

F I A F . -----

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MEXICO - June 13, 1982

DRAFT AGENDA and TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Adoption of the Agenda	1
2. Membership questions.	
a) Koblenz / Bundesarchiv - Filmarchiv	2
b) United Nations - Visual Materials Library	2
c) Miscellaneous	7
3. Commissions:	
a) Preservation Commission	7
b) Documentation Commission	8
c) Cataloguing Commission:	
- Information on Computer Systems	9
- Union list of Holdings in Member Archives	9
4. Relations with UNESCO - Proposals for RAIP	10
5. Projects underway and new projects	11
6. Future Congresses	14
7. Analysis of the Congress +	15
8. Miscellaneous	15

In attendance :

Members : W. Klaue, R. Borde, E. Bowser, D. Francis, R. Daudelin, J. de Vaal,
 G. Cincotti, M. Gonzales Casanova, E. Orbanz, A.L. Wibom

Deputy members : C. Alves-Netto, S. Kula

Commission heads : H. Harrison, H. Schou

Executive Secretary : B. van der Elst

Interpreter : J. Johnson

MEXICO CITY - Sunday, June 13, 1982 - Morning Session (only)

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

a) Koblenz / Bundesarchiv - Filmarchiv

Mr Daudelin reported that he and Mr Klaue had had the proposed meeting with Mr Kahlenberg to clarify points relating to Article 3 (autonomy). He understands the position very well and will submit a new application signed by himself, in time for it to be discussed at Madrid.

Mr Kula mentioned that his own situation was very similar and the difficulty was to get hold of documentation to prove their autonomy. He had arranged to send Mr Kahlenberg copy of the document that the Dominion Archivist of Canada provided for FIAF. Apparently the Dominion Archivist is a good colleague of the German national archivist and they have already discussed the problem, at their own International Round Table on Archives.

In response to a question from Mr de Vaal, Mrs Orbanz confirmed that she was of course in favour of their membership and understood the problems.

Decision: Next meeting.

b) United Nations - Visual Materials Library

Mr Daudelin reported on the meeting he, Mr Klaue and Mrs Bowser had with Mr Sydenham. It was informative and friendly. He was eager to have some formal link with us even though nothing is foreseen in our Rules. He is very willing to pay to be some sort of informal observer, "a permanent guest", so he could be invited to congresses and receive publications, including the Bulletin. The problem was to decide the implications of setting a precedent.

Mrs Bowser mentioned that Visitors should be asked to pay to come to Congresses, and be subject to annual approval.

Mr Francis agreed, and pointed out that the presence of extra people at Congresses made the whole event more expensive, for FIAF and the host. In response to a question from Mr Kula, it was stated that Observers pay 400 Sw.francs, only 1/7 of the fee paid by Members (2850 Sw.francs).

Mr Klaus was concerned about the problems that might be created by setting a precedent, particularly with reference to Article 104:

- normal Visitors need approval of the local member, but should this apply to international organisation?
- if the Visitor pays the Observer rate, what happens about film exchanges? (UNO were not interested in film exchanges but other organisations might be).

Mrs Orbanz asked why it was necessary for them to have a formal status: they could be invited to the Congress each year, subject to paying the fee, and they could buy the publications; then only the question of the Bulletin needed to be discussed.

Mr Kula felt it was important for FIAF to know the specific status of all attending its congresses. Maybe we could find some non-membership status that would enable a semi-permanent link to be made and also generate revenue and promotion for FIAF. Perhaps in the case of international organisations, the Executive Committee should make the decisions; in the case of national organisations, the national member could decide. It was important for the fee to take into account the cost of the Congress and the additional burden for the host of handling larger numbers, perhaps there should be separate additional charges for the special events and excursions.

Mr Francis suggested that as Associate was no longer used, perhaps this term could be adopted, with special conditions being applied, provided they were approved by the General Meeting.

