

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Bologna, 29/30 November - 1 December 1990

---

### AGENDA

	<u>Page</u>
1. Adoption of the agenda	1
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Havana meetings	1
3. Report from the Membership group : discussion of the draft for the new FIAF Statutes and Rules	1
4. Membership questions :	
4.1 Reconfirmation of Members : Budapest, Milano, Oslo, Sofia, Wellington	12
4.2 Reconfirmation of Observers : Alger, Bogota/C.D., Paris/CF	15
4.3 New candidates for Membership :	16
Paris : Cinémathèque Française	
Bogotá : Fundación Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano	
4.4 New candidates for Observership : Bucuresti, Caracas	17
4.5 Miscellaneous : Berlin	21
Other requests for affiliation	
5. Finances :	30
5.1 Report of the Treasurer	30
5.2 Draft Budget for 1992	31
5.3 Report of the Fundraising Committee	33
6. Report of the specialized Commission	34
6.1 Documentation Commission	34
6.2 Preservation Commission	35
6.3 Commission for Programming and Cultural Uses	35

	55
6.4 Cataloguing Commission	39
7. Projects and Publications underway (list in annex)	29 & 39
8. Congresses	44
8.1 Havana : Evaluation of the retrospective "Saved by FIAF"	44
8.2 Athens 1991	24 & 45
8.3 Montevideo 1992	47
8.4 Invitations for further years	48
9. Relations with UNESCO and other international organizations (UNESCO - IASA - FIAT)	49
10. Miscellaneous	52

**M I N U T E S**  
**MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**29-30 NOVEMBER - 1 DECEMBER 1990**  
**BOLOGNA**

---

V. BOARINI welcomed the Executive Committee in Bologna and said both the town and the Cinemateca were very honoured. He wished the EC a fruitful work.

R. DAUDELIN, President, formally opened the meeting noting and regretting the absence of Mr Luis de Pina and of Mrs Maria Rita Galvao. He recalled Hector Garcia Mesa's death and dedicated the EC meeting to his memory.

**1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The proposed Agenda was formally adopted.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE HAVANA MEETINGS**

The minutes of the previous EC meetings in Havana were approved unanimously with a minor change  
p. 16 : first word 'prize" replaced by "award".

**3. REPORT FROM THE MEMBERSHIP GROUP : DISCUSSIONS OF THE DRAFT FOR THE NEW FIAF STATUTES AND RULES**

B. ROSEN thought the spirit of the changes made in Havana did not really reflect in the changes introduced in the Statutes and Rules.

D. FRANCIS had made a list of questions which he thought required further discussion. He suggested to analyse any issue of the Havana meeting and decide how they could be put into practice.

Issues :

- Dominance by one country
- Language issue : "Candidate Member", dit not sound good in Spanish
- Subscription rates
- Can regional archives become Members
- Overrepresentation of Associates
- Special interest archives with national aims
- Autonomy in relation to larger bodies
- Difficulty for Members to match FIAF's storage regulations (10 %)
- Materials treated as masters
- What is preservation
- How to accomodate commercial companies
- National heritage rather than national production
- Redefinition of categories of Members and Observers
- New form of congresses
- One member per country for the EC

Ch. DIMITRIU added a few other points to be discussed -

- a letter from Cineteca Italiana asked to define more precisely the membership categories
- a letter from the Museum of Jewish Heritage wondered about the use of an archive in a broader sense.

It was decided to discuss each point suggested by D. FRANCIS.

**a) Dominance of one country**

D. FRANCIS explained that if FIAF was opened up the problem of dominance was going to be increased rather than decreased. The new rules did not insure that there was no such domination.

Ch. DIMITRIU reminded that it had been clearly said at the GA that there would be no limitation for a country in terms of representatives.

R. DAUDELIN was not sure the timing was as accurate as it might seem so. History was changing and FIAF was no longer facing the same situation. FIAF's doubts in the past had been about US or Italy, countries where there were so many regional and specialized archives but this could change rapidly.

W. KLAUE repeated the GA had not given the EC any mandate to limit. But there were still the fears of certain Members such as Italy. According to him, the only way to limit the explosion of membership was by executing carefully the rules for admission. FIAF needed the evidence that Members fulfilled all their obligations, as for the EC, balance would come automatically.

**b) Language problem**

Ch. DIMITRIU reminded that the final decision in Brussels had been to use Full Members, Provisional Members and Associates in the Statutes & Rules. He asked if everyone agreed and wondered if it was a reasonable decision taking into account that the Spanish group preferred "Observer".

R. DAUDELIN felt there was a problem with the French wording of Associates - Associés.

Concerning the Associate category, B. VAN DER ELST underlined the discrepancy existing between the english version and the french version of Article 5 of the Statutes.

The english text was longer including "if after a minimum of four years it becomes eligible, such an organisation may apply directly for full membership".

It was decided that it should be rewritten.

### c) Subscription rates

B. VAN DER ELST explained that the budget for 1992 had been prepared with new rates of subscription, but it was not sufficient because even with the new rates the budget was not balanced. She reminded the amounts that had been discussed in Brussels.

Members no change	2850 SF
Associates	half
Provisional Members	650 SF

R. BORDE felt the subscription rate for the Provisional Members was much too low. According to him it depreciated the Provisional Member as such, therefore he suggested half the Members' rate for the provisional Members as well.

Ch. DIMITRIU agreed because for him, young archives got more benefit from being Member at the beginning, they could get all the publications of the federation and it was only after 3 years when they were fully equipped that they were asked to become Full Members.

D. FRANCIS reacted, reminding the difficulties of an Observer in meeting the membership cost. For him a higher subscription rate would be exclusive and the aim of FIAF was to encourage an archive, particularly in a country where no archive existed, to enter the Federation. He asked if figures existed showing the percentage of observers which had

difficulties to pay.

B. VAN DER ELST answered that no statistics existed but that for example all the archives in Latin America had difficulties.

E. BOWSER believed the federation should not carry Provisional Members. The subscription should at least cover the cost of the publications they received.

A.L. WIBOM remarked that a subvention from UNESCO would help FIAF over those difficult years. FIAF had to establish itself within UNESCO and get the subvention that would cover secretariat cost and young membership fees or developing archives fees.

R. DAUDELIN advocated a system of two subscription rates :

100 % Members

50 % Associates and Provisional Members

R. BORDE, E. BOWSER and Ch. DIMITRIU agreed with R. DAUDELIN's suggestion.

For E. BOWSER, the choice of how to approach the federation, as a Provisional Member or as an Associate, was not to be made on which was the cheapest. For Ch. DIMITRIU, the only criterion for admission into the federation was the activity of the archive, if the organisation was doing preservation then it would become a Member, otherwise it had to remain an Associate.

W. KLAUE recalled that one reason, FIAF advocated low rates for Provisional member was to encourage potential members from the third world.

D. FRANCIS said it was a question of principle. Was it the role of the federation to provide subsidy to encourage

developing countries ?

A.L. WIBOM said the decision concerning that question had already been taken by FIAF's financial situation.

B. ROSEN stressed that the problem of rates ought to be kept separate from the problem of subsidy. FIAF could commit itself to find subsidy for developing countries.

D. FRANCIS concluded the topic saying that the membership group accepted what was necessary to do to balance the budget but this did not mean that the original feelings behind a proposal of this sort had been forgotten.

d) Regional archives

The question was : can a regional archive become a FIAF member ? This had already been answered positively in Havana.

No further discussion.

e) Special interest archives with national aims

A.L. WIBOM asked the real meaning of NATIONAL.

