller typeface.

Mr FRANCIS felt these decisions could not be made until one had decided how the publication was to be used. He recalled it was originally intended as a prestigious "public relations" publication to be given to Ministers, international organisations and funding agencies, to impress upon them the international coverage of FIAF and the importance of its work. He would like to see the international aspect emphasised by having the directory information for each archive in its own language. If it was simply a publication for sale, then perhaps English and/or French would be better.

Mr BORDE and Mrs BOWSER thought it had a dual function: the prestige give-away but also a book to be widely available for sale in bookshops during the Congress and subsequently available for sale from archives.

Mrs ORBANZ preferred to revert to the original idea of one page per archive to ensure it was a quality publication with plenty of space. Mr KULA suggested one had to find a compromise between the impressive souvenir with high visual impact and the cheap utilitarian directory: he envisaged a visually attractive quality paperback, with sewn binding. Mr DAUDELIN envisaged something like the Kodak Book of Film Care. Mr SPEHR recalled the dangers of design by committee and suggested an editor should be appointed, briefed and left to use his creativity.

Decision : MM BORDE and DAUDELIN to continue as Joint Editors and present final content, presentation and financial details in Berlin. To avoid having too many similar pictures of storage facilities, archives to be asked to provide more visually exciting alternatives eg stills, stars, posters, etc., to make a more interesting publication.

ii Poster design + Film leader, letterhead and stamp

Mr DAUDELIN circulated the signed design provided by Norman McLaren for incorporation into a poster. He was happy for the design to be used however FIAF wished, perhaps also adapting all or parts for the Anniversary Letterhead, stressing that he was not a typographer or poster-designer himself. In addition, there was a possibility that the Office National du Film would pay for McLaren's colleague, McWilliams, to make a 20-30 second animation to be used as a leader for the FIAF anniversary films (the birds in colour would fly and then arrange themselves into the "50" logo). It could be used by the individual archives however they wished and for the touring show. Mrs ORBANZ suggested the design could be used as the cover for the Livre d'Or.

Mr SCHMITT suggested it might be more diplomatic to have the poster completed by a French artist/typographer, adding the texts and specifying the colours required. For budgeting purposes, they would need to decide if they wanted to use it on street hoardings and in the metro as these were expensive.

For the leader, they would simply add "FIAF 1938-1988". For the poster, it was agreed, at the suggestion of Mr FRANCIS, that there should be two versions:

- the first version to have the basic design with the words "FIAF" at the top, and "Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film" plus the FIAF address at the bottom, and the dates 1938-1988, stressing simply the 50 years of FIAF with space left blank for archives throughout the world to superimpose information on their own activities, in their own language, for use throughout the preceding 12 months.
- the Congress version in French, showing the basic design plus "FIAF Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, Paris 1988, Congrès du 50e anniversaire", with perhaps 10 lines of text listing the various events, a main contact address and an acknowledgment of the Ministry of Culture's support.

Mrs WIBOM hoped that the first poster could be available for distribution in Berlin. Mr FRANCIS suggested 2,500 copies for archives to use and distribute widely in their own country. Mr CINCOTTI suggested archives should be offered 20 free posters each, with additional copies available for purchase and onward sale.

At the suggestion of Mr KLAUE, it was agreed that reproduction by newspapers and film reviews should be encouraged. He hoped in particular it would be used by one of their reviews which regularly had an archive poster on the back cover. If posters were sold, they would need to decide what to do with the money if it was in currency that could not be easily converted.

Mr SCHOU mentioned that the Australian Postal Service had been interested in printing a special stamp to mark the Canberra Congress but needed two years' notice to fit in the schedule. He asked if the basic McLaren design could at least be suggested to the French postal authorities, if not in other countries. Mr FRANCIS asked if the United Nations still had their own stamps.

On the leader, it was assumed dupe negatives would be provided for archives to make their own prints. Mr SCHOU suggested the designers, in planning for the academy frame, should bear in mind the constraints of possible wide screen use. The letterhead design would be referred to the poster designer.

Action:

- Mr SCHMITT to find French designer for posters and finalise text for two versions of the poster; the first version to be printed and ready for Berlin, if possible using the same colour scheme as the film trailer
- Mr KULA to enquire if UNO/Unesco could print commemorative stamp
- Mrs WIBOM to thank Mr McLaren
- Mr DAUDELIN to liaise with Mr SCHMITT on colour scheme
- Mr DAUDELIN to formally thank ONF on FIAF letterhead and coordinate production of the trailer.
- Mrs VAN DER ELST to liaise with Mr SCHMITT and a French designer on design for the letterhead.

iii organisation and finance

On the organisational side, Mrs WIBOM first referred to the two recent letters, expressing support, from the Minister of Culture and the CNC and asked Mr SCHMITT to thank them for their generosity.

