

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Oslo, 24-26 May 1993

**Present :**

Robert DAUDELIN	President
Eva ORBANZ	Secretary General
Anna-Lena WIBOM	Treasurer (from May 25)
Christian DIMITRIU	Vice-President (from May 26)

**Members**

Michelle AUBERT  
David FRANCIS  
Clyde JEAUVONS  
Vladimir OPELA  
Guy-Claude ROCHEMONT  
Bob ROSEN  
Henning SCHOU (Head of the Preservation Commission)

**Commission Heads**

Joao BENARD DA COSTA	Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections (from May 25)
Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing Commission
Ronald MAGLIOZZI	Documentation Commission

**Special guests**

Vittorio Boarini	(from May 26)
Michael Moulds	(from May 26)

**Secretariat**

Brigitte van der Elst	Executive Secretary
Béatrice Trouveroy	Assistant to the Executive Secretary

**Excused**

Maria-Rita GALVAO  
Manuel MARTINEZ CARRIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
Oslo, 24-26 May 1993

A G E N D A

	Page
1. Adoption of the agenda	3
2. Approval of the Minutes of the EC meeting in New York	3
3. Matters arising from the Minutes of the EC meeting in New York	3
4. Membership questions :	
4.1. Reconfirmation of Members : Mexico (CN), Mexico (UNAM), Luxembourg, Habana, Montevideo, Los Angeles (AFI), Torino, Buenos Aires	3
4.2. Candidatures for Membership : Vaticano - Tokyo	8
4.3. Candidatures for Provisional Membership / Associateship:	9
Wales Film & TV Archive (UK), Film Archives of Slovenia (Ljubljana), ECPA (Ivry-France)	
4.4. Miscellaneous	12
5. Finances :	
5.1. Approval of the accounts for 1992 & 1994 budget	12
5.2. Proposals for a new scale of membership fees	13
5.3. Report of the Fundraising Committee	15
6. Relations with Unesco & other international organisations	18
7. Centenary plans	20
8. Report on the preparations for the Mo i Rana Congress:	23
- opening	
- Workshops	
- Symposium	
- other...	
9. Report of the specialized Commissions to the EC	24
10. Review of all other points on the agenda of the General Assembly: Chairmanship of the various GA sessions	28
11. Miscellaneous	32

The members of the Executive Committee were warmly welcomed by Kjell Billing, who spoke on behalf of Jan-Erik Holst and the Norsk Filminstitutt, host of the meeting. Unfortunately, Manuel Martinez Carril and Maria-Rita Galvao were not able to attend the meeting and had asked to be excused. Anna-Lena Wibom and Joao Benard da Costa could not attend the meeting before May 25 at 11.00, nor could Christian Dimitriu before May 26 at 12.00.

#### **1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Robert DAUDELIN and Eva ORBANZ had reshaped the order of items on the draft agenda, based on the availability of both Wolfgang Klaue and Jan Erik Holst who had to report respectively on the preparation of the Symposium and the Congress.

The agenda was then adopted in its new form.

#### **2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETING IN NEW YORK**

There being no amendment, the minutes of the Executive Committee in New York were adopted.

#### **3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETING IN NEW YORK**

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned the calculation of a new scale for membership fees, which was subject to further discussion during this meeting.

Referring to page 30, he informed the EC that after being tested in Montreal, the computer material financed by the Development Fund had just been shipped to Cinemateca de Cuba.

Finally, referring to page 25, he said he had informed Mr Alberti of the EC's decision not to recommend Mr Commencini for honorary membership to the General Assembly in Mo i Rana.

#### **4 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS**

##### **4.1. Reconfirmation of Members**

##### **4.1.a. Buenos Aires : Cinemateca Argentina**

Eva ORBANZ recalled their reconfirmation had been postponed in both Montevideo and New York because the disaster endured by Cinemateca Argentina in 1992 had made it difficult for the cinematheque to give correct information and to pay their annual dues for 1991 and 1992.

Referring to their annual report, she stressed they seemed to recover but still needed help.

After Ms VAN DER ELST had said the subscription dues of Cinemateca Argentina for 1991 and 1992 would be settled in Mo i Rana, Ms ORBANZ recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

Ms AUBERT suggested that when such disasters occur in "poor" archives, FIAF should make a gesture and discharge them from one year's subscription. The money saved hereby could then be used by the archives to buy new material (cleaning machine, ...).

Ms Orbanz thought that as long as we can afford it, this was a very good suggestion.

Mr DAUDELIN seconded Ms ORBANZ and proposed to wait for the Treasurer to see if we could possibly make it a formal proposal to be submitted to the General Assembly.

Ms VAN DER ELST thought it wiser to operate through the Development Fund rather than wiping off one year's subscription; e this might create a precedent difficult to assess for other cases.

Ms ORBANZ insisted on the exceptional side of this gesture, saying it would only happen in case of "disaster".

Dr SCHOU was surprised that the Preservation Commission had not been requested to make any recommendation after the disaster and added he could have sent Joao Socrates from Sao Paulo to Buenos Aires to identify their needs in terms of technical material.

Ms ORBANZ suggested Dr SCHOU should talk to Paulina Fernandez about this.

Ms AUBERT regretted this had not been undertaken one year earlier in Montevideo, when Ms Fernandez had reported on the catastrophe and had instantly called to more developed archives for free second-hand technical equipment.

Mr FRANCIS agreed it was the EC's duty to foster consultancy by our Commissions in case of such disasters but in his opinion, this type of actions could only be undertaken at the request of the concerned archive.

#### 4.1.b Habana : Cinemateca de Cuba

Although their reconfirmation file did lack some data - the cinematheque had two excuses for this : period of reorganisation in the institution and terrible communication conditions per fax, telephone and even mail, Ms ORBANZ thought there were enough elements in their

questionnaire and annual report that enabled us to trust and reconfirm them in their status of Member. She therefore recommended the reconfirmation of Cinemateca de Cuba.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

4.1.c. Los Angeles : National Center for Film and Video Preservation at the American Film Institute

This case had already been discussed at length during the EC meeting in New York.

Ms ORBANZ commented on the letter Mr Lukow had sent in response to her questions regarding the autonomy of NCFVP within the American Film Institute and the access to their documentation center. She was disappointed they had not sent their annual report.

Mr ROSEN, who had been asked to give his comments on the letter, said its contents were accurate and declared there were no radical difference between the present situation and the past when they were last reconfirmed.

Mr FRANCIS reaffirmed his belief that Associateship would ultimately be the appropriate position for the AFI, given they were not directly involved in preservation activities.

Ms ORBANZ argued at the same time that they became (full) Member in 1972 precisely because they were spending all their money on preservation in the various US archives. This difference in perception between herself and Mr FRANCIS, she added, pointed to the need to redefine in details the criteria and guidelines for the three membership categories in FIAF.

Mr JEAUVONS said we were all living in houses partly made of glass and we should be careful where we throw our stones. He claimed it was essential to know who was effectively in charge of the NCFVP and officially entitled to speak on behalf of the AFI.

Mr FRANCIS strongly believed we should receive an explanation why Ms Susan Dalton was no longer the representative of NCFVP, as was the case at the time of their last reconfirmation. In his opinion, this type of questions was essential in the frame of any reconfirmation.

Ms ORBANZ recommended the reconfirmation of the National Center for Film and Video Preservation at the American Film Institute as Member.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation

It was also agreed that Ms ORBANZ would informally talk with Gregory Lukow and Susan Dalton in order to receive some clarifications about who was effectively in charge of the NCFVP and officially entitled to speak on behalf of the AFI.

4.1.d. Luxembourg : Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg

Referring to their reconfirmation file, Ms ORBANZ noted that 20% of the budget was spent on acquisitions, which was very much, whereas there was no explicit indication of any part of the budget dedicated to preservation. She also underlined that the question whether they were preserving the whole national production had remained unanswered. Regarding their storage facilities, Ms VAN DER ELST had heard they had nearly completed the building of new vaults.

Ms JEAUVONS complained that Mr JUNCK was infringing FIAF's rules by trading films in other members' territories.

Ms AUBERT believed there were many similar cases in other countries and deplored that many non-FIAF institutions were benefiting from FIAF privileges only by dealing with Members overpassing FIAF rules. She insisted the Executive Committee should take the opportunity this year to repeat very strongly the strict rights and duties linked to the status of Member in FIAF. This "discipline" should be stated in a positive way, showing the advantages of working following FAF rules.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed with Ms AUBERT. Mr ROSEN felt this point was important enough to be the subject of a general discussion with the membership, reminding us all of the basic reasoning lying behind this Rule, while most of the archives seemed more to view it as a perk of membership. Mr JEAUVONS added that a firm statement from FIAF would help him re-affirming his rights in his own organisation. It was probably an appropriate moment to remind everyone that this was a strict rule, since it seemed to be infringed more and more.

Ms ORBANZ suggested to first ask Mr JUNCK a few more details about unclear or missing elements in his reconfirmation file.

Decision : letter to be written to Mr JUNCK according to Ms ORBANZ' suggestion; reconfirmation postponed until the next EC meeting.

Mr FRANCIS finally stressed that when a Member was due for reconfirmation, we needed to go back to its admission as Member and see if all original elements were still relevant and still reflected the FIAF of 1993 as opposed to the FIAF of the year when it was accepted.

4.1.e. México : Cinemateca Nacional

Ms ORBANZ commented on their reconfirmation questionnaire, pointing out that being only state subsidised by 30%, they had to make their own money in order to function.

The annual balance sheet was missing and the questionnaire indicated no money spent on preservation and 4.18% of the budget on film restoration. As in many other cases, Ms ORBANZ felt here that film restoration was interpreted as film cleaning, film handling, technical repair, rather than making copies.

Mr DAUDELIN thought we could not reconfirm Cinemateca Nacional without having more details on certain questions that could be asked to Lic. Guadalupe Ferrer Andrade in Mo i Rana.

Mr JEAUVONS thought we should also ask both archives in Mexico how they work together and who is keeping the national production.

