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MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
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JERUSALEM

Mr DAUDELIN, President, formally opened the meeting.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Points 3, 4 and 5 concerned with membership were postponed until the following day because of Mr ROSEN's late arrival. It was therefore decided that the Working Group on Membership would meet at the end of the first meeting day.

The proposed agenda was then formally adopted.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETINGS IN ATHENS

Ms GALVAO pointed to an error on page 21, paragraph 1. The name of the archive in SOURE was Archivo Nacional de la Imagen and not the National Film Archive.

Ms AUBERT, referring to page 12, paragraph 2, precised that the Axelrod Collection and the Aqadati Collection had been dealt with responsibly with the help of foreign archives (National Film Archive and the Service des Archives du Film).

The Minutes were approved with those two corrections.

The Executive Committee expressed their appreciation for the excellent job done by Ms STAIKOVA in preparing these Minutes.

6. FINANCES

6.1. Report of the Treasurer

Accounts 1991: income

Ms WIBOM reported on the 1991 accounts and indicated it had been a crisis year as FIAF had had to break into its Reserve Fund and cut down on everything as much as possible. While commenting on the various items of the 1991 budget, she pointed out that the publication sales' income had proved lower than expected.

It was remarked that FIAF should try again to obtain better conditions from the publishers. Having noted that mailing the publications was sometimes more expensive than their actual price, Ms AUBERT suggested that SAUR should finance the mailing of the publications they did for FIAF.
Expenditure

Ms WIBOM declared that the expenses were pretty close to budget.

Ms VAN DER ELST was asked to comment on the VAT problem related to Jill Johnson's work for FIAF during the last five years, which had led to an unexpected payment of 250,000 BF.

Following to the Bulletin's financing problem encountered with Cineteca del Friuli, Ms AUBERT stressed that collaboration with other archives should be based on written commitments.

Ms WIBOM insisted that FIAF should be extremely cautious in its future commitments, knowing that it might loose a certain number of members as a result of the rise in membership fees.

She concluded that although FIAF's finances were under control, she was very anxious about their future.

Ms VAN DER ELST then introduced her new assistant, Béatrice TROUVEROY, who had been working for FIAF since September 1991. Ms VAN DER ELST informed the Executive Committee that she would be gradually stepping down over the following years, giving more responsibilities to Mrs TROUVEROY who was supposed to replace her when she would retire (i.e. by the end of 1995) if both parties agreed.

6.2. Alternatives for paying membership fees

Ms WIBOM said she had recently asked Ms SPRINGER to investigate whether UNESCO would accept to function as a “clearing house” for the members of FIAF who had to settle their subscription in non-convertible currencies; however this was very unlikely.

Ms WIBOM felt it was high time FIAF found new ways of funding to avoid the unpopular raise of subscriptions every year. In that respect, she deplored that FIAF was being used by international organisations, such as UNESCO, DOMITOR, which were sometimes making benefits out of FIAF's activities (books, commissions' work, meetings). She claimed that FIAF really had to get some payment for its work. It should for example charge UNESCO (at least 20%) for the contracts executed for them. She also advocated more publicity around our symposia. She further suggested to charge the commercial people making use of FIAF's meetings to contact the archivists.

Mr ROSEN remarked that publicity was mostly the task of the host archive, within the country where the Congress was being held.

He also had many doubts about the possibility of charging other organisations – even if they were indirectly using FIAF's members during the congresses – unless FIAF did provide specific services to them.

Talking about the importance of FIAF's worldwide “network”, Ms AUBERT said that some organisations could not survive without FIAF's international meetings: such organisations had to pay FIAF something in return.
Mr DAUDELIN’s point was that FIAF could not automatically charge any group (e.g. the Latin-American delegates) meeting at the time of its congresses although it would have been appropriate to do so with DOMITOR which had used the Lisbon Congress for its own meeting.

Talking about future symposia, Ms WIBOM said that the 100th anniversary of the Cinema was a golden opportunity to approach the important art foundations, the big “film-manufacturers” and obtain from them substantial funding, which was essential to help the developing archives. She added that getting the A Status in UNESCO might be a help for FIAF and we should try to achieve this.

Ms ORBANZ insisted that FIAF should convince the industry that it represented an important purchasing power.

Mr ROSEN added that the booklet related to the Congress should include advertisements of equipment suppliers from different countries, fostered by the various archives.

Mr JEAVONS encouraged negotiation with stock manufacturers such as AGFA.

Dr SOCHU supported Ms Orbaz’s point: FIAF is a “market” and should therefore try to obtain better prices on polyester stock. He further suggested that FIAF should be placed on the diary of important events.

Ms AUBERT, referring to the surprisingly high quotes she received in answer to her questionnaire for ACCE, noted that FIAF should have a more realistic conscience of its force, in order to persuade manufacturers.

Mr ROSEN said that KODAK did have money to buy itself a better image towards film producers and filmarchivists, but Ms VAN DER ELST knew from experience that FIAF as an international group was not very likely to get money from KODAK because of their decentralised structure.

Mr JEAVONS recalled the idea of selling a high-quality calendar with film stills or posters for the benefit of the Federation.

Ms WIBOM suggested that FIAF should build up a Fund, bigger than the Reserve Fund, that would bring out a yearly income to support developing archives.

She further reminded that FIAF and/or members had to formulate concrete projects to be understood by the funding organisations and individually financed. Mr JEAVONS agreed and, referring to his experience, stressed that sponsors liked entertaining their guests at major gala events (e.g. a restoration film festival, symposia, etc.).

Mr DIMITRIU explained how he had succeeded in systematically raising extra-budgetary funds for the Lausanne recent seminar. He added that national branches of KODAK might be interested in sponsoring more events such as the ones he had organized.

6.3. Report of the Fundraising Committee

Referring to the profit-making selling of cinema postcards by the Swedish archive, Ms WIBOM wondered if FIAF could publish a set of 10 posters on postcards, as a way of making money for FIAF but Ms AUBERT noted that the distribution of such products was very expensive.

Mr ROSEN pointed out that exploiting FIAF’s material did require a professional expertise, engaged by FIAF itself.
Mr DIMITRIU raised the question of how to share the earnings of such merchandising between the individual archive that organized it and FIAF as a group. Ms WIBOM replied that the part of the earnings going to FIAF would simply be a gift from the individual archive.

Mr DAUDELIN noted that a prestige calendar with FIAF material could be a good testing-ground and recalled L. DE PINA’s suggestion to dedicate one screening per year for the benefit of FIAF, in each archive.
Mr ROSEN and Mr JEAVONS proposed themselves to try identifying possible marketers for this type of product.

Ms AUBERT thought the only products that FIAF could sell as a group were its network and its congresses. Mr DIMITRIU agreed with her but found it interesting to add the marketing of postcards to those products.

