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AGENDA

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes of the EC meetings in Montevideo
   2.1. Matters arising from the Minutes of the last EC meeting.
3. Membership questions:
   3.1. Reconfirmation of Members: Beijing, Havana, Lausanne, Lisboa,
        Los Angeles UCLA, Los Angeles AFI, Montevideo, Pyongyang
   3.2. New candidates for Membership: Vatican, Tokyo
   3.3. New candidates for affiliation: Musée Albert Kahn, Taiwan,
        Caracas,
   3.4. Miscellaneous
4. Report of the working group on membership dues + discussion
5. Finances: Report of the Treasurer
   5.1. Draft Budget for 1994
   5.2. Development Fund
   5.3. Report of the Fundraising Committee
6. Specialized Commissions
   6.1. Preservation Commission report
   6.2. Documentation Commission report
   6.3. Cataloguing Commission report
   6.4. Commission for Programming & Access to the Collections
   6.5. Reconfirmation of Chairpersons
7. Projects and Publications underway
8. 100th Anniversary of Cinema: report of the working group
9. Future Congresses
   9.1. Ho i Rana 1993
   9.2. Bologna 1994
   9.3. Centennial Congress 1995
   9.4. Future years (Beijing - London - Madrid...)
10. Relations with Unesco and other international organizations
11. Nomination of Honorary Membership of FIAF
12. Future Executive Committee (eligibility of present members)
13. Any other business
The members of the Executive Committee were warmly welcomed by both Ms Eileen BOWSER and Ms Mary Lea BANDY, hosts of the meeting. Unfortunately, Manuel Martínez Carril was not able to attend the meeting and had asked to be excused.

As Ms Eileen BOWSER was now no longer in a position to prepare the "summary of decisions taken" which should be sent to all FIAF affiliates, Mr DAUDELIN called for a new reporter among the EC members and Mr Guy-Claude ROCHEMONT volunteered to do the job.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Referring to the decision taken in Montevideo to insert the item "matters arising from the previous EC meeting" in the agenda of all EC meetings, Mr DAUDELIN suggested to insert it as point 2.1. Point 9.1. was put before point 3 as Mr Holst and Mr Billing had come to New York to discuss the preparation of the next Congress in Mo i Rana.

The Agenda was then adopted.

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE EC MEETINGS IN MONTEVIDEO

Referring to page 3, point 3, Ms GALVAO specified that the name "CLAIM" comprised the initials of Coordinadora Latino Americana para los Archivos de Imagenes en Movimiento.

There being no other comment, the Minutes of both Executive Committee meetings in Montevideo were approved.

2.1. Matters arising from the Minutes of the last EC meetings.

2.1.a. First Executive Committee meeting (19-21 April 1992)
- page 6 : Mr DAUDELIN had received a formal letter from Beijing proposing to host the FIAF Congress in 1996.
- page 7 : Mr DAUDELIN had not yet written to Kodak-Argentina to thank them for their help to Cinemateca Argentina. It was generally felt it was not too late to do it. The Secretariat should seek to obtain details of name and address for this letter.
- page 10 : Mr DAUDELIN said the GRAF filmography was about to come out and FIAF had already paid the promised amount to sponsor this publication.
- page 13 (Unesco) : Mr DIMITRIU’s advice to meet with Director-General Federico Mayor would be discussed under point 10 of the present agenda.

2.1.b. Second Executive Committee meeting (25 April 1992)
- work of the Commissions : no merger of Commissions is envisaged for the time being.
- page 8 (Cinémathèque Royale - Brussels) : the legal action is evolving favourably (the opponents have caved in) thanks to the help of the lawyer Michael Henry, recommended by Clyde Jeavons. Case to be discussed during the symposium on copyright in Bologna in 1994.
FUTURE CONGRESSES

9.1. Mo i Rana
Mr HOLST distributed the new program of the Congress. The overall schedule was accepted as follows:

May 24–26: EC meeting in Oslo
May 27: travelling day for all participants to Mo i Rana
May 28 am: GA
pm: Visit of the Film Archive in Mo
May 29: GA
May 30: excursion
May 31 am: GA (elections)
pm: Workshops
June 1–2: Symposium
June 3: departure to Bodo/Oslo and further destinations

The whole Congress (except the Symposium on Newsreels) would take place in the hotel meeting rooms.

It was suggested to devote part of the Newsreel Symposium to Commissions' work in relation to "newsreels", rather than to organize Commissions' workshops.

Concerning the workshop on legal deposit, Mr JEAVONS formally suggested to invite Mr Michael Henry, a British copyright and legal deposit specialist, provided he could finance his own trip.
Ms AUBERT suggested to gather the following documents to be discussed together with the Norwegian law at this workshop:
- paper prepared by Birgit Kofler for Unesco;
- ACCE paper on the situation in EEC countries
- Michael Henry's papers
Mr FRANCIS felt this represented already enough material for the 1994 symposium in Bologna, while Mr ROSEN recalled that workshops were initially conceived to meet the needs and interrogations of an open public in a specific domain. He feared we were now shifting from the initial concept.