Decision : discussion on reconfirmation postponed until we get more detailed information.

4.1.f. Mexico : Filmoteca de la UNAM

Ms ORBANZ commented on their reconfirmation file and warmly recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

4.1.g. Montevideo : Cinemateca Uruquaya

There had not been any change in general compared with their last reconfirmation.

Referring to their annual report, Ms ORBANZ reported that their new vaults were now operating and recalled that they were not subsidised but all their income did result from their screening and other cultural activities. This justified that they could not spend a very large amount of money on preservation.

Ms ORBANZ recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

4.1.h. Torino : Museo Nazionale del Cinema

Their file was fairly complete and contained many elements in favour of their reconfirmation : very valuable film collection, more money allocated to preservation and restoration (great efforts to raise money in the frame of "Lumière"), good collaboration with their Italian colleagues, no fundamental change since their last

reconfirmation except that they had now more power and more money.

Ms ORBANZ recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision : unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

#### 4.1.i. Members due for reconfirmation next fall

1. Kobenhavn : Det Danske Filmmuseum
2. London : National Film and Television Archive
3. New York : Film Department - Museum of Modern Art
4. Ottawa : Audiovisual Center, CAVA - National Archives of Canada
5. Rochester : Film Department - George Eastman House, International Museum of Photography

#### 4.2. Candidatures for (full) Membership

##### 4.2.a. Tokyo : National Film Center

Every EC member had received Anna-Lena's report on her visit to the National Center, which supported their admission as Member. Ms ORBANZ underlined the importance of their preservation activities described at length in their annual report and she recommended to submit their nomination as Member of the Federation to the vote of the General Assembly.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

Result of the vote : unanimously in favour.

##### 4.2.b. Vaticano : Cinemateca Vaticana

In New York the EC had postponed its decision on the admission of Cinemateca Vaticana as Member, pending more details regarding their preservation activities. As the information received from Mgr Planas at the request of Ms ORBANZ still needed some clarifications from Christian Dimitriu, who had visited the archive, it was decided to postpone the discussion until his arrival expected on May 26. In the afternoon of May 26, Mr DIMITRIU re-explained why, in his opinion, they were not qualifying as Member (cfr. Minutes of the EC in New York), underlining that the new preservation facilities announced in their annual report had not been set up yet.

Ms ORBANZ and Mr DAUDELIN had understood from Filmoteca Vaticana's annual report that collecting religious films was their prior concern whereas active preservation clearly appeared to be secondary to them. The report indicated no preservation programme as defined by our Statutes and Rules. As already discussed in New York, it was felt their present activities did correspond to the criteria of Associateship rather than Membership. It was also regretted that some gestures had been authorized to



encourage them to apply as Member. We should be more careful in the future with other applicants.

Decision: Ms ORBANZ to write them a letter explaining the EC's point of view and proposing two alternatives in a very positive way :

- either they become Associate of the Federation
- either they develop a preservation programme in the way it is asked for in our Statutes and Rules so as to meet in the longer run the criteria for admission as Member.

#### **4.3. Candidatures for Provisional Membership - Associateship**

##### 4.3.a. Ivry : Etablissement Cinématographique et Photographique des Armées (ECPA)

Ms ORBANZ commented on their application file, underlining the specific and unique character of their collection. She added the three French Members had agreed on this candidature.

In Ms AUBERT's opinion, ECPA's activities did perfectly meet the criteria for Provisional Membership and certainly (full) membership in the longer run but she explained that because of internal administrative questions within the Ministry of Defense, they had preferred to apply for Associateship.

Ms ORBANZ thanked Ms AUBERT for this clarification and called for a vote to be taken by a show of hands on the admission of ECPA as Associate of the Federation.

Result of the vote : unanimously in favour.

As a general point, Ms van der ELST asked whether candidates for the status of Associate needed to produce a bi-lateral "declaration of collaboration" with all the Members of their country, as was the case for Provisional membership (Rule 12). She agreed that all existing members should be asked to comment on the new application, but what about formal "declaration" which was sometimes hard to obtain from certain Members and could then block the candidature. In other words, should the application procedure be exactly the same for Provisional members as for Associates ?

Mr FRANCIS thought there should nevertheless be a different level for Associates producing such declaration. For Associates, the collaboration should be more voluntary since their preservation activities are (usually) not in the film field. Collaboration is evidently desirable but this obligation should have less force than it does for Members.

Ms ORBANZ said that the principle was the same for all, but that the EC was always authorized to relieve the applicant

of this obligation in specific cases. She proposed that, additionally to the "declaration of collaboration" requested from the applicant (cfr. rule 12) the Secretariat should seek in writing the opinion of the Member(s) in the same country.

#### 4.3.b. Ljubljana : Arhiv Republike Slovenije

Every EC member had received a copy of their whole application file. Mr OPELA, who had visited the archive, had made a written report on their activities, which was distributed to all EC members.

After reading it, Ms ORBANZ called for a vote to be taken by a show of hands on the admission of Arhiv Republike Slovenije as Provisional Member of the Federation.

Result of the vote : unanimously in favour.

#### 4.3.c. Aberystwyth : Wales Film and Television Archive

Referring to their application file, Ms ORBANZ briefly presented the candidate and asked Mr JEAUVONS to comment on their activities.

According to Mr JEAUVONS, this new regional archive was sharing the same ambition as the Scottish Film Archive, i.e. to be regarded as an independant film collection looking after a 100% Welsh national culture. He spoke highly of their documentation center, their efficiency and their ambition, adding that, like the Scottish Film Archive, they were complementing the work of the NFTA. He supported their application as Provisional Member.

Ms ORBANZ called for a vote to be taken by a show of hands on their admission as Provisional Member of the Federation.

Result of the vote : unanimously in favour.

Ms WIBOM joined the meeting at this stage.

A general discussion followed on FIAF's affiliation policy. Many issues already raised in previous discussions came back to the floor. It was agreed that, now that the the rules regarding our membership categories had been formally modified, we should enter the second stage and carry out an active membership policy based on the new criteria. Many felt also that those criteria still needed clarification. This policy should be directed especially to potential Associates (namely filmmuseums and filmschools) in developed as well as developing countries. In that respect, Mr FRANCIS proposed to set up a list of potential applicants which might be interesting for Associateship.

Ms ORBANZ having stressed the need to remain vigilant when admitting new affiliates, Ms AUBERT said, as an example, that by being too exclusive for our Associates' category,

we had, recently and in France only, lost the opportunity of admitting 2 potential affiliates (Musée d'Orsay and the Vidéothèque de Paris) which were now always dealing with many FIAF members as if they were (full) Members themselves, whether we liked it or not, and at the same time having a bad feeling about FIAF. She mentioned several examples of such dealings. If FIAF had admitted them as Associates, we would at least have the benefit of their subscriptions ! Mr DAUDELIN repeated that the problem came principally from our members who dealt with those institutions without going through the national Member. He also remembered that, when dealing with the candidature of Musée d'Orsay in November 1991, everyone had agreed on their non-admission. Maybe this was due again to the unclear definition of what we think the Associates' category should include.

Mr ROSEN felt we had never resolved in attitude a core question, namely : did we make those statutory changes to accomodate the fact that a number of entities wanted to be associated with FIAF and to find a place for them, or did we do it because we wanted to attract a wider array of institutions into FIAF and to some extent, at least by nuance, change its direction ? He believed we accepted the first and rhetorically but never really psychologically accepted the second; if we had, we would have a "program" to do that, including organizing Congresses differently, the literature we make available, preparing a list in each of our countries of those entities we would like to have as Associates and we could pursue. If we want to build this category of Associates, we need a campaign and a plan on how to do it.

Mr FRANCIS underlined we seemed to concentrate on areas like filmmuseums, filmschools for which we could have unanimity and keep away from those that caused problem now, i.e. non-profit organisations whose main activity is screenings. In order to get the decision through, we had to steer away from certain areas. Now, we have to have a much fuller discussion, and know exactly how far we can go before we can actually define it and write about it. This was an uneasy agreement. The changes were not universally accepted. Mr ROSEN suggested to put this as a charge to the next EC, as a priority, to get us through that next stage of "building up" the Associates' category. Trying to identify all the organisations that might be Associates, make a list and look at them one by one, identifying the problems they might pose. This would be a starting point.

Mr KLAUE suggested to examine the whole list of applicants and see why they were rejected or why they did not proceed with their application. He added he would be ready to list up archives with remarkable collections from the World

Directory he was presently compiling by the next EC meeting.

Decision : discussion to be prolonged at the EC meeting next fall.

#### 4.3.d. Miscellaneous

##### **Beijing - Taipei**

Everybody had received a letter of protest from Beijing regarding the naming of the archive in Taipei, namely "National Archive of the Republic of China". The discussion resulted in the decision that the President and the Secretary-General, together with Wolfgang Klaue, would go and talk with respectively the delegates of Beijing and Taipei in Mo i Rana in order to see what compromise could be reached. Meanwhile, we should also investigate what names are used for Taiwan institutions by other international organisations.

##### **Cinémathèque Universitaire (Paris)**

Ms AUBERT reported that the law case would be reviewed in September. A decision will have to be taken in 1994, when every Associate and Provisional Member will be up for reconfirmation.

##### **List of addresses**

The question on whether FIAF affiliates should be listed up by city or country in the FIAF's book of addresses was discussed at length and it was finally agreed to make it by country. As regards the shortened list of addresses, it was decided to make it by country as well, with the name of the contact person.

## **5 FINANCES**

### **5.1. Approval of the 1992 accounts and 1994 budget**

At the request of Ms WIBOM, Ms VAN DER ELST commented on the 1992 accounts, which had been approved by FIAF's auditor. There were no particular problems.

Ms VAN DER ELST commented on the budget for 1994.

There had been a request from the TCC to receive from member organisations a yearly subsidy of 1.500,- US\$. Dr SCHOU said this money would be used among others to finance the proceedings of the JTS Symposium in Barcelona in August 1993. Ms ORBANZ felt that the TCC was so far the only practical result emanating from the discussions at the NGOs' Round Table.