Mr SCHMITT said the first priority was to establish a budget as firm and detailed as possible so that the actual cash flow could be agreed for 1987 and 1988, bearing in mind that money would be coming from several sources:

Ministry of Culture, via CNC; FIAF itself; Unesco;

and possibly other Ministries, organisations and commercial "sponsors".

For example the Ministry of Foreign Affairs might pay travel and staying costs for some delegates from developing countries.

He suggested the most practical approach would be to set up a special short-term "Congress" Association in Paris to receive and disburse the monies from various sources.

For the budget, he recognised that decisions still had to be made but, in view of the generous sum already mentioned by CNC, recommended a "maximalist" budget be submitted within 15 days, stressing that there would be no second chance to ask for supplementary sums later.

Action:

Mr SCHMITT to liaise with CNC to set up the Association with the following officers:

Secretary: Mrs VAN DER ELST

President: Mr BORDE

Treasurer: Mr SCHMITT

Members: Mrs WIBOM; representative(s) of CNC

Mrs WIBOM suggested the full EC should discuss the Touring Show, the Exhibitions and the Symposium. The Working Group should then meet separately after the EC to review progress reported by the Coordinators for the various other activities (see Canberra Minutes, pp 34/5).

iv Touring Show

Mrs BOWSER had distributed a report including 15 tentative programmes based on films offered so far, a list of archives requesting the show, and a note on budgeting and other problems. More films had been promised and some, for instance a 1984 film from China, didn't appear to qualify as examples of archive restorations.

Mrs BOWSER was concerned about the length of the show, as this would have a bearing on the transportation and insurance costs. There were still a number of archives, including Stockholm, Rome and Amsterdam, who had offered films but not yet sent details. Mr DE VAAL suggested they should make a choice when all the offers were in. Mrs VAN DER ELST suggested there were so many requests they might find it easier for archive programming to offer two shorter alternative programmes.

Mr FRANCIS was concerned about copyright clearances which would be difficult outside archive locations. Mrs BOWSER said the principle was that archives offering films had obtained clearance for showing in any FIAF archive; if particular films were wanted elsewhere, as for example at Festivals, then the archive concerned should refer back to the lender for special clearance.

Mrs WIBOM mentioned that FIAPF were awaiting suggestions on how they could support FIAF on its anniversary. So far the EC had Mr DAUDELIN's suggestion that they should honour FIAF with a gala performance of a new film and the suggestion that FIAPF should ask its members to give clearances where requested to let the touring show circulate freely.

Mrs ORBANZ and Mr KLAUE felt they should not involve the producers in the touring show, which was primarily non-commercial.

To simplify customs clearance for the assembly of the programmes and their transmission from country to country, it was agreed that it would be easier if films were exported as gifts rather than supplied on temporary loan. Circulation would be easier if one programme stayed in Europe and another in America.

Decisions :

- Mrs BOWSER to give new deadlines for contributions and then plan two alternative programmes; to clarify to the Chinese the idea behind the show.
 - Mrs BOWSER to collect film information from the archives for the notes.
 - Distribution of the shows to be coordinated by the Secretariat.
 - Programmes to be shown by Bois d'Arcy at the same time or just before the Congress, especially to show to the Press and help in publicity for the Congress. It might be shown at the Centre Pompidou or La Villette.
- Showings to be open to the public free of charge.
- Ask Cinémathèque Française to participate.
 - Mrs WIBOM to ask FIAPF for gala film only.

v Exhibitions

Mr FRANCIS regretted that the Museum of the Moving Image due to open in London in September 1987 was now due to open in June 1988, which would make it impossible for him to be available to work on the assembly of the Equipment Exhibition. He wondered if the project should be dropped. Alternatively, could they find someone else to work alone or develop his ideas? He was willing to define it but felt that, in fairness, whoever was responsible for the work should have the right to do the creative part as well.

He had had 9 responses to his requests for help and information on some very interesting material. He, Mrs WIBOM and Mrs VAN DER ELST had visited two possible sites for the two exhibitions (Musée des Arts Décoratifs (MAD) and Musée de la Publicité (MP)) and CNC had suggested the new Musée d'Orsay as a possibility. He favoured the Musée de la Publicité as it was an interesting turn of the century building (a former ceramics factory), had some 300 square meters of exhibition space and a curator who was himself a film enthusiast and had written books on the film poster. The problem was that, unlike museums in England, they had no in-house staff or workshops so FIAF would have to hire outsiders to do the work, making it less of the cooperative effort he had envisaged.

Mr SCHMITT mentioned that the Musée d'Orsay had plenty of staff and facilities but they had no specialist knowledge of the equipment. He would regret it very much if one were to abandon the idea of the exhibition; he felt something should certainly be done, perhaps with the Bois d'Arcy collection at least.