D. FRANCIS answered reminding the broad theory according to which if each country covered its national production effectively, the world cinema heritage would be covered. He suggested to leave it to individual decision when applications arose.

R. DAUDELIN gave the example of an archive in France which collected only trailers and advertising clips. He believed, the archive was of national importance but did not deal with preservation.



D. FRANCIS noted, this would mean a very large addition of full Members in the federation, if they were accepted. The idea of special interest archives was developing very fast. Could the federation cope with a very large membership? Would it not affect on the running of the federation ?

**f) Autonomy**

D. FRANCIS explained the question arose from an observation that more and more archives were part of larger bodies. The question was left open.

**g) Storage and preservation regulations**

R. DAUDELIN quoted a passage of the document on membership recommendations discussed in Havana.

"Members are expected to demonstrate a significant and ongoing commitment to film preservation as a primary area of activity. This would characteristically involve spending at least 10 % of their budget (excluding staff costs) on making preservation masters of their national production by priority".

He said that it was not an article of the statutes but that it should be a key part of any presentation for membership. But in Havana it had been repeated that it was very difficult to meet FIAF's standards.

B. ROSEN insisted on the term "characteristically" which meant that it was not a sine qua non commitment. The intention was to help archives to better their standards.

D. FRANCIS said the EC had to single out certain aspects of the storage conditions and the elements of the preservation commission recommendations, which the group felt were key. It had to be clearer than it was at present.

R. DAUDELIN suggested to have in Article 4 of Statutes and Rules a definition of Preservation, Restoration, etc.

D. FRANCIS said this definition would have to come from the Preservation Commission itself.

#### h) The percentage of materials treated as masters

D. FRANCIS said the question was how to incorporate that point in FIAF's guidelines.

Three elements were present :

- 10 % of the budget for preservation
- storage
- the extent to which an archive was preserving master material of national heritage importance.

#### i) Commercial organisations' involvement with FIAF

D. FRANCIS raised the question : should FIAF find a way of having some sort of formal relationship with the best of commercial companies' film archives ?

E. BOWSER was opposed to the idea of any kind of formal affiliation of a commercial institution because, she said, their priorities were different.

#### j) National heritage vs National production

The phrase "National heritage" was judged better than "National production" because National production was too limited.

#### k) Definition of Associates and Provisional Members

D. FRANCIS said there was a feeling in Havana that the definition was not clear enough.

B. ROSEN said the core was clear : either the archive was involved in preservation and therefore could become a Provisional Member and eventually a Member ; or it was less involved in preservation therefore it had to stay an Associate. He reminded there had been two reasons to that change of categories :

1. open the federation
2. retain the core commitment of FIAF to film preservation.

Even if, in practice, the rights of both groups were not that different, by having those two groups, FIAF was reaffirming that its main concern was film preservation but with openings for preservation in other areas.

He added that subsidies and aids would be only for Provisional Members, not for Associates.

W. KLAUE wondered what were in legal terms the distinction between a Provisional Member and an Associate.

D. FRANCIS stressed that the reason to be a Provisional Member before being accepted as a Full member was that it was very difficult to assess a potential Member without knowing him. But basically a Provisional Member was a Member not an Associate.

E. ORBANZ stressed the fact that a Provisional Member had the same limitations as an Associate ie : he was not allowed to exchange films.

#### 1) New form of Congresses

B. VAN DER ELST : suggested to the EC to see how the Congress with workshops was going to work in Athens.

Rule 77 : Rotation of Commission Members

R. DAUDELIN asked H. SCHOU to introduce his paper "Guidelines for Commission Work".

H. SCHOU had tried to put together different arguments why he felt the introduction of the rotation rule 77 was not a good decision.

- It was difficult to recruit qualified technical people for the commissions.

In 1984 and 1988 he had sent a letter to every FIAF Member and Observer asking them to nominate a member of staff for membership of Prescom and had only one third of responses out of which only one was positive.

- Concerning communication within FIAF, all technicians had been encouraged to offer constructive criticism or comments on every Prescom technical paper and no answer had been received.

- He did not believe that a specialist commission was the place to spend FIAF funds training people.

- On the contrary, it was important that specialist committees consisted of the best people, not only for the work of the Commission but also to establish FIAF's reputation as the leader in film archiving.

- Continuity was essential for some projects of the commissions.

To introduce the notion of a rule change, he suggested the creation of "corresponding members" who would contribute to discussions, research, glossaries and other work of the Commissions. This would allow experts whose archives were unable or unwilling to sponsor them, to contribute.

R. DAUDELIN tried to recall the EC's approach. The EC felt that the Commission heads were becoming almost a state within a state. They had to face the EC, but their work was never put to vote by the GA.

By giving a limited mandate to Commissions, the Assembly knew that the Commission members were to do a specific job within a specific period of time.

R. DAUDELIN stressed that the proposed change of Rule 77 should not be interpreted as a vote of non confidence in the existing heads of commission.

H. SCHOU had given a counter proposal and R. DAUDELIN read it to the floor.

- 1) To withdraw the proposal to enforce retirement after 3 (maximum 4) terms from the specialist commissions,
- 2) To allow provision for corresponding or associate members of the Commission.

D. FRANCIS said there was already a mechanism for reconfirming the chair of commissions and the chair was responsible for opposing to the EC's decisions about membership within the Commission. The difficulty in the past, he added, had been for the chair to make a suggestion which would involve someone leaving the Commission, but if the decision was made by the EC in conjunction with the chair it no longer became simply a chair decision.

R. DAUDELIN stressed that if there was a limited period of time, it made it clear to the GA what were the terms of reference for the tasks of the Commission, then it took off the EC the burden of saying no to a specific member of a commission, being a real vote of non confidence.

A.L. WIBOM added that it might be easier to recruit members for the various commissions if the archivists knew it was not for ever.

Eva ORBANZ did not think there was an unanimous vote on that question, therefore she suggested to put it to the GA to vote.

D. FRANCIS suggested to pick out substantive changes and to vote on them individually. The rotation issue would be the last substantive change because he did not want that discussion to influence the rest of the voting.

E. BOWSER and A.L. WIBOM agreed on the idea of a separate vote.

A.L. WIBOM added that whoever would introduce that matter to the GA ought to make it absolutely clear that the suggestion from the EC was in no way a talking of discontentment with present commission work.

The EC then decided to go through the Statutes and Rules together in order to insert as many points of the discussion into the Rules.

It was finally decided to rework the Statutes and Rules in a smaller group.

#### 4. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

##### 4.1 Reconfirmation of Members

###### 4.1.a Budapest : Magyar Filmintezet-Filmarchivum

E. ORBANZ reminded that the decision had been postponed in Havana because at that time they had not sent their annual report for 1989.

Now there was a clear description of the very uncertain situation of Budapest just like for the other former socialist countries.

Nevertheless, E. ORBANZ still had questions concerning their budget and the storage conditions. She noted that there was no basic change in the structure of the archive and added

that the questionnaire was not completely answered.

D. FRANCIS suggested to ask them to complete the form carefully.

Decision : postponed until Athens.

#### 4.1.b Milano : Cineteca Italiana

E. ORBANZ said that the dossier submitted by Milano was complete.

D. FRANCIS observed that there were two answers to the question : who controls the use of the collection ?  
- The director and the Administration Council of the Cinema sector.

G. CINCOTTI who had been asked to explain, said that the director controlled the collection, but he himself was controlled by the Administration Council.