Mr JEAVONS stressed the necessity for FIAF to enter the real world of “fund building”, in order to meet its financial needs. There were two ways for this:
- fund raising, which did not cost any money
- merchandising of products, which was a financial risk, but with the essential advantage that FIAF would be exploiting free material.

It was decided that Mr ROSEN would report to Ms WIBOM on the results of his first search for merchandising professionals.

Ms AUBERT encouraged the archives to get more advertisement from their equipment suppliers to be placed in the Bulletin.

Ms WIBOM announced that she had raised 5,000 $ for the Development Fund. She deplored that she still had not got any feed-back from the letter distributed in Athens about the specialized projects to be funded and she stressed these projects were supposed to be the fundraising raison d’être.
Ms ORBANZ said she would send this letter to the archives which were not represented in Athens.

7. REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONS

7.1. Report of the Preservation Commission

The Commission’s report was circulated and presented by Dr SCHOU. The main activities of the Preservation Commission had been reported in the last issue of the Bulletin.

Mr SCHOU commented on the the three completed publications of the Commission. The first and second paper, Basic Principles of Preserving Colour Films Produced in Processes Which Used Colour Separations on Nitrate Film and The matting and Polishing of Motion Picture Film (available as an audio-visual package containing 27 slides), were meant to be added to the Technical Manual.

Ms AUBERT informed that Bois d’Arcy could possibly translate the first publication into French upon request.
Ms ORBANZ suggested to make a video out of the second paper and Dr SCHOU said this might be envisaged. Mr JEAVONS was very much in favour of preparing a list of the most common questions so as to ease the teaching of the programme.
Dr SCHOU thanked Ms AUBERT and her staff for their recent French translation of Harold Brown's book on aids to film identification.

Both Dr SCHOU and Ms AUBERT spoke highly of Jean-Pierre VERSCHEURE's talk in Lausanne about the different sound techniques, the evolution of the sound track and the identification of different DOLBY systems. Mr VERSCHEURE might possibly become a consultant to the Prescom, in the same manner as Harold BROWN was.

Dr SCHOU further congratulated Mr Bob GITT, member of the North-American preservation sub-commission, for having been attributed the annual BFI Award for Archival Achievement.

Dr SCHOU finally thanked Ms GALVAO for her invitation to hold the next Preservation Commission meeting in Sao Paulo after the Montevideo Congress.

As to the Preservation Commission corresponding members, Dr SCHOU said it had proved quite difficult to get a feedback from the archives to his questionnaire. However, he promised to respond faster to the already returned questionnaires.

He concluded saying that the FIAF Preservation Commission had to discuss the possibility of having a European sub-commission.

Mr DAUDELIN thanked Dr SCHOU for his report.

7.2. Report of the Documentation Commission

Ms AUBERT formally presented the EC with her resignation as President of the Documentation Commission. She proposed Mr Ron MAGLIOZZI as her successor; he was willing to accept. She claimed that the Commission needed more members and spoke very much in favour of Teresa TOLEDO from the Cuban archive as a possible member.

Ms GALVAO indicated that having Ms TOLEDO as a member of the FIAF Documentation Commission would be a good way of helping the Latin-American archives. Ms VAN DER ELST said that Ms TOLEDO's collaboration could be further discussed during the latter's stay in Brussels and Paris in December.

Ms AUBERT's report was circulated and she commented on the existing synergy between the PIP and the Commission stressing the importance for Michael Moulds to have contacts with the Commission.

Mr ROCHEMONT remarked that the CD-ROM was a very interesting product to merchandize. Ms AUBERT underlined that the CD-ROM was a nice opportunity for Mr MOULDS to attract the interest of publishers.

She indicated that the Bibliography of FIAF members's publications would be published not only in the annual PIP volume but also as a single pamphlet to be individually distributed. This was the less expensive solution for this publication which would be compiled by Rene Beauclair from Montreal.

Ms AUBERT asked the EC for some suggestions about a possible joint Summer School in 1995 with both the Documentation and the Cataloguing Commissions.
The vote on Ron MAGLIOZZI’s candidature was postponed to the general discussion on Commissions’ work.

In the name of FIAF, Mr DAUDELIN thanked Ms AUBERT for her fruitful collaboration as President of the Documentation Commission.

The next day, Ms Aubert who had talked to Ron Magliozzi over the phone was able to detail his curriculum vitae and strongly supported his candidature as the new head of the Documentation Commission.

Mr DAUDELIN proposed to use this nomination to suggest to the Commission to re-open its mandate. Ms ORBANZ also suggested to change its name and to call it: Commission for special collections.

Mr DAUDELIN asked the EC members’ vote on Ron Magliozzi’s nomination as Head of the Documentation Commission.
Result: 11 in favour
1 abstention

7.3. Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Ms HARRISON reported orally on the Commission’s various projects. She had not yet been able to write a report since the Commission had met just prior to this meeting (cfr. annex for the written report).

a) Technical Guidelines: to be published soon.

b) Bibliography of National Filmographies: nearly completed by Rolf Lindfors.

c) Early Production Company Names and Logos: Ms HARRISON regretted that Mr Opela had not yet received any contribution from other archives. Ms AUBERT believed this project felt more under the scope of the Documentation Commission’s work which could therefore help V. Opela. She thought it could be a very good project for the 100th anniversary of the cinema.
Ms HARRISON suggested that the gathering of information should be made through personal contacts with the archive curators.

d) Project on Genres: even if not members of the Commission any longer, Dr. Schulz and Ms Gebauer had proposed to continue their work by preparing an international glossary of genre terms (excluding form and film schools terms) which could serve as a model for archives seeking to follow a single standard.

e) Glossary of filmographic terms: The Commission had decided that if work on the glossary was continued, it should include some non-European languages, e.g. far-eastern languages. Ms WIBOM also felt this was highly necessary. She said the issue should be discussed in a future Congress.
Ms VAN DER ELST pointed out that FIAF could not afford to pay for such translations and would have to find a publisher.
f) **Computer formats**: Ms HARRISON presented this new major project and asked the Executive Committee members their opinion about it before the Commission went on. Mr ROSEN strongly supported the project, stressing it was a basic prerequisite to the sharing of information amongst archives. Ms AUBERT thought this project needed a preliminary survey on the already existing formats.

g) **Revision of the FIAF Cataloguing Rules**: Ms HARRISON asked for some comments on the Commission’s plan to publish short papers clarifying or explaining some rules (e.g. how to cope with signs, numbers, symbols...). Ms ORBANZ thought this would be very useful.

h) **Guidelines for Selection Criteria**: the Commission suggested a new project to prepare a set of selection criteria for archives who were seeking guidance in deciding which materials to keep in their archives and which could be considered extraneous for their needs. But this was considered more in the line of the Programming Commission.

i) **Rules for Preparing Filmographies**: a new project had been suggested in the Commission to create standards for the citing of films within textual documents and for preparing filmographies (as distinct from catalog)
Ms GALVAO suggested the Cataloguing Commission first compare the specific rules for filmography used in the various archives and then make suggestions.

j) **Nitrate Union Catalog**: Ms VAN DER ELST was asked to send reminders to those who had not yet participated. Ms Harrison would prepare letters for archives whose collections are in scope for the project, and should be encouraged to participate.

k) **Glossary of Audio-Visual archival terms**: Gerald Gibson (IASA) had asked for the collaboration of FIAF Cataloguing Commission, and Ms Harrison felt the Commission could agree to the usage of some terms of its own Glossary for this project. It was financially impossible for FIAF to get more involved in it.