Decision : the requested subsidy is approved provided it is allocated to the proceedings of the JTS in Barcelona. This

amount will be raised from the budget for "special publications" in 1994 as long as the proceedings are approved by the Head of our Preservation Commission. In the future, no extra money will be reserved for the TCC unless they have a specific agenda to propose.

Talking about "special publications", Ms VAN DER ELST asked the Commission Heads if extra-budgetary money would have to be raised for possible coming publications. Mr BENARD DA COSTA mentioned Jean-Pierre Verscheure's publication planned in 1994 and for which special money would have to be raised.

A discussion followed regarding the cost of the FIAF Bulletin and its distribution policy. The present number printed was 400, which made the cost per copy very high. Ms WIBOM insisted that archives should be better informed that they can buy a bunch of copies at a much lower price to distribute or to sell. Mr FRANCIS was in favour of printing more copies for free publicity.

Ms AUBERT insisted on the importance of FIAF affiliates' collaboration to try and find advertisers for the Bulletin. Ms WIBOM suggested to foresee several thousands of copies to be distributed at film festivals and was confident this was the best way of publicising ourselves.

Ms VAN DER ELST pointed out that 500,000.- Belgian francs were foreseen for the Centenary Fund in 1994 but wondered where this money would come from.

The item "Development Fund" was introduced in the 1994 budget even though the source of its financing was still very vague.

Following Mr ROSEN's proposal, it was generally agreed to send out the bi-annual calendar with the Bulletin. Ideally, the whole package should be published several thousand times in order to reach the largest audience possible, which would also attract more advertisers.

Each issue would cost 1.300,- US\$. As a way of funding this, the Secretariat was asked to write a circular letter to all FIAF affiliates about Luis de Pina's suggestion to devote the income of one screening per year to the Federation.

Ms WIBOM said she would try to find financial support for this project but did not precise how.

#### 5.2. Proposals for a new scale of membership fees

Ms AUBERT described the new principle of calculation, dividing membership fees into three categories according to

the affiliates' annual budget. She proposed to apply the same calculation system to the three membership categories.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested to make a quick budget survey at the beginning of the GA to know in which category each archive would fall. This would enable us to make a quick calculation of the final outlook of the new approach.

Mr KLAUE insisted we should explain clearly how the archive budget would have to be estimated, stressing it would be difficult to evaluate the budget of departments integrated into larger institutions.

Ms VAN DER ELST noted that the basic fee suggested for Provisional Members (50,000.- BEF) exceeded the present amount (37,500.- BEF) which some of them could hardly afford to pay.

Mr FRANCIS wondered whether there would be a periodical assessment of members' staffing and budget to see if their category was still relevant.

Mr JEAUVONS said that another way of evaluating an archive was to evaluate their performance and their contribution to the goals of the Federation. With non-paying archives, we should ask ourselves what performance they deliver FIAF as a compensation for their non-payment.

Mr KLAUE raised the problem of archives having a currency with a totally unrealistic exchange rate when converted into dollars. For example, would Gosfilmofond, one of our largest archives, go into the C category only because of currency techniques ?

Mr DAUDELIN feared this system might lead to an embarrassing situation with Associates : they would not have any right to vote nor the privileges linked to the status of Member whereas they might be paying nearly the same subscription !

Mr JEAUVONS suggested to create a membership dues sub-committee, including the Treasurer, with the following missions :

1. to look at this structure in more details;
2. to work as an arbitrating group to examine special cases of non-payment.

Ms AUBERT agreed to draft a form to be distributed to all delegates at the beginning of the General Assembly, in order for them to evaluate their annual budget, and to present the new FIAF scale accordingly.

### 5.3. Report of the Fundraising Committee

Ms WIBOM reported the only funds that the Fundraising Committee had been able to raise this year was 4.500,- US\$ from the Lauritzen Foundation for the Newsreel Symposium.

A leaflet conceived for FIAF 100 YEARS OF CINEMA FUND DRIVE had just been produced by Mary-Lea Bandy in New York.

Ms WIBOM believed the next edition of this brochure should much more emphasize FIAF's role as a research, training and information center for the long life of the moving images. She was confident those three concepts were more attractive to possible contributors than the strict idea of collection and preservation. She advocated we should market not only what we are but also what we are doing.

In that respect, Ms AUBERT recalled it would soon be completed by the concrete results of the Survey of FIAF archives' work which she had been conducting. She believed the results of the survey should also be analysed in the FIAF Bulletin and Mr DAUDELIN suggested to summarize Ms AUBERT's survey into a very spectacular 30 or 60 second clip, to be made available all around the world.

In Ms AUBERT's opinion, it would also be easier to show to the outside world what we represent if we produced a "FIAF annual book of reports" with the Federation's main achievements over the years.

Mr ROSEN thought it was essential to approach possible contributors with specific and clearly defined projects to fund.

Mr JEAUVONS thought the leaflet was a very valuable achievement and he expressed his congratulations to Ms Bandy for this work. In approaching possible contributors, he said we should also emphasize the value of our work as putting new life into old films and bringing them back on the screen. In that respect, he suggested to produce a list of well-known films that have been saved and can now be seen.

For Ms AUBERT and Ms WIBOM, this leaflet was the starting point of a general campaign promoting our Federation, which should be carried on as follows :

1. On the occasion of big international film festivals around the world (Cannes, Venice, San Sebastian, Ciné-mémoire, Berlin, London, Academy of Awards, ...) FIAF should be physically represented by one or several FIAF member(s) responsible for the distribution of leaflets and calendars, for contacts with journalists and personalities (cocktails, press conferences...), for the organisation of

screenings. Such screenings could be for example clips of important moments in cinema history; they might as well be devoted to the one or the other contributor who helped us cover the screening costs.

Ms AUBERT suggested to plan for Cannes next year a press conference with a Honorary Committee of directors committed to film preservation. She therefore proposed to ask our affiliates to send to the secretariat a list of prominent film producers or film directors in their country who would like to be part of the Honorary Committee for the Centenary and have their name printed on our projects. It was agreed we should first have to find a person to preside over the Board of this Committee.

Ms ORBANZ underlined the need to have some guidelines in selecting those personalities because it might happen that the Fundraising Committee did not wish the presence of this or that person on the Honorary Committee.

For Cannes again, Ms AUBERT proposed to set up an exhibition of pictures of FIAF members' vaults and buildings, underlining the need to present us visually and to strike people's imagination. She said she could ask FIAF archives to send her negatives of such pictures.

Another way of making FIAF "physically" present and publicizing our work during festivals was, according to Ms WIBOM, to prepare a "box" of FIAF publications that would be easily transportable to every festival where FIAF has a representation. This would foster FIAF's reputation as a research and information center.

2. Funds for this campaign should come from external contributors. Ms WIBOM suggested that all FIAF affiliates make up a list of possible national and international sponsors"(sic) to subsidize these actions. Ms WIBOM and Ms AUBERT were confident we could get some funding from our big international film stock manufacturers (Agfa, Fudji, Kodak,...) if we emphasized the vital outlet we represent for their film stock (especially black and white), by underlining how many meters of film we all buy and use every year. This information could be obtained from the survey. Ms AUBERT found the national agencies of these international companies should be approached by prime contact. Mr JEAVONS remarked that, as film stock manufacturers were getting more and more keen on using polyester, we might especially gain their interest if we were moving more towards using polyester.

Money should also be found on a national level, and a certain amount of FIAF archives could raise an amount of



25.000 US\$ each. Ms AUBERT therefore suggested to ask our affiliates during the GA to make this effort.

As an alternative to finding contributors (which might be extremely difficult in some countries), Ms AUBERT said some archives might contribute to this general drive by sharing with FIAF the income of one or several film shows, at least once a year from now till 1995. Further to this alternative and in line with Luis de Pina's suggestion, Mr DAUDELIN proposed to ask all our affiliates to give FIAF the income of one screening in December, in memory of the first screening at *Le Grand Café* on 28 December 1895.

Mr ROSEN was concerned that FIAF's fundraising strategy might be competing with each archive's internal efforts to raise funding for their individual activities.

A discussion followed regarding the possibility for FIAF to seek the collaboration of one or several professional fundraiser(s).

Mr ROSEN was convinced we should adopt a strict professional attitude towards any candidate for fundraising. Ms WIBOM rejected the idea of "hiring" a professional fundraiser. There should be no contract but only a document stating that this or that person has the authority to represent FIAF in raising money from this or that company or in this or that country. The only financial agreement with the possible fundraiser would be that he/she could have a percentage (25%) on whatever he makes. Such "external" fundraisers could devote their efforts on non-film institutions, like Marlboro, Philip Morris, Piper-Heidesiek...

Ms AUBERT said she could contact a professional French fundraiser very much concerned about "heritage matters" in general and ask her some advice.

It was finally agreed that two or three professionals could be approached by FIAF members to raise funds in the name of FIAF.

3. What will be the reward for our contributors ?

This was a great concern to Mr FRANCIS who underlined that competition in fundraising was getting tougher and tougher. Ms WIBOM believed sponsors should have their contribution recognized during the 1995 Congress which, in her opinion, had to be the biggest FIAF media event possible. If we plan to print their name on our projects as a way of recognizing their contribution, Mr ROSEN repeated his concern that such projects would have to be clearly defined in advance.

After hearing the Fundraising Committee's general point of view, Ms ORBANZ felt we should approach the situation in two steps, i.e. first make FIAF well-known with the money available before fundraising (dissemination of the survey, the Bulletin and the calendar) and once FIAF has strengthened its profile (peak in 1995), then we could go fundraising for specific projects.

Mr DAUDELIN thought the Fundraising Committee would have to meet in Mo i Rana. Ms ORBANZ asked Ms WIBOM to keep the Secretariat informed of the main decisions taken during this meeting.