R. DAUDELIN remarked that the EC did not know much about the archive's activity and he asked G. CINCOTTI to situate Milano in regard with other Italian film archives.

G. CINCOTTI answered Milano was not very active in terms of relationship with other archives, moreover their relationship with other italian archives was not very good. Their work essentially consisted in very active screening, conservation, not much preservation and a museum.

E. ORBANZ recommended the reconfirmation.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

#### 4.1.c Oslo : Norsk Filminstitutt

In reviewing the dossier, E. ORBANZ said that there was a slight change in the archive's structure. The archive had a new activity centered on a video register which lead to a change of rules.

A. L. WIBOM added there was also a new director and that the task of the Norsk Filminstitutt had changed. In fact, she said, they were going through the same transformation than the Swedish Film Institute had experienced earlier.

R. DAUDELIN suggested to ask Arne PEDERSEN for more information about the archive's autonomy within the new structure.

Decision : the reconfirmation was postponed until the question of autonomy would be answered.

#### 4.1.d Sofia : Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka

In reviewing the dossier E. ORBANZ said that there was no change in the structure nor in the activities of the archive. She therefore recommended the reconfirmation.

Decision : Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

#### 4.1.e Wellington : The New Zealand Film Archive

E. ORBANZ said there was no change in the structure of the archive except for a new director.

She remarked that the archive received money regularly from the lottery board, and recommended the reconfirmation.

Decisions : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.



#### 4.1.f Seoul : Korean Film Archive

E. ORBANZ reminded that in Havana, the EC still had a question concerning the archive's budget, but the archive had been reconfirmed.

The budget had now been received and corresponded with the answers to the questionnaire.

She noted that a little less than 10 % was devoted to preservation and suggested to write a letter about that.

#### 4.1.G Rio de Janeiro : Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna

Subscription unpaid for 1988-89-90.

B. VAN DER ELST said she had received a cheque from a company in New York, which she presumed covered the 1988 Rio subscription.

R. DAUDELIN reminded the decisions that had been taken by the EC concerning Rio. A further delay of six months (in accordance with Art. 16) had been given to Rio in Havana but nothing had been done by them, except perhaps this payment.

**Decision** : it was decided to postpone the suggestion of deletion of the archive to the GA unless they showed some sign of activity towards paying their remaining debts.

#### 4.2 Reconfirmation of Observers

##### 4.2.a Paris : Cinémathèque Française

E. ORBANZ reminded that the Cinémathèque had not been reconfirmed in Havana because of lack of report. Now the report had been received.

**Decision** : reconfirmed.

#### 4.2.b Bogota : Cinemateca Distrital

Report submitted.

Subscription paid.

Decision : reconfirmed.

#### 4.2.c Alger : Cinémathèque Algérienne

No report submitted.

Subscription unpaid.

R. DAUDELIN said the integrist movement was gaining ground every day in Alger. The Cinémathèque Algérienne was one of their targets. A theatre had been closed down in Constantine by integrists who said : "No more foreign films for the algerian people !"

B. VAN DER ELST proposed to postpone the decision until Athens, because 1990 was not finished yet.

#### 4.3 New Candidates for Membership

##### 4.3.a Paris : Cinémathèque Française

R. DAUDELIN said there was no basic problem with the application except that the EC had to check if there were any remaining questions with other members.

A.L. WIBOM reacted, saying that the EC had agreed that any bilateral difficulties were no longer FIAF's affairs. They had to be dealt with, on a bilateral basis.

D. FRANCIS was annoyed by the list of films on which the Cinémathèque claimed to hold the production rights. He objected that Napoleon (A. GANCE) for example would appear on that list.

R. BORDE supported their application.

E. ORBANZ suggested the visit of a non French EC member. A.L. WIBOM volunteered to go.

**Decision** : it was decided to postpone the vote to Athens after A.L. WIBOM's report.

#### 4.3.b Bogota : Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano

E. ORBANZ said the dossier included a detailed description of all their activities ; there was also a report on the relationship with the Cinemateca Distrital.

M.R. GALVAO's report on the archive was very favorable. She considered that FPFC qualified absolutely as a member. Nevertheless she underlined a language problem saying that most of the papers were written in Spanish. It was decided to insist in the future to have the reports in English or in French.

E. ORBANZ asked for a secret vote to decide on the application for full membership.

Results : 9 in favour

1 abstention

Subject to the ratification of the General Assembly in Athens.

#### 4.4 New Candidates for Observership

##### 4.4.a Bucuresti

E. ORBANZ said she had only received the questionnaire, there was no budget, no statutes.

Since the archive had been Member for many years, she thought the EC could accept the archive as an Observer.

B. VAN DER ELST stressed that their situation was still very difficult, especially financially.  
The archive had a new director : Mr STIOPUL.

E. BOWSER opposed their coming back into the Federation unless the EC received a response about the touring show in FIAF's archives of American Social Documentary that they had received and never returned.

W. KLAUE who was in charge of trying to negotiate the problem with Bucuresti, added that he had received no reply to his requests. He had even offered to take care for the transportation of the films.

E. ORBANZ proposed to postpone the decision and ask for clarification on that case.

#### 4.4.b Caracas : Cinemateca Nacional

The discussion on this application was done together with that of Biblioteca Nacional/Audiovisual Archive.  
According to Mrs. GALVAO, Cinemateca Nacional was mainly a screening organisation with no preservation activity.

#### 4.4.c Caracas : Biblioteca Nacional

E. ORBANZ said the file was complete with a lot of information on the archive. She stressed the question of autonomy because it was part of the National Library. Mrs. GALVAO's report was very favorable for the Biblioteca Nacional. The collection of films was very important (more than 20.000).

R. DAUDELIN and Ch. DIMITRIU wondered why FIAF should have two observers in Caracas : one (Cinemateca Nacional) was mainly a centre of documentation and screening, the other

(Biblioteca Nacional) dealt mainly with conservation not with public screenings.

B. VAN DER ELST reminded that the Cinemateca Nacional had been an observer in FIAF for several years, but that there had been a lot of difficulties and problems, a lot of promises and no actions.

D. FRANCIS was worried by Mrs. GALVAO's comment on the fact that it would be unlikely to get an agreement of cooperation between both organisations.

Vote on Biblioteca Nacional's Audiovisual Archive : unanimous yes.

Vote on Cinemateca Nacional

1 in favour

7 against

2 abstentions

#### 4.4.d Skopje : Kinoteka MaSR Makedonja

E. ORBANZ said the file was complete.

The archive had a very important regional collection.

She suggested to insist with the archive to collaborate with our member in Belgrade.

W. KLAUE added that FIAF had to be prepared to receive other applications because there were certainly other regional archives in Yugoslavia.

Vote : 8 in favour

2 abstentions

#### 4.4.e Tbilissi : Cinemateque de Georgie

E. ORBANZ said the file was not complete. No statutes, no budget.

R. DAUDELIN noted it was a Film Studio Archive and wondered to which degree it was different from the Gaumont Cinemathèque which the EC had objected to, in the past.

W. KLAUE said it was a state archive part of the national archive.

B. ROSEN remarked a studio archive would be unprecedented in terms of categories.

D. FRANCIS wondered why as a state archive they did not receive money from the government. The file said autofinancing, what did it mean ?

W. KLAUE said it was not a commercial organisation nor a studio archive as Gaumont or Pathé running the archives for commercial purposes. Tbilissi ran the archive in a cultural sense, not on a commercial level.

The archive was not aware of what FIAF was asking for : statutes, budget, autonomy...