Mr DAUDELIN then asked Ms HARRISON to describe the situation of the Commission’s membership, which she did as follows:

She explained that this year, the Commission had been faced with the departure of three members: Günter Schulz, Ani Velchevska and Jon Gartenberg who was still willing to remain associated with the Commission. As it now only consisted of 5 members, she found that some more people should be invited on the Commission. A certain number of candidates (from other continents) had been suggested for membership.

Mr HARRISON then described her own changed status within the Library of Congress. She had been transferred to another Division which was more concerned directly with Cataloging (Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy) but did not belong to the MBRSC Division, our Member. She would like to stay on as Chair of the Commission, particularly during this transition period. She had received the agreement of her new boss to go on working for the Commission.
7.4. Report of the Programming Commission

Mr BENARD da COSTA commented on his written report including the completed activities and future projects of the Commission.

Between the meeting of Athens and Pordenone, some members of the Programming Commission (G. CLAES, C. GAUTHIER, P. CHERCHI USAI, J. BENARD DA COSTA and C. JEAVONS) had informally met in July in Valencia.

The Symposium on Programming in Montevideo was the main issue on the agenda of Pordenone, based on the draft program that Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL had presented to the EC in Athens.

The Commission had decided to devote half a day of this symposium to the Latin-American situation, under the coordination of Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL. The organisation of the remaining program had been left to the care of the Commission and had been agreed upon by Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL.

Revision of the Toulouse questionnaire: having unanimously agreed that this was no longer up-to-date (the returned answers were not precise enough to meet the needs of the work) the Commission had elaborated a new document to be sent in December to all Archives' curators and programming department heads, with the hope it would be returned before the following Commission meeting.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA drew the attention on some of his report's remaining issues, namely Mr CHERCHI USAI's proposal to introduce the Access Policy Guidelines for cultural uses in Montevideo and Steven Ricci's proposal to form a working group within FIAF discussing the relationship between film archives and film schools. He indicated that the first meeting of this working group could be placed within the Montevideo workshop schedule.

He also expressed the Commission's willingness to participate in the preparation of the cinema centennial.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA reported that the name of the Commission had been re-discussed both in Valencia and Pordenone: it had been generally felt that the members of the GA in La Havana had voted for the "concept" of the Commission rather than for the name itself (cultural uses), which was too vague as a term. He asked the EC to raise the issue again during the next General Assembly. The word "access" brought about a short debate between different members of the EC.

Mr ROSEN and Ms AUBERT approved the Programming Commission's project to study the relationship between film archives and film schools. Mr ROCHEMONT also supported this project, stating that a film archive could not be a service supplier but had to participate in the cultural reflexion of its environment.

For Mr ROSEN, the "key" question in programming was: how can an archive play a role in winning and educating a growing audience (younger people, filmmakers...). Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that this issue would be examined by the working group and dealt with during the Montevideo symposium.

Ms ORBANZ found the report very interesting but regretted it did not mention Mr DE PINA's project (one free screening for FIAF).
Ms WIBOM, supported by Mr JEAVONS, pointed to the large amount of projects scheduled by the Programming Commission for the Congress and wondered about their financial feasibility.

Mr DAUDELIN thanked Mr BENARD DA COSTA for his report.

7. GENERAL DEBATE ON THE WORK OF THE COMMISSIONS

Mrs WIBOM reported on the meeting of the working group on Commissions which had been held on November 25 and was attended by herself, V. OPELA, H. SCHOU and M. AUBERT.

It had been generally agreed that the work of the Commissions created FIAF's public face and a lot of FIAF's raison d'être. The relations between the EC and the Commissions should be vitalized. The EC should demand more from Commission heads, a more dynamic approach to the reporting and the definition of projects.

The group had agreed that it was necessary to describe criteria for membership in a Commission.

For Commission heads and members, a curriculum vitae should be requested. Commission members should all be mainly occupied in their respective Commission's field.

The EC should (in cooperation with Commission heads) prepare guidelines describing the tasks of the Commission heads, who should also get more precise information about their respective finances.

It had been further suggested that Commissions should consist of five members only (including the President), with the possibility of inviting corresponding members, a method that would encourage and stimulate the future nomination to full membership in the Commission.

Mr SCHOU personally believed that reducing the number of members was in contradiction with the recognized argument that as many people as possible should gain experience through participation in the Commissions.

A lengthy discussion had taken place regarding the introduction of a rotation system in Commission membership - maybe similar to the system used in the EC.

V. OPELA and H. SCHOU had strongly stressed the need for continuity and the difficulty of recruiting qualified members. They had further underlined the difference between EC-executives and Commission members. EC executives were selected by the GA for their general qualities whereas Commission members were selected on professional grounds.

The important thing for a Commission President was that his superior competence was recognized by the other members. Competence could not be measured by voting.

Ms AUBERT and Ms WIBOM had favoured the rotation system, confident that among the more than 85 FIAF members there were certainly a lot of qualified people, willing and able to serve on the various Commissions. But Mr SCHOU was against it.

It was also suggested that the Commission heads should nominate a vice-president in case the president was (temporarily) unable to fulfill his assignment.

Within the EC one member should be nominated to stay in closer contact with Commission heads, for any FIAF matter that might occur during the year.
As to the present number of Commissions within FIAF, it was felt that, given our present financial difficulties and the membership problems in the Cataloguing Commission, the issue should be re-examined at the GA in Montevideo.

Mr ROSEN believed that the GA should first of all examine how compelling the economic reasons were for reducing the number of Commissions.

He also remarked that the rotation system was restricting the openness and the fluidity of the commissions. He feared that this restriction could lead to the loss of still very valuable members.

In Mr DIMITRIU’s opinion, FIAF’s prior concern should be to determine clearly the most urgent Commission projects and see if they could be met financially. Funds should be allocated according to their urgency and interest.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA totally agreed on this. He added that the financial problems were not directly linked to the number of members in a Commission.

Mr JEAVONS agreed that money should not be the governing factor but said one should avoid overlapping projects. On the question of the enforced rotation system, he underlined that the EC was already a refresher system within FIAF, which kept the commissions under scrutiny and criticism. He said that whether people stay or leave the commission should be decided on a democratic basis, because an enforced rotation compelling the people to leave could be very destabilising.