It was finally decided to have our Norwegian colleagues organize the "workshop" on legal deposit only as an information session, which might possibly serve as groundwork for the symposium in Bologna.
The 2d workshop for filmschools would be organized by the UCLA archives. A workshop for filmmuseums possibly directed by Jürgen Berger (MOMI) would be organized by David Francis.

One evening screening would then be dedicated to "Commercials" and introduced by Mr Holst.

It was decided that the participation fee for non-FIAF people would amount to 150 US$ (not for the "speakers" to the workshops or the symposium).

Mr HOLST evaluated the total cost of the Congress to 50,000 US$, including meeting and hotel costs, and everything connected with the Congress (papers, badges,...) so that the delegates' contribution would be the lowest possible. 20,000 US$ would be used out of this 50,000 US$ amount for the translation.
Mr HOLST was to send to the Secretariat all the necessary details for Newsletter 2.

**Symposium on Newsreel Collections**

Everybody had received Mr KLAUE's written proposals which Mr DAUDELIN went through page by page, asking for the EC members's opinion and comments.

Those proposals were dealt with and approved as follows:
- **definition of newsreels (point 1)**: accepted
- **participation (point 2)**: the members generally preferred budgets b) and c) and the following was decided:
  1. letter to be sent to all FIAF affiliates, asking them to provide the Secretariat with a list of names to be informed about the Symposium;
  2. Baltic countries to be invited to participate in the meeting;
  3. commercial Newsreel companies to be invited to participate in the meeting;
- **organisation**: Roger Smither would be asked to be responsible for the communication related to the Symposium and its practical coordination, while Wolfgang Klaue would conduct the conception and contents of the Symposium. It was also decided to ask Christopher Horak and Enno Patalas if they were still willing to collaborate in the preparation of this symposium.
- **budget**: Mr Holst and Mr Billing proposed to subsidise the technical part of the symposium (the organizers should then calculate how much was needed), while the preparatory part would be sponsored by FIAF.
- **public relations (point 3)**: Roger Smither to write - as soon as possible - a letter to the membership, asking for a list of names of possible participants. Ms AUBERT suggested to ask Mr Marc Ferro to participate in the discussion.
- **alternatives (point 4)**: the low budget version was adopted.
- **dates and time (point 5)**: accepted.
- **working sessions (point 6)**: the symposium should be lavishly illustrated.
- **facilities (point 7)**: U-Matic tapes should be asked from everyone.
- **evening showings (point 8)**: should last 90 min. instead of 3 hours and could include compilations. No simultaneous translation foreseen for those showings.
- **Minutes (point 9)**: the publication of the proceedings of the Symposium shall be foreseen after the Congress.
- **Survey on Newsreel Collections (point 10)**: the questionnaire was approved. It was unclear whether London or Berlin would steer this project. This should be discussed with Wolfgang Klaue. Ms AUBERT suggested to involve the FIAT collections in this project.

3 **MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS**

3.1. **Reconfirmation of Members**

3.1.a. **Beijing: Zhongguo Dianying Ziliaoguan (China Film Archive)**

Ms ORBANZ explained that no budget was received, because the archive's budget was part of the State budget; one could, however, see from the 1991 report that film acquisition and film preservation formed a major part of the activities of the China Film Archive.
Mr SCHOU said the Preservation Commission would be interested in establishing under what conditions the archives' collections were stored; he suggested to add a separate question in the questionnaire to this end.

**Decision:** unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

3.1.b. Havana: Cinemateca de Cuba / Montevideo: Cinemateca Uruguaya

The reconfirmation documents of both archives having not yet reached the Secretariat, their reconfirmation was postponed to the next EC meeting in Mo i Rana.

3.1.c. Lausanne: Cinémathèque Suisse

Ms ORBANZ reported that no budget had been received, but a balance sheet. From the 1991 report we knew that Cinémathèque Suisse had received a lot of money for preservation activities.

In the discussion, it was explained by Mr DIMITRIU that 15% of the annual budget were spent on laboratory work. Comments on point 13 of their questionnaire brought about a long discussion about the interpretation and the distinction of the terms preservation and restoration. It was agreed that those two items should be separately mentioned in point 13 a). It was also felt that storage costs should constitute a separate item in point 13.

**Decision:**
- unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.
- Mr SCHOU is asked to formulate the new items for question 13 in the reconfirmation questionnaire.

3.1.d. Lisboa: Cinemateca Portuguesa

Mr Joao BENARD DA COSTA, new President of Cinemateca Portuguesa, was asked to leave the room during the discussion.

Referring to their reconfirmation file, Ms ORBANZ pointed to Cinemateca's new law, its new structure and its exhibition activities, saying that those changes were all positive for the evolution of the archive's activities.

Mr FRANCIS suggested that, for the purpose of their reconfirmation, archives should be asked to summarize in more details their activities in the annual report coming the year before their reconfirmation, under the form of an elaborate portrait rather than statistics.