The EC had to give them hints on what FIAF expected from an archive. FIAF had to ask for the statutes and the basic principles of their work. He added that it was possible that such an archive became an independent autonomous archive but that for the time being the archive was financed through the studio not the government. He concluded saying that the EC ought to be careful in adopting Tbilissi because it had the appearance of a studio archive.

E. BOWSER wondered if the archive was open to public access, because the studio archives in general were not public.

It was decided to ask them for more information and discuss the matter again in Athens, even inviting their director to attend the Congress.

#### 4.4.f Miscellaneous

B. VAN DER ELST mentioned a list of requests for information and application

- Vidéothèque de Paris
- Cinémathèque de Lorraine
- National Archive of Malaysia
- Centre de documentation audio-visuelle in Barcelona
- Public Archive of Novarkota (Canada)
- Puerto Rico : Archivo de Imagenes en Movimiento.

#### 4.5 Berlin

Concerning the transfer of the Staatliches Filmarchiv to the Bundesarchiv (the EC had received a letter where it said very clearly that the SFA had stopped to exist and that all the collections and all the activities had been taken up by the Bundesarchiv/Filmarchiv from October 3rd).

E. ORBANZ asked the EC to comment on that problem.

D. FRANCIS felt the only concern of the EC was the staff problem.

W. KLAUE made several comments :

- The EC had to accept the resignation of SFA which had ceased to exist and was integrated in another member of the federation.
- . He asked if the SFA still had any commitments towards FIAF.
- He said that the membership ought to be informed about the situation because formally Members were authorized to cancel all the film exchanges they had done in the past

with the SFA eventhough the letter said the Bundesarchiv/  
Filmarchiv would not revoke the loans agreed with SFA.

- There would be restrictions also concerning the restoration work. The capacity for restoration of both archives put together was of 4,5 million DM or 5 million DM but it had been reduced to 2 million DM.

This restriction was based on the overall cost of the unification of the country. According to W. KLAUE, FIAF ought to underline the importance of restoration because all the German archives were going to suffer from those restrictions.

- Concerning the former cultural activities of the SFA, some of them would not be continued by the Bundesarchiv/  
Filmarchiv.
- Considering the present situation, the Bundesarchiv/  
Filmarchiv would have to fund
  - one EC member
  - one member of the Cataloguing Commission
  - two members of the Preservation Commission
 but there was no willingness to support two members of the Preservation Commission.

E. ORBANZ informed the EC that until two weeks from then, W. KLAUE was to be the head of section 7, ie a film archive under the head of the Bundesarchiv but then they had learnt that it was no longer the case and that some other staff members would not be taken over either.

The chair of the association of German Archives had decided to write a letter to the Minister of Interior claiming their opposition to the decision and praising W. KLAUE's work.

E. ORBANZ sincerely hoped that FIAF could also do something concerning W. KLAUE.

W. KLAUE explained that no definite personal decision had been taken except in his case. People were individually interviewed and only after the decisions would be taken



later. His case had been dealt with by the Ministry of Internal Affairs against the intentions of Mr KAHLENBERG, President of the Bundesarchiv.

As far as he knew, 40 members of the staff would have to leave but there would be no deep impact on the professional work of the archive.

Mr KLAUE left the room and the EC discussed the question further.

D. FRANCIS saw two steps in FIAF's move :

1. Acceptance of the resignation of SFA
2. Acceptance of the new member SFA + Bundesarchiv/  
Filmarchiv.

This point could wait until all the bilateral agreements were confirmed.

R. DAUDELIN agreed, saying the EC could answer the letter, already asking special questions concerning the future structure of the Filmarchiv within the Bundesarchiv.

It was also decided that the letter of Mr. KAHLENBERG would be sent to the Membership together with the EC's answer.

A.L. WIBOM wanted a clarification on the status of film exchanges between the archives.

W. KLAUE returned to the meeting, was informed about the discussion and added that the EC should not raise further questions but ask for additional information for the next EC meeting on the ongoing integration of both institutions.

FIAF could even ask for figures for the next EC meeting before Athens, at that time the new structure would be in full operation.

## 8. CONGRESSES

### 8.2 Athens 1991

Th. ADAMOPOULOS, Director of the Greek Film Archive and Ev. SOROGAS, member of the board joined the EC meeting for this topic.

They gave the EC several details concerning the Congress in Athens.

#### Symposium on video

Th. ADAMOPOULOS presented the first project for the symposium.

- a) Mario CALZINI would introduce the present and future situation of the video as a primary media.
- b) Brian JENKINSON would speak about the problem of transfer film/video and video/film and about the various video formats. This would include the presentations of the new technique of High Definition Television.
- c) Film/video presentation.
- d) Lunch break.
- e) Practical advice on how to store and preserve video tapes.  
Mr HOUSHOLD would discuss the international standards and practical problems and solutions as experienced by NFA.
- f) Technical questions : speakers would answer questions from the audience.
- g) General debate presided by Cl. JEAUVONS.

Th. ADAMOPOULOS explained that the Greek Television Network would give its assistance for that day.

### Symposium on independent Cinema

The Greek archive had booked, during the whole week of the Congress, a movie theatre (PALACE) in which it could be possible to present films of independent film makers.

Therefore, Th. ADAMOPOULOS asked for the help of E. BOWSER and A.L. WIBOM. He suggested to present Greek films with English subtitles at the same time but in the auditorium of the Film archive.

He also suggested to have a Greek speaker to talk about the Greek situation in independent cinema.

### Registration fee for non members-visitors

Excursion by boat		40 \$
GA	2 lunches	80 \$
	4 coffee breaks	
Symposium	2 lunches	80 \$
	4 coffee breaks	

After the presentation of his programme, Th. ADAMOPOULOS asked for comments of the EC.

### April 19 - Workshops

There had been a misunderstanding and B. VAN DER ELST explained what were the needs for that day.

There would be four workshops (documentation - cataloguing - preservation - programming) including each 20-25 participants. Two rooms would then be needed in the morning and two in the afternoon.

Th. ADAMOPOULOS answered those rooms were already booked.

On the same day the EC needed to meet again and therefore another room was needed for two or three hours.

### Meetings of the Commissions

- Concerning the Cataloguing Commission (H. HARRISON), B. VAN DER ELST explained they wanted to meet after the Congress in Poros. They would leave the group in Poros during the excursion day. B. VAN DER ELST would take care of the reservations in Poros.
- The Preservation Commission would only meet during the workshop.
- Nothing was decided yet for the Programming Commission and the Documentation Commission but B. VAN DER ELST would try to know before leaving Bologna and would inform the Greek Archive.

### Symposium on Independent Cinema

R. DAUDELIN agreed with the greek proposal to have a greek speaker and said that, so far, all the other speakers were from FIAF, but there could be one or two others. He added that the approach ought to be strictly on independent, experimental cinema.

A.L. WIBOM wondered who would compose the programme of screenings foreseen by Th. ADAMOPOULOS and also who would provide the films. She said it was a very important job.

Th. ADAMOPOULOS admitted he needed the help of FIAF for this programme.

It was decided that R. DAUDELIN, G. CLAES and E. BOWSER would get together and make a proposal.

### Symposium on video

T. COOK was asked to present the programme of NFA for that day :

- 20 minutes talk by Brian JENKINSON to explain the purpose of the presentations and High Definition Television.
- 5 minutes presentation of three films
  1. from the NFA LONDON
  2. from the Greek Archive
  3. High Definition film produced by KODAK
- 2½ hours presentation of video tape screenings
  1. EUREKA High Definition Television video
  2. D2
  3. 1" - C format
  4. Betacam BP
  5. 3/4' U-matic
  6. ½" Super VHS
  7. VHS
  8. Film transfer from the EUREKA video tape

all of those presentations would be without sound so as to concentrate on the picture quality.