Ms ORBANZ stressed that the Commissions were doing a work which in the end resulted in what Ray Edmondson had called “a philosophy of film archiving” and this was the scientific background of FIAF activities.

Ms ORBANZ agreed that there should be one person within the EC responsible for Commissions over a longer term. She encouraged Commission heads to decide together which projects should be carried out by which Commission or even be deleted.

Ms WIBOM insisted that Commission heads should submit some of their projects to the Fundraising Committee. However, she asked to postpone decisions involving future expenses as the income for 1992 was greatly uncertain.

Referring to his paper Guidelines for Commission Work, which had been distributed, Mr SCHOU re-affirmed his point of view against enforced rotation.

He further explained to what extent it was interesting to have a large provision of corresponding members.

As a conclusion, he re-formulated his request to apply more effectively the mechanism of reconfirmation of Commission members every second year.

Mr DAUDELIN referred to Rule 77 concerning specialized Commissions and asked the working-group to make a proposal fitting their new suggestions in this Rule. He agreed with Ms ORBANZ that the EC functioned as a 5th Commission.

He then asked the EC members to re-examine the present Commissions’ membership to see if it brought about new questions.
The personal situation of Mrs HARRISON raised the question of membership in one of FIAF's commissions when working outside a film archive. He noted that this issue was not mentioned in any rule.

Mr ROSEN was still in favour of periodical renewal in the Commissions and proposed a rotation mechanism based on the voting system where people could self-nominate, similar to that of the Executive Committee.

Mr JEAVONS shared Mr SCHOU's doubts that FIAF had enough qualified people to go on replacing the membership every few years and he feared for unqualified Commissions.

Mr DIMITRIU found that the reputation of the Federation mainly depended on the quality of the technical performances and found it normal that FIAF guaranteed a certain continuity for these projects. He said that the two criteria for projects to be successful were continuity on the one hand and adaptability of the Commission to the external changes on the other hand. He feared that with a lack of flexibility FIAF could be considered as old-fashioned and he stressed that FIAF had competitors, using its technical services. A small group could be established to evaluate the adequateness of FIAF's projects to external changes in the field.

Ms WIBOM endorsed Mr DIMITRIU's point as to "adaptation" and insisted that this could be achieved only by the rotation system, which brought into the commission young people with updated education (computer knowledge...).

According to Mr ROCHEMONT, the reconfirmation of a commission member should depend on the work he has carried out.

Ms AUBERT felt it was essential to improve relations between the EC, the members and the commissions. Therefore, she proposed that the list of FIAF addresses should mention for each archive not only the curator name but also the name of the various department heads (preservation, cataloguing, documentation and programming).

Mr DAUDELIN summarized the discussion as follows:

- the EC agrees that Commission work should be more adapted not only to the new technical developments and needs but also to the reality of developing countries.

- the EC favours the concept of flexibility to preserve the quality of the work; how to reach such flexibility had to be answered by committing a Commission head with reliable expertise or more mechanically by rotation, e.g. Mr ROSEN's proposal.

- The number of Commissions and the Commissions' membership had been questioned. Should rule 77 be modified and transformed into a proposal for the GA in Montevideo?

After a general discussion, Mr DAUDELIN asked the EC to vote on the following proposal, presented as a rule:
* Commission members should all be mainly occupied (more than 50% of their time) within the field of study of their Commission.
Result of the vote: 7 in favour
4 abstentions
Mrs AUBERT’s proposal to mention the name of each department head in the list of archives was unanimously agreed upon and Mrs VAN DER ELST was asked to modify the form accordingly.

Mr DAUDELIN then asked the EC to vote on the following proposals or recommendations:

a) that for the Commission heads, a CV should be required and presented to the members of the EC and that the same procedure be recommended for Commission members.

Result of the vote: 11 in favour *
1 abstention

It was further proposed by Ms AUBERT to publish this CV in the Bulletin so as to ease communication amongst the whole membership.

b) that Commissions should consist of 5 members (including the president), with the possibility of inviting corresponding members.

Result of the vote: 3 in favour
7 against *
1 abstention

Ms AUBERT was asked to rewrite the guidelines for Commission work in accordance with the EC decisions and to organize a system of contacts between EC and Commissions.

Mr ROSEN proposed that at times of renewal, candidates could self-propose for consideration and it was generally agreed that nominations would be invited from the membership.

6. STATUTES AND RULES: LETTER FROM ROGER SMITHER

Mr DAUDELIN announced that the issue would be dealt with under the next point.

7. REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

Mr DAUDELIN recalled that in Athens, the General Assembly had voted to amend the categories of affiliation to include Associates, Provisional and Full Members. There had been primarily three major reasons for adopting these changes:

1. The category of Associate would expand the possibilities for specialized archives with limited film preservation programs and institutions with related areas of preservation (museums, documentation centers, etc...) to participate in the activities of the Federation.

2. The rules would affirm more clearly FIAF’s support for film preservation as a major commitment for Members.

3. The categories would provide the Federation with a clear basis for making fair and equitable decisions about affiliation.

Mr DAUDELIN then passed the floor to Mr ROSEN to describe the chosen criteria for the determination of appropriate categories for affiliated institutions. Mr ROSEN summarized them as follows:
ASSOCIATES:
Associates are non profit institutions that have significant preservation programs in areas cognate with film preservation (moving image museums, television and video archives, documentation centers, etc.)

OR

Associates conserve major collections of prints and support the goals of film preservation, but may have limited or no film preservation programs. Specialized archives of various kinds would typically be Associates.

MEMBERS:
Membership remains basically as currently defined by the Statutes and Rules. Within its national context, a Full Member has a major film collection and a significant program specifically for film preservation. Evidences for the latter include the following: specialized equipment and facilities, specialized professional staffing, the scale of preservation activities, the importance accorded to preservation within the overall activities of the institution, and, most importantly, the holding and manufacturing of preservation masters.

PROVISIONAL MEMBERS:
Provisional Members must have achieved at least a threshold level in developing a preservation program (as defined above) and can demonstrate a specific plan for building a full scale preservation program within a reasonable period of time.

Mr ROSEN then stated the various implications of the new guidelines:
- The difference between national and regional archive is no longer relevant to determine the category of affiliation.
- There are a number of indicators of the seriousness of the purpose involving a preservation program (the most important being the holding of master materials), to grant a fair evaluation in making the distinctions.
- The EC should reexamine the new categories in five years to evaluate their effectiveness.
- As to the organisation of the Montevideo Congress, it will provide flexibility for the various affinity groups to meet and talk.
- Excluded even from Associateship are commercial archives, film Festivals, exhibition institutions and very small preservation entities.
- In terms of classification for Full Members, the decisions of the past remain unchanged but at the time of the reconfirmation, the new criteria will be applied.

Mrs GALVAO stressed that in some areas, an "insignificant" archive is better than no archive at all and such entities should be accepted as Associate so that eventually they can become a "significant" archive.