**Decision:** unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

3.1.e. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive

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

Ms ORBANZ underlined the impressive growth of the archive, which appeared in their very detailed and complete reconfirmation file.

**Decision:** Unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.

3.1.f. Pyongyang: The National Film Archive of the D. P. R. of Korea

Ms ORBANZ favourably noted that 40% of their budget was devoted to preservation.

**Decision:** unanimously in favour of reconfirmation.
Los Angeles : National Center for Film and Video Preservation at the American Film Institute

Referring to their reconfirmation file, Ms ORBANZ reported that nothing had formally changed since their last reconfirmation, except that they had developed secretarial activities for the Association of Moving Image Archivists and the Film Foundation.

Her personal feeling was that they could be reconfirmed as a Member. She evoked Mr Christopher Horak’s letter to Robert Dauldin, in which he was arguing against their reconfirmation as a Member, explaining all their qualifications fitted the status of Associate.

By the time of this debate, Mr Horak’s arguments had been examined and discussed by the American colleagues of the National Center at the AFI.

Mr FRANCIS remarked that FIAF’s membership structure had been modified without any rule being made to allow or normalize transition from the category of Members or Provisional Members to the category of Associates. He deplored that according to the present rules, such a transition would be experienced like a punishment.

Mr ROSEN recalled that the new membership criteria had primarily been defined to create a guide for future affiliations, to enable us to increase the size and scope of FIAF. He pointed to the danger of questioning the status of all existing Members according to the new membership criteria. Mr DAUDELIN evoked the procedure we would theoretically have to follow in order to change a Member’s status into Associateship: first suspend its affiliation to FIAF, wait until it applied again and then offer him the status of Associate! This was very unrealistic. But Ms VAN DER ELST recalled that, at the EC meeting in Jerusalem, the membership group had suggested to re-evaluate the status of existing Members on the occasion of their five-yearly reconfirmation. However, she did not think a firm decision had been taken on this point.

Mr FRANCIS disapproved with point 4 of the Mr Lukow’s letter, explaining that no money was allocated to the preservation of what they defined as their collection. He specified that the institution was only channelling money from the government to the archives of the United States which then preserve titles of their choice. Ms ORBANZ recalled that collecting money for the purpose of preservation and distributing it again was the institution’s specificity, which had been appreciated at the time of their acceptation as (Full) Member.

Mr FRANCIS did not oppose to their reconfirmation; he just wanted to raise the question of how we should cope with archives of that kind. He felt that maybe such an institute would qualify as an Associate.

He also evoked the representation problem of the National Center in FIAF meetings, which was for him the change since their last reconfirmation. In that respect, Mr ROSEN was very much concerned by the absence of any Board representing them as an independent entity within the AFI. Before deciding to reconfirm the National Center, he claimed it was crucial for us to:

1. be assured that the NCFVP was effectively represented by a Board or a person guaranteeing its autonomy within the American Film Institute and directly involved in the collection and preservation related activities of the NCFVP.
2. receive some clarifications about the status of access to their documentation center.

3.2. New candidates for Membership

3.2.a. Tokyo : National Film Center
Referring to the very detailed application file, Ms ORBANZ reported on their activities, drawing the EC members’ attention to the fact that they considered transfer from nitrate to acetate as “preservation”; in the eyes of the Film Center, the small amount of nitrate films in their possession therefore justified the low percentage of “preservation” activities.

During her visit to the Film Center in March ..., she had noted the absence of any preservation programme, but she found that their intention of spending more energy in preservation did now clearly appear in the present report, and this was very encouraging for the future.

Mr JEAVONS said we had to be aware of the archive’s shortcomings and develop maximum efforts to help them recover the considerable losses of Japanese films.

For the purpose of a Member status, Mr SCHOU thought we needed more details about their restoration work and the appointment of a preservation technical officer. He pointed out to some inconsistency in the figures mentioned in the questionnaire.

Ms ORBANZ stressed that, according to their letter, they would be able and promised to further develop those preservation activities only if they were accepted as Member.

It was finally decided to send a very positive and encouraging letter saying that we are in favour of their affiliation as Member but therefore need some clarification about what they are doing now and what they intend to do in the next coming years in the preservation field. The letter would then announce the formal visit of a member of the EC.

Decision : Ms WIBOM to pay a formal visit to the National Film Center of Japan on her way to Vietnam before the next General Assembly. She would bring with her a list of criteria prepared by Mr SCHOU.

3.2.b. Filmoteca Vaticana
Referring to his written report, Mr DIMITRIU described Filmoteca Vaticana’s infrastructure for film storing, adding that more than half of their collection consisted in video and that the number of original films in their possession did not exceed 15. His feeling was that the institution was working more as a study center than as a preservation center.