D. FRANCIS remarked the subject of the symposium had changed. The original idea had been to deal with the use of the video within the film archives.

Another element of discussion was the transfer film-video and video-film and the progress it had made since Brighton 1978.

H. SCHOU said KODAK was developing "electronic printing", he reckoned the system would be ready for demonstration in about three months. Perhaps a collaboration with KODAK could be envisaged to be able to show the document.

B. ROSEN stressed that video was a very controversial subject with great commercial interests involved, it covered three areas :

- a) video as a preservation medium
- b) video as an access medium
- c) video as a medium in itself

and we should be very careful in handling these topics.

A.L. WIBOM reminded that FIAF's attitude towards video had always been rather hostile.

The most important point for the Members of FIAF was to have a discussion and a demonstration of where the video would be useful in the daily running of an archive.

Most of the archives were not prepared for a specialists' discussion on a High Definition Television.

W. KLAUE suggested to divide the symposium in two different sessions.

The morning session would be devoted to the programme presented by T. COOK and the afternoon session to a general debate and all the other topics on the connection between film archives and video technology.

Th. ADAMOPOULOS then made a new proposal :

Morning session :

- Introduction of Calzini, 30 min.
- Two hours demonstration of several types of video
- Technical question on this subject

Afternoon session :

- At least two hours for the questions and answers dealing with archives and video

The schedule for that day would be 9-13 and 15-18.

R. DAUDELIN concluded, suggesting Clyde JEAUVONS as president for the afternoon session.

The EC would ask Cl. JEAUVONS to prepare a position paper that would list a number of issues linked with the use of video and film archives.

## 7. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

### Summer School 1992

T. COOK presented the draft programme of the Summer School 1992 in London and gave the following additional details :

Dates : 14/6/92 to 5/7/92

Place : The Paul Getty Jr Conservation Centre  
in Berkhamsted outside London.

Accommodation : guesthouse at Beaconsfield

### Programme

The Summer School programme was not for beginners, a minimum experience was expected from the participants.

T. COOK asked if any financial support would come from FIAF. He said that Cl. CLEAVONS would be talking with the British Council for funding.

BFI director had promised 10.000 £ for the course.

W. KLAUE said it was impossible to plan a summer school based on a selfsupported project. A participation fee was of course necessary but the EC had to try to get support from UNESCO for the summer school.

- He explained that UNESCO usually covered certain transportation costs for participants from 3rd world countries. Therefore the EC's requests for subventions should be addressed to UNESCO having transportation in mind.

FIAF should prepare a shortened version of topics covered by the summer school and a list of possible countries of the 3rd world from which participants could come from.

- Members would have to be informed before Athens so that the interested people could ask for extra information during

the Congress.

- Another problem was the selection of the right candidates. If there would not be enough interest from FIAF's affiliates, then other organisations (ICA television archives) could be approached. But priority had to be given to FIAF candidates.

D. FRANCIS said the British Council was ready to interview candidates and to judge their application provided the EC sent a questionnaire.

The funding to be expected was also for transportation costs but they also had a budget for approved training. If the Summer School get a training approval then it could have a contribution.

B. VAN DER ELST asked if her substitute could be trained during the Summer School. The answer was yes.

## 5. FINANCE

### 5.1 Report of the Treasurer

Before presenting the budget, R. BORDE made two comments :

1. It had been decided to convert the Reserve Fund into Belgian Francs because Swiss Francs gave very little interest. FIAF had bought shares of a loan of the Belgian Gouvernement at 9 % annual interest, of 3.000.000 BF. These were negociable securities so that there was no blocking of the Reserve fund. B. VAN DER ELST had rented a safe at the bank for the securities.
2. For 1989, there were still 5.450 BF to be collected. Buenos Aires, Rio and several observers still had to pay their subscriptions for 1989.



Document : Evaluation and budget comparison for 1990

Reviewing the document R. BORDE pointed out that the income was lower than expected because of the decline of the Swiss Franc. Sales of FIAF publications on the contrary were increasing.

Concerning the Development Fund, he suggested to isolate it from the totals.

Concerning the current expenses, the staff salaries were also lower than foreseen because B. VAN DER ELST's assistant had stayed only four months. He observed that taxes were unfortunately very high in Belgium. The expenses for office supplies and equipment had increased because of the new computer.

There were no questions from the floor.

5.2 Draft budget for 1992

R. BORDE reminded the Committee that the subscriptions had not been raised since 1981. The first proposal for new subscriptions was,

Members	3.000 SF
Associates	1.500 SF
Provisional Members	650 SF

but the previous day the EC had decided to propose to the GA a unique subscription of 1500 SF for Associates and Provisional Members.

If FIAF raised its subscriptions the budget would not only be well-balanced but there would even be a sum in excess.

Concerning the Commissions R. BORDE wondered if there would always be 4 commissions. He thought the Cataloguing Commission could be twinned with the Documentation Commission.

He also said that the item "Special publications" that had been cancelled for 1991, were reestablished for 1992.

A.L. WIBOM wondered on the reaction of the membership to the EC's proposal. She suggested to say that the Funding Group would do its utmost to help cover any difficulties with the subscription fees.

She strongly supported the suggestion to raise the fees and even thought the EC should adopt a policy of yearly raise of X % that would match the world inflation.

Ch. DIMITRIU supported the idea of pegging subscription in relation with the Belgian Franc.

W. KLAUE did not favour the idea of an annual raise of subscriptions, he considered it frightening for many of FIAF's poorer members. For many Members it was a question of non convertibility of currencies and a lot of archives had real difficulties to find that money.

Besides, FIAF should be prepared for possible alternatives in case Members did not agree with the raise of subscription.

A.L. WIBOM believed that perhaps some Members would be willing to pay a double subscription or 500 SF more for the poor Members.

She thought that suggestion should be introduced to the GA.

João BERNARD DA COSTA speaking on behalf of L. de PINA suggested that each archive gave the receipt of one screening per year.

B. ROSEN emphasized the importance to present the different issues to the GA in a relevant order. The issue of subscriptions and the issue of the changes of the membership rules should not be discussed together.

In terms of strategy of presentation, the question of an increase for Observers and the question of the Development Fund had to be discussed together.

B. VAN DER ELST suggested to prepare a crisis budget in case FIAF could not raise the subscriptions and explain the implications for every post, ie :

- less staff, meaning lower services,
- less work of commission
- less mailing, books, publications...
- one meeting of the EC per year.

R. BORDE suggested to make a crisis budget with subscriptions for Observers of 1.000 SF. With that amount the budget could be balanced by reducing three posts :

- Executive Committee meeting assuming that everyone would speak english (100.000)
- Commissions 400.000 instead of 600.000
- Publications 50.000 reduction.

### 5.3 Report of the Fundraising Committee

A.L. WIBOM informed the Committee that four personal computers had been sent to Havana thanks to the Swedish International Development Authorities and that they had agreed in principle to equip the Vietnamese Archive (100.000 \$ for three consecutive years). The Vietnamese Archive had ask H. SCHOU to help them ; the Thai Archive was also willing to help. She had received a letter in June from UNAM, asking for money for a technical symposium to be held in Mexico in September. She had answered it was too late.

A.L. WIBOM thought L. DE PINA's suggestion to dedicate one screening day per year for the benefit of FIAF was a good idea.