Mr ROSEN underlined that how small the collections might be, those entities had to show a preservation ideal.
Mrs AUBERT pointed to an ambiguity concerning the status, in France anyway, of the very different regional or specialized archives (sometimes collecting films or film related materials but sending them elsewhere for preservation): some of them might not fulfil the new criteria for entering FIAF whereas they were holding materials belonging to the national heritage and were therefore complementary to important museums or archives members of FIAF. Mr ROSEN specified that exhibition centers with a resourceful specialized collection but without specific preservation program would be Associates, whereas an archive with a small collection but with a serious preservation program and/or holding master materials could become a Provisional Member.

Ms WIBOM also raised the problems of archives located in countries where preservation is centralised.

Speaking in the name of Mr FRANCIS, Ms HARRISON said he was very much concerned that all, Associates or not, could participate in discussions such as Open Forum, ... Responding to that remark, Mr ROSEN said that there was no hierarchy between the Members, the Provisional Members and the Associates; this broader dialogue was therefore possible and should also be encouraged in the Bulletin, through the Commissions and during Congresses.

Decision: Mr DAUDELIN suggested that the guidelines proposed by Mr ROSEN in the name of the Working Group be adopted and applied for present Observers and future applicants.

5. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

Observers had been asked to indicate their choice for a new category (Provisional Member or Associate). Ms ORBANZ submitted to the EC a list of the former Observers mentioning either each of their own choices or, if no preference was indicated, the suggestion of the Working Group (see hereunder). Provisional Member = PM / Associate = A.

1) BANGKOK : PM
2) BERKELEY : PM *
3) BOGOTA CD : A
4) BOLOGNA : see point 8.2.
5) BUCURESTI : PM
6) CAIRO : PM
7) CARACAS : PM
8) DEN HAAG : PM
9) DHAKA : PM
10) DUBLIN : PM
11) FRANKFURT : PM *
12) GEMONA : PM
13) GLASGOW : PM
14) HANOI : PM
15) HARARE : PM
16) JAKARTA : A
17) JERUSALEM SSJFA : PM *
18) LA PAZ : PM
19) LIMA : PM
20) LUANDA : PM
21) LYON : A
Each case was examined separately and sometimes at length. The EC did not agree with the choice of those marked with * and felt they belonged to the category of Associates. It was therefore decided that they would receive a letter explaining why the EC disagreed and requesting further justification for the status they had chosen. All the other cases were approved as chosen.

5.1. Reconfirmation of members

5.1.a. Buenos Aires : Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina

Ms ORBANZ recommended the reconfirmation of Cinemateca Argentina as a Full Member. Ms VAN DER ELST said that because of severe financial difficulties, they had not been able to pay for their subscription for the last two years but she had heard that Madrid would accept to settle this debt for one year. 

Decision: unanimously in favour of reconfirmation, provided that subscriptions in arrear were settled.

5.1.b. Rio de Janeiro : Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna

Referring to the questionnaire, Ms ORBANZ asked Ms GALVAO to answer the following questions:

1) concerning the legal deposit, do the Brazilian films go to Rio or to Sao Paulo? Ms GALVAO said that the legal deposit was a project underway.

2) is their preservation programme (40% of the budget) linked with the one of Sao Paulo? Ms GALVAO said that this had not been the case for the year 1991 and she explained that 40% of their budget had been allocated to preservation as there was nothing else that they could do, considering the Museum was closed.

Decision: unanimously in favour of reconfirmation of the Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna, upon receipt of their late subscription.
5.1.c. Tirana : Arkivi Shtetëror I Filmit I R.P.S. Te Shqipërisë

Ms ORBANZ said that the preservation budget in the questionnaire was fairly satisfactory. As to the structure of the archive, Mr DIMITRIU had recently heard it had been undergoing thorough changes; he therefore suggested that contacts be taken with the new directors for more precise information about the present situation of the archive.

Decision: 11 in favour of reconfirmation.
1 abstention

5.1.d. Toulouse : Cinémathèque de Toulouse

Mr ROCHEMONT was asked to leave the meeting room during the discussion.

Following the request of Ms ORBANZ, Ms AUBERT explained the evolution and the present situation of the Cinémathèque de Toulouse. Talking about the collaboration between the Cinémathèque de Toulouse and her archive, she explained why the nitrate films of Toulouse would be transferred to Bois d'Arcy for preservation. She also underlined the necessity to link the three national collections, (Cinémathèque Française, Bois d'Arcy and Cinémathèque de Toulouse) into one data base network. Ms AUBERT was in favour of reconfirmation.

Decision: unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

Mr DAUDELIN asked Mr ROCHEMONT to comment on the building of the new preservation vault (1989) and the land purchase (1990) mentioned in the questionnaire.

Mr ROCHEMONT said this purchase had been influenced by local political power but was actually not ideal for preservation. The CNC had decided not to rebuild the whole infrastructure but to adapt it to the preservation basic requirements.

5.1.e. Torino : Museo Nazionale del Cinema

Ms ORBANZ commented on the submitted questionnaire, stressing the feeble preservation programme as opposed to the growing collection and projection activities. In his accompanying letter however, Mr Bartetto had announced a substantial project of restructuring their vaults and the establishment of a lab for 1993.

To Mr DAUDELIN as well as to Ms AUBERT, it seemed that the archive gave priority to cultural entertainment, rather than to preservation. He proposed to send them a letter reminding them that preservation must be the main objective of a member archive and to postpone reconfirmation.

Decision: reconfirmation postponed to 1993.

5.1.f. Vienna : Österreichisches Filmmuseum

Referring to their questionnaire, Ms ORBANZ remarked there had been no change for 5 years. She had received no specific budget for preservation in spite of many requests and the organigramme had not shown how many people effectively worked in the archive. However, they were doing their best to preserve the Austrian cinema.

Decision: unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.
5.1.g. Vienna : Österreichisches Filmmuseum

No big change since the last reconfirmation. A large part of the budget was spent on preservation.

Decision: unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

5.1.h. Budapest Magyar Filmintezet

The reconfirmation had been postponed in Athens, pending the receipt of their budget which had now been received. Mr OPELA pointed to the changed situation of the "archive", saying it had lost its independance within the Institute. The Secretary General should verify this attentively in their next annual report.

5.2. New candidates for full membership

5.2.a. Bologna : Cineteca del Commune di Bologna

Ms ORBANZ commented on different aspects of the candidature file and strongly supported the application. Everybody agreed that the candidature was very positive. Ms WIBOM accepted to go and visit the archive towards the end of January, according to FIAF's requirements.

Decision: the candidature of Cineteca del Commune di Bologna as a Full Member to be submitted to the vote of the next General Assembly.

5.2.b. Filmoteca Vaticana

Ms ORBANZ informed the EC that an application for full membership had very recently been received from this archive. It would be examined at the next meeting.