Decision: Working Group to find alternative suggestion for Berlin.

For the Poster Exhibition, Mrs VAN DER ELST had received only 15 contributions.

Action: Mrs VAN DER ELST to send reminder.

Exhibition Catalogues and choice of Location

Mrs WIBOM reported that, contrary to their previous expectations, the museums were not able to pay or even contribute to the cost of the catalogues. MAD had suggested working with Flammarion but Mr SCHMITT felt working with them would require long and tedious negotiations.

Mrs WIBOM and Mr FRANCIS preferred the MP as it was cheaper, the curator was much more enthusiastic and keen to work with FIAF. He had several ideas for possible publishers as well as sponsors. Mr BORDE also favoured them as it was a new museum which was growing fast and attracting considerable publicity for itself; the curator was interested in preparing a poster for the exhibition which he would distribute to his 800 regular locations. Mrs WIBOM mentioned that unfortunately it was in the Xe arrondissement and was not too easy to find but it was felt this wouldn't matter. Mr SCHMITT noted that they were becoming increasingly better known and advertised quite actively

in publications like Paris-Scope. He felt, however, it might be too small to have both exhibitions there.

vi Symposium

Mr BORDE asked for formal EC approval for himself and Mr DAUDELIN to decide which historians should be invited to prepare contributions for the 3-day symposium so that they could present the proposed programme in Berlin. They envisaged 15 short contributions and most of the time devoted to screenings.

vii Archiving Exhibition at MATP

Mr SCHMITT confirmed that plans for this were well underway.

viii FIAF Attitude to Sponsorship

Mr SCHMITT asked for the EC's attitude to sponsorship, in kind or in cash. Kodak had already asked him to put proposals to them. Mr BORDE reported that the Ministry of Culture was urging all its organisations to actively seek outside sponsorship which had now become respectable. The EC agreed that sponsorship was welcome.

Mrs WIBOM then closed the meeting by thanking all those present for their contributions.

During the 3 days, the EC was invited to:

- a municipal reception at the City Hall
- a reception at the Glasgow Film Theatre, followed by a programme of films from the Scottish Film Archive presented by the Curator, Mrs Janet McBain
- a tour of the Scottish Film Archive and an opportunity to meet the staff
- a tour of the city and the newly-housed Burrell Collection

The day after the EC meeting, the EC members were guests of the Scottish Film Archive on the occasion of their 10th Anniversary,

at "Whose Heritage?",

a one-day seminar to discuss the role of regional and specialist film collections and their relationship to centralised national archives

attended by some 40 representatives of UK national and regional organisations

Meeting of Paris 1988 Working Group

Thursday 27 November 1986, following EC meeting in Glasgow

FIAF EC Coordinator	Mr BORDE
FIAF EC	Mrs WIBOM, Mrs BOWSER, Mr DAUDELIN, Mr FRANCIS; Mrs VAN DER ELST (Secretariat)
CNC Coordinator	Mr SCHMITT

The Working Group met immediately after a discussion of the Paris Congress in the full EC to progress questions of detail.

i Poster

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr SCHMITT to liaise as agreed on colour scheme, with advice from the McLaren team. Mr SCHMITT to find graphic artist/typographer in Paris to produce 1st version of the poster in time for distribution in Berlin.

ii Livre d'Or

Mr DAUDELIN and Mr BORDE to liaise. Mr BORDE to progress the texts; Mr DAUDELIN to collect and edit all outstanding directory entries and to come to Berlin with final text and illustrations for all sections, together with ideas and possibly samples on final appearance of text. Decision on number of photos illustrating the history of FIAF to be made when collection of possible photos is received from Mr DE VAAL.

iii Budget

Mr SCHMITT recalled they had agreed a global sum of 2,100,000 French francs, including 165,000 FF contributed by FIAF. It was seen as an important and prestigious project by the Ministry of Culture who suggested the estimates were too low. They should be more generous and include a contingency sum. He had inflated the figures wherever possible and arrived at a new total of 2,335,000 which with a further 10% Contingency and Miscellaneous, gave a grand total of 2,579,050 FF which he thought would be acceptable.

Although the Ministry was willing to pay the total sums required, less any contributions FIAF could make, it would be more diplomatic to include some possible additional sources of finance, eg

- sales of publications and posters
- subsidy for travel and staying costs of delegates from developing countries (hopefully from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
- sponsorship in kind or in cash, eg for reception

Mr SCHMITT offered to take responsibility for seeking help from sponsors given guidance from the EC on the sums they thought he should try to obtain. It was felt he should himself decide as he was more aware of the possibilities open to him.

iv Official letters to CNC and Ministry

Mrs WIBOM and Mrs VAN DER ELST to agree appropriate texts together.