Mr Cincetti felt that our present categories of membership were not satisfactory and he felt it might be better to revert to 3 categories but refined as follows:

- Members
- Candidate Members i.e. organisations which, by their nature, could hope to qualify in time as full Members.
- Observers i.e. national or international organisations which could never qualify as Members.

Mr Klaus agreed in principle but felt such a change would take maybe two years to implement perhaps a small group of 2 or 3 should start examining the Statutes and Rules to see how one could let in other organisations, especially the archives of international bodies. Meanwhile, there was the single case of the UNO which needed to be decided on soon. He felt the fee should be very close to the Observer fee, but slightly less to indicate the difference in status. The next decision was to consider what categories of publications he should be entitled to:

- The Bulletin (up till now for internal distribution only).
- Reports of Commission work (generally for sale).
- Administrative documents produced by the Secretariat and not for sale: Book of Reports, General Meeting Minutes, Project publications (some for sale).

Mr Kula suggested one could institute a subscription scheme for a given selection of publications. He felt Minutes should certainly be excluded.

Mrs Wibom agreed with Mr Kula but opened up the wider issue of how to handle visitors and would-be visitors to Congresses. It was at Mr de Pedro's visit to the Swedish archive that she had suggested to him he might find his questions answered by attending the Mexico Congress. For the Stockholm Congress, she had already a number of individuals from within and outside Sweden who were particularly interested in the Symposium and wanted to attend: what should she say to them? how much can she charge?

Mr Cincotti was in favour of the widest possible diffusion of all our non-private publications.

Mr de Vaal recalled that it had been confirmed in Rapallo that the Bulletin would remain internal.

Mr Daudelin said the question of Visitors was covered by Article 27 but this Article did not take into account the increased interest of the technical and historical symposia for outsiders. Decisions have to be made for each individual as to whether they may be admitted to the General Meeting.

On the question of Mr de Pedro, Mr Daudelin expressed surprise that UNESCO had paid his trip to the Congress. Mr Casanova said that Mr de Pedro had asked one of the interpreters at the symposium to translate some documents for him so that he could use them in Panama but he had refused.

Mr Klaue identified 3 questions in the discussion to which they had to find answers and Mr Borde gave his opinion on each as follows:

- 1) Possible change of statutes:
As long as UNO was the only candidate, he felt there was no need to embark on this.
- 2) Decision on UNO:
He felt they should be welcomed as "Subscribers".
- 3) Decision on Visitors to Congresses:
He felt they should be welcomed provided they pay a fee for the General Meeting and the Symposium.

Mrs Bowser agreed that we should not consider changing the statutes till we had more candidates of similar categories. She also felt ordinary Visitors should pay fee for Congress costs.

Mr Cincotti asked who the Congress fee should be paid to, the host or FIAF?

On the question of the possible change to Rules, Mr Klaue asked if it was the opinion of the meeting to wait? Mr Kula was not entirely happy as if it was to take 2 years, that would be a long time to wait for would-be candidates. However, he felt the Subscriber idea would be a useful interim solution. Mr Francis felt we should not make changes yet but, when we did, we should consider the 3 categories suggested by Mr Cincotti.

Mr Klaue summarised the feeling of the Meeting:

- No study group to consider changes to the Rules for the moment but we should keep open to various possibilities.
- For UNO, charge fee for "services" to include: Commission and Project publications, additional general information but not the Bulletin, Book of Reports or General Meeting Minutes (General Meeting Minutes include the closed session), plus option to attend the Congress and Symposia.

Mr Casanove had a further suggestion that before each Congress:

- The Executive Committee should discuss the list of Visitors to establish if all may be admitted to the General Meeting.
- The General Meeting should have a closed session initially to decide if all the Visitors may be admitted. Individual members may have objections to Visitors that the Executive Committee and others may not be aware of, so it was important to give them this opportunity for veto.

Mr Francis noted that this suggestion raised extra problems:

- The closed session was normally closed to Observers, yet Observers should have the right to veto Visitors.
- Although Observers were barred from the closed session, they could read about it in the Minutes. (He had just learnt this from Mrs van der Elst).