5.3. New candidates for affiliation

5.3.a. Barcelona : Arxiu d'Audiovisuals de la Generalitat de Catalunya

Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL and Ms AUBERT commented on the situation of the Barcelona archive. After a long discussion on membership criteria, the EC eventually decided to postpone the decision on this case until the next meeting, mainly because of a letter received from Filmoteca Espanola on the general situation of film archives in Spain.

The EC thought the Madrid archive's objection to the affiliation of Barcelona was not clear enough and required further justification.

At this stage of the Executive Committee meeting (Friday 29), Ms WIBOM had to leave and go back to Sweden. She therefore did not take part in the following discussions and decisions.

5.3.b. Beverly Hills : A.M.P.A.S. / Academy Film Archive

Ms ORBANZ commented on the additional information she had received from Mr Friend since the EC meeting in Athens where the candidature had already been discussed. She asked Mr ROSEN for his comments on the candidature.
Mr ROSEN said that the A.M.P.A.S. had all the necessary signs of the intention to develop a preservation program but he underlined that their actual achievements so far were very limited. However, the status of Provisional Member would help Michael Friend to accomplish his goals and convince the Academy Board to move forward to preservation.

Ms ORBANZ recommended the status of Provisional Member for the A.M.P.A.S.

Decision: unanimously in favour of acceptance as Provisional Member.

53.c. Paris: Musée d’Orsay

Ms ORBANZ did not find the answers given to the questionnaire very satisfactory and asked Ms VAN DER ELST to give more information about their application.

Ms VAN DER ELST reported that in their letters, the different member archives in France had no objection to the Musée d’Orsay being an Associate. She noted that their budget for preservation was very limited and called for Ms AUBERT’s comments on their possible involvement in any preservation activity.

Ms AUBERT said that they contributed only partially to the restoration of films for which they wanted to get copies. The two major activities of this cinematographic department in the Musée d’Orsay were the programming and the production of films related to their holdings.

Mr ROSEN felt they did not fulfil the criteria for “associateship”.

The candidature of the Musée d’Orsay was therefore rejected.

Ms VAN DER ELST regretted that candidates such as the Musée d’Orsay, having considered the “application questionnaire” as an encouragement towards affiliation, might feel discouraged or very disappointed to be refused.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed and therefore suggested that together with the questionnaire, candidates should be sent an information sheet explaining FIAF’s objectives and new membership criteria.

Ms ORBANZ agreed with Mr DAUDELIN, saying that this would help the candidate itself to consider its chances of being accepted as an Associate.

5.4. Miscellaneous

Talking about the National Film and Sound Archive in South-Africa, Mr JEVONS asked what was FIAF’s official approach to this country, now that its political situation was improving.

Mr DAUDELIN said the initiative for a possible affiliation had to come from Mr De Lange, the Director of the archive.

About the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde in Frankfurt: Mr JEVONS informed the EC that so far the archive had refused to return a Lotte Reiniger films’ collection it had bought in England. He said this was breaking one of the cardinal rules of FIAF. Mr DAUDELIN advised him to make a complaint to FIAF which would then try to normalise the situation. Ms ORBANZ said he first had to give Frankfurt a last deadline.
Mr DAUDELIN asked Ms AUBERT to inform the EC about her visit to Ouagadougou (Burkina-Faso).
Ms AUBERT had been there to investigate the possibility of creating an African film archive, which would be based in Festpaco and centralize the collections of black Africa. Most African film producers had agreed with this project. Ms AUBERT was confident in the success of such a scheme but underlined it needed financial support; she said the CNC wanted to play an active role in the set up of this cinemathèque by raising funds from the French ministries.

News from Koblenz : Ms ORBANZ informed the EC that nobody had been appointed yet to the vacant Presidency of the Bundesarchiv-Filmarchiv.

News from Brussels : Mr DAUDELIN talked about the legal action taken by Gabrielle Claes against a right-holder wanting to use the master materials of films restored by the Cinémathèque Royale. He reported that Ms Claes had asked some assistance to the EC : had this situation already occurred in other countries ? Could FIAF set up a general policy in this case?

Ms AUBERT said this problem had already been raised in France with Gaumont and recalled the danger that there was no legal framework for the archives concerning copyrights. She said that the ACCE wanted to create a case-law in order that the work of the archives would be recognized by both distributors'and producers'associations.
Mr DIMITRIU insisted that a common policy be adopted by all FIAF members.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA said that the Brussels problem should be considered as a case-law. Ms AUBERT suggested to define a rule forcing the right-holder to compensate for preservation and restoration costs when he retrieves his master materials.

Mr JEAVONS insisted that FIAF had to give Gabrielle Claes the support she was asking for. Mr DAUDELIN suggested that the Programming Commission, in the frame of its "access" policies, should draft guidelines on this matter.

Mr DAUDELIN said he would report to Ms Claes.

Cinémathèque Suisse in Lausanne : Mr DAUDELIN asked Mr DIMITRIU to inform the EC about the reasons for his resignation from the Cinémathèque Suisse.
Mr DIMITRIU explained the whole situation and added he was willing to fulfill his mandate in the EC until the end of his term or at least until the next Congress.
8. FIAF PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

**Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films (D. Francis/M. Staykova)**
Ms VAN DER ELST presented the work done by Milka STAYKOVA as the continuation of a study initiated by D. FRANCIS a couple of years ago on the handling of nitrate films. In her report, Milka Staykova was asking the EC for some advice on how to conclude the project.
Mr SCHOU felt the work had to include an introduction on the instability of cellulose nitrate. He accepted to do this job and re-read Ms Staykova's version before the deadline of the contract made with Unesco on this publication.

**International Index to Film and TV Periodicals/P.I.P. (M. Moulds)**
Michael Moulds' report was distributed and initiated a discussion on CD-ROM. Ms AUBERT accepted to report the discussion to Mr. Moulds and said they would examine the technical questions before the Montevideo Congress.

**Fiaf Summer School (Berkhamstead 1992)**
Mr JEVONS presented the draft programme of the Summer School 1992 focused on film handling and the technical work of film archives, including lectures, visit to other international organisations, tours...
He gave the following additional details:
Dates: 14/6/92 to 5/7/92
Applications: he had received 16 applications so far and expected 25 in total.
Funding: each participant would have to pay a participation fee.
Besides, he was trying to raise money from many different institutions. UNESCO had accepted to finance a training video.

**Glossary of laboratory terms (P. Spehr/H. Schou)**
Ms ORBANZ noted the project had been "dead" for years. Mr SCHOU was not keen on taking it on the Preservation Commission and doubted there was need for it. Everybody agreed to delete the project from the list.