Ms AUBERT noted that Filmoteca Vaticana was now seeking to collect a large amount of lost films abroad, Vatican films and films made by religious groups belonging to the catholic faith.
For Mr DAUDELIN, it had always been clear that Filmoteca Vaticana's collection did not correspond to the the profile of FIAF Members, i.e. archives with an original heritage collection; it was a specialized collection made primarily of foreign copies. In that respect, it was generally felt that they better fitted the category of Associates. It had been a mistake to accept them as Provisional Member in the EC meeting of Jerusalem last November. Could we now tell them to change categories and to become an Associate? This brought about a short discussion.

Ms VAN DER ELST reminded the EC members that it had been a principle guideline to accept as Provisional Members all those Observers who had expressed that wish and represented a country where there was no other film archive.

Mr FRANCIS underlined that the question now before us was merely: being a Provisional Member, are they acceptable as Member or not? It was agreed that they could become a Member only if and when they fulfilled the conditions for "preservation".

Ms ORBANZ asked for a vote to be taken by a show of hands on recommending to the next General Assembly the nomination of Filmoteca Vaticana as Member of the Federation.

Result of the vote: 11 against
2 abstentions

Decision:
- Ms ORBANZ to write a letter to Filmoteca Vaticana to explain the situation.
- FIAF affiliates to be informed of the EC's decision.

The reconfirmation of the following Members' status would be examined in the next Rana:
- MEXICO : Cinemateca Nacional
- MEXICO : Filmoteca de la UNAM
- LUXEMBOURG : Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg

+ (reconfirmation postponed from previous EC meetings :)
- HABANA : Cinemateca de Cuba
- MONTEVIDEO : Cinemateca Uruguaya
- LOS ANGELES : National Center for Film and TV Preservation at AFI
- TORINO : Museo Nazionale del Cinema
- BUENOS AIRES : Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina

3.3. New candidates for affiliation

3.3.a. Boulogne : Musée Albert Kahn
Their candidature had already been examined in Montevideo and since then, the EC members had received the last formal document needed for the completion of their application file.

Ms AUBERT spoke highly of Musée Albert Kahn's achievements; she was in favour of accepting them as Associate in the Federation.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.
Decision: Unanimously in favour of their affiliation as Associate.
3.3.b. Caracas : Fundacion Cinemateca Nacional

Ms ORBANZ presented their application file and asked Ms GALVAO to comment on their activities. Referring to her visit to the institution, Ms GALVAO reported on a couple of serious building projects, namely for a documentation center; she underlined they were fully collaborating with Biblioteca Nacional, but she pointed out that the candidate was not the main archive in Venezuela and that its collection was much smaller than the one of Biblioteca Nacional. She was in favour of their re-joining FIAF.

After a long discussion on whether they should be accepted as Provisional Member or Associate, Ms ORBANZ called for a vote to be taken by a show of hands 1’) on the affiliation of Fundacion Cinemateca Nacional as Provisional Member.

Result of the vote: 4 in favour
5 against
3 abstentions

2’) on their affiliation as Associate.

Result of the vote: unanimously in favour.

Mr FRANCIS insisted we should make very clear that being an Associate is not an inferior position. In that respect, Mr DAUDELIN felt that the letter to Cinemateca Nacional should be written in a very positive way.

3.3.c. Taiwan : National Film Archive R.O.C.

Everybody had received a copy of their application file which brought about a few very favourable comments.

Ms ORBANZ called for a vote to be taken by a show of hands on the affiliation of the institution as Provisional Member.

Result of the vote: unanimously in favour.

3.4. Miscellaneous

3.4.a. Beograd

In Pordenone, Mr DAUDELIN had met with Mr Cosanovic, who had been nominated in June as President of the Board of Jugoslovenska Kinoteka. The latter had insisted it was vital for them to maintain contacts with FIAF and their colleagues, in spite of the United Nations’ recommendation according to which cultural institutions should not maintain links with ex-Jugoslavia. He had also reported that because of a lack of room and vaults to store their films, hundreds of titles had been destroyed.

Decision: No change in our collaboration with this Member.

3.4.b. Armenian archive

Ms AUBERT reported that France had a new embassy in Armenia and the French cultural delegate on the premises was willing to foster links between FIAF and the Armenian archive.

3.4.c. Brno

Ms ORBANZ asked Mr OPELA to comment on the Film Archives of Moravia-Silesia, which had applied for affiliation to FIAF.
Mr Opela had distributed the translation of a letter he had written to them following their application. He was opposed to their affiliation, explaining that they were not a true film archive; their only concern was to show prints, without any interest in film archiving nor in film history, copyright... Furthermore, they actually did not have the budget they said they had to develop their activities.

**Decision:** Ms ORBANZ to write them a letter saying they lack some basic requirements to be affiliated to FIAF.

3.4.d. Cinémathèque Universitaire
Ms AUBERT said she was to meet with the "Fédération des Distributeurs" to discuss the case of Cinémathèque Universitaire. She will keep the EC informed of further developments.

3.4.e. Chile
Ms GALVAO had received a letter from Cinemateca Universitaria, asking for a technical mission there. She had contacted the other archives of Chile, asking them if they could be associated with this project.