Mr Kula was surprised even though he had been an Observer himself, he suggested there should be separate minutes for the closed session.

Mr Alves-Netto saw no reason why they should not get the closed session minutes, there were no secrets, and in any case you could hear everything from outside if you wanted. He felt that Observers should be allowed to attend but not to talk (unless specifically invited).

Mrs van der Elst reported there had been only one exception to the Observers getting the full Minutes, i.e. when Mr Ledoux made his big speech at Brighton. She asked again about the Bulletin which she didn't think was secret. She was reminded by Mr de Vaal that it was partly a question of copyright and partly the fact that Executive Committee decisions were reported in it.

Mr Klaue recalled that at Rapallo we had decided we should review the status of the Bulletin and this should therefore be discussed at the General Meeting in Stockholm.

Decision: Mr Daudelin to draft letter offering proposal to UNO.

On the question of Visitors, Mr Klaue read out Article 27. He felt FIAP should be seeking to encourage attendance at our activities:

- especially from countries where there was as yet no member (e.g. Mozambique, Philippines);
 - relevant international organisations (e.g. FIAT, ICA, IFLA, UNESCO);
- so in these cases there was no "country of origin" member needing to give permission.

In the case of a country where no member exists, but only observers, he understood the reservation in Article 27 to apply only to the General Meeting. In his view, the Symposia should try to reach as wide an audience as possible.

Mr Francis felt there were two points to be careful about:

- The Visitor should not have as many services or advantages as the Member or Observer who paid higher subscriptions.
- We should be wary of overloading the host and make it very clear who is responsible for inviting the Visitors: FIAP (in which case they should help with the costs) or the Congress host.

Dr Cincotti felt that the approval required in Article 27 only referred to attendance at the General Meeting. No-one should be able to veto attendance at the Symposia; the host must be free to choose.

Mr Kula supported Mr Francis' view that one should be careful not to let the Visitor have all the advantages of the Observer, at a cut price. The main difference at the moment was the privileges regarding exchange of materials which was important.

He also mentioned the problems of overloading with Visitors so that there would not be enough room in the often fairly small auditoria available for screenings.

Mr Alves-Netto asked if it would be possible to limit the number of times the same Visitor could attend under the same status.

Mrs Wibom was concerned with the very practical problems of determining who invited the visitor, what they should be charged, and whether the host had to bear the costs of their participation in all the events, especially the social events: parties, government invitations, excursions, etc. where extra numbers could increase costs significantly (e.g. hire of transport, meals, etc).

Mr Borde felt that Article 27 should be strictly observed for the General Meeting but that the Symposia should be open. He mentioned that Madame Melhête Melies had asked if she was entitled to go to the General Meeting and he had certainly not been consulted.

Mrs Bowser returned to the question of who gets the Visitor's fee: for the single occasion Visitor, she felt it was the host who had the expense and who should therefore set and get the fee.

Mrs van der Elst quoted her experience of other international organisations' Congresses. They had several categories of fees:

- the basic participation fee,
- the fee for hotel and staying costs,
- separate fees for different events which were optional,

Mr Klaue proposed that for Stockholm FIAF should invite the international organisations and they will be asked to pay a fee to be set by Mrs Wibom; this fee will be in addition to the basic hotel/meals costs which they have paid up till now.

FIAF may also invite some developing countries who cannot pay their own way but he felt it would be confusing for them to get the general circular indicating the participation and hotel fees. However, he felt some developing countries, e.g. Philippines, could well pay their own way.

He felt it was probably time to think about a new set of Guidelines: decisions on whether visitors can speak, how often they can attend without becoming observers, etc.

Mr Alves-Netto felt it would have to be very flexible as some Visitors were more important than others, if they couldn't speak, we might perhaps want them to answer.

Mr Casanova felt the Executive Committee should have some Recommendations for its own use but there would be so many possibilities that he thought it was important for the Executive Committee to review the list of Visitors before each Congress. For Oaxtepec, he had reviewed the list with Mr Klaue.