**FIAF Bulletin (R. Daudelin/B. van der Elst)**
Ms VAN DER ELST reported on her meeting in Pordenone with P. Cherchi Usai, E. de Kuyper (replacing Hoos Blotkamp) and E. Bowser: they had decided to continue along the same lines. The editorial board wanted to create a new column on historical film research. Mr Cherchi Usai had also suggested to add an item on preservation programmes underway.
Ms VAN DER ELST underlined the financial necessity to find more publicity for the Bulletin and called for more creativity in finding article topics.

**Bibliography of FIAF members' publications (Montreal)**
Ms AUBERT wanted to come back to the system whereby archives' publications used to be systematically sent to all FIAF members. Ms ORBANZ replied this was too costly for many archives. One could not force them and the Bibliography was sufficient to inform those who wanted to acquire the publications.
Proceedings of the Athens Symposium on independent cinema

Ms VAN DER ELST was asked to check with the Greek Film Archive whether they had collected papers delivered on this occasion.

Towards a philosophy of film archiving (R. Edmondson)

Ray Edmondson’s paper was circulated and Mr JEAVONS was asked to comment on it. Mr JEAVONS felt that this project was somewhat superfluous. Although the thinking and motives behind the paper were appreciable, the philosophies articulated in it were already those consciously espoused or aspired to by most FIAF archives in their daily work. Therefore, there may not be a lot to be gained at present by discussing them at symposium level within the Federation. Moreover, regarding R. Edmondson’s proposal that this topic become one of the main symposia at Bangkok in 1993, a developing archive in a geographical area with many more practical concerns might not be an appropriate venue for a debate about philosophy.

The EC agreed on these comments. However, both Ms AUBERT and Mr ROSEN thought that staff in technical areas should also sometimes be made aware of the philosophical dimension of their work, but this should be a natural part of the training we give them and an automatic element of such things as Summer Schools, introductions to technical manuals, etc.

Mr JEAVONS was asked to articulate the EC views in a letter to Ray Edmondson.

International Directory of Cinematographers, by Alfred Krautz

Ms ORBANZ reported that the project was going on.

GRAF Filmography (DOMITOR)

Mr DAUDELIN had received no news from this (non-FIAF) project since the Athens Congress, and no publication date was available. Mr Gaudreault was still working on it and had asked some FIAF members to write an introduction.

In the absence of the Treasurer, Ms ORBANZ and Mr DAUDELIN agreed that FIAF’s subsidy to this project should be transferred to the 1992 budget.

Preservation of news-reels shot on video (L. de Pina / Open Forum)

Ms VAN DER ELST recalled that during the Open Forum in Athens, Luis de Pina had pointed to the non-preservation of news-reels, especially those shot on video for television, and that we had thought of having a joint action with FIAT to solve the situation.

Mr ROSEN described the alarming situation of American TV-newsreels and proposed to organize a symposium on the preservation of such material. Mr JEAVONS supported the idea, underlining that less film was used for newsreels to the benefit of video. It was a critical moment: what did we want to preserve? Film or video? He later added that the NFA had now made a priority of cataloguing their newsreels.

Ms GALVAO said that preservation of newsreels was well developed in most of the Latin-American countries.
Ms AUBERT suggested to investigate into the newsreels production worldwide in order to find out what has been done, where they are, which have been restored,... The FIAF Secretariat could therefore send out a questionnaire which Mr ROSEN undertook to draft.

12. NOMINATION OF HONORARY MEMBERS OF FIAF

Proposals had been received from several EC members to nominate both Wolfgang Klaue and Harold Brown as Honorary Members. This could lead to a very unpleasant competition considering the present limit of 5 Honorary Members. In order to simplify the discussion, Mr DAUDELIN proposed to delete the first sentence of Rule 40 (phrasing this restriction) so that FIAF could welcome those equally valuable candidates as Honorary Members if the General Assembly so decided.

Result of the vote: unanimously in favour of
- deleting the first sentence of Rule 40
- recommending both candidatures at the next General Assembly.

11. FIAF AWARD

The subject was deleted from the present agenda and postponed to a possible future meeting.

13. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Ms ORBANZ asked Mr DIMITRIU and Ms VAN DER ELST to report on FIAF's relations with UNESCO.

Mr DIMITRIU had not been able to attend the last meetings with UNESCO and therefore passed the floor to Ms VAN DER ELST.

Ms VAN DER ELST reported on the two projects contracted under the auspices of UNESCO since Athens' Congress:
1) World Directory of Moving Images and Sound Archives. This project had been elaborated at the Round Table of audio-visual archives (IASA, ICA, IFLA, IFTA, FIAF) in Brussels, in May 1991 and was being coordinated by Wolfgang Klaue. It should come out in June 1992, published by SAUR.

2) Guidelines for the shipment of nitrate films, which Milka Staykova had agreed to revise for FIAF (see pt. 8.1.)

Ms VAN DER ELST added that FIAF had signed three other contracts with UNESCO in the name of IASA or the Joint Technical Committee, explaining that IASA or the TCC (based in UK) did receive the necessary funds from UNESCO through FIAF's bank account because the UK had left UNESCO.

As reported in the Minutes of Athens, Ms VAN DER ELST had attended the Round Table in Den Haag together with Mr Klaue. The following Round Table, organised by FIAT, would take place in March 1992 in Torino and FIAF was as usual invited to participate.
Ms VAN DER ELST finally announced that FIAF had been invited by UNESCO to attend the Nineteenth Meeting of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Council for PGI (General Information Program), on February 26, 1992. Mr DIMITRIU was asked to go and represent FIAF possibly with Ms VAN DER ELST. Hence the need to prepare a presentation paper to be defended.

Ms ORBANZ, referring to the list of the Round Table projects, stressed that FIAF should be more properly rewarded for the work done for UNESCO. Ms VAN DER ELST stressed that in order to be properly funded, the projects had to be presented well on time, continuously reminded and lobbied for.

She recommended that FIAF should first locate the funding areas of UNESCO and then submit projects falling within those areas.

As to the relations with FIAT, Mr JEAVONS reported on the seminar he had attended in Turin in 1991 as a representative of FIAF and in which he had sensed a slightly better awareness of the preservation imperative among FIAT archives. He had given a lecture on the Vinegar Syndrome which had made some impression.

Mr ROSEN wondered if the openness of FIAF should be advertised to independent (non-commercial) TV archives. Mr JEAVONS supported this point saying that a selective approach could be profitable to FIAF.

Ms GALVAO thanked Ms VAN DER ELST and Ms HARRISON for their very useful help in the frame of O.E.A.'s (Organisation of American States) work.

Mr JEAVONS further reported on the ACCE (Association of the Cinematheques in the European Community), based in Lisbon, having its own media project ‘Lumiere’ whose objective is to give general support to the national heritage collections across the EEC countries, to establish European filmographies or to foster training for archives.