B. ROSEN promised to help to write guidelines based on the draft from Ch. DIMITRIU to apply for money. Those guidelines could be distributed in Athens.

A.L. WIBOM also suggested to try and find money for the Summer School, she therefore asked for detailed information. She repeated that UNESCO took 25 % and that FIAF should also have a share of any money given (10 %) which could be spent on helping some delegates for developing countries to come to FIAF meetings.

Ch. DIMITRIU spoke about a new source of funding, namely the advertising included in the Bulletin.

## 6. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSION

### 6.1 Documentation Commission

R. DAUDELIN asked for comments on those documents presented by Michèle AUBERT.

E. BOWSER reminded that she had been rather critical on the projects of the Commission but that she now saw improvement, a sensible working plan and interesting projects.

Ch. DIMITRIU supported her remarks.

Concerning one of the new projects of the Commission : "Bibliography of legal copyrights of audiovisual archives", W. KLAUE referred to a UNESCO publication on legal problems of audio-visual archives and said the bibliography already existed.

D. FRANCIS said the Commission wanted money for the publication of a thesaurus.

It was decided to postpone that question until Athens, to be able to hear from M. AUBERT directly.

## 6.2 Preservation Commission

H. SCHOU commented on the report of the Commission and asked the floor for questions.

B. VAN DER ELST wondered about the project on Funguns and Mould. H. SCHOU had heard nothing from the group and for UNESCO funding it was too late.

W. KLAUE said the backing for an East-European sub-commission no longer existed.

He suggested to discuss that point at the following Commission meeting, it would be more effective to have a European sub-commission.

E. ORBANZ mentioned the plan to have the next joined technical symposium in 1993. They were hoping that FIAF would organize it but FIAF could also be asked.

D. FRANCIS wanted to state that the work of the Preservation Commission was fantastic.

## 6.3 Commission for Programming and Cultural Uses

J. BERNARD DA COSTA presented the list of members foreseen for the Commission and asked the EC the right to have 8 members instead of 7 in accordance with rule 78.

He explained that he had already held two meetings at Pordenone, one of which had been attended by B. VAN DER ELST.

The members had been :

- looking for new criteria for programming
- discussing the role of programming
- discussing the name of the Commission
  - . programming
  - . or programming and Cultural Uses.

During the second meeting the members had

- elaborated a provisional calendar
- proposed to write to all the archives to ask for suggestions and comments on their programming
- prepared a text on the name of the Commission and its priorities.

The first formal meeting was foreseen in February 1991 at Açores or in Athens before or after the Congress.

Discussion started on the proposed names for members of the Commission.

G. CINCOTTI wanted to suggest the name of Gianluca Farinelli of Bologna who used very modern criterion in programming.

R. BORDE regretted the absence of Latin American in the list of members proposed. Latin American archives were very much concerned by programming activities ; therefore he suggested to replace a European member by someone from Latin America.

Ch. DIMITRIU supported completely R. BORDE's remark and added that the people proposed on the list were more interested in programming than in the cultural uses of an archive. According to him the focus of the Commission had to be broadened.

R. DAUDELIN also regretted the absence of Latin America in the Commission.

He added that for budgetary reasons, the number of members should be limited to 7.

W. KLAUE reminded that the mandate of the Commission was for programming and cultural uses, not for access which was a much wider scope and which would need a different composition of the membership. The Commission should be concentrated on the active role film archives are playing in the cultural

field.

A.L. WIBOM also regretted the absence of Latin America but was even more concerned by the fact that all the names of the list represented very well established archives. She would have liked to see young people from young archives or from small archives.

D. FRANCIS said it was difficult to talk of the membership without first having the list of projects.

He suggested to choose 4 or 5 people for the first year, to produce a key list of all the subjects and then look for the people needed to meet the projects.

J. BERNARD DA COSTA said he believed a certain cohesion was needed, at least for the beginning of the Commission.

W. KLAUE felt unable to vote on the members proposed because there was disagreement on the selection. He also felt unable to make a decision because no terms of reference were defined for the work of the Commission, there was no working programme. He suggested to postpone the formal confirmation of the members of the Commission to the following EC meeting and ask J. BERNARD DA COSTA to come before the GA with a new proposal for members and also for a practical working programme.

J. BERNARD DA COSTA said he was in a very difficult position and regretted not having been told about Latin America right from the start. W. KLAUE's proposal was the one which had been rejected by the GA ie : to create a working group to present a programme at Athens.

D. FRANCIS suggested to confirm four members at this stage and ask that group to look at the specific proposals that had been made at the GA and comment on them.

J. BERNARD DA COSTA had another proposal. To accept his list of members with a specific mandate until Athens. At Athens the Commission would resign and another one would be chosen.

R. DAUDELIN asked the EC to vote on both proposals :

1. To nominate 5 members, including the president for the new Commission, asking the new Commission to take the time until Athens to define its task and possibility to complete its membership.

Result of the vote : 7 in favour  
2 against.

2. J. BERNARD DA COSTA proposal to confirm the 7 members with a mandate until Athens.

Result of the vote : 2 in favour  
1 abstention  
6 against

Following D. FRANCIS's suggestion, the EC voted by secret ballot on the choice of 4 members + the President so that it was not a decision that J. BERNARD DA COSTA had to make.

Result of the vote : G. CLAES

P. CHERCHI USAI

St. RICCI

E. PATALAS

J. BERNARD DA COSTA said he was going to think about the result of the discussion. He no longer knew if he was going to accept the presidency in such circumstances. Everything would depend on the group's reaction.



#### 6.4 Cataloguing Commission

R. DAUDELIN asked for comments on H. HARRISSON's written report.

B. VAN DER ELST precised point 4 "Revision of Film Cataloguing" was not a project of her own.

E. ORBANZ said the Cataloguing Rules (point 5) were ready. The first copy was expected by the end of 1990.

#### GENERAL DISCUSSION ON WORKSHOPS IN ATHENS

B. VAN DER ELST volunteered to take care of the organisation of the workshops. It was decided to devote the morning for the Documentation Commission and the Preservation Commission the afternoon for the Cataloguing Commission and the new EC meeting.

A.L. WIBOM reminded that the basic idea of the workshop was to decide on one topic and go into details, instead of discussing all the projects of the Commission.

E. BOWSER wondered if that idea had been fully communicated to the Commission.

### 7. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

#### 7.1 100th Anniversary of the Cinema

R. DAUDELIN stressed the importance to link that celebration with the Congress of 1995.

B. VAN DER ELST had attended in Pordenone the meeting called "Celebrating the Centenary of Cinema. What, when and why?".

The attendants all had said FIAF should coordinate the event.

B. ROSEN said FIAF could organise massive and complex programmes which he suspected was not realistic or provide the ideological framework so that the 100th Anniversary was viewed in the perspective of preservation.

D. FRANCIS remarked that FIAF members should do things that would actually add to our knowledge of cinema whether in preservation, cataloguing or documentation, FIAF should try to represent all areas of its activities but it should be new knowledge.

E. ORBANZ reminded that a group had been formed in Havana to work on that project : A.L. WIBOM, P. SPEHR, W. KLAUE, N. GIRET.

D. FRANCIS said that if FIAF decided not to do anything then it should be said that we were counting on individual members.

B. ROSEN reacted, saying he did not think that providing a framework, providing a justification, a logo, a clearing house of information was nothing. It was quite substantial but different than organizing touring shows.