Mr Francis agreed with this suggestion. (He thought it could become very important if people like Dr Roads who didn't represent any organisation presented themselves at our Congresses). He felt the Open Forum was the opportunity for the Visitors to join in the open discussion.

Mrs Orbanz was not clear why they should not be allowed to speak when they had been invited and paid their own way to attend.

Mr Daudelin cited examples:

- At Brighton, we had given the floor to the International Film Society but not expected them to intervene otherwise.
- Newcomers to FIAF meetings, like Mr de Pedro, could intervene on every topic and talk for hours, totally disrupting the proceedings.

Decision: - Mr Klaue and Mrs Orban to draft some Guidelines for Madrid.
- The Executive Committee to review the list of Visitors immediately before each Congress (not to refuse, but to identify and anticipate potential problems).

c) Miscellaneous

Mr Daudelin asked the Executive Committee for formal reconfirmation of the Observers in Caracas and Koblenz which he had already put before the General Meeting as they were both represented, and he submitted their reports.

He mentioned that the membership reconfirmation procedures would be initiated for Ottawa and the two Mexican archives, for consideration at Madrid.

3. COMMISSIONS

a) Preservation Commission : Terms of Reference

Mr Klaué suggested the Terms of Reference should be based on Mr Schou's statement to the General Meeting and his letter to the President, together with ideas which were mentioned in discussions, for example:

- Definition of technical categories for describing holdings for possible IIAF Union List (visual identification, not cataloguing aspects). (From Mr Francis).
- Special needs of archives in developing countries.
- List of competent nitrate laboratories worldwide. (From Mr Spehr).
- Fungus problems of film materials. (From Mr Konlechner).
- Guidelines for tape holdings. (From Mrs Wibom).

Mrs Wibom pointed out that there was a lifetime's programme and asked for Mr Schou's ideas on priorities, also on membership of the Commission.

Mr Schou replied as follows:

- Membership

As there was such a broad and complex field to be covered and people's time was limited, he envisaged regional sub-commissions, whose heads would be the active members of the main Commission. He wants first to identify how many people around the world might be interested before being more specific but he hoped that the large archives would operate as a Working Group, reporting on specific items to the Commission.

- Priorities

Now that the main theoretical works had been published (Preservation and Restoration of Colour and Sound), he felt it was important to review the practical side and produce User Manuals for use at the workbench.

Mr Kula and Mr Cincetti wanted to know if the 2 unsuccessful candidates were to be on the Commission and Mr Klaue reported that he had spoken to them, they were willing, but the decision rested with Mr Schou, not the Executive Committee. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the mention of 7 Members in the Rules was a suggestion not a requirement or limitation.

Mr Kula and Mrs Wibom both welcomed the Sub-Commission idea. Mrs Wibom felt that help on preservation in developing countries was desperately needed and hoped it would be a priority.

Mr Francis asked what should be done about the tape manual which Mr Volkmann had been working on, as it was already out of date on the practical side. Mr Kula agreed though both thought the historical section was useful. FIAF were thinking of producing a basic manual, loose-leaf, on tape handling practice and it might be useful to pass the work on to them.

Decisions: - Mr Klaue to formally thank previous members of the Commission for their work.

- Mr Schou to contact possible members before the end of 82 in order to prepare and present proposals at Madrid for members of Commission and Sub-Commission.
- Mr Schou to decide on date of first meeting.
- Mr Klaue to arrange for Mr Schou to meet with Mr Volkmann for formal handover, including files which he needs to keep or have sent to the Secretariat (in accordance with the Guidelines on Commission Work).

B) Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser reported on the supporters' meeting as follows:

- Annual Volume

As MOMA is financing this for two years and there have been no problems in recouping their costs, they would like to ask FIAF to take over the financing role next year. (MOMA will finance TV Volumes).

- Publicity

They plan to ask all members to provide information to help them extend their international mailing list.