Ms VAN DER ELST stressed the need for the Secretariat to receive clear instructions from the Fundraising Committee in order to implement the above-mentioned proposals (letters to affiliates regarding the creation of a Honorary Committee, regarding fundraising on national level..., etc

Both Ms WIBOM and Ms AUBERT would be reporting on the plans of the Fundraising Committee at the General Assembly.

Mr MAGLIOZZI proposed to use the Commissions' help to distribute the FIAF leaflet to film periodicals, universities, collectors,...

## 6 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### 6.1. Relations with Unesco

Ms ORBANZ commented her written report on FIAF's relations with Unesco and other NGOs, which had been distributed to everybody.

Although she felt that NGOs' opinions were rarely taken into account during Unesco meetings, she was convinced we should "keep a foot in the door" and attend the meetings we are invited to, even when it may seem a waste of time.

Having noted that very often, international organisations attending Unesco meetings were considered as hindering "lobbying groups", Mr KLAUE strongly encouraged individual initiatives from our affiliates to express the importance of preservation to their national commissions. This approach, he said, can have a real impact on Unesco officers.

He then stressed the importance for the NGOs' Round Table to orientate their discussions towards more concrete actions. In that respect, he suggested to limit the agenda of the next Round Table to 1 item only : areas of cooperation between our NGOs.

He finally proposed to invite Federico Mayor, Unesco's Director General to our Congress in 1995, as a way of promoting FIAF in the eyes of Unesco.

Mr ROSEN and Mr DAUDELIN agreed. Mr DAUDELIN added we should take the opportunity of our EC meeting in Paris next November to formally meet with Unesco representatives and make this invitation a part of our meeting with them.

## **6.2. Relations with other international organisations**

### **CITRA**

FIAF was invited to attend their annual conference in Mexico City in September. One of our Mexican members would be asked to represent us.

### **IFLA**

FIAF is on their mailing list for their Bulletin. The FIAF Secretariat was asked to transmit to our members pieces of information which could interest them.

### **FIAT**

They will have a joint Congress with IASA in 1994 in Berlin.

### **CILECT**

Mr ROSEN reported they were willing to have a more formal relationship with FIAF around the question of filmmuseums and archives. He said he would keep attending their meetings in order to continue the dialog.

### **ACCE (incl. the Lumière Project issued from the European MEDIA programme)**

Mr JEAUVONS reported Lumière had met several times and dispersed its main funding for restorations. There were now 40 restoration projects completed or in existence amongst EEC archives.

Mr JEAUVONS added Lumière had now a very high rating among the MEDIA projects. The European filmography, which had led Geoffrey Nowell-Smith to start a dialog with the Cataloguing Commission, was progressing and a draft proposal on how the project for the research of lost films should be conducted had now been agreed.

Ms AUBERT added Lumière's membership would soon be extended to Norway, Sweden and Austria. In future, it might also include archives from Eastern Europe.

### **COUNCIL OF EUROPE**

Ms ORBANZ explained that the Council of Europe was preparing a convention to protect the European audiovisual heritage.

Ms WIBOM asked what their plans were for the cinema centenary. Mr JEAUVONS knew that Christian Zeender was leading the Centenary Committee but regretted they had no specific money to carry out centenary-related projects on their own.

#### UNIVERSITY OF EAST-ANGLIA

Mr JEAUVONS reported on the success of this archive course and Ms ORBANZ wondered whether we could push the NGO Round Table's project of the "Curriculum Development Working Party" in this direction and perhaps raise some money from Unesco to support students attending this course in terms of travel and accomodation. Mr JEAUVONS thought this was worth trying but feared that the University of East-Anglia would bear no interference from Unesco as a contributor in its programme.

### 7 CENTENARY PLANS

#### 7.1. Calendar

In the name of the working group on the cinema centenary (Mr FRANCIS, Mr JEAUVONS and Mr ROSEN), Mr ROSEN presented various possible formats for the bi-annual FIAF centenary calendar.

A long discussion on this item led to the following decisions :

#### Title of the calendar

To be consistent with the logo, i.e. to contain the three following concepts : FIAF - centenary - cinema.

#### Format

To be sized for insertion as a fly-out in the FIAF Bulletin.

Printing : printing will be done in Los Angeles.

Deadline for the first issue : September 1993

#### Budget and funding

Budget to foresee per issue : max. \$ 1,500. It was agreed that the first issue would be funded with "inside-budgetary" money, whereas the following issues might require extra-budgetary money, especially if we wanted to extend the distribution to PR boxes in festivals. In that respect, Ms WIBOM suggested to foresee some space for contributors at the back of the calendar.

#### Distribution : 3 posts

1. to FIAF affiliates and buyers of the Bulletin, by insertion in the FIAF Bulletin (task of the Secretariat)
2. to festivals (task of the representatives of FIAF at festivals)
3. to member archives for mailing to journals and newspapers in their country (task of the Secretariat, based on the press lists received from these members).

### 7.2. FIAF Centenary Logo

After a general discussion on the use of our logo, the Secretariat was asked to write a letter to all FIAF affiliates, inviting them to use this logo on the official format of centenary-related projects (publications, exhibitions, restoration projects...) that they would like to associate with the Federation. Should some non-FIAF institutions in contact with our archives wish to use the FIAF logo for their own centenary-related projects, the awarding of the logo will remain under the FIAF archives' responsibility.

### 7.3. Congress 1995

On behalf of the coordinated committee of the three FIAF members co-sponsoring the 1995 Congress (UCLA Film and TV Archive, the Motion Picture Academy, the National Center at the AFI), Mr ROSEN made a first presentation of the event and announced that after this Congress, Steven Ricci would become the official correspondent between the coordinated committee and FIAF.

#### Funding

The committee had received a commitment from the National Endowment for the Arts and the AFI for US\$ 75,000. They had had discussions with a number of studios about in kind participation in dinners, tours,... and had got an enthusiastic response. They would try to seek some help from the Rockefeller Foundation to alleviate the costs of some delegates coming to the Congress. Mr ROSEN wanted to be informed on FIAF's financial participation in the Congress.

#### Meetings and day events

The core events/meetings would be held in Westwood and Beverly Hills, contiguous to one another whereas AFI, further away, would host one or two particular side-event(s).

The preliminary programme was planned as follows :

- April 22-24 : EC meeting in the Motion Picture Academy.
- April 25-26 : General Assembly at UCLA.
- April 27 : Excursion ("behind the scenes" tour in some of the theaters downtown)
- April 28-29 : Symposium
- April 30 : Workshops

Ms van der ElST asked the organizers to plan some time for the second meeting of the EC and for other possible meetings (Lumière, PIP, Commissions...)

### Evening events

Mr ROSEN wondered how many events it was realistic to plan in the evenings but already announced there were at least two "high-profile" evening events planned : one at UCLA with the various directors involved in some way with issues of film history and the need for preservation, and another at the Motion Picture Academy.

### Symposium

Two different themes were proposed for two different symposiums, totally media-oriented :

1. First 100 years of cinema : what has been preserved so far ? What has not been done because of a lack of means and what does still need to be done ? The coordinated committee's proposal was to seek among our members some thematic issues and concerns that would be "exciting" to the press and which would therefore be submitted to a selection based on the concern that the symposium be as effective a possible and not necessarily as inclusive as possible. For this first symposium, Mr ROSEN underlined the need to have figures and statistics prepared in a very accessible way, which would need a lot of interaction with all Commissions.

Mr DAUDELIN said we needed people from the outside (well-known historians for example) to stress the importance of saving films.

2. Next 100 years of cinema : discussion on new technologies, what will archives be doing in a changing communication environment, what will they be collecting,...

### Miscellaneous

VISAS : there was every reason to believe that all affiliates would be welcome in the USA although this could not be *absolutely* guaranteed.

Transportation: Mr JEAUVONS suggested to investigate car hiring possibilities in Los Angeles.

### Recognition of contributors to the FIAF 100th Anniversary Fund

Following the request of Ms WIBOM, Mr ROSEN agreed to write a statement about the recognition of contributors, being confident that the public events planned in the evening would be the best opportunity to honour them. This statement would be joined to FIAF's fundraising letter.

## 8 REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF THE CONGRESS

After expressing his gratitude to Roger Smither for his highly valuable collaboration in the preparation of the Symposium, Mr KLAUE made two remarks regarding the organisation of the event:

1. the time for preparation had been too short not only to raise money for the event but also to find the "ideal" speakers and to be able to present now the final version of the programme for the Symposium and the 5 evening showings. Mr KLAUE firmly insisted that a longer period of preparation had to be taken into account for future events, especially when we wished participation of outside experts.

2. there had been extremely little response from the membership to the request for help they all had received. Outside the EC members, only 4 archives had showed interest in contributing to the Symposium. Such a disinterest pointed to the need to choose more carefully the themes for our future symposia. They should be really in the interest of members.

Mr KLAUE then described the provisionnal programme originally divided into 8 sessions but now merged into 5 sessions. He thanked Mr Holst for helping him to get in contact with experts from Norway and finally commented on the programmed evening screenings.

Directory of Newsreels collections : Mr KLAUE reported that the Bundesarchiv had made no firm promise to fund this publication but hoped they would finance the whole infrastructure for this project (mailing, preparing questions, printing of questionnaires, computer programme...).

He added that with the Treasurer's help, they had received US\$ 4.500,- from the Lauritzen Foundation, which would be used for travel and/or staying costs of some of the invited speakers.

Mr HOLST commented on the programme and organisation of the GA, the excursion, the symposium, the workshops and the evening screenings.

It was decided that the planned workshop on legal deposit would be this time a "planning" workshop intended to prepare next year's symposium in Bologna. Ms van der Elst said each person responsible for a workshop should draft an updated description of his/her workshop to be distributed in all pigeon holes on the very first morning, in order to prepare lists of attendanc for each group.

## 9 REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

### 9.1. Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections

At the request of the EC in New York, Mr BENARD DA COSTA had produced in annex to his report a document entitled "objectives and purposes of the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections", which was circulated.

As required from each Head of Commission, Mr BENARD DA COSTA had appointed Ms Gabrielle Claes as Deputy Chairman.

