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<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous: letter of Ray Edmondson</td>
</tr>
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</table>
MINUTES

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

16-18 APRIL 1990 - HAVANA

Mr DAUDELIN, President, formally opened the meeting noting and regretting the absence of Mr GARCIA MESA and of Mr FRANCIS.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The proposed Agenda was formally adopted with a minor addition
- addition of point 11 - Miscellaneous, including discussion of a letter of Ray EDMONDSON.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting in Helsinki were approved unanimously.

Mrs BOWSER was asked to write a short version of the minutes of EC meetings in general to be sent to the membership in annex to the Bulletin.

Special thanks were given to Ms JOHNSON for all her work.

3. REPORT ON THE PREPARATIONS OF THE HAVANA CONGRESS

Mr PASTOR VEGA thanked FIAF for its important support (especially Mrs VAN DER ELST) in the organisation of the Congress.

He informed the EC, that they had received financial support from UNESCO which has allowed them to invite several archives from Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Mr. PASTOR VEGA then briefly reviewed the programme including both working and social events:
16/04 Dinner with Julio GARCIA ESPINOSA at the Havana Libre Hotel.
18/04 11 AM : Press Conference
8.30 PM : Welcome Party but also celebration of the 30th anniversary of the Cinemateca de Cuba.
19/04 Official opening of the Congress with the Minister of Culture, Mr Armando HART.
Apart from the Minister, 14 other officials were expected.
20/04 Presentation of "Caligari".
21/04 Second EC Meeting.
24/04 Excursion day :
- Visit of the Filmschool.
- Party at the Latin American Foundation of Cinema.

4. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

4.1 Report from the working group on membership

Mr Rosen reported on the work done since Helsinki by the working group on membership.

*Unfortunately the tape recording this session is inaudible.*

*See working session on membership of the General Assembly*

4.2 Reconfirmation of Members

4.2.a Budapest : Magyar Filmintezet/Filmarchivum

Mrs ORBANZ said that nothing had been received from Budapest, therefore she suggested to postpone the decision to the EC meeting in Autumn.

Decision : Postponed.
4.2.b Beograd : Jugoslovenska Kinoteka

In reviewing the dossier, Mrs ORBANZ said that there was no change in the structure nor in the activities of the archive.
She noted that there was a new director Mr S. ZIANG who would be present at the GA.  
Mrs ORBANZ recommended the reconfirmation.  
Decision : Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

4.2.c Berlin (DDR) : Staatliches Filmmuseum der DDR

Mrs ORBANZ noted that, since the political changes in East Germany, there was no change concerning the daily work of the archive.  
She said that they would affect mostly the two state archives, the SFA der DDR and the Bundesarchiv of Koblenz and, in a lesser way, the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek of Berlin (BRD), but that for the time being nothing could be foreseen.  
She considered that, being most important, the SFA had the biggest chance not only to continue but also to play an important role in Film Archiving in Germany.  
Mrs ORBANZ recommended to reconfirm them and stressed that it would help them in their negotiations.  
Decision : Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

Mr KLAUF was asked to tell the floor more about the last paragraph of his letter, which reads:  
"Final remark : The information given is based on the actual situation on February 15, 1990. The situation will change rapidly after the election on March 18. As long as the GDR exists each government will be faced with the archive and its responsibility for the moving image heritage. I suppose the Archive will survive for a while, but certainly not for ever. With the unification of
Germany also archives in east and west will be merged together. Thinking and working in this direction began. Nobody knows when this development comes to an end." He answered that he was not able to go much further because the situation had not yet changed fundamentally.

Regarding his archive’s situation Mr KLAUE presented two alternatives.

1. The Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR in Berlin remains as an institution.
   Mr KLAUE had many doubts about this alternative. Because in a united Germany there would be no subsidy for two institutions doing nearly the same.

2. Close cooperation between both archives in Berlin (Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek and Staatliches Filmarchiv).
   Mr KLAUE considered this creation of a new German archive formed by both institutions as possible but, he said, it raised the problem of cooperation and division of tasks between the Filmarchiv in Berlin and the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz.

Nevertheless, he emphasized the fact that no formal decision had been taken, the last alternative seemed to be the most realistic but nothing definite was decided.

4.2.d Madrid : Filmoteca Española

Mrs ORBANZ said there was no change within the Filmoteca Española but that they had become member of the Instituto de la Cinematografía y de las Artes Audiovisuales. She had a letter explaining the aims of this institute. Although the archive was not the Institute’s priority, the Filmoteca Española agreed that they enjoyed sufficient autonomy to continue their work in a satisfactory way. Therefore Mrs ORBANZ recommended their reconfirmation.

Decision : Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.
Mrs ORBANZ said that the dossier submitted by Seoul was very clear and satisfying. Nevertheless, she was puzzled by the organigram (6 directors and only one technician) and by the budget in which they mentioned their net profit without saying what they planned to do with it. She reminded the floor that one or two years earlier, FIAF was not sure whether the Korean Film Archive really worked as an archive or just promoted films. She said, their report showed a greater independence from the Film Foundation.

Contrary to Mrs ORBANZ, Mrs BOWSER did not find the report very clear especially concerning the question of membership of the Korean Archive.

Mr DAUDELIN made two remarks:
He noted that trying to use Mr ROSEN’s "10 % on preservation approach" the Korean Archive would rate 4.9%, whereas their answer to the questionnaire said 20 %. Consequently very little was devoted to the collection and care of films.

Another problem was their relationship with the other film organisations.

Mrs WIBOM reminded the history of this archive. They had been founded by the producers’ association and they were in a wonderful position: the Korean producers gave them the negatives of their productions. Moreover, the lab was situated in the same building.
She explained that, as they received new negatives and had very few positive prints and not very much screening, there was not so much preservation to be done.

Mr KLAUE suggested to raise a certain number of questions:
- Contradictions between the budget and the answers to the questionnaire,
- The problem of the 6 directors. Are the 6 directors actively working in the archive?
- Justify the fact that they answer no to the question: "Does the archive have regular contacts with members of FIAF?".

Mrs. VAN DER ELST proposed to ask all those questions to Mr. CHUNG here in Havana.

Decision: postponed to the EC meeting the 21st.