- Budget

This was approved but some expressed their concern at rising costs.

c) Cataloguing Commission

Mr Klaua asked Mrs Harrison to report on the two projects which were discussed at the General Meeting:

- Information on Archive's Use of Computer Systems

Mike Lynskey had volunteered the services of David Watson from Australia who had already done a similar study for Australia. The suggestion is that he should prepare a new questionnaire and send it initially to Roger Snither who had been willing to do the project but could not start for another year.

In response to a question from Mrs Harrison, Mr Kula felt it would be very useful to send it also to FIAT. He felt it was important however not just simply to assemble and publish the results of the questionnaire; to be useful there was need for some evaluation of the different experiences.

Mr Francis agreed and wondered indeed if it would be more appropriate to produce a Supplement to the previous publication which would draw attention to the important points that had emerged with experience:

- . the difficulties of adopting someone else's system,
- . the mistakes,
- . the inevitable miscalculations of the time required to plan and implement.

Mr Kula mentioned that the RAMP publications included not simply an analysis of questionnaires but an expert's evaluation of the experiences, not necessarily recommendations, but practical assessment.

Decision: Mrs Harrison / Mr Schou to check if Mr Watson is competent to do such an analysis.

- Union List of Members' Holdings

Mrs Harrison asked for advice from the Executive Committee on priorities and procedures:

. Cataloguing Guidelines

They had some agreement but not an "official" document yet; it was important that any eventual Union List should observe any FIAT standards.

. Minimum Data

This could be worked out by taking a consensus of members through a questionnaire or by the Cataloguing & Preservation Commissions preparing a draft first.

. List of Nitrate Negatives

Was this part of the same project or a different one?

NB: About 10 minutes of the discussion is not recorded on the tape at all so following is based on Mrs van der Elst's notes.

Mrs Bowser stressed that one should plan for the catalogue ending up on a computer.

Mr Francis referred to his proposal of some years back that members should be encouraged to exchange information, perhaps bilaterally, on what they hold of each other's production. This would produce something useful and practical for members fairly quickly, especially if it was encouraged by the Executive Committee.

Mrs Wibom asked if it would be useful to have a special Workshop on Cataloguing at the Stockholm Symposium. Mrs Harrison welcomed the idea but wondered how to organise it: would the European members of the Cataloguing Commission be able to do it?

Mr Klaus felt we should encourage members to participate in bilateral exchanges of information on holdings and that the Executive Committee should recommend this as step 1 towards a Union List. For the next stage, which would be much more difficult, he felt we should be ready to discuss at the next General Meeting.

Mr Kula felt it was a very ambitious project. He felt a very valuable task would be to agree a standard to describe or grade one's own material in such a way that it could be interpreted in other archives. This was probably a task for the Preservation Commission but it would be very useful element of a Union List.

Decision: Mr Klaus to draft letter to members about bilateral exchange and about Union List, and agree the text with Mr Francis before distribution.

4. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO - PROPOSALS FOR R.A.M.P.

Mr Klaus said he had made a compilation of the 30 proposals made at the General Meeting Open Forum, under 4 headings (Training, Special Studies, Standards and Information Systems), but it had unfortunately been mislaid so he couldn't present it. He wanted to present them to Unesco without waiting for another meeting as they were due to have a conference to review RAMF fairly soon.

Mr Kula suggested there was no need for the Executive Committee to discuss the proposals at this stage as no FIAP commitment was involved. If any were accepted, we could contract the work outside, retaining part of the fee as 'Supervisors': this was common practice in international organisations.

Decision: Mr Klaus to submit list to Unesco.

5. PROJECTS UNDERWAY AND NEW PROJECTS

The numbers below refer to the original list of Projects provided for Oaxtepec:

2) Catalogue of long silent films (Ledoux)

Mr Daudelin referred again to the problem of confidentiality because it emerged that many archives had not been asked to contribute to the new edition: at first it was thought Observers had been excluded but it then emerged in discussion that several Members had not been asked either, probably those that had not been able to contribute to earlier editions.