He commented the progress report of the Commission. The survey on programming and access in film archives would be presented by Catherine Gautier during the Open Forum in Mo i Rana.

Jean-Pierre Verscheure's manual for technical standards and guidelines for projection was to be published by the end of 1993, in order to be presented at the 1994 Congress in Bologna. As the funding of this project was not included in the budget for 1993, Mr DAUDELIN suggested to make it a centenary project subsidized by a private sponsor (Agfa, for example), insisting the publication should be illustrated as largely as intended by Mr Verscheure. In that case, Ms ORBANZ said the publication should be included in the FIAF centenary calendar as a "FIAF" activity. She also suggested to use this project for one evening screening about technology during the 1995 Congress. Ms van der ELST said we should not forget to foresee a reward for Mr Verscheure's work. Another cost to foresee was, according to Ms AUBERT, the translation of the publication into English. She suggested to have this book sponsored by trade projectionists' organisations (like "Fédération des Industries Techniques" in France). Mr SCHOU insisted on a better communication between the Preservation Commission and the Programming Commission on this subject.

In reply to Mr DAUDELIN, Mr BENARD DA COSTA said the publication re. access by Paolo Cherchi Usai would be published in 1994.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that, while understanding the reasons, he very much regretted the resignation of both Paolo Cherchi Usai and Enno Patalas as members of the Commission. Besides, he had just received a letter from Manuel Martinez Carril saying that for a number of personal and financial reasons, he could not remain on the Commission. Therefore, the Commission's membership was now reduced to 4. He would soon propose suggestions for new members. Mr DAUDELIN suggested to replace only 2 members



instead of 3, given the economics of the Federation. He added those new members should preferably be involved more in "access" than "programming" issues.

Ms AUBERT proposed to send to each Commission head a copy of the answers to her survey relating to their field of specialization.

This suggestion was warmly welcomed.

Ms AUBERT also encouraged the Commission heads to read carefully the members' annual reports which often contained interesting information for their work.

She suggested that the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections try and enhance the value of little known films or documentaries which archives have restored from their national heritage but which they cannot promote at the end. This could be done by creating a catalog of restored films in which those films would be linked together. Mr BENARD DA COSTA said he would report this proposal to the Commission meeting in Mo i Rana.

## 9.2. Cataloguing Commission

Roger Smither had been temporarily designated as Deputy Chairman of the Commission.

Ms HARRISON circulated her oral report to the GA commenting on the archives' cataloguing activities described in their annual report.

Their next meeting was due to be held in Prague next September and would celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Cataloguing Commission.

In addition to her written report, Ms HARRISON then commented on some Commission's projects, namely :

- Bibliography of FIAF members' filmographies (Rolf Lindfors) : ready to be sent to archives for corrections and then to be published.

- Cataloguing rules : to be translated into French via Ms AUBERT.

- Guidelines for selection criteria : as there was no definite volunteer to translate this publication into English, extra financial support might be required to achieve this translation professionally.

Varia : A corresponding member of the Cataloguing Commission had noted a variation of definition regarding the standard length of feature films between the EC's definition for annual questionnaire on statistics (60 min.)

and the Commission's definition (approx. 40 min.). This difference was due to the fact that the EC was referring to current materials in the questionnaire, whereas the Commission meant old material. Ms HARRISON recommended more consistency within FIAF literature and suggested that each Commission head check whether such variations exist between their own definitions and FIAF's various documents and publications.

Ms ORBANZ had been surprised to note that in spite of the fact that IASA's project to survey audiovisual archives' holdings had not been formally approved during the Round Table in Den Haag where it had been presented by Gerald Gibson, the latter had sent to FIAF's membership a questionnaire about their holdings. However, Mr FRANCIS reported the project had been presented to him as a formal agreement of the Round Table, adding it was funded by Kodak.

Ms ORBANZ doubted FIAF would receive any feedback from this survey to which its members had been asked to pay time and attention.

Decision: Mr FRANCIS to convey to Gerald Gibson that if he wants this question to be debated, he must send a formal letter to FIAF.

There were now 5 members on the Cataloguing Commission but Ms HARRISON proposed to have Olwen Terris (London) as new member. Before that, the Commission was planning to invite her as guest expert at their next meeting in Prague.

Mr ROSEN asked whether it would be possible to report on the main progress made in cataloguing in the last 10-20 years. Ms HARRISON said her Commission would try to analyze the data regarding cataloguing issues in Ms AUBERT's survey.

### 9.3. Documentation Commission

René Beauclair had been designated as Deputy Chairman of the Commission.

Mr MAGLIOZZI regretted that because of financial difficulties in Cinemateca de Cuba, Teresa Toledo had not been able to take part in the last Commission meeting in Montreal in October 1992. Ms van der ELST suggested that in such cases and with the agreement of the Treasurer, FIAF should try and support travel costs with the money remaining from the general budget allocated to Commissions.

Referring to his written report, Mr MAGLIOZZI commented the various projects and publications of the Documentation Commission.

He reported that Susan Dalton (AFI) had put on a STAR database the publication "Treasures from the Film Archives" which she was ready to update every year and, subject to the approval of the EC, he suggested this should become another Commission project.

Ms AUBERT proposed to enlist the Commission publications in the calendar and to mark them with FIAF's logo.

The following day (Monday 26), Mr MAGLIOZZI was asked to introduce his Statement describing the subject and purpose of documentation commission work as part of his report to the GA and, after Mr Rochemont had volunteered to translate it into French, the Secretariat was asked to distribute it to the membership with a recommendation to hand it over to the proper staff in their archive. The same was decided for the Objectives and purposes of the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections, presented earlier by Mr BENARD DA COSTA.

Michael MOULDS, who had been invited to join the meeting at that point, was asked to demonstrate the P.I.P.'s new International FilmArchive CD-ROM indexing system for FIAF members' publications. A lot of questions were raised and suggestions made regarding the content, the price, the promotion, funding, marketing and updating of the index, which Mr MOULDS and Mr MAGLIOZZI noted for further action. Mr MAGLIOZZI insisted that FIAF heads of archives should underline the value of this database among their staff. Mr DAUDELIN thanked Mr MOULDS for his demonstration and all his work.

#### 9.4. Preservation Commission

Mr Harald Brandes had agreed to be designated as Deputy Chairman of the Commission.

As Henning SCHOU and Tony COOK were now working as a team in the same place, it was decided that the latter -at present very busy with the FORCE project - would leave the Commission and be replaced by another member.

Ms AUBERT noted an error in Mr SCHOU's report, i.e. the FORCE project was not part of the Media Programme but of another EEC Programme.

Mr SCHOU commented on the various new papers that were now ready for distribution or very close to being published. Following Ms van der ELST's suggestion, it was agreed to distribute also the paper Acetate or Polyester ? Mechanical Properties and Indicators for Film Stability by Joao Socrates de Oliveira, already published in Bulletin FIAF 46, April 1993.

At Mr DAUDELIN's request, Mr SCHOU also accepted to write a review of the Technical Manual for the Bulletin, including the new papers and to revise accordingly the summary of contents of the Technical Manual in FIAF's list of publication.

According to the decision of the EC meeting in New York, Dr SCHOU had set up a list of questions which were posed to the National Film Center in Tokyo by Ms WIBOM during her visit there and in connection with their application as full Member. Dr SCHOU thought that part of that list should be included under point 13 of the admission questionnaire for candidates to Membership and asked for Ms van der ELST's collaboration to prolong question 13 accordingly.

As to DANCAN's inaccurate reporting regarding storage containers, Mr SCHOU had not written directly to the membership as decided in New York but had simply included a note on this subject in his written report under "News Items" so as to avoid any legal battle between FIAF and the can manufacturer.

Referring to the recent meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee for the International Audio - Film and TV Archives (TCC) in preparation of the Joint Technical Symposium in Barcelona, Mr SCHOU feared that at this stage the JTS still did not have a sufficient number of quality speakers and was not ready to be held.

The next Commission meeting was to take place in connection with the JTS in Barcelona.

## 10 REVIEW OF THE VARIOUS POINTS ON THE AGENDA OF THE GA

### GA4 Report of the President

Mr DAUDELIN read aloud his draft report and took into account the remarks made by some EC members before editing the final version to be presented to the GA.

### GA6 Cinema Centenary

Mr ROSEN would report on behalf of both the working group on cinema centenary and the American joint committee organizing the 1995 Congress. Following Ms ORBANZ's recommendation, the vote on the Congress would include Provisional Members and Associates, as had been done for the Congress in Bologna in 1994.

**GA7 Projects and publications underway**

Training and Summerschools : referring to his comprehensive report on Summerschool in Berkhamsted which had been distributed to every EC member, Mr JEAUVONS commented on the alternatives he proposed for future summerschools :

*Alternative 1* : summerschools to be held at appropriate intervals in one suitably equipped archive which accumulates the experience of doing that, such as the Conservation Center in Berkhamsted. Advantages: a definite willingness from the staff to do this again. However, it puts a strain on the archive and slows down the production activities.

*Alternative 2* : to organize summerschools more frequently in different archives, on a rotation basis. Advantages : the work burden can be shared and the language can change from time to time (translation is very expensive and hardly feasible in such demonstration circumstances). This would also freshen the approaches to the training and avoid a dominant methodology one always adapts to one's own circumstances.

*Alternative 3* : to run summerschools on an inter-archival basis, sharing the work in a very formal way.

He would submit those questions and suggestions to the GA.

Mr JEAUVONS then suggested to create a training group which would attend general questions of training worldwide. This group would not only help set up "summer" schools but also other training opportunities. Such a group would develop cooperation with other training groups in other NGOs. Mr JEAUVONS believed that by formalizing our approach to training and offering that synergy to Unesco, we might entice more Unesco funding.

Ms AUBERT explained Bois d'Arcy's experience with trainees coming by little groups from French-speaking developing archives and supported Mr JEAUVONS' suggestion to create a training group which, in her opinion, should examine whether training tools that have been produced by FORCE (publications, videos,...) can be somehow re-used more effectively for our programmes.