4.3 Reconfirmation of Observers (all)

Mrs. ORBANZ reminded that the EC had decided to reconfirm all the Observers every second year when there was no election. She suggested to read down the list and for each Observer check whether they had paid for 1989 and/or sent their annual report. And she also called for remarks or questions from the floor.

1. Alger: Cinémathèque Algérienne
   No report submitted.
   Subscription unpaid for 1989.

2. Bangkok: The National Film Archive
   Report submitted.

3. Berkeley: Pacific Film Archive
   Report: not expected because just admitted.

4. Bogota: Cinemateca Distrital
   No report submitted.

Mrs. GALVAO explained that the Cinemateca was having a problem. She reminded that Mr. GARCIA MESA had written a report on their situation for the meeting at Helsinki but that since then there had been no improvement. The Cinemateca was afraid not to exist any longer facing the activities of the Fundación Patrimonio Filmico Columbiano; they had already lost their library and their
documentation department and they were afraid of losing also the films.
It was decided to write them to ask for a report and to re-examine their case at the Fall meeting of the EC.

5. Bogota : Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Comlumbiano
   Report submitted.

6. Bologna : Cineteca del Comune di Bologna
   No report submitted.

   Mrs VAN DER ELST proposed to write to explain them what was expected in a report, as this was their first year in FIAF.

7. Cairo : Al Archive Al-Kawmy Lil Film
   Report submitted.

   Mrs ORBANZ noted that there were not many activities and that they had a plan of having a new building and therefore were asking FIAF members for help. She mentioned that they had acquired 87 feature films.
   Mrs VAN DER ELST spoke about a problem of communication concerning this archive. They had asked to be helped to come to the Congress, FIAF had sent them a ticket and nothing else had been heard from them.

8. Dhaka : Bangladesh Film Archive
   Report submitted.
   Subscription not paid.
   Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that Dhaka always paid one year later.

9. Dublin : The Irish Film Institute
   Report submitted.
10. Frankfurt : Deutsche Filmmuseum
   Report submitted.

11. Gemona : Cineteca del Friuli
   Report was not yet expected.

12. Glasgow : Scottish Film Archive
   Report was not yet expected.

13. Hanoi : Vien tu Lieu Phim Viet Nam
   Report submitted.

14. Harare : National Archives of Zimbabwe
   Report submitted.

15. Jakarta : Sinematek Indonesia
   Report submitted.

Mrs VAN DER ELST remarked that this report was very negative.
She talked about a representative of the National Archives in Jakarta who was at the Bangkok Preservation workshop and seemed much more active than FIAF’s Observer. The question was: are they interested in joining FIAF?
Mr KLAUE answered that the main problem was that they had no government authorisation to apply for membership in another international organisation than ICA.
Mr SCHOU reported that they had received in Canberra a delegation of 6 people from Jakarta, each of them spending one day in the archive and the director, Mr Misbach Biran of the Sinematek had spent another 3 days studying the activities of the National Film and Sound Archives. According to Mr SCHOU this proved that something was going on in Jakarta in the field of film archives.
16. Jerusalem : Steven Spielberg Jewish Film Archive
   Report submitted.

17. La Paz : Cinemateca Boliviana
   Report submitted.
   Subscription unpaid.
   Mrs VAN DER ELST explained that in spite of the positive report, she knew the situation of the Cinemateca Boliviana was very difficult.

18. Lima, Fimoteca de Lima
   Report submitted.

19. Luanda : Cinemateca Nacional de Angola
   Report submitted.

20. Lyon : Musée du Cinéma de Lyon
   Report submitted (1 page).
   Mr BORDE was struck by the report which he found was too succinct when two things very important had happened in Lyon.
   1. A conclusion had been reached in the negotiation with the heirs to the Lumière Family concerning the deposit of prototypes (including the 360° copper projector which was used at the 1900 Exhibition);
   2. The Musée du Cinéma de Lyon, together with the SFA in Bois d’Arcy, had been able to locate the whole production of Lumière with the exception of 10 items. Therefore Mr BORDE believed that there was a certain discrepancy between a pessimist report and what they had done.
   It was decided to ask them for a more elaborate report.

21 Madison : Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research
   Report submitted.
22. Managua : Cinemateca the Nicaragua
Report submitted.
Subscription unpaid.

Mrs ORBANZ noted that the report talked about the
difficulties they were having.
Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that they were going to
inaugurate new premises this month.

23. Manila : Film Archives of the Philippines
Report submitted.
Subscription unpaid (two years in arrears).
Mr ROSEN noted that their report was almost a call for
help. Indeed they made very clear the problems they were
having.
A delegate from Manila was expected to attend the Congress
and to bring the subscriptions in arrears.
Moreover it was decided to write a letter answering the
questions raised in the report.

24. Montevideo : Archivo Nacional de la Imagen
Report submitted.

25. München : Filmmuseum/Münchner Stadtmuseum
Report submitted.

26. New York : Anthology Film Archives
Report not yet expected.

27. Paris : La Cinémathèque Francaise
No report (in spite of several reminders).

28. Paris : Cinémathèque Universitaire
Report submitted.
29. Perth: The State Film Archives of Western Australia
   Report submitted.

30. Quito: Cinemateca Nacional del Ecuador
   Report submitted.

31. Reykjavik: Kvikmyndasafn Islands
   Report submitted.

32. Tehran: Film-Khane-Ye Melli-E Iran
   Report submitted.

33. Tokyo
   Report not yet expected.

34. Valencia
   Report not yet expected.

35. Vaticano: Filmoteca Vaticana
   Report submitted.

36. Washington: Human Studies Film Archives
   Report submitted.

37. Washington: Motion Picture Sound and Video Branch
   National Archives.
   Report submitted.

Comment from Mrs VAN DER ELST, saying that the EC checked
thoroughly if Observers had sent their report but several
Members also did not send their report.

Mrs ORBANZ summarised this review of Observers stating that
there were problems for the reconfirmation of seven of them,
The following decisions were taken with regard to them.

1. Alger
   Postpone the reconfirmation to the autumn EC meeting.

2. Bogota
   Same decision.

3. Dhaka
   It was decided just to remind the payment of the subscription.

4. La Paz
   Same decision.

5. Managua
   Mrs WIBOM was surprised to read about "serious economical limitation" because she knew that SIDA (Swedish International Development Authority) had contributed 180,000 $ to the complete reconstruction of their film theatre equipped with new projectors and climatised vaults which meant they had received a very important contribution.
   Concerning the payment Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that Managua was only one year in arrears.
   It was then decided to reconfirm Managua and to send a reminder for the payment.