He added that the Council of Europe (representing a wider range of countries than the EEC) had set up a working group on exactly the same subject, i.e. to explore the possibilities of Europe-wide preservation initiatives. He proposed that the Council of Europe had no money but a certain amount of legal strength (it can establish cultural laws to be used as political weapon). The first meeting of this working group had been held in Geneva in the presence of a few FIAF delegates. They had been able to stir away from the kind of practical things that were done by FIAF and in the ACCE towards convincing the Council of Europe to set up a Convention about the cultural and access rights to film heritage. He concluded that this had been formally accepted but could take years to be executed.

Mr SCHOU, who had attended the IASA meeting in Budapest in May 1991 spoke in favour of exchanging reports between different organisations, and he informed that the National Film and Sound Archives of Canberra were also involved in the next IASA meeting in Canberra in September 1992.
9. HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CINEMA

Ms Orbanz circulated a paper in which she had listed all the suggestions to do with the centenary that had been made so far.

Mr ROSEN said that FIAF as such, independantly from the archives, had to make plans about what it wanted to achieve for this circumstance. Mr DAUDELIN added there should be a working group coordinating these efforts to conduct the projects. Ms AUBERT stressed that FIAF had to stick to strictly "FIAF" projects and identify the projects it could get associated with.

Mr JEAVONS said that the World Filmography project (n°5) was entirely feasible by coordinating volunteers in the name of FIAF. He proposed to conduct the project himself and his initiative was warmly welcomed.

He added that the International Catalogue about the Cinema in the early period (n°10), which he called the ultimate encyclopedia of early cinema, was part of FIAF's global projects and he was confident that it was also achievable by coordinating FIAF resources.

He further believed that FIAF should be associated with documentary projects, such as the "A hundred years in moving pictures" documentary series developed by a group of archivists and researchers he was part of, or such as "The other Hollywood" by Kevin Brownlow.

Mr ROSEN came back on the importance of making a resumé of all what been achieved by FIAF over the past 100 years and what remained to be done, which would serve as a strategic tool for finding additional support.

Mr DIMITRIU proposed the name of a well-known and top-quality Swiss graphist, Werner JEKER, to create the logo representing "FIAF and 100th Anniversary of Cinema", at production cost price.

Ms GALVAO explained that her country did have projects but she wondered to what extent they could be exported.

Ms AUBERT suggested to establish a chronology of ALL the first films in the world before 1900, focusing on the rivalry between Edison and Lumière.

Mr ROSEN proposed that every archive designate one or two events as part of the celebration and present them as such to the media, stressing that they belong to FIAF's global objectives.

Decisions:
- a small working group (M. Aubert, C. Dimitriu, C. Jeavons, W. Klaue) to meet in Brussels in January to discuss FIAF marketing and the projects related to the centenary.
- Preparations of the centenary to be reported on in the March '92 issue of the Bulletin.
- Mr Jeavons to coordinate collaboration with the Programming Commission on this topic.
10. FUTURE CONGRESSES

10.1. Montevideo: April 1992

Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL explained to what extent the Montevideo Congress would support and encourage Cinemateca Uruguaya in its development. He deplored the resignation of Mr Eugenio HINTZ from Archivo Nacional de la Imagen (Sodre), insisting that as one of the first film archivists in Latin-America, his work had been vital for the cinemathqueques of that region.

Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL then passed the floor to Mr BENARD DA COSTA to summarize the general programme of the Symposium, which ran as follows:

1. Introduction by M. Martinez Carril and J. Benard da Costa
2. Legal aspects of programming followed by a general debate
3. "FIAF collections and their usage for research - A guidelines' manual"
4. Links between programming and preservation, when programming generates preservation
5. Technical standards for the presentation of moving images
6. Discussion around the concept of "access"
7. Le décalogue du bon programmateur

Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL said they had planned to devote half a day of the symposium to the programming situation in Latin-American archives and that a meeting was planned for those archives just after the Congress.

Mr ROSEN felt that the programme lacked some essential questions regarding film culture, such as the role of a cinemateque in the present world, the identification of spectators' expectations, how to create a national interest in the programmes of a cinemateque...

Mr DAUDELIN supported Mr ROSEN's remark, pointing to the gap between traditional programming and the expectations of the new generations. He strongly felt that the role of such a symposium was to help the archives to fulfil successfully their cultural responsibilities.

Mr BENARD DA COSTA explained there was not enough time to elaborate on that specific subject; the short seminar was a unique opportunity to deal with new topics, as important as the issues regarding film culture and cultural role that had moreover already been discussed - although theoretically - in Lisboa. Mr ROSEN insisted that this central issue should be discussed without repeating what had been said in Lisboa.

A general discussion on the themes of the symposium followed.

Ms VAN DER ELST raised the question of how to finance the travels of the non-FIAF experts invited to the symposium.

As to the workshops, Mr ROSEN insisted on deciding now about their respective programme. Ms ORBANZ supported him, stressing the importance of specialized workshops for our new Congresses.
As planned, the subject of the first workshop remained the interaction between archives and filmschools, as proposed by Steven Ricci from the Programming Commission.

Ms HARRISON, referring to the workshops on cataloguing in Athens, advised to have a suggestions box and to set up very flexible open programmes in order to have time to answer and elaborate on the audience's questions. This was agreed.

Mr MARTINEZ CARRIL said he had received requests from companies such as SOFTITLER (electronic sub-titling) to introduce themselves to the archives during the Symposium but everyone agreed that such companies had to pay for their participation.

It was decided that FIAPF and FICC would not be invited to the symposium.

10.2. Other Congresses

Bangkok 1993
Ms WIBOM reported that the Congress would probably take place in the new UNESCO building on Chao Fa Road. She said that the Minister of Cultural Affairs would possibly come to Montevideo to present the formal letter of invitation.

Projects for the symposia:

1) Symposium on regional cooperation for film archiving, with the help of W. Klaue for the organisation. Reports from Latin-American and European groups of archives would be highly welcome. This symposium was meant among others to foster the creation of a regional preservation center. Therefore, Ms WIBOM asked to be able to tap on the Development Fund for this, unless she could find other ways of funding.

2) Symposium on shadowplays, with the collaboration of several countries in the region. Ms WIBOM insisted that this second symposium should be largely advertised in order to be self-supporting. Mary-Lea Bandy and herself were already looking for financial and organisational support for this.

3) Program on Asian Films, which would be presented in Montevideo.


Bologna 1994
Ms VAN DER ELST had been to Bologna in order to visit the possible places for the 1994 Congress and it was eventually decided that the Congress would be held in the brand-new Palace of Congresses.

1995 and after
Mr Rosen said they were still investigating the possibility to hold the 1995 Congress in Los Angeles.
An invitation had been received from Filmoteca Espanola to hold a Congress in Madrid in 1997.
14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was decided to print the new version of the Statutes and Rules only after the modifications of Rule 40, and possibly Rule 77 on Commissions, had been made and agreed upon by the General Assembly.

Talking about the next Executive Meeting, Mr. DAUDELIN said it might take place in late October 1992 possibly in North-America.