Mr DAUDELIN proposed to formalize the creation of this working group at the meeting of the next EC in Mo i Rana. He suggested to already put on their agenda a list of needs for training repertoriated in the annual reports of our affiliates.

Mr ROSEN suggested to include relations between film schools and film archives as another topic for this group.

Publication of Papers of the Athens Symposium : Ms van der ELST reported that Cinémathèque Française still volunteered to publish these papers in a more general publication on avant-garde cinema but they were still negotiating with some contributors to fund this project.

Ledoux' Catalog of Silent Films : it was decided to ask the membership at the GA whether this catalog should be updated and published again.

#### **GA8 Membership questions - miscellaneous**

Ms WIBOM reported on her visit to the archives of Bangkok, Hanoi, Saigon and Vientian (Laos) on her way to Tokyo in December '92. The archive in Laos really wanted to have a link with FIAF, especially for training and equipment. Ms WIBOM pointed to the paradox that they could not afford to join FIAF whereas they were those who needed us the more. Mr JEAUVONS believed we had an obligation to help them, saying the inventory of their needs in terms of training could become a mission for the new working group.

Ms WIBOM accepted to translate her report in English and/or German and to send it to bigger archives likely to offer some help, perhaps through official governmental channels. She also mentioned that the Archive in Hanoi had recently managed to get enough resources to erect a new building which, unfortunately, was already deteriorating because it had been built regardless of any of FIAF's guidelines in this field. She explained that although the archive's curator was aware of those recommendations, there was no way for him to implement his knowledge in his own country as people would not listen to him.

Referring to her experience with Laos and Africa, Ms AUBERT said the case of Hanoi pointed to the necessity of close follow-up and regular contacts with the developing countries we help, contacts on all levels (embassies, government, with the people in charge of building, training, shipping and setting up of equipment, ...). Mr DAUDELIN suggested to send to Laos a letter of encouragement and offer them a set of FIAF publications.

Mr ROSEN suggested to recommend to these archives to use the political weight of FIAF when dealing with their government for the building of new vaults or the acquisition of equipment.

He also drew the EC's attention on the heavy bureaucracy of these countries, which could be an obstacle to the proper delivery and setting up of the equipment shipped from bigger archives.

Decision: Ms WIBOM to address this theme under "Membership - Miscellaneous" during the GA, as would Mr JEAUVONS on his trip to Hong Kong.

**GA9 Relations with Unesco and other international organisations**

Ms ORBANZ to report to the GA about relations with Unesco.  
Mr JEAUVONS to report about FIAT and to introduce Tedd Johanssen, member of FIAT who will be attending the meeting.

**GA10/11 Financial report and 1994 budget**

Ms WIBOM to report to the GA and the Secretariat to add US\$ 1,500 (for the publication of the JTS papers) under "special publications" in the 1994 budget.

**GA17 Future Congresses**

1994 : Mr BOARINI, who had arrived in the afternoon, reported on the preparation of the next FIAF Congress in Bologna. According to his proposals and to some EC members' remarks, the following was agreed :

- Congress organized by Cineteca Comunale with the participation of C.S.C.-Cineteca Nazionale in Rome (suggestion of the Ministry) and the other Italian archives.
- dates : EC meeting on 23-25 April and GA on 26-27 April. Workshop day: April 28. Symposia on April 30 + May 1st. Monday May 2d will be dedicated to a visit to Cineteca Nazionale in Rome, its vaults and Cinecitta. There will be no "excursion" as such but the possibility to attend the Bologna Festival *Il Cinema Ritrovato*, on April 29.
- 1st symposium on legal (statutory) deposit, prepared by a working group chaired by Mr JEAUVONS and including Mr BOARINI. Questionnaires on this subject to be sent out to the membership.
- 2nd symposium on Precinema. Mr FRANCIS to include in Mo a discussion to prepare this symposium.
- translation foreseen in English and French + perhaps Spanish for the GA and the Symposium.

1996 and later : vote to be taken on the Congress in Beijing. Membership to be informed of invitations of Madrid and Barcelona for the 1997 Congress.

As it had not been minuted in the report of the last EC meeting in NY, Mr JEAUVONS re-stated his invitation to hold the FIAF Congress at the National Film and Television Archive in the year 2000.

**GA18 Open Forum**

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said Catherine Gautier would comment on the results of the survey on programming and access to the collections in archives. This referred Mr JEAUVONS to a problem regarding the lack of communication between archives when restoring a print, which sometimes led to absurd situations where none of the prints of the same

title was available for distribution because these prints were held as "preservation or conservation copies" in different archives.

Mr ROSEN said he would report briefly to GA on the AMC Festival on preservation recently organized by UCLA, and explain the nuance between conservation and preservation copies.

Mr JEAUVONS believed better communication regarding intentions of preservation would avoid duplication of efforts. In that respect, Ms van der ELST said the membership could make much better use of the Union Catalog available from the Secretariat.

#### **GA20 Election of the Executive Committee**

Ms ORBANZ went through the list of candidates which so far did not match the required number of EC members and would remain open until the very last moment during the election session.

#### **GA21 Election of Honorary Member(s)**

All EC members agreed that Eileen Bowser should be recommended to the GA as Honorary Member.

#### **Chairmanship of the General Assembly Sessions :**

1st session : Mr DAUDELIN  
2nd session : Mr ROSEN  
3rd session : Ms ORBANZ  
4th session : Mr FRANCIS

#### **11 MISCELLANEOUS**

Before closing the meeting of the Executive Committee, Mr DAUDELIN expressed a serious concern shared a.o. by Ms ORBANZ. He believed it was high time to redefine more precisely the "identity" of our Federation. He therefore suggested to extend the next EC meeting in Paris by 1 day entirely devoted to a think-tank exercise questioning the actual mandate of the Federation and of its directing body. This discussion might include people outside the EC, connected with the archival world or not (film historians, for example) in order to set up a general discussion.

This new suggestion brought about a number of remarks from the members :

As an alternative to this extra-day, Mr FRANCIS proposed to systematically make place for such a general discussion within the 3 days of each EC meeting and therefore deformatize its standard agenda by simply agreeing (upon recommendation of the Secretary-General or the President) on a series of items that are almost a formality and that should be raised only if there is an objection to them. Mr ROSEN supported this suggestion.



In order to make EC meetings more efficient, Ms WIBOM insisted that the President of the Federation should demand from every member of the EC that he/she brings a personal and active contribution to the meeting (reports, suggestions, draft proposals...).

Ms AUBERT thought we were spending too much time discussing relations between FIAF and other organisations and not enough on the essence of FIAF. Mr DAUDELIN replied that we precisely needed to redefine the essence of FIAF in order to firmly and rapidly deal with matters regarding our collaboration with such organisations. For example, if we had a clearer conceptual view of what we are, we would react much more firmly to IASA's tendency to encroach on FIAF's field of action.

Ms AUBERT added the EC should have a better knowledge of FIAF's composition itself, e.g. by reading more carefully the book of annual reports. Referring to the case of Laos, she found it very important that the EC members should more often share their feeling about visits to not only FIAF archives but also non-FIAF institutions or archives in developing countries, which need our help or/and might one day join the Federation.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed we should have a clearer view of FIAF's composition, saying that after reading all the reports he had been alarmed to note some archives' evolution as seriously deviating from FIAF's Rules and philosophy. We should take a more objective look on our Federation and we needed more questioning from the outside.

Although Mr JEAVONS recognized the importance of inter-relation with "outsiders", he thought it was not appropriate to invite such persons in a think-tank style meeting because of the time we would loose on giving them all the information on our ground work. He believed we could only invite those persons in a broader forum, like the one organized by Christian Dimitriu in Lausanne in 1991. Such opportunities to discuss archival issues in a broader sense should occur more often.

Talking about the general evolution of the Federation, Mr ROSEN expressed two points of view:

1. let us not fall into the trap of "continuing the business as usual", because this will lead us to a situation of decline;
2. about "reaffirming FIAF's rules and mandate" : either we keep a "conservative" attitude and reaffirm FIAF's commitment to its traditions, or we adopt a more "progressive" attitude and talk about the Federation's change in relation to the important shift that is going on in the world of moving images outside FIAF.

Mr FRANCIS suggested to formally ask every future candidate for the EC (from 1995 on) to take the floor and say what she/he hopes to achieve in this office, as was commonly practised in many organisations. Mr JEAVONS thought this proposal would be especially attractive if there were a too large number of candidates.

Ms ORBANZ insisted on the active presence of the Commission Heads not only during the general discussion before the next EC but also during the EC sessions themselves and, seconded by Mr DAUDELIN, she expressed her wish to involve Mr ROSEN and Mr FRANCIS in the general discussion and more particularly the debate about membership categories at the next EC meeting.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Mo i Rana, 31 May 1993

**Present :**

Robert DAUDELIN  
Eva ORBANZ  
Clyde JEAUVONS

President  
Secretary General  
Treasurer

**Members**

Hoos BLOTKAMP  
José Manuel COSTA  
Jan-Christopher HORAK  
Jorge NIETO  
Vladimir OPELA  
José Maria PRADO  
Guy-Claude ROCHEMONT  
Steven RICCI  
Roger SMITHER  
Ivan TRUJILLO BOLIO

**Commission Heads**

Joao BENARD DA COSTA  
Harriet HARRISON  
Ronald MAGLIOZZI  
Henning SCHOU

Commission for Programming and  
Access to the Collections  
Cataloguing Commission  
Documentation Commission  
Preservation Commission

**Secretariat**

Béatrice TROUVEROY

Assistant to the Executive  
Secretary

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Mo i Rana, 31 May 1993

**A G E N D A**

---

	Page
1. Adoption of the Agenda	37
2. Nomination of Vice-Presidents, Deputy Secretary-General and Deputy Treasurer	37
3. Membership questions	37
4. Training	39
5. Fundraising	39
6. Review of the General Assembly / Projects, matters arising from the discussion	40
7. Next meeting of the Executive Committee	43
8. Miscellaneous	43

Mr DAUDELIN welcomed the new members of the Executive Committee, saying we were now at a turning point marked by the need to revise our approach to various issues regarding the Federation's work. Every EC member had an important role to play in this new approach. He and Ms ORBANZ would therefore try to design the work and appoint tasks accordingly.