6. Manila
   Manila being the only observer two years in arrears for the payment, it was decided to wait for the arrival of their delegate and resume discussion at the EC meeting on the 21st.

7. Paris CF
   Wait for the arrival of their delegates in Havana.
Final decision

It was decided to postpone the reconfirmation of those who had not sent their annual report and to send a reminder for those who had not paid for 1989.

Next reconfirmation of members

The Archives in Budapest, Milano, Oslo, Sofia and Wellington were due for reconfirmation at the Fall meeting of the EC.

4.4 New candidates for observership: 's Gravenhage

Mrs ORBANZ presented the application of 's Gravenhage: Audiovisual Archive of the Nederlands Rijksvoorlichtingdienst (Information Service).

Mrs ORBANZ recalled that the application dated back to 1983 and that at that time FIAF did not have the agreement of the Nederland’s Filmmuseum.

Finally in Helsinki FIAF had been informed that there was no longer any opposition from the Nederlands Filmmuseum.

Mrs ORBANZ summarised the informations and documents received from this organisation since 1983 and mainly in 1988.

She finally recommended to accept the archive as an Observer despite the fact that it was not really independent, but part of the Information Service.

She added that if they wanted to become a Member, then they would have to prove more closely their independence.

Concerning the reaction of the Netherlands Filmmuseum, Mrs ORBANZ repeated that they were in favour of having the archive as an Observer.

Decision: Unanimous in favour of admission.
4.5 Other requests for affiliation

* Caracas: Biblioteca Nacional y de Servicios Audiovisuales
  The request was from 1989. But their file was still incomplete. Therefore Mrs ORBANZ advised to postpone the decision to the following EC meeting. Mrs GALVAO informed that this institution was one of the best archives in Latin America. Mrs VAN DER ELST said that three representants from the other archive in Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela were also coming to the congress. Mrs Orbanz was to have an explanation with them concerning their status in FIAF.

* Bucharest: Archiva Nationala de Filme
  This former Member now asked to come back to FIAF as Observer. They were willing to pay the subscription, but they still had to fill in the other formalities.

* Cinémathèque Méliès
  Mrs VAN DER ELST spoke about a letter from Madeleine Malthête Méliès in which she put into words the hope that her private film-library could enter FIAF as an Observer or in any other capacity that would be decided by the EC. Mr BORDE explained that the Cinémathèque Méliès was in fact a business company that united the heirs of Méliès for the exploitation of the Méliès films. He did not consider it as a film-library because it had a commercial aim. Mrs ORBANZ suggested to ask them to do their normal application.

* Guatemala: Cinemateca Universitaria Enrique Torres
  Mrs. ORBANZ recalled that FIAF had received a letter in which they explained their activities but they still had to fulfill the formal application.
Cardiff : Welsh Film Archive
Mrs ORBANZ reported that at first they had wanted to join FIAF but then they had postponed the application. However, she added, they had sent a very interesting text about their activities and she was wondering whether in such cases, this kind of information could not be distributed in a certain way to the members. the Bulletin was evoked as a possibility.

4.6 Miscellaneous

London NFA
Mrs ORBANZ gave a short report on the situation at the NFA/London saying she had written Mr STEVENSON (director fo the BFI) a letter expressing how FIAF was concerned with the projects of restructuration. She was answered that it should not be the concern of FIAF.

Tokyo : National Film Centre
Mrs ORBANZ informed the EC that she had been invited to visit their archive by the Director of the Museum of Modern Art, Mr OZAKI.
She reported that she had visited the offices and the actual archive. She found out that they had no problems for storing films but that on the one hand they had no room for Nitrate films (they did not have any but it is well known that there is a big collection with the Japan Film Foundation) and on the other hand, they had no technicians in their staff.
It seemed that Mr OZAKI’s priority was to have access to the collection.
Finally Mrs. ORBANZ stated that she had written a letter suggesting them to have technicians and a preservation programme.
Mrs ORBANZ also said that she had taken the opportunity of her visit to Tokyo to go to the reception of the Kawakita
price and also to attend the Thai Film Festival. Mr KLAUE asked Mrs ORBANZ to give a written report of her visit to Tokyo because it could perhaps be used when Tokyo applied for membership. Mrs BOWSER hoped that FIAF could follow up in some way on Mrs ORBANZ’visit because we needed to know more about the situation of nitrate films and of film preservation in general in Japan.

* Argument between the Cinémathèques in Brussels and Luxembourg

Reviewing the case Mrs ORBANZ said that there was no change but that the situation was not worse.

* Rio de Janeiro: Cinemateca do Museu do Arte Moderna

Mr DAUDELIN presented the problem of this Archive vs FIAF: subscriptions unpaid for 1988-89-90. Mr Cosme ALVES NETTO was invited to explain the situation. He described the general economical situation in Brazil and said the Film Archive of Rio was almost in a deadlock with no money and no sponsorship. He suggested to pay some services to FIAF as a solution. (Mr Alves NETTO was asked to leave the room). Mr KLAUE wondered what services the archive could provide to FIAF and proposed they should step down as Observer as another solution. Mr BORDE suggested to concede them an extra term of payment of six months. Mrs GALVAO agreed on that proposition because, she said, their situation could change within that period. Mr DAUDELIN suggested then a new term of payment until the Fall EC meeting. Mrs BOWSER, for her part, considered that it was more important to keep contacts with the archives than to insist on them staying full members. Mr CINCOTTI agreed with the suggestion of a term payment of six months Whereas he did
not agree with the solution of observership because then, if they failed to pay, they would be crossed off as observer which would mean the same negative result.

Mrs GALVAO informed the EC, that an Institute of the Brazilian Historical Patrimony had just been created that could possibly be put in charge of the Cinemateca of Rio.

Mr ROSEN suggested the creation of an emergency fund for active members who find themselves during a limited period of time in a position where the economic situation in their country makes it impossible to pay the subscription. The fund, he added, would be raised from the outside and would pay the subscription for a period of one or two years for the healthy and active archives. The fund could even specify the possibilities of repayment.