3.4.f. San Juan: Archivo de Imagenes en Movimiento
Mr FRANCIS had been to the opening of their new facilities set up by Luis Rosario Albert and his wife. He had been very much impressed by what they had achieved with so little money. He would provide a written report of his inspection of the archive, which could be used when examining their possible application to become a Member.

4 REPORT FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON MEMBERSHIP DUES + DISCUSSION

Ms VAN DER ELST reported that Mr Graham Gilmour was working on various proposals to calculate subscription fees according to the decision made in Montevideo. One of the suggestions was a scale based on each country's gross national product (GNP). Ms WIDOM said she had calculated the various fees based on this principle and had concluded this would bring about very drastic changes in fees, even for so-called wealthy archives (Sweden would pay a fee half the one of the US archives, for instance!)

A general discussion followed and Mr DAUDELIN asked the working group to come up with a new clear recalculation system, ideally to be submitted to the next General Assembly.

There were various proposals: Ms AUBERT suggested to define a scale following the archive's general budget, as declared in their annual reports or reconfirmation files; Mr FRANCIS preferred a scale based on the archive's budget for acquisition, e.g. the system used by the International Museums' Association. He feared that calculating fees based on the country's Gross National Product would increase uncertainty in the yearly budget forecast.

Ms AUBERT proposed to divide the affiliates in three categories: for example:
A: archives with a general budget exceeding 2,000,000 US dollars
B: archives with a general budget between 500,000 and 2,000,000 $
C: archives with a budget under 500,000 USD.
then see how many archives fitted in each category and calculate the appropriate fees according to the needs and projects of the Federation.
The minimum fee, corresponding to Category "C", should not be lower than the actual cost of an affiliate to the Federation’s budget in terms of current expenses for the Secretariat, i.e. 1,000– US Dollars per affiliate in 1993. This would guarantee that an increasing number of affiliates admitted to this category would not contribute to FIAF’s deficit. The difficulty would be of course to differentiate even further between fees to be paid by Members and by Provisional Members or Associates, unless one decided to put them all on equal footing as they all received the same services from FIAF (but did not have the same rights...).

Decision: Ms WIBOM and Ms AUBERT to calculate the various figures for the three categories (A,B,C) in collaboration with Graham Gilmour and the Secretariat. Proposals to be submitted to the EC in No 1 Rana.

5 FINANCES: REPORT OF THE TREASURER

A provisional sheet of accounts, as at October 15, 1992, had been distributed. Regarding the income, Ms WIBOM underlined it was at this date lower than expected, partly due to the non-payment, or the delay in payment, of many subscription dues.

Referring to the "special expenses" of the year 1992, Ms VAN DER ELST asked for the EC members’ opinion on whether we should go on publishing the Bulletin in its present (i.e. expensive) form. Ms GALVAO, later supported by several other members, was very much in favour of keeping it in its present form.

Ms ORBANZ insisted that extra copies of the Bulletin should not be freely distributed any longer but possibly bought at cost price by the archives and sold by themselves to various interested individuals, institutions or distributors. This idea was generally accepted.

Decision: Ms VAN DER ELST to write to Bob Rosen, Clyde Jeavons, Michelle Aubert, Christian Dimitriu, Ron Magliozi and those interested, asking them to contact distributors in their country which might be interested in buying the Bulletin. For the next issues, she should need to know in advance how many copies to foresee for those archives willing to sell the Bulletin around.

As regarded advertisements to be placed in the Bulletin, Mr FRANCIS thought we should foresee a number of publicity copies to be freely sent or distributed to possible advertisers. We could also attract more advertisers by asking them to send off-prints concerning their product. By enclosing this off-print in the Bulletin, they would be charged less than by printing an advertisement in the Bulletin itself.

Ms AUBERT suggested to create a joint subscription for the PIP publications and the FIAF Bulletin. Ms VAN DER ELST must discuss this with Michael Moulds.

5.1. Draft Budget for 1994

Ms VAN DER ELST raised the question of increasing our income by accepting more Associates. In that respect she recalled her idea of offering the status of Associate to some of our present Subscribers.
The minimum fee, corresponding to Category "C", should not be lower than the actual cost of an affiliate to the Federation's budget in terms of current expenses for the Secretariat, i.e. 1,000- US Dollars per affiliate in 1993. This would guarantee that an increasing number of affiliates admitted to this category would not contribute to FIAF's deficit. The difficulty would be of course to differentiate even further between fees to be paid by Members and by Provisional Members or Associates, unless one decided to put them all on equal footing as they all received the same services from FIAF (but did not have the same rights...).

Decision: Ms WIBOM and Ms AUBERT to calculate the various figures for the three categories (A,B,C) in collaboration with Graham Gilmour and the Secretariat. Proposals to be submitted to the EC in Mo i Rana.

5 FINANCES: REPORT OF THE TREASURER

A provisional sheet of accounts, as at October 15, 1992, had been distributed. Regarding the income, Ms WIBOM underlined it was at this date lower than expected, partly due to the non-payment, or the delay in payment, of many subscription dues.