W. KLAUE made two proposals :

1. To send a letter to all the members asking them to think about activities they could execute and invite them to send their proposals until the end of March to the Secretariat. FIAF would compile those proposals and inform all the other members.
2. The working group should meet before the EC meeting and the GA in Athens, and devote one day discussing projects of the Federation.

E. ORBANZ suggested to distribute a document to the membership before the discussion at the GA.

R. BORDE proposed to add a paragraph to the letter to the members asking them if they knew of any individual initiative in their country concerning the invention of cinema. The role of FIAF was to make a universal synthesis of the invention of cinema.

A.L. WIBOM said the Swedish Film Institute had already made a programme for the 100th Anniversary but it was very locally based.

B. ROSEN suggested a special logo linked with FIAF's name to serve for each country's individual project and programme.

Final decision : meeting of the working group 11th April in Athens. D. FRANCIS volunteered to join the group if he could come. B. ROSEN would send ideas. A.L. WIBOM would write the letter to the members.

### 7.2 Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films

Nothing new had been done since Havana.

### 7.3 International Index to Films and TV periodicals

B. VAN DER ELST quoted a passage of M. MOULD's account : "The financial situation of PIP is reasonably healthy this year and should not be a cause of concern".

She then showed around the book of Headings published in August.

She added that M. MOULDS had been lucky to have the help of Milka STAKOVA in London for three months.

#### 7.4 FIAF Summer School

cf. p. 29 of these minutes.

#### 7.5 Revised Edition of the "Handbook for Film Archives"

E. BOWSER reported she had serious problems with producing this handbook.

The publisher was still expecting it for this year but she had no contacts with J. KUIPER. She had learnt the copy was in the hand of S. DALTON for reading.

She had written an angry letter to J. KUIPER and B. VAN DER ELST had also written a sharp letter on behalf of the EC. Since then she had received one chapter and a half.

Nevertheless, she still believed it could come in time for publication.

H. SCHOU asked to modify the text on the vinegar syndrome.

B. VAN DER ELST said that assuming that the new handbook was coming, the Secretariat had taken out the old one from the list of publications and there were still a lot of those copies to be sold.

#### 7.6 Glossary of laboratory terms

F. FRANCIS was asked to investigate on the Glossary in Washington.

#### 7.7 FIAF Bulletin

E. BOWSER announced that the double issue of the Bulletin would cover a wide range of topics of interest to FIAF and the appearance would be greatly improved. It would however be the last issue she should do as Chief Editor but she was willing to continue as Assistant Editor.

Her proposal was that Ch. DIMITRIU should be asked to take that post.

B. VAN DER ELST wondered about the price it could be sold to the public.

15 \$ seemed to be a reasonable amount for two issues but the problem was that if there were paid by cheque the bank took almost everything for costs.

D. FRANCIS suggested to open small accounts in different countries around the world.

R. DAUDELIN said FIAF could suggest Members to sell some issues, but it was additional work for the Secretariat.

#### 7.8 Proceedings of the Canberra Restoration Symposium

H. SCHOU said he was in a very embarrassing situation and that being realistic he could not really see much happening in the near future.

In agreement with R. EDMONDSON, he suggested to collect all the papers they had at the moment and send them out to all the archives.

#### 7.9 Bibliography of FIAF members' publications

B. VAN DER ELST quoted the fax from Janer VOSIKOVSKA received in September saying that she would send a master copy by the end of December 1990.

The next issue would no longer be done by her. It was too much extra work for the Secretariat. It was decided to ask René BEAUCLAIR in Montreal if it could become a Documentation Commission project.

### 7.10 International Directory of Cinematographers, Set and Costume Designers in Film

There was no written report from A. KRAUTZ, but W. KLAUE said the work was going on, a new volume was finished. A. KRAUTZ would, from February on, use the possibility of early retirement and continue the work on the project.

### 7.11 Proceedings of the Vienna Historical Symposium

B. VAN DER ELST reported she had received the last page and the introduction and that the work would be printed before the end of the year.

### 7.12 Proceedings of the Lisbon Symposium

Recently printed but some errors had been found. A version with an errata would be received shortly by the Secretariat.

### 7.13 Working groups on training and public relations

M. AUBERT had suggested the idea but was not ready to work on it. It was decided to remove the project from the list unless someone was ready to take it up.

## 8. CONGRESSES

### 8.1 Havana : Evaluation of the retrospective "Saved by FIAF"

A.L. WIBOM had insisted that the EC should evaluate the series of screenings in Havana. She had attended a few screenings and on each occasion either the print or the screening facilities or the way the film was projected did not correspond to archival standards.

She wondered if anything could be done about that problem.

She knew the situation of Havana, did not want to blame any

specific person but for FIAF's reknown something needed to be at least said or done.

D. FRANCIS said it was one of the reasons why FIAF was firstly concerned with the Programming Commission. He felt this problem could be a topic for a wonderful cooperation between the Preservation Commission and the Programming Commission.

E. BOWSER was surprised that there was no mention of the leading archives on the program.

A.L. WIBOM said that if for a Congress a substantial part was devoted to screenings, it would be advisable that the expert commissions would help in the structure of those Congresses.

B. ROSEN saw two separate issues

1. In the planning of Congresses to what extent should FIAF foresee things.
2. In larger terms he thought the issue of archive presentations was a perfect point for the new Commission.

## 8.2 Athens 1991

R. DAUDELIN said that after having discussed it with E. BOWSER, he suggested to replace the 6 days of screenings foreseen by the Greeks by one or two good programmes that would be exemplary of experimental cinema.

He reported that the President of the Cultural Commission of the European Parliament wanted to come to the Congress and take this opportunity to meet formally with the heads of the European Film Archives attending the Congress. He wanted to get the Cultural Commission more closely associated with the archives.

He had suggested to the archives of the European Community to form themselves into an association.

He would like the meeting to be as official as possible and ideally to be included in the agenda of the Congress.

R. DAUDELIN added that they would like the President of the Federation to be there to open the meeting and to welcome the President of the Cultural Commission.

D. FRANCIS reacted, saying that an organisation of EEC archives as such already existed and that the request should be addressed to them.

A.L. WIBOM reminded that this proposal had already been made before. According to her, FIAF was an international organisation and therefore could not be involved in promoting a certain group of Members.

W. KLAUE thought it was justified that during a FIAF congress, meetings of regional archives took place. He proposed to foresee a time on the schedule for regional meetings. Latin Americans would perhaps want to meet also.

B. VAN DER ELST recalled that FIAF had been invited to participate in the meetings of the European year of Film and Television eventhough they knew FIAF was a world organisation.

She had taken the liberty to present G. CLAES as the FIAF representative at a meeting of the professional of Cinema in the European Community in Brussels.

R. DAUDELIN together with B. VAN DER ELST felt a formal association with the European Community was needed if FIAF wanted financial help.

R. DAUDELIN summarized the topic in four points :

1. Have a formal meeting on their own initiative.
2. To publicize the meeting in the official programme of the



Congress.

3. To invite two or three people from the Cultural Commission to attend the Congress. This was refused.
4. To have the President of FIAF and European Members of FIAF to attend the meeting, following their availability.

Concerning the timetable of the Congress in Athens it was decided to try to stick to the standard timetable ie : 9 H-13 H 15 H-18 H or 18.30 H

### 8.3 Montevideo 1992

B. VAN DER ELST commented on the letter of Eugenio HINTZ who suggested a very tight timetable, and asked for reactions of the floor.