Mrs WIBOM warmly welcomed this suggestion and explained that if FIAF could have such an emergency fund or a possibility that FIAF could lend money to archives in the same situations it would therefore no longer link membership to payment or non payment.

She specified that this loan would have to be running at an interest and be handled strictly like any other credit office.

Mr BORDE announced that he was ready to back up this new idea. He explained that FIAF had a Reserve fund of 130,000 Swiss Francs on which only the EC could decide. The EC could exceptionnaly lend the equivalent of one subscription to Rio, this would give them one year for trying to find solutions.

Mr DAUDELIN closed the discussion by proposing to keep the solution for the autumn meeting.

Mr ALVES NETTO was asked to come back and Mr DAUDELIN informed him of the three decisions taken by the EC:

(1) The EC recommended a final time limit until Nov. 1990 (next EC meeting) which Rio hopefully would find solutions.
(2) Mr ALVES NETTO was asked to send a report on the situation of the archive for the autumn meeting.
(3) Finally Mr ALVES NETTO was asked to specify in writing and in concrete wording which services the archive could provide to FIAF as an alternative for the subscription fee.

Mr ALVES NETTO warmly thanked the EC for these favorable decisions and took the opportunity of being there to make two proposals:
1) He suggested to introduce the notion of suspension of an Archive during 1, 2 or 3 years instead of deletion.
2) He reminded the EC, that in the past Sao Paolo and Rio had always been able to give mutual aid and it was the first time that both archives were in a bad situation.

5. FINANCIAL REPORT

5.1 General Document on FIAF’s Finances

Mr BORDE recalled that a suggestion had been made at Helsinki to establish a short document to explain to FIAF’s Members how FIAF finances worked and to inform them on the income and the expenses. This document was written by him and Mrs VAN DER ELST. The EC agreed to have it distributed at the General Assembly, with a few minor corrections.

5.2 Balance as at 31 December 1989

Reviewing the document Mr BORDE pointed out that the income was a little higher than expected, the expenses were also higher than expected but finally the debit balance was lower than foreseen.
He underlined that FIAF publications had been sold much more than expected, thanks to the publicity.
Unfortunately the rest of this topic was inaudible on the tape

5.3 Draft budget for 1991

Mr BORDE announced that following the decision made in Helsinki, the budgeted expenses for 1991 had been reduced. He explained that it was a "crisis budget" in order not to raise subscriptions before the vote on the new membership policy. All the reductions came under special expenses:

- the expenses for the Executive Committee were reduced to 100,000 BF leaving out the simultaneous translation,
- special publications and publicity were not cancelled for that year.

Mr DAUDELIN proposed to add 30,000 BF to the income of FIAF publications, which was reasonable and the budget would be well-balanced on a basis of 4,580,000 Belgian Francs. Concerning UNESCO contracts,

Mrs WIBOM reported that UNESCO charged 25 % of administrative fees and if FIAF could do the same, it would be a source of income for the Federation or the development fund.

Mr KLAUE agreed with this proposal and Mr ROSEN insisted that if operation fees could be dedicated to the development fund, it gave a higher justification to those fees.

Mr DAUDELIN judged that while 25 % was a little too high, between 10 % and 15 % was current practice and could be adopted by FIAF.

Mrs VAN DER ELST said that the Swiss franc had lost 10 % during the last two years, therefore she suggested to ask for subscriptions to be paid in Belgian Francs from 1991 or 1992
onwards. Decision would be made in November.

Subscription

Concerning the question of subscription Mr. DIMITRIU earlier in the discussion has proposed to reduce the difference between the subscription of Members (2850 SF) and the subscription of observers (400 SF).

This topic will be raised during the discussion on membership at the GA.

6. REPORT OF THE FUNDRAISING COMMITTEE

Mrs WIBROM recalled that according to the decisions made in Helsinki, the most urgent job had been to fund the Havana Congress and they had encountered more difficulties than expected. She asked Mr. DIMITRIU and Mr. ROSEN to explain their experience in raising money for the Havana Congress.

Mr. DIMITRIU had approached a certain number of institutions in Switzerland and said it had been very difficult to raise money for the 3rd world. The companies he had approached were willing to give money, but for projects in Switzerland. He finally obtained 3000 SF.

Mr. ROSEN explained his experience with the Rockefeller Foundation. At first they had agreed to give 15.000 $ because of their particular interest in Latin America. But later their lawyers had made inquiries and had said it was against the rules on the blockade against Cuba. Nevertheless, he thought FIAF should go back to them for other activities.

Mrs WIBROM had been to the Swedish International Development Authority who had helped to organise the FIAF Congress in 1983 and she received 11.500$.
She also mentioned that Mrs VAN DER ELST had been very successful in promoting the Cuban demand for money to UNESCO. She said that the main concern for the working group had been how to receive financial support on a more general level A) to help FIAF finances, B) to support special projects. She then distributed and commented a document she had drafted and called "An International Fundraising Project for the Preservation of the Moving Image in Developing countries"

(Mrs WIBOM comment is lacking on the tape)

Mr ROSEN wondered what was the best mechanism to submit a project to a funding agency. He thought it was perhaps a too heavy task for FIAF.

Mrs WIBOM reported that the Vietnam filmarchive was interested in the whole procedure. They had an important lack of equipment. She proposed to go to Vietnam with a technician, prepare a complete programme of help and use it as a test case because it was a project limited in time and money.

Mr SCHOU said the main problem in Vietnam was that the majority of their collection suffered from the vinegar syndrome and was eventually going to disappear completely, unless it was possible to take the necessary measurements.

Mrs WIBOM said that the applicants would have to specify the project they would want FIAF to consider. She suggested to call a committee or a working group who would work out guidelines on how to handle this kind of question. FIAF could reach the maturity to be a partner in this international development field.
Mr KLAUE advocated to explore the possibility of involving the National Archives and chanelling projects through them. This should be handled by one group. Nevertheless, he advised to start with one project a year.

Mr DIMITRIU asked whether the Fundraising group was meant to find money for the Members or for FIAF. He said that if it was to find money for the Members, then FIAF acted as a consultant and the interest should come from the Members wanting to develop something in their country. FIAF would then designate someone to sponsor the project.