There was much concern on several issues:

- The purpose of the project was to increase the information available: it was absurd therefore to exclude large collections like Bois d'Arcy, Koblenz and Los Angeles.
- If it was a FIAF project, then surely all affiliates of FIAF should both be invited to contribute and be able to receive copies whether or not they had silent films in their collections.

Decision: Mr Daudelin to advise Mr Ledoux of the concern expressed at the General Meeting by many who had not received the questionnaire and ask for clarification of his intentions, to enquire whether Mr Ledoux saw it as a FIAF project and therefore open to all; to report back in Madrid meeting.

7) Programming in archive cinemas (Borde)

Decision: Mr Borde to update and publish in the Bulletin. Separate copies to be available from the Secretariat for potential "subscribers" not entitled to see the Bulletin.

11) Training of archivists (Klaue)

Decision: Mr Klaue to ask members to mention training possibilities and results of training in their Annual Reports as well as making formal reports on each trained directly in connection with this Project.

13) Questionnaire on relations with film-schools (Casanova)

Decision: Mr Casanova and Mr Klaue to draft report to GILECT.

New Projects

Mr Klaue reviewed the new ideas that had been raised in discussion:

a) 9,5 mm Catalogue

Decision: Mr Francis to get approval from the authors, take manuscript to Brussels for costing session, advise Mrs Orbanz for negotiations with possible sponsor, and report to Madrid meeting.

b) Bibliography of film literature in Spanish

Mr Klaue asked for discussion as to whether this should be a FIAF project or remain a project of UNAM in association with the Spanish-speaking archives.

Mr Casanova clarified what he had said at the previous meeting, namely that the project was to cover anything on the cinema (history, techniques, etc) which was available in Spanish regardless of who published or where it was published. He stressed that he thought it was important to have a FIAF project which was concerned with something Spanish.

Decision: FIAF to send circular letter to all affiliates (not just Spanish-speaking) together with project description, inviting them to participate. (Drafted by Mr Klaue and Mr Casanova). Adopted as FIAF project, responsibility of UNAM.

c) UNESCO-COURIER special issue

Mr Daudelin confirmed that he had had many offers of assistance following the Open Forum discussion

from MM. Borde, Alves-Netto, Casanova, Peter von Bagh, de Vaal, Kuiper, Pierre Véronneau, Orbanz, Klaue, Kula, Schou.

He will also seek help from others during the summer and hoped that with contributions in by September 15, he would be able to deliver to Unesco by mid October.

d) Archive film in compilation

It emerged in discussion that no-one was very clear about the intentions of this project and whether it would necessarily be useful to restrict the list to films made by archives themselves.

Decision: Mr Klaue to contact the Finnish Film Archive for clarification.

e) Customs problems

Mr Klaus reported that he had discussed the problems experienced by the Argentines and thought it was an individual problem, not a potential FIAF project.

Decision: Mr Klaus to write a FIAF letter to the Argentinian Customs, also to those in Brazil based on information provided by the national archives.

f) Catalogue of old apparatus

Mr Francis suggested the first task was to collect existing published catalogues, make a compilation and then identify gaps. He suggested a letter to members asking for names and addresses of all established collections in their countries so that the people responsible for the project could then contact them direct. He felt private collections should be excluded, certainly initially.

Decision: Ideas to be forwarded to Cinematheque Quebecoise who will be responsible for the project suggested by Pierre Véronneau.

g) Archive publications bibliography extension

Item 3 on Project Underway:

Decision: Mr Kula to draft criterion for inclusion of films: either co-productions with archives, using archive material or about archive work.

(N.B.: Would not this also include compilations as in item 4?)