E. ORBANZ said that the GA could be reduced to one day instead of two because there were no elections foreseen.

H. SCHOU reacted saying that would mean only 5 or 10 minutes for Commissions's reports.

R. DAUDELIN explained that the spirit was to stick to one day for the GA and in order to balance that, to have one day for the workshops.

It was decided to send Montevideo the EC's ideal timetable with the number of days devoted to each point. Two extra days were needed, one for the EC and another one for the symposia or the workshops :

GA	23/04
Workshops	24/04
Two symposia	25/04
26/04 would be left free for something special	
Excursion	27/04

Several things could be done during the extra day : specific meetings, regional meetings, etc.

It was decided to ask Montevideo for information on dates, prices and symposia.

#### 8.4 Invitations for further years

Gian Luca FARINELLI joined the meeting at this point for the discussion on future Congresses.

There was no invitation for 1993.

Invitation for 1994 from Bologna when the Cineteca Comunale would be having its 20th Anniversary.

R. DAUDELIN asked if it was possible to envisage Bologna's invitations for 1993.

G. FARINELLI answered saying that taking into consideration the anniversary and the special events foreseen for that celebration, 1994 was a better date.

As for Cinema Ritrovato, there were plans to change the dates of the Festival because it was just after Pordenone and to move it to end of May just after Cannes' Festival.

G. FARINELLI needed to know as soon as possible the intentions of FIAF because it took time to reschedule the Festival.

After G. FARINELLI's departure, E. ORBANZ suggested to accept the invitation for 1994 and propose it to the GA.

R. DAUDELIN explained the reason of his question was that there was an invitation from Pordenone for the Fall of 1995 and that would have meant two consecutive congresses in Italy. He agreed to keep Bologna's invitation for 1994.

A.L. WIBOM did not think it would be catastrophic to have a congress in November after 18 months.

D. FRANCIS said it would create budgetary problems.

W. KLAUE suggested to approach Bangkok again for a congress in 1993.

A.L. WIBOM volunteered to make the formal request to Bangkok.

R. DAUDELIN insisted on having an answer for Athens to be able to present a proposal to the GA for 1993 and 1994.

R. DAUDELIN saw the problem of the link between 1995 and the 100th Anniversary and he thought it should be part of the general debate on 95 in Athens.

## 9. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### UNESCO

W. KLAUE said he had not been able to devote time on UNESCO and other international activities ; therefore the results were not very positive.

Nevertheless, one contract with UNESCO had been finalised on a survey done many years ago. The second contract which he feared could not be realised as foreseen was the continuation of the Curriculum project. This project was to prepare one year course for the education of audiovisual archivists at the Humboldt University in Berlin. When the university and himself had agreed on organizing that, the conditions were different. He felt the prerequisites to continue with that project were no longer given and FIAF had either to find another alternative or to inform UNESCO it was impossible to take up that project.

He informed the EC that during the first half of the year the situation at UNESCO had been very confusing because of foreseen internal changes which had an impact on the division which was in charge of audiovisual archives (PGI : Programme General d'Information).

B. VAN DER ELST reported FIAF had been invited to attend for the first time the annual council of PGI and that she had been sent as FIAF's representative since both W. KLAUE and E. ORBANZ were unable to go. Colleagues from IASA and FIAT were also present.

She explained that the Council of PGI groups representatives of 30 countries elected for a period of time. They decided on a policy and chose among a list of projects presented to them by UNESCO.

The main project on that list for development of audiovisual archives as priority one was to explore the use of optical discs as a valuable and economical medium for archival storage especially in hot and humid climate. All FIAF's projects came under priority 2 or 3 and were diluted among other projects.

She had decided to react against that project and had then been asked to explain in writing the reason of her opposition.

R. DAUDELIN asked H. SCHOU to prepare that answer.

B. VAN DER ELST added it had been a good opportunity to present the federation to PGI. During the meeting there had also been a brief mention of the collective project that ICA wanted to start called "Disaster Prevention Program". PGI wanted to extend that program to audiovisual archives and asked FIAF for assistance.

There was also an invitation to attend the IPDC council.

W. KLAUE explained that IPDC (International Program for the Development of Communication) had a separate budget. In the past, this separate fund had been used for activities devoted to audiovisual archives (television and sound archives).

Two projects were foreseen for IPDC :

- Latin American project to develop facilities for regional

participation in technical film restoration, cataloguing, documentation and basic and advanced training.

- The creation of a computerized documentation and archive centre for press, radio and television in the Congo which followed up Ch. DIMITRIU's mission.

The fouding for the project of developing an archive in Soudan came also from IPDC.

He considered IPDC as an additional source which could be used for film archives activities.

Their main interest was communication but they could not operate without archives. The meeting was scheduled for February 91 and W. KLAUE could not promise he would be able to attend.

E. ORBANZ informed the EC, the trip to Soudan had been postponed because of political tensions in the country.

She spoke about the Round Table in Den Haag in March 91 and asked W. KLAUE to try to attend it.

She also mentionned a contact between UNESCO and IASA to work on a glossary of audiovisual terms. FIAF was invited to participate in that project and she suggested Günter SCHULZ.

R. DAUDELIN together with H. SCHOU had met G. GIBSON, IASA's new president, in Montreal. He reported that the meeting was positive but very general. Nevertheless they had agreed on exchanges of information between commissions.

FIAF had been invited to give a speech at the last IFLA Congress in a special section for training of audiovisual librarian. A.L. WIBOM read W. KLAUE's speech.

FIAF had also been invited to a seminar in Tokyo, parallel to FIAF General Assembly. Cl. JEAUVONS and W. KLAUE had attended one session of this GA with a general debate on FIAF policy and development. W. KLAUE mentionned one problem concerning a principle change in FIAF's approach. FIAF recommended the establishment of video archives outside the Television

stations. They understood themselves more clearly as the archive of the Television Stations not as the public video archives. It was a new tendency but there was no policy yet.

R. DAUDELIN had met José Manuel COSTA and had reported to him FIAF's decision about ACCE. FIAF could not formalize regional meetings within FIAF congresses.

E. ORBANZ suggested to give a mandate to G. CLAES to attend those EEC meetings in Brussels.

W. KLAUE felt it was too formal ; the mandate had to come from the group of European archives. FIAF could not nominate her for this session.

#### 10. MISCELLANEOUS

R. DAUDELIN was very embarrassed by the situation with J. BERNARD DA COSTA.

R. BORDE understood R. DAUDELIN embarrassment but repeated that there was no other solution than the one voted by the EC previously.

R. DAUDELIN said there had been a lot of misunderstanding in that affair. He would try to meet him and rediscuss the problem with him.

R. DAUDELIN spoke about an invitation from Jean ROUCH for a meeting of Cinema Museums to be held in Paris in January 1991. The meeting was now postponed.

D. FRANCIS suspected that ROUCH's list of participants was effectively the old Frankfurt list. There had been a meeting in September in Dusseldorf. He said the conflict continued and FIAF had to be very carefull how it approached this

conflict.

G. CINCOTTI proposed Alberto LATTUADA, founder of the Cineteca Italiana, to be the 5th Honorary Member of FIAF. It would give prestige to FIAF in general.

It was decided to examine this proposal during the EC meeting in Athens.

E. ORBANZ asked G. CINCOTTI to make his proposal in writing.

Before leaving Ch. DIMITRIU spoke about an invitation from Lausanne to hold an EC meeting there next Autumn.

E. BOWSER reminded she had made a commitment on behalf of the EC to Jerusalem to go there the following year.

Ch. DIMITRIU said he needed an answer for January, February 1991.