Decision: the Fundraising working group was reconfirmed and asked to continue working on the lines discussed here above.

Action: It was decided to prepare a new paper to distribute to the GA, including Mr KLAUE’s guidelines and Mrs WIBOM’s draft reduced to one text.

7. ROLE OF THE COMMISSIONS

It was recalled that in Helsinki, Mr BOWSER and Mr KLAUE had been asked to prepare guidelines on the role of Commissions.

Mrs BOWSER regretted that the Commission heads had not received the minutes of Helsinki. She then introduced the subject by reading the "Guidelines for Commission Work".

Mr KLAUE proposed some changes in the working bodies of FIAF:
1. Continuity and renewal of Commission, he suggested a system of rotation and a limitation of 6 years for membership in Commissions with a maximum of 10 years (on special request of the chairperson of the Commission).
2. Widening and introducing other means of cooperation within the Federation
   He distinguished between three means of collective work
in FIAF:

a) Commissions  b) working groups  c) committees.

a) The Commissions would take over really important subjects in their specific field.
b) The working groups would be established by the EC, with very limited and specific tasks, a limited number of participants and for a limited time period.
c) Finally, the committees would be established on demand of the membership. The aim would be to share experiences or to join activities. The EC would have to establish certain rules for those committees and decide on its degree of interference or guidance.

Reactions to these proposals were numerous:

Mrs AUBERT stressed the need of flexibility in the work of Commissions. According to her, some contributions needed continuity, others needed a limited period of time.

Mr SCHOU agreed with Mr KLAUE and insisted on the need to restrict the number of projects.

Mrs HARRISON stressed that it was more important to have a continuity in the membership because, as a main argument, the Commission projects take mostly a long time to be carried out. It would not be very good to have someone working on a project and then, because of rotation, have to leave it.

Mrs ORBANZ emphasized the need of continuity in the Commission work, therefore she agreed with the idea of reconfirmation. She accepted the idea of working groups for certains subjects but said that the Commission work was part of the Federation and consequently did not approve of the idea of rotation.
Mrs BOWSER agreed with the idea of keeping projects to working groups in a limited time period whenever possible but she said that on a practical level the name of the Commission served a very useful purpose. The prestigious position of being a Commission member carried weight in individual archives.

Mr ROSEN thought that Mr KLAUE’s tri-partite distinction was very interesting and for each type he made a certain number of remarks:
- Committees would raise the problem of communication and representation,
- the notion of bottomline and of schedule for the working groups was very attractive,
- what stroke him about the Commissions was the lack of interest for their work among the delegates at congresses.

This lack of interest was denied by Mr SCHOU and Mrs HARRISON, who said that the discussions and the questions took place after the presentation of the reports to the GA.

Mrs AUBERT said that the best way to report to the GA was through technical symposium and not with a formal presentations.

She suggested to establish two new working groups at an early date:
- a working group on training,
- a working group on public relations.

Mrs WIBOM felt that a rotation system ought to be adopted in some way for two reasons:
1. she considered it to be a hard burden for a single archive to be in charge of the job for such a long period,
2. she said that working in a Commission was a very good training in itself and that possibility would have to be offered to many staff Members of different archives.
She also felt that it was important to determine a bottom line to when the Commissions would be prepared to answer specific questions from the membership on the projects because their expectations were great and should not be postponed too long.

**Mr SCHOU**

was reluctant to set a time frame. The EC would have to decide on each occasion whether a Commission member should be reconfirmed or had run stale,

concerning the question of experience he agreed with Mrs WIBOM, but he pointed out that it was also very difficult to recruit qualified people on the Commission,

about training, he fully agreed with Mrs AUBERT, saying that it was one of FIAF main aims not only to collect information but also to train people. He gave the example of the audiovisual presentation demonstrated the year before in Lisbon. His idea was to duplicate the slides and the text in order to give them to any archive,

he also remarked (as Mrs WIBOM) that sometimes the expectations of the Members were too high. The information sent out for the Bulletin was based on months, even years, of research and it was not always possible to send new informations for each issue of the Bulletin.

**Mrs GALVAO** insisted on having a limitation of 10 years.

**Mr KLAUE** reacted to Mr SCHOU’s suggestion. The EC did not have the necessary information to decide whether a person ought to be reconfirmed or not. Non-reconfirmation could only take place on request from the chair person of the Commission.

He repeated that he was in favour of rotation - reconfirmation - a limitation in the membership (for Commissions, 10 years would be a maximum).
Mrs GALVAO imagined the case of someone who could not be replaced after 10 years. Was it possible for this person to remain?

Mrs WIBOM answered that the person could become a consultant to the Commission.

Mrs HARRISON was concerned by the idea of term unless there was some flexibility because, she said, it was not easy to find new Members for a Commission. Therefore she proposed a break of two years during which a former member could become a consultant and go back to the Commission after.

Mr DE PINA had two preoccupations
1. he insisted on the need of valuing the work of Commissions in general,
2. he remarked that in the reports of Commissions there was no account of the relationship between the Commission and the FIAF Members.

Mr DAUDELIN asked Mr KLAUE to prepare an amendment to the guidelines taking into account the preoccupations of flexibility and rotation. This text would be discussed at the following EC meeting.

Mrs AUBERT reinsisted on the need of a financial structure and the importance of training and public relations.

Mrs HARRISON seconded Mrs AUBERT saying that the EC had been discussing for years the possibilities of training or workshops without funds.

Mr KLAUE focused on the creation of a training committee and a group of three persons for the Public Relations.
Mr DAUDELIN concluded the discussion saying that the EC was unanimous concerning the rotation issue. He said that the flexibility applied for the issue of number in rule 78 should also be applied for the rotation procedure. He raised a new question asking Commission heads what they thought about the rule concerning their presence at the EC. The reaction to that question was positive.

The heads of Commission were then asked to comment on their membership.

Cataloging Commission

Mrs HARRISON reported that Dorothea Gebauer had just retired and therefore she stayed with eight Members. She requested reconfirmation for all of them.

Mr DAUDELIN considered that if Mr GEBAUER was staying as a consultant, there was no need to add a ninth member.

Documentation Commission

Mrs AUBERT reported in the Commission were five Members, most of them new. She asked for the addition of a new member. Michael MOULDS (PIP) asked to be an observer of the Documentation Commission.