Referring to the "special expenses" of the year 1992, Ms VAN DER ELST asked for the EC members' opinion on whether we should go on publishing the Bulletin in its present (i.e. expensive) form. Ms GALVAO, later supported by several other members, was very much in favour of keeping it in its present form.

Ms ORBANZ insisted that extra copies of the Bulletin should not be freely distributed any longer but possibly bought at cost price by the archives and sold by themselves to various interested individuals, institutions or distributors. This idea was generally accepted.

Decision: Ms VAN DER ELST to write to Bob Rosen, Clyde Jeavons, Michelle Aubert, Christian Dimitriu, Ron Magliozi and those interested, asking them to contact distributors in their country which might be interested in buying the Bulletin. For the next issues, she should need to know in advance how many copies to foresee for those archives willing to sell the Bulletin around.

As regarded advertisements to be placed in the Bulletin, Mr FRANCIS thought we should foresee a number of publicity copies to be freely sent or distributed to possible advertisers. We could also attract more advertisers by asking them to send off-prints concerning their product. By enclosing this off-print in the Bulletin, they would be charged less than by printing an advertisement in the Bulletin itself.

Ms AUBERT suggested to create a joint subscription for the PIP publications and the FIAF Bulletin. Ms VAN DER ELST must discuss this with Michael Moulds.

5.1. Draft Budget for 1994

Ms VAN DER ELST raised the question of increasing our income by accepting more Associates. In that respect she recalled her idea of offering the status of Associate to some of our present Subscribers.
Mr FRANCIS felt that the search for new Associates should happen more gradually, namely by fostering the meeting of interest groups (filmschools, filmmuseums) during our Congresses, whereby we would make them aware of the importance of becoming an Associate of FIAF.

An item "Centennial Fund" would be added both on the income and the expenditure sides of the 1994 budget.

5.2. Development Fund

Mr JEAVONS suggested to foresee an additional item for a fund dedicated to training and/or summerschools. This idea was generally welcomed.

It was decided to answer favourably to the budgeted request Cinematheca de Cuba had made in 1990 to the Development Fund for a grant of 2,000– US$ to carry out a computer project for the Cinematheca’s documentation Center. Cinémathèque Québécoise (René Beaucclair) had studied the request and was willing to find and ship the necessary equipment on behalf of FIAF.

There was a discussion about the allocation policy of the Development Fund. In this particular case, everybody was confident of the effective utility of this financial help and aware of the major impulse it would bring to the development of the Cuban archive’s Documentation department. Members should be encouraged to present their requests in the same very precise way and the EC would then be able to reach a decision accordingly.

5.3. Report of the Fundraising Committee

At this point, Mr DAUDELIN invited Mary-Lea BANDY, as member of the Fundraising Committee, to join the discussion.

Ms WIBOM reported that after the Congress in Montevideo, the Fundraising Committee had met in Cannes with Gilles Jacob and Marie-Pierre Auril, chief organizers of the Festival. They had agreed to host the campaign for the Centenary Fund and to lend FIAF an office during the Festival for the three following years. They would also lend theater(s) to the Committee to present restored films. The Committee intended to make a press conference at the next Cannes Festival to start a Fund drive. The Cannes Festival was to be held from May 8 to May 22.

Ms BANDY presented the campaign’s general outlook, the main aim being to stress the role of film archives not only in film preservation but also in the whole film community. They would also try to create a honorary committee of film personalities from all over the world to endorse their campaign.

The Fundraising Committee’s goal was to obtain 1,000,000,– US Dollars by 1995. Ms BANDY stressed the importance of indicating clearly to the public what they were fundraising for.

Mr JEAVONS thought the key-concept of the press conference should be the visibility of film and thereby the valorisation of FIAF’s work. A discussion followed about how the campaign should be presented.

Mr OPELA said that Cesky Filmovy Ustav would be ready to lend the FIAF representatives in Cannes its restored tinted version of "Monte-Cristo" (1928, 210 min), for a screening in the name of FIAF.
6 SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

6.1. Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU commented on his written report. He said the Commission would be keen on having at its disposal a desktop publishing system to enable them to produce their own papers. It was understood that if financed by FIAF in the frame of the Commission budget, such a computer would formally belong to FIAF. Mr SCHOU is to investigate the cost of such equipment.

The proceedings of the last Joint Technical Symposium (Ottawa, 1989), to be produced by the TCC, had not yet come out and this was very worrying as Unesco had threatened to cancel its financial support to the publication because the deadline had been overstepped by several months. Mr SCHOU said he would talk to George Boston on that problem.

He then expressed his concerns about the sales procedures adopted by DANCAN, a Danish film can manufacturer, showing to what extent those procedures were likely to affect the Preservation Commission's reputation. Ms ORBANZ and Mr OPELA proposed that the Preservation Commission should write their own recommendations about cans, which Mr SCHOU considered as difficult since can tests were not conclusive so far. In Ms AUBERT's opinion, DANCAN's misuse of the Preservation Commission's recommendations in his commercial papers could become the object of prosecution.