Mr Klaus mentioned four other projects that he would like to have discussed in Madrid when they had more time.

h) Statistics on archive holdings

He felt the statistics would be very impressive as indicating the archives' role in preserving international cultural heritage and a very useful document for public relations purposes.

i) Catalogues of Latin American Holdings

He saw this as a useful follow-up to the Latin American seminar, including holdings anywhere in the world by or about Latin America.

j) FIAF's own History

FIAF would be celebrating its 50th anniversary in 1988 and he thought it was important to start thinking now about a retrospective publication.

k) List of periodicals holdings

This was a project for the Documentation Commission, an important adjunct for new subscribers to F.I.P. to know where to get hold of the nearest or most accessible copies of the originals.

l) Spanish as a potential official language for FIAF

Mr Klaus suggested we should discuss this at Madrid but invited Mr Casanova to introduce the topic.

Mr Casanova said that all the Spanish speaking archives recognised the extra costs that would be incurred through having an extra language but felt it would enable Spanish speaking archives to make a greater contribution to FIAF. He had 2 main suggestions:

- FIAF manuals for use in archives:

The Filmtoteca Espanola and UNAM between them would be willing to fund the translation and publication of these in Spanish.

- Simultaneous translation at Congresses:

He would like to see a recommendation (but not an obligation) to Congress hosts to consider the possibility of providing simultaneous translation in Spanish to enable the Spanish speaking archives to make a more active contribution.

Mr Klaus felt the proposals should be studied very carefully for their implications and that a document should be prepared for the Spanish speaking archives especially, setting out the position and the possibilities.

6. FUTURE CONGRESSES

For Australia, Mr Schou had a new suggestion to help with the expenses: they have good experience of getting money from private sponsors and they suggest that any archive who had to pay in excess of a basic agreed travel cost (air-line portion) should be reimbursed from this fund.

Mr Daudelin reported that there would be a formal invitation from Lisbon during the summer for 1987, they would like a decision at Stockholm.

Mrs Orbanz confirmed that West Germany would like to invite the Congress as soon as possible too, 1988 or 1987.

7. ANALYSIS OF THE 1982 CONGRESS

Mr Klaus invited general comments, ideas, criticisms that might be useful for future occasions:

- Mr Deudelin asked that the basic pattern of General Meeting before the Symposium should be reverted to for future years (although he appreciated it was worthwhile to change the order on this occasion).
- Mr Kula mentioned that the generosity of the host in paying the staying costs for the Executive Committee, not only for the extra days but for the whole stay had led to critical comment from a number of archives who felt that if there was any extra money available it should be used for other purposes, eg:
 - . reducing the general price.
 - . inviting extra people from developing countries,
 - . additional events for all.

Mr Klaus felt it had been an important help to many members of the Executive Committee but the decision was in the hands of the host.

- Mr Klaus felt the format of the symposium with long "academic" type lectures was very tiring, especially as the translations were sometimes difficult to follow. He would have preferred shorter contributions interspersed with films and demonstrations.

Mr Francis agreed and hoped that it would be possible to hold the symposium in a place where one could have high quality projection and simultaneous translation at the same time.

- It was widely felt that bars should be open later into the evening, at least until midnight, to encourage members to go on talking.

8. MISCELLANEOUS

a) Next meeting of the Executive Committee in Madrid

Arrival January 17.

Executive Committee = January 18, 19, 20.

Leave: January 21.

b) Centralised services

Mr Francis asked for time to be set aside in Madrid to consider the feasibility of various centralised services which might involve an extra staff member, e.g. purchase of film stock, equipment assessment, etc.

Decision: Discussion in Madrid.

c) Proposed study of European silent cinema

Mr Daudelin reported on a proposal submitted via Mr Cincotti by the Association Italienne pour la Recherche sur l'Histoire du Cinéma.

They claim that a general filmography of silent cinema had not been attempted before and asked for FIAF collaboration.

Mr Cincotti felt it was ambitious but had certainly been attempted before; however, they were serious and he felt we could give them "moral support" but with caution bearing in mind our World Film History Project experience.

Decision: Mention in the Bulletin inviting co-operation.

d) Article 104

Mr Kula asked for clarification on what had been agreed.

Mr Klaus said there were no plans for change at the moment but any individual member was free to submit further proposals for change.

The meeting closed with Mr Klaus expressing thanks to Mr Casanova as host.

=====