Mrs AUBERT explained that Janos VARGA had not taken part in the Commission and therefore she could not recommend his reconfirmation as a member.

Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU presented the Members of his Commission and recommended their reconfirmation. He added that Harold BROWN was consultant and that he had yet found no one to replace Frantz SCHMITT.
8. REPORT ON THE PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

The Members had before them a document prepared by the Programming Committee for the General Assembly but not yet discussed by the EC.

It was explained that the programming committee was in fact a sub-committee because all its Members were Members of the Executive Committee, it could eventually become a working group.

Mr BORDE said the document presented two different conceptions of the Programming Commission
a) a Programming Commission with a cultural dominance
b) a Programming working group with a technical dominance.
He favoured the first alternative.

Mr KLAUE on the contrary favoured the second alternative but with changed terms of reference. The working group would allow to execute tasks in a limited time period (two years) and present the results at the Symposium connected with the 92 congress.
And then FIAF could decide whether to establish a working group or a Commission.

Mr ROSEN was conflicted because he thought the idea of establishing a Commission committed to the cultural uses of archives was very important but that the project was restricted to one aspect of the cultural uses of archives (ie: putting films on the screen); therefore he thought the context was not broad enough to justify the creation of a Commission.

Mr KLAUE agreed with Mr ROSEN wondering whether the scope of the programming committee should be extended. He insisted that we were talking about the Cultural "uses" of archives and not their "cultural role".
Mr DE PINA insisted on having a Commission, something with an institutional strength.

**Decision:** finally it was decided to propose to the GA to establish a working group with a limited mandate of one year whose task would be to evaluate the possible establishment of a Commission and to better define its mandate.

Members of that working group might be: Gunnar ALMER, Steve RICHIE, Joao Bernard DA COSTA and Catherine GAUTHIER

9. REVIEW OF ALL THE POINT ON THE AGENDA OF THE GA

**GA1 Official opening**

On April 19 at 9.00 AM with the Minister of Culture. The cuban guests would stay until the coffee-break.

**GA2 Report of the President on behalf of the Executive Committee**

The text presented by Mr DAUDELIN was approved unanimously after very minor modifications and additions.

**GA3 Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the Members present or represented**

Two proxies:
- from Warsaw to Mr KLAUE and
- from Vienna FA to Mrs ORBANZ

It was said that some visitors would like to attend the symposium but also the General Assembly. It was decided to discuss it later in the evening with the list of visitors in hand.

**GA4 Adoption of the agenda**

"Miscellaneous" was added under 16b.
Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Assembly
Guido CINCOTTI had been forgotten in the list of Members elected for the EC. It was decided to mention it at the GA.

membership questions: new Observers
Mrs ORBANZ will formally introduce the new Observers to the GA.

Relations with UNESCO and other international organisations
Mr KLAUE would report to the GA.

UNESCO

Mr KLAUE reported that the programme for the Development of Audio Visual Archives, which had been formerly under the responsibility of the Culture and Communications Sector, had been transferred to the Division of the General Information Programme (PGI) and would be administered jointly with the Records and Archives Management Programme (RAMP) as an integral part of PGI.
Mr KLAUE said that three contracts were proposed to FIAF
a) final editing of survey on Moving Heritage,
b) pilot project for a one year training on film archiving at the University of Berlin,
c) preparation of a world directory of film, tv and sound archives.

Other International Organisations
IASA
Mr KLAUE said that FIAF had a formal invitation to attend IASA’s general assembly in Ottawa.
It was decided that Mr SCHOU would represent FIAF except for one day when Mr DAUDELIN would be there.
FIAT
Nothing special was mentioned concerning FIAT except that there was a good cooperation on the curriculum project.
Alberto MARTINEZ of the Cuban Institute of Radio and TV would be the FIAT representative in Havana.

GA8 Working session on membership policies
This topic will be introduced by Bob Rosen under the chairmanship of Wolfgang Klaue.

This point was discussed at length under point 5 of the EC Agenda.

GA10 Projects and publications underway

Item 1 : 100th Anniversary of the Cinema 1892-97 (D. Francis)

Mr DAUDELIN said it was necessary to establish a working group for this project. At Helsinki it had been decided that one member from each Commission would be appointed to that working group.

Mrs BOWSER said Charles MUSSER was very honoured to act as historian on this committee.

Mrs WIBOM said she had been appointed to take charge of the 100th Anniversary in Sweden and she presented some points of the programme, i.e. world wide film festival for young people and students.

Mr DE PINA reminded that this anniversary embarked three important dates:
- 1895-1995
- the 100th anniversary of various national cinematographies.
- the commemoration of the 20th Century.

Mr BORDE asked the working group to be chaired by an American or a German because in France the focus was too much on Lumière.

According to him, Mr KLAUE corresponded to the profile, he could be helped by A.L. WIBOM, P. SPEHR, C. MUSSER, N. GIROT and others.

Mr KLAUE reacted to Mr BORDE’s suggestion saying that it was a long standing commitment and he could not say if he would be able to do it until the end.

Mrs WIBOM volunteered to take in charge the working group with the help of Mr KLAUE until Athens.

Mr KLAUE accepted Mrs WIBOM’s suggestion and presented the tasks for the future:
- first task would be to compile a list of projects necessary and possible to achieve over the next years in connection with the 100th Anniversary,
- he pointed out that this anniversary was not only an occasion for programming and celebrating but also it was necessary for the Archives to create higher awareness on the necessity of preservation.
- he suggested to compile the projects of all the Members and then define FIAF policy.

Item 2: Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films

It was reminded that the project had been started by Mr FRANCIS.
Questionnaires had been sent to everyone and only 35 answers had been received until now. Moreover contradictions in the answers even of the same country had been noticed. The Secrétariat was continuing the project.
Item 3: International Index to Film and TV Periodicals/PIP (Mr. MOULDS)

Item 4: FIAF Summerschool

The project to hold the FIAF summerschool in London in 1992 would be mentioned during the GA.

Item 5: Revised Edition of the "Handbook for Film Archives (E. Bowser)

Mrs. Bowser explained the delay saying that it would probably be published in 1991. It was decided to write a letter from the Secretariat to Mr. KUIPER.