Decision: Mr SCHOU to write to all FIAF affiliates explaining his views about storage containers and warning them that according to the Preservation Commission, DANCAN's recommendations were not reliable.

Mr DAUDELIN thanked Mr SCHOU for his report.

6.2. Report of the Documentation Commission

The Commission's report was circulated and presented by Mr MAGLIOZZI.

He commented on the following points (when relevant, decisions by the EC are mentioned):

- 1.2. Membership: Mr MAGLIOZZI was to appoint a Deputy Chairman and inform the EC members during or before the EC meeting in Mo i Rana.

- 2.1. Mr MAGLIOZZI's proposal to include the "Bibliography of members' publications" in the annual volume of the "International Index to Film and TV Periodicals 1992" was accepted.

- 2.3: PIP Editor's Report.
Mr MAGLIOZZI underlined Michael Moulds' concerns about the cancellation of the American Film Institute’s subscription, which included their financial support.
He strongly supported the CD-ROM project, vital for the future of the PIP, but pointed out to the financial difficulties. He formally announced Michael Moulds' request to FIAF for a loan without interest, to help the CD-ROM project (about 4,000 £). Mr DAUDELIN suggested to grant the PIP the unspent amount of the Documentation Commission's 1992 budget. This was agreed.
Mr ROSEN suggested that M. Moulds should write directly to Greg Lukow about the API's support and subscription. He might have been unaware of this matter.

Following Ms GALVAO's questions about the use of CD-ROM, Ms AUBERT suggested that an article be written on the usage modalities of this technology in the next Bulletin.

- 2.7. Discussion on the outline of the Documentation Commission's handbook as defined in the Mr MAGLIOZZI's paper "Statement describing the subject and purpose of Documentation commission work", was postponed to the next EC meeting. Meanwhile, each EC member and Head of Commission should read this document and possibly discuss it with appropriate staff members.

- 2.6. The proposed participation in the Newsreel Symposium was warmly welcomed.

Ms ORBANZ suggested to receive the Commission reports from all Commissions early enough before the EC meeting so that they can be read by everybody before discussion. This was agreed by everybody.

6.3. Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Ms HARRISON presented a very complete set of documents produced by the Cataloguing Commission and describing its current projects, its long-term targets, including a list of both its members and corresponding members together with their curriculum vitae. She underlined the corresponding members' list was very useful for the Commission, adding that in the long run, this would be a much easier way of choosing new members.

Referring to her written report, she commented on the evolution of the Commission's various projects, since the last EC meeting in Montevideo.

Ms ORBANZ believed that "Guidelines for Selection Criteria" (point 5) could become an interesting theme for a future FIAF symposium.

Ms VAN DER ELST reported that the Nitrate Union Catalog (point 7) was hardly ever consulted and Ms HARRISON wondered if this project was worth continuing. Following Ms AUBERT's suggestion, it was finally decided to send to each participating archive a list of the catalog's titles which belong to their national production.

Ms HARRISON finally presented the Commission's ideas for new projects which were welcomed, and Mr DAUDELIN thanked her for this report.

6.4. Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections' Report

The written report of the Commission's last meeting, held in New York on October 31 and November 1, had not been produced yet. Referring to the minutes of the two previous meetings, held successively in Montevideo and Munich, Mr BENARD DA COSTA reported on the following projects:

1) The publication of the Manual for Technical Standards for Presentation was foreseen in 1993. Some aspects of this work needed discussion with the Preservation Commission.

3) Working group on archives and film education: Steve Ricci intended to carry on the work in this field.

4) Survey on the Programming and Access Policy in film archives: about 70% of the answers to the survey had been received so far and the Commission would report on the results of this survey at the General Assembly in Mo i Rana.

5) Participation in the celebration of the cinema centenary: the Commission's idea was to send to all FIAF archives a list of 5 or 6 types of films to be programmed around the celebration.

Mr JEAVONS had some doubts about the meaning of the above project. Mr BENARD DA COSTA specified the general idea was to propose a list of innovative categories of films which have never been shown but importantly illustrate the history of cinema. For Mr JEAVONS, this work rather served the purpose of an advisory guide pointing out the dark corners of archives. But this would be a project to be carried out on a much longer run. Ms ORBANZ also had some interrogations about the final target of the project. Due to schedule constraints, the discussion was interrupted at this stage. To be continued.

6) Among the Commission's preoccupations were some reflexions about specific aspects of programming, namely:
   a) programming from archival collections: how can programs reflect the profile of the archive and its acquisition policy;
   b) selection criteria: how to improve the relation between the preservation policy and the programming activities;
   c) the role of the programmer.

Those points would be the object of studies to be prepared during 1993.

6.5. Reconfirmation of Chairpersons

The reconfirmation of the Commission Heads was examined case by case by the EC members only. After the discussion, when they rejoined the meeting room, Mr DAUDELIN formally announced the results of the debate:

Dr Henning SCHOU: reconfirmed as Head of the Preservation Commission
Mr Ron MAGLIOZZI: reconfirmed as Head of the Documentation Commission
Ms Harriet HARRISON: reconfirmed as Head of the Cataloguing Commission
Mr João BENARD DA COSTA: reconfirmed as Head of the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections.