#### 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

There being no amendment, the agenda was adopted.

#### 2 NOMINATION OF VICE-PRESIDENTS, DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL AND TREASURER

Having considered a number of possible deputies according to the experience in their archive and the geographical situation of the various EC members, Mr DAUDELIN formally proposed the nomination of the following officers :

- Hoos Blotkamp )
- Vladimir Opela ) as Vice-Presidents
- Ivan Trujillo )
  
- Roger Smither, as Deputy Secretary-General;
- Steven Ricci, as Deputy Treasurer.

In answer to the nominees' questions, Mr DAUDELIN elaborated on their role as deputy or Vice-President. His proposal was then unanimously approved.

#### 3 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

##### 3.1. Reconfirmation of Cinemateca Nacional, Mexico, as Member of the Federation

Their reconfirmation had been postponed at the Oslo meeting, pending more information about their preservation programme (cfr. Oslo EC minutes, pt 4.1.e.). After having met in Mo i Rana with Lic. Guadalupe Ferrer Andrade, who had provided this information together with a detailed written report, Ms ORBANZ recommended their reconfirmation as Member of the Federation. She explained all their funds available for preservation was now allocated to the building of three new vaults, while preservation itself was currently done in collaboration with Filmoteca de la UNAM.

Mr TRUJILLO and Mr NIETO seconded Ms ORBANZ's recommendation and felt that building new vaults was part of a preservation programme.

Mr HORAK felt he was not sufficiently aware of their file to be able to vote on their reconfirmation.

Ms ORBANZ then called for a vote to be taken on their reconfirmation.

Result of the vote : 8 in favour  
3 abstentions

### 3.2. Filmoteca Vaticana

Referring to the discussion during the 1st EC meeting in Oslo (cfr. pt 4.2.b.) and to her discussion with Mgr Enrique Planas in Mo i Rana, Ms ORBANZ said their application as (full) Member was postponed until the next EC meeting, pending more precise information.

All the new EC members would receive the main elements of Filmoteca Vaticana's file by the next EC meeting together with Christian Dimitriu's report on his visit to their premises.

### 3.3. Reconfirmation of Members in 1993

Besides the archives due for reconfirmation in Fall 1993 (Ottawa, Rochester, London NFTA, New York and Copenhagen), the reconfirmation of Cinémathèque de Luxembourg would be examined again in Paris, when we have received answers to our questions mentioned in pt. 4.1.d. of the minutes of the Oslo meeting.

All EC members to receive the main elements of Cinémathèque de Luxembourg's file.

### 3.4. Beijing - Taipei

As decided during the first EC meeting in Oslo (cfr. pt. 4.3.d.), Mr DAUDELIN had met with respectively Mr Chen Jinglian (Beijing) and Mr Ray Jiing (Taipei) in Mo i Rana to see how this delicate issue could be settled. Both parties had proven friendly and cooperative, they had even met together and discussed during a long time but nevertheless, this was a formal issue that had to be settled. In a formal letter addressed to Mr Ray Jiing in Mo i Rana and which he read aloud, Mr DAUDELIN had suggested three alternatives to the present naming of the archive. Mr Jiing had replied the three suggested names were not acceptable to their board and had proposed "Film Archive, Taipei". Meanwhile, Mr Jinglian had presented to Ms ORBANZ a list of "acceptable" and "unacceptable" names to Beijing, which excluded the above-mentioned naming.

Ms BLOTKAMP proposed to formally re-send the letter to Mr Jiing in Taipei, who will keep in contact with his colleagues in Beijing, and then see what happens. Mr DAUDELIN agreed.

#### 4 TRAINING

Referring to Mr JEAUVONS' proposal to create a working group on training (cfr. minutes of the 1st EC meeting in Oslo, pt 10-GA7), Ms ORBANZ called for suggestions regarding the membership and the tasks of this group.

Mr JEAUVONS said the profile of this "working committee" was agreed in principle, i.e. it should be composed of representatives of the various Commissions and be kept as tight as possible but have the possibility to co-opt useful participants. Mr JEAUVONS was responsible for creating this working committee and would try to draw up a programme and an agenda for it. He would report on this more formally at the next EC meeting. All suggestions were welcome.

Mr SCHOU encouraged that Commissions be heavily involved in this work (slide packages,...).

Mr RICCI reported that there had been a lot of discussion on training issues during the workshop on the relation between film schools and film archives. It had been informally suggested that the first matter of business would be to investigate what courses or training resources are already available and then compile a list.

Mr SMITHER added the training party should also make a compilation of qualifications expected or demanded by archives and investigate whether there are particular posts which require a particular level of training or a qualification in a particular subject.

Mr JEAUVONS already proposed Mr RICCI and Mr TRUJILLO as first members of the working committee on training.

#### 5 FUNDRAISING

Mr DAUDELIN reported that both Anna-Lena Wibom and Michelle Aubert were willing to remain on the Fundraising Working Group, which had to be reconfirmed. Ms WIBOM had suggested to pay professional fundraisers, such as Christian Dimitriu, by granting them 25% of their take. There was no exclusivity for this job.

We badly needed guidelines for this working body which would have to work very closely with the Treasurer and the EC.

Ms BLOTKAMP proposed to address special fundraising institutions for this job.

Mr HORAK knew that, in the USA, giving a fee for fundraising in the frame of non-profit institutions was considered as unethical by the national association of

fundraisers. What was usually worked out was the "flat" fee.

He underlined the necessity to carry out a feasibility study for fundraising, explaining one cannot start fundraising until one has the guarantee that there is a chance to achieve a goal. One must know in advance who the potential donors will be and settle contacts with them. Also, before starting fundraising, one must already have some money in hand, at least to pay the professional fundraisers. He felt 1,000,000. US\$ was a very ambitious goal and feared there might be some conflicts of interests between FIAF and the individual archives which have been asked to raise 25,000 US\$ for FIAF.

Mr JEAUVONS said archives could possibly share with FIAF what they nationally raise. Besides, he was confident Mary-Lea Bandy's professional experience in fundraising would be of great help in the Fundraising Group.

He would report on this discussion to the Fundraising Group.

## 6 REVIEW OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY/ PROJECTS, MATTERS ARISING FROM THE DISCUSSION

### 6.1. FIAF Bulletin

Mr DAUDELIN called for comments on Paolo Cherchi Usai's suggestion to ask each new member of the EC to make in the next FIAF Bulletin, a clearcut description of his intentions regarding his work in the EC.

Although he recognized it was important to the membership to learn about what elected members think in terms of the work of the Federation, Mr RICCI feared this might make our journal become a forum for internal political debate, which would be of very little interest to the intended larger audience of the FIAF Bulletin.

Ms BLOTKAMP thought it was more important for the membership to hear what the Committee as a whole intends to do in the coming years.

Mr NIETO feared that, if asked to candidates before the elections, such "declarations of intentions" would bring about a political campaign within FIAF. He preferred the idea of just asking a brief profile of each candidate at future elections. Mr JEAUVONS supported this idea.

Mr COSTA said we should first start with a deep discussion in the EC about our Federation's future policy before expressing our ideas in the open.



## 6.2. Membership - miscellaneous

Mr HORAK said it had appeared very clearly from the workshop on cinema museums that we urgently needed to incorporate those kinds of entities within FIAF, otherwise they might join other associations. He proposed to start thinking of the agenda of a working group that would formulate recommendations to incorporate cinema museums. His suggestion was welcomed; he would report at the next EC meeting.

## 6.3. Membership of the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections

Now that Enno Patalas and Paolo Cherchi Usai had left the Commission and that Manuel Martinez Carril could practically no longer work on the Commission (although he had not precisely resigned), Mr BENARD DA COSTA formally proposed to accept two new candidates on the Commission : Dominique Paini and Edith Kramer. There being no objection to this proposal, it was approved.

Mr JEAUVONS said in this case it would be useful for the EC to receive "profiles" as well from the new candidates. This was agreed.

The Commission now had 6 members and one consultant, i.e. Clyde Jeavons. Contacts would be maintained with Manuel Martinez Carril, who was officially not considered as having left the Commission.

## 6.4. Election procedure

After considering the need to modify the election procedure, questioned by Vittorio Boarini at the GA, with a more democratic approach, Ms ORBANZ, Mr DAUDELIN and Mr JEAUVONS had elaborated a possible new formula, subject to discussion :

Successive stages of election :

- 1) The President
- 2) Twelve members of the Executive Committee
- 3) Among those : election of the Secretary-General

The Treasurer could be appointed by the newly elected EC from among its members, at a later stage as is being done for the Vice-Presidents. The secret "no" vote should be eliminated when there is only one candidate for a post, as a matter of courtesy to the candidate. The same could apply to the election of Honorary Members or else, a mass show of hands ought to be enough.

Mr NIETO suggested the President propose his own list of candidates to work with him as a team to achieve a certain number of goals.

Decision : Ms ORBANZ and Ms BLOTKAMP to come up with suggestions regarding the revision of Rule 39 and other related Rules and to ask Vittorio Boarini to propose his ideas in writing, following Mr KLAUE's suggestion.

#### 6.5. Procedures of the General Assembly : needs of revision

##### 6.5.a. Guidelines for Commissions' reports

Ms BLOTKAMP and Mr HORAK thought the Commissions' written reports should be circulated in advance to all participants. If everyone had read it before the GA, they would be more time available for discussion between the Heads of Commissions and the Assembly. Mr JEAUVONS agreed.

Mr SCHOU also agreed, saying this would help Commission Heads to obtain more response from the membership. The reports should therefore be circulated together with a note addressed to the corresponding department in the archive and asking to mention one or several questions that the archive representative could raise during the Congress. He insisted the EC members should also read in advance the Commissions' written reports.