Item 6: Glossary on laboratory terms (P. SPEHR/H. SCHOU)

Mr. SPEHR would report at the GA.

Item 7: FIAF Bulletin (E. BOWSER)

Everyone agreed that the Bulletin needed new talents. The editorial board should be increased of at least two people chosen among the Members, and Mrs. VAN DER ELST as assistant editor.

Decision was postponed to the following EC meeting.

Item 8: Proceedings of the Canberra Restoration symposium (R. EDMONDSON/H. SCHOU)

This publication was postponed again because it needed updating.

Item 9: Bibliography of FIAF Members' publications (Ottawa/Secretariat)

In Helsinki, a decision had been taken to find someone in a socialist country to take the job but without success. FIAF
would publish one joint volume 88-89. Then Montreal could possibly take over awaiting for Prague’s decision.

**Item 10 : International Directory of Cinematographers, Set and Costume Designers in Film (A. KRAUTZ)**
A written report would be distributed at the GA.

**Item 11 : Proceedings of the Vienna Historical Symposium**
Vienna had sent the manuscript almost finished except one chapter and the introduction. The publication should be completed by August 1990.

**Item 12 : Proceedings of the 1989 Lisbon Symposium (Luis DE PINA)**
Mr DE PINA said it would be ready soon.

**GA 11 Future Congresses : Decision on venue for 1992 and 1993**
1991 Athens.
Mr ADAMOPOULOS will report on the general organisation of the Congress and Mrs WIROM on the symposium.

1992 : POONA is not able to organise the congress. An alternative should be looked for urgently.

Mr KLAUE remarked that Asian countries were interesting for a future congress because there was a lot of archival movement in that region.

**GA 12 Report of the Preservation Commission**

**GA 13 Report of the Documentation Commission**
GA14 Report of the Cataloging Commission

These points were discussed under point 7 of the EC agenda.

GA15 Access policies (programming)

Already discussed under pt 8 of EC Agenda.

GA16 Open Forum : Proposals for new projects : Miscellaneous

Mrs ORBANZ proposed two topics for the Open Forum:
- discussion of the paper submitted at the Lisbon Congress by the Latin American archives,
- what is to be done with nitrate films that have been copied?

10. NEXT EC MEETING

To be decided at the EC meeting on April 21st.

11. MISCELLANEOUS

Mrs ORBANZ asked for a decision on how to present to the General Assembly the letter of Ray EDMONSON about FIAF’s lack of formal philosophy of film archiving.

Mr KLAUE said it was a topic for the Open Forum and suggested to distribute the letter, put it to discussion and ask for volunteers for the project.

Concerning MAP TV (Memoire Archive Programme), an organisation emanating from the European Film & TV Year, Mrs WIBOM said FIAF had to be represented at their meeting in München mid-November. It would be interesting to know in what ways FIAF could cooperate with them.

Mrs WIBOM was asked to attend on behalf of FIAF.

Mrs ORBANZ and Mr KLAUE had been invited to help in the
formation of the programme of a Symposium in Düsseldorf:
The three subjects of that symposium were:
1. Information between films museums,
2. Declaration of films as National Monuments

Concerning the question of visitors to the GA, it was decided that journalists could stay for point 1 and 2 of the GA.

A letter from Jerzy TOEPLITZ was read. He thanked the EC for its attention paid to his 80th birthday.

Mrs ORBANZ then formally closed the Executive Committee Meeting by thanking everyone for their participation and hard work.
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M I N U T E S

The 2d EC meeting in Havana was held on April 21 in the evening at ICAIC, with Robert Daudelin in the chair.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft agenda was adopted as prepared by the Secretary-General.

2. FIAF COMMISSIONS

2.1. The Executive Committee had the task to reconfirm the Heads and the members of the Commissions as foreseen in Rule 77. This reconfirmation was done case by case and unanimously, acknowledging the excellent work done by each Commission.

Michelle Aubert, head of the new Documentation Commission which was going to meet in the very next days, was specially asked to prepare a detailed workplan and to envisage some new projects such as Guidelines for the handling, preservation and cataloguing of documentary material other than books and periodicals (photos, posters, clippings, censorship documents, etc...). Mrs Aubert agreed but said that such guidelines often existed already in other professional library or museums' associations and that the Commission should be careful not to duplicate this work. Mr Klaue however insisted that it would be useful for FIAF to know where to find theses guidelines. It was also decided that Michael Moulds, editor of the P.I.P. and employee of the Federation, could not be a "member" of the Documentation Commission but should have close and even formal links with it and should attend its meetings whenever necessary.
As suggested by comments from the General Assembly, the EC decided to propose a change in the rules that would limit the number of consecutive terms to be served by members and heads of Commissions in the same way that members of the Executive Committee are now limited, that is to three terms of two years each for a total of six years. A member could possibly be prolonged for another term at the special request of the chairman if he is linked with an unfinished project and, more generally, reasonable deadlines should be assigned for the completion of projects.

The intention is to give opportunities for other experts to serve in the Commissions and broaden representation of the field. The proposed change will be added to the changes in Statutes and Rules now being prepared for the vote of the General Assembly in Athens.

2.2. Consequently to the charge given by the General Assembly, the EC established a new FIAF Commission for Programming and Cultural Uses.

The commission will be asked to address problems of access to the archives' film collections in the broad sense and to work in cooperation with the other commissions to avoid duplication of projects. The EC decided to use the Reserve Fund to provide the same support as the other Commissions for meetings of the new Commission in 1991, since a restricted budget has been adopted for the coming year and the new commission should not reduce the funds available for the already existing commissions.

The EC examined a list of possible candidate members for this commission and designated the new Head: João Benard da Costa. He will immediately be asked to prepare a work program and to select a list of possible members which he will submit to the EC at its next meeting in the fall.
3. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

3.1. Reconfirmation of Observers

Reconfirmation procedures were not complete for 3 Observers: Cinemateca Distrital in Bogotá and Cinemathèque Française because their annual report had not been received. It was agreed to remind them of their obligations and to postpone decisions until the next EC meeting.

On this occasion, it was also agreed that, when writing to ask for the annual reports, the Secretariat should inform the full Members that the delivery of an annual report was also an obligation for them.