Referring to the latest "guidelines for FIAF Commissions" drafted by Michelle Aubert (see annexe), Ms HARRISON explained that, as the Commission reports were to survey the achievements made by the FIAF membership as a whole in the subject field of their Commission, they could not be issued before the book of annual reports, i.e. not as early as suggested by Ms BLOTKAMP. An earlier circulation of the reports would therefore require a modification of this regulation. Mr KLAUE, seconded by other EC members, believed these achievements by our membership did not necessarily have to be reported in writing in the Commission's report but could be commented orally at the GA in addition to the report on the Commission's activities. He encouraged a change of the regulations to this end.

Referring to Catherine Gautier's report on the Programming Commission's survey, Mr DAUDELIN said the Commission Heads should focus and comment on specific items in their report rather than simply read it.

##### 6.5.b. Opening procedure

Mr KLAUE deeply appreciated that the informal opening of the GA meeting this time had made it possible to start the discussion as from the first session, which had rarely been the case before. Separating the official opening's formalities from the meeting itself had been a successful experience which should be taken into account for future Congresses.

#### 6.5.c. Lay-out of the meeting room

Mr SCHOU spoke in favour of a rectangular arrangement of the tables, which, in his opinion, would be more appropriate for discussions than a stage arrangement whereby the board overlooks the Assembly.

#### 6.5.d. Confirmation of the voting rights of the Members

Mr KLAUE strongly believed this item on the agenda should be dealt in another way and insisted we should stress instead the presence of new participants.

#### **6.6. New scale for membership fees**

The Treasurer was asked to follow up the work of the working group on possible alternatives for a new scale of membership fees and to stay in contact with Michelle Aubert on this issue.

### **7 NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

After describing the hosting conditions of Cinémathèque Française for the next EC meeting due to be held in Paris next November, Mr DAUDELIN reiterated his proposal to devote one or two days apart from the standard agenda to a think-tank meeting on the work and identity of our Federation.

After a broad debate about the guidelines of this two-day discussion (please also refer to the last point of the minutes of the EC meeting in Oslo), the following was agreed :

- the agenda of this meeting would be prepared by a co-ordinating group (H. Blotkamp, J-M Costa and J-M Prado), based on papers received from all EC members, Heads of Commissions and Honorary Members who would be invited to join the meeting.
- these position papers could either mention 1 or several priority point(s) that should be revised/changed or it could present thoughts regarding the work/role of FIAF and the Executive Committee. Papers to be circulated to each member of the co-ordinating group and the Secretariat before 15 September 1993.
- the debate in Paris will be the starting point of further discussion.

### **8 MISCELLANEOUS**

#### **8.1. Next EC meetings**

Mr DAUDELIN suggested that the 1994 Fall Executive Committee be held mid-October in Tunis, at the time of the Carthage Festival. He asked those who had contacts with Tunis to test this possibility.

#### **8.2. Preparation of future symposia/JTS**

Ms ORBANZ felt a decision on the theme of the symposium for our Congresses had to be made a long time in advance. We needed at least 2 years to properly prepare our symposia which, she added, should be exceptionnal events. It was therefore high time to launch the preparation of the symposium in Los Angeles and also in Beijing. Mr HORAK suggested to have a call for papers for the symposium in Los Angeles.

#### **CLOSURE OF THE EC MEETING**

Mr DAUDELIN thanked all the participants and closed the meeting.

Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film

Secrétariat  
190, rue Franz Merjay  
B - 1180 Bruxelles  
Tel: (32-2) 343 06 91  
Fax: (32-2) 343 76 22

GUIDELINES FOR THE WORK OF COMMISSIONS, AND FOR COMMUNICATIONS: (1) AMONG  
COMMISSIONS, (2) WITH THE GENERAL MEMBERSHIP, AND (3) WITH THE EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE

(November 1982)

A. Membership on the Commissions.

1. Members are experts in their fields and are chosen on this basis. As Commission members they function as specialists rather than as representatives of their particular archives.
2. The number of members on a commission and the types of commissions represented are determined by the Executive Committee. Commission presidents may request the Executive Committee to raise the maximum number of Commission members, but final decisions in this matter rest with the Executive Committee.
3. Commissions can call upon written evidence or support from non-members and may invite experts to attend meetings in accordance with Article 87 of the Internal Rules.
4. Every two years, Commissions should reconsider their memberships and make recommendations to the Executive Committee about any desired changes. In considering changes, both the Commissions and the Executive Committee should take into account the work contributed by members and their attendance at Commission meetings. Where necessary, the Executive Committee shall be empowered to ask members to resign, based upon Commission recommendations.
5. Presidents of the Commissions shall be appointed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consider recommendations from outgoing Presidents, and from the Commissions, in making these appointments.

6. Presidents of the Commissions shall present nominations for new Commission members to the Executive Committee. These nominations shall be based upon the recommendations of Commission members.

7. Commissions shall prepare internal guidelines for the more orderly functioning of their work, as considered necessary. They may set up ad-hoc working groups to undertake specific tasks or projects.

B. Relations among Commissions.

1. Commissions should coordinate their work, suggesting joint projects where proposed work overlaps specialty areas, thereby avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort.

2. Commission Presidents should exchange the minutes of their meetings with other Commission Presidents for circulation among their members.

C. Communications between Presidents of the Commissions and the FIAF Membership.

1. Minutes of all Commission (or working group) meetings should be sent to the Secretariat.

2. Reports of Commission work should be made for the FIAF Bulletin and sent to the Editor.

3. Each Commission President is required to attend the General Assembly sessions of the FIAF Annual Congresses. If he/she cannot attend, he/she may choose a member of his/her Commission to represent him/her at the meetings.

4. Each Commission President should prepare an annual report for the FIAF Congresses. This report should be presented by the Commission President or his/her chosen representative--who should also be a Commission

member. If no member of a Commission is able to attend the General Assembly in any given year, the report should be given to an officer of the Executive Committee for presentation to the general membership.

D. Communications between Presidents of the Commissions and the Executive Committee.

1. The Presidents of the Commissions should be invited to attend all sessions of the Executive Committee. They should at least attend the session of the Executive Committee prior to the General Assembly.

2. Commission Presidents should receive formal invitations to attend Executive Committee meetings. Such invitations should be issued well in advance of the meetings and should include information about the dates and place of the meetings. They should be in a form which permits the Presidents to seek travel and expenditure funds from their parent organizations utilizing these invitations.

3. The Presidents of the Commissions should prepare written reports on the activities of their Commissions for each session of the Executive Committee. These reports should include a discussion of Commission accomplishments, proposals for new projects, and any problems for which advice, or Executive Committee actions or approvals, are sought. They should be presented both orally and in writing at the sessions.

4. If the President of a Commission is unable to attend a session of the Executive Committee, he/she may choose an alternate from among the members of his/her Commission to represent him/her at such meetings.

5. Presidents and their representatives understand that the meetings of the Executive Committee are confidential in nature and do not discuss session proceedings with anyone outside the Executive Committee. They do not vote and generally do not contribute to discussions

unless requested to do so. They attend the meetings in order to report on their activities and to maintain an understanding of the directions the governing body of FIAF wishes to follow in any given period.

6. The Presidents of the Commissions receive the minutes of the sessions of the Executive Committee. They understand that these minutes are confidential in nature and do not discuss them with persons outside the Executive Committee. They report to the Commissions only those portions of Executive Committee deliberations which concern their Commission's work. They utilize the remaining information as background guidance in their decision making.

7. At the beginning of January each year, Commission Presidents submit to the Treasurer proposed budgets for the year commencing the following January. These budget requests should include separate sections for general expenses and for publication expenses.

8. The Presidents receive copies of all approved budgets from the Treasurer or from the Secretariat.

9. The Commissions, through their Presidents, should have control over the use of all funds allocated to them for Commission work. Commission Presidents should approve all expenditures from these funds. They should submit to the Treasurer an annual report of all expenditures incurred.

10. Should any Commission President be unable to obtain funds for attendance at the General Assembly and at the Executive Committee session which precedes it, the Executive Committee should seek to provide for funds to defray travel and/or staying costs. In the cases where Commission funds are not required for any other expenditures, these funds may be used for the above purpose with the consent of the Treasurer.

11. Upon his/her resignation, each Commission President will turn over to the incoming President any Commission files which are needed by the new incumbent for the ongoing work of the Commission. The remainder of the files will be turned over to the Secretariat.



GUIDELINES FOR FIAF COMMISSIONS (July 1992)

by Michelle Aubert  
Curator of Archives du Film du CNC  
Bois d'Arcy, France

-----

1) The objectives :

A brief text (10 lines) should be supplied by each Commission setting out their long-term (5 to 10 years) objectives and thus providing both new Commission members and the membership of FIAF with broad aims for that period.

A plan of action for the shorter term (1-3 years) should also be drafted in a calendar form, providing if possible :

- names of projects
- resources necessary
- time scale
- geographical settings

and including venues of proposed Commission meetings.

2) Improving the image of the Commissions :

Each Commission should publish a list of its members and explain the reasons for their selection. To this end, each Commission member should provide their president with a career resumé, emphasizing their areas of expertise and specialisation (projects undertaken, publications, development areas).

These details will identify possible points of contact for FIAF members, who may, if necessary, make direct approaches for advice and help rather than relying on a generalised approach to the Commission president.

3) Improving communications with the Executive Committee and the FIAF membership :

Commission presidents will be required to write one report per year. In the context of declared objectives (see section 1) the report should describe progress and fully explain difficulties encountered (e.g. lack of response to a questionnaire that has been circulated, etc).

Each year, each president will be asked to survey the achievements made by the FIAF membership as a whole in the subject field of his/her Commission and to report his/her findings to the President of the Federation. This exercise will require Commission presidents to familiarise themselves with members' activities in relevant fields, as described in annual reports, and will ensure that the aims and objectives of their commissions are grounded in the grassroot reality of archive experience and expectations.

Each president will also be provided with details of the budget available to the Commission and of the procedures to be followed in administering that budget. Reports will include details of budgetary expenditure.