The Film Archives of the Philippines which had not paid their subscriptions for more than two years were deleted, as required by the Rules.

3.2. Membership working group

David Francis, Eva Orbanz, Wolfgang Klaue, Christian Dimitriu and Brigitte van der Elst will meet in Brussels before the end of September to draft new Statutes and Rules according to the changes discussed at the General Assembly concerning membership categories, and will add to the agenda the changes proposed to the rules governing Commissions.

3.3. Application for full membership

Eva Orbanz informed the EC that she had received an application for full membership from Fundacion Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano in Bogotá. This candidature will be examined at the next meeting and Maria Rita Galvao is asked to report on the visit she made to this archive in 1989.
4. FIAF BULLETIN

Eileen Bowser reported on the meeting of the Bulletin's editorial board which had been held in Havana the day before. The editorial board had been widened and was composed now of: Eileen Bowser, Chief editor, + Robert Daudelin, Jonathan Dennis, Christian Dimitriu, Paolo Cherchi Usai and Brigitte van der Elst.

Considering the decision to open up the distribution of the Bulletin and the necessity to find a way to finance it, the editors proposed to improve the look of the Bulletin. Ms Bowser asked for the agreement of the EC to buy for the Secretariat some equipment for desktop publishing on our computer. This was agreed within reasonable limits of prices which Ms van der Elst was asked to investigate in Brussels. Cineteca del Friuli has generously offered to print the Bulletin in Gemona.

5. P.I.P. FINANCIAL REPORT

Eileen Bowser reported on the P.I.P. supporters' meeting held during the Congress and in which they looked over the financial report of the project. The finances of the project appeared in good shape. The supporters also said they would like to have proposals from the editor on plans for future extension. The project should not remain in status-quo but should already build up an expansion fund. The Executive Committee also decided that there should be no more free services to any socialist archives considering the recent changes in the Eastern European countries.
6. NEW PROJECTS

Two new working groups, one on training and another on public relations, were proposed during the General Assembly by Michelle Aubert. The EC agreed to study this possibility but action was postponed to the next meeting. Meanwhile, Luis de Pina agreed to work in a public relations group and Michelle Aubert was asked to prepare her ideas for a workplan for this group.

The contract with SAUR on FIAF publications was discussed and it was agreed that the first publication under the contract would be *FIAF Cataloguing Rules*. Saur asked to have a publication advisory board and the EC decided to recommend the heads of FIAF Commissions to constitute that board in addition to Eva Orbanz and Wolfgang Klaue who had started negotiations with the publisher.

Harriet Harrison having asked whether it was possible to obtain free copies of the publications issued by the Commissions for their members, Mr Klaue said he would try to obtain this.

Ms Aubert protested against the fact that FIAF would perceive no royalties on any of its publications under this contract; however the other members underlined they were aware of this problem but that they considered FIAF was already saving a lot of money by not having any publication costs and having it distributed much more widely than the Secretariat could ever do it. Some of our publications are too specialized to find any market easily. Other NGOs have found this a practical thing to do and we should try it too. We could try to negotiate royalties on more popular publications like the Handbook or a new issue of Embryo, for example.
The FIAF Secretariat will publish FIAF Computerisation Survey 1989/90 by
Roger Smither for the Cataloguing Commission, with some extra copies for
sale outside FIAF. It should be advertised in the Bulletin and in other
NGOs bulletins.

7. FUTURE CONGRESSES

a) Athens 1991

The EC discussed the organisation of the day dedicated to workshops
(19 April) and it was decided that each Commission head would be
responsible for one workshop / presentation, allowing for a free
question-time on the model of the Open Forum. The heads of Commissions
present said they were all having their Commission meeting during the very
next days and that they would discuss the matter. The Programming
Commission should also be invited to prepare one or two topics. One should
also allow time for a meeting of the new Executive Committee on that day.
As for the organisation of the two Symposia, it was decided that Wolfgang
Klaue, Eva Orbanz, Robert Daudelin and Anna-Lena Wibom would meet with
the two Greek delegates here in Havana and define more precisely the topics
and the people responsible for them. A representative of the Greek archive
should also be invited to attend the next EC meeting in the fall or a
member of the EC should go to Athens on the way to Jerusalem.

b) Montevideo 1992

Discussions with the delegates of both Montevideo archives are already far
advanced. The EC only waits for a final commitment from the Uruguayan
government to confirm the acceptance of their invitation.

c) Gemona had already offered to host the Congress of 1995
8. EVALUATION OF THE HAVANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The EC members thought the General Assembly had been quite successful as far as the participation of the members was concerned. The discussions had been lively because the members were better prepared probably due to the sending of basic papers well in advance. Christian Dimitriu even said the GA had worked "in the spirit of Baragual." Mr Klaue however thought one should still be very careful to prepare just as much the discussion and the vote on membership changes next year. Papers should be distributed at the beginning of the GA with a warning to read them and the vote should only come on the 2d day.

Following the discussion on Fundraising, Mrs Wibom asked if she could give priority to the Vietnam project. She thought someone from FIAF would have to go there to help the Vietnamese draft their project. It should then be signed by our President and presented to possible sponsors. She also added she had already been approached by several Latin American archives for other projects.

The evaluation on the Symposia held in Havana and the retrospective "Films saved by FIAF" will be put on the agenda of the next EC meeting.

9. NEXT EC MEETING

The Executive Committee agreed to accept the invitation of Lia van Leer to meet in Jerusalem from 29 November (arrival on the 28th) to 2 December which would be an excursion day offered by the Israel archive. She will soon send details on accommodation prices.
10. MISCELLANEOUS

a) Fundraising evening for FIAF

Luis de Pina made a proposal which could help FIAF's finances: he calculated that if every FIAF affiliate should dedicate the earnings of one evening per year (preferably the same) of their showings to the Federation, we could raise approx. 10,000 US dollars. The EC considered this idea as brilliant and asked Luis de Pina to make it a written proposal to the Fundraising group.

b) Lecture on film cataloguing

Harriet Harrison reported she had been asked to give a 3-days rather advanced course on film cataloguing at the University of Bologna last year and that it had been rather successful. She said this lecture was now available for others and that it could be used anywhere.

The EC thanked Ms Harrison for her nice proposal.

The 2d EC meeting was then formally closed.