Referring to Rule 77, Mr DAUDELIN asked each of the Commission Heads to appoint a Deputy-Chairman before the next EC meeting in Mo i Rana.

Mr SCHOU was asked to follow up the offers made to him by archive staff to work as corresponding members for the Preservation Commission.
Mr BENARD DA COSTA was asked to produce, in the same way as Mr MAGLIOZZI had already done for the Documentation Commission, a detailed official statement describing the object and purpose of the work of the Commission for Programming and Access to the Collections. Mr DAUDELIN believed that this statement, expected in time before the next General Assembly, would be of great interest to all FIAF affiliates.

7 PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

7.1. FIAF Summerschool

Mr JEAVONS reported on the last FIAF Summerschool held last June-July in Berkhamsted. A written report of the Summerschool, including reactions of various participants, was foreseen and articles on the course would probably appear in the next FIAF Bulletin. All formal papers (training papers and general addresses) were to be published in a special dossier.

Many participants' reactions demonstrated the event's unqualified success, on both technical and social levels.

Mr JEAVONS was very concerned that the information concerning the Summerschool had not been properly circulated among the archives' staff. He strongly believed there should be an obligation to circulate this kind of information.

Each participant had been charged 1,000 US $. On the one hand this was not enough for the NFA to cover the costs of the course; on the other hand it was too much for many participants, especially those from developing countries. The subscriptions' income had covered about 66% of the overall budget (excluding staff costs), which had left the NFA with a deficit of 19,000 $. The money raised from various sources had not proved sufficient to compensate for this deficit. Mr JEAVONS thought that FIAF should grant financial support to future Summerschools.

He described three possible alternatives to go from here:
1) to continue holding the Summerschool in Berkhamsted, on a three-annual basis;
2) to hold it in different archives on a rotating basis;
3) to combine 1 and 2 and share staff costs between the participating archives and the host archive.

The EC thanked Mr JEAVONS for his detailed report, for his and his colleagues' effort to make the Summerschool such a success. Ms ORBANZ stressed the importance to continue this form of training. She agreed that FIAF's support - financially as well as morally - should be stronger in the future.
Concerning the 3 alternatives suggested by Mr JEAVONS, she favoured alternative 2.

Like many other EC members, Ms WIBOM very much liked the international and social (in terms of human experience) dimension of the seminar, insisting that participants should also be looked for in areas where FIAF has no representation.
Mr DAUDELIN favoured the idea of holding the seminar every third year while Mr FRANCIS suggested to hold the FIAF Congress and Summerschool together every second year.

Mr DIMITRIU believed the Summerschool was an excellent product to sell to sponsors.

Ms ORBANZ proposed to create a working group on training/Summerschool, which would start working upon publication of the Summerschool's report.

7.2. FIAF Bulletin

Mr DAUDELIN reported that due to personal reasons several members had to leave the editorial board. One was looking for new members. The following names were put forward to join the editorial board: Gian Luca Farinelli, Mary Lea Bandy, Ib Monty, Eric Leroy or Emmanuelle Toulet.

Mr SCHOU suggested to appoint a Technical Editor for the Bulletin and volunteered to take up this position. It was felt that the Head of the Preservation Commission should play an ad hoc advisory role for technical matters at the request of the editorial board without being officially designated as technical editor for the Bulletin.

Mr ROSEN and Mr DAUDELIN thought the number of pages in the present issue of the Bulletin should be maintained if we wanted to sell the publication at a reasonable price.

Michael Moulds' suggestion to index the FIAF Bulletin in the P.I.P. was accepted. Mr DAUDELIN felt this might bring us new subscribers.

7.3. International Index to Film and TV Periodicals

This issue had already been dealt with during the presentation of the Documentation Commission's report.

7.4. International Directory of Cinematographers, Set and Costume Designers in Film (A. Krautz)

Ms ORBANZ had not received any report from Alfred Krautz be she knew he was continuing the work and reaffirmed the need for FIAF's participation in this project.

Ms AUBERT and Mr MAGLIOZZI thought it should be suggested to Mr Krautz to involve the national archive of the country concerned in the final edition of a manuscript. Ms ORBANZ agreed to report to Mr KRAUTZ accordingly. The issue would be discussed next time.

7.5. Publication of the Athens Symposium's Acts on "Independant Cinema"

Ms AUBERT explained Mr Alain Marchand was still trying to collect the concerned papers to be published under Cinémathèque Française's leadership.

7.6. Promotion of FIAF / Statistics

Ms AUBERT was working on a brief leaflet about FIAF, based on the answers to her questionnaire to the membership. She would try to get it ready by the Cannes Festival in May 1993.
Talking of "figures" as information on FIAF’s achievements, Ms VAN DER ELST evoked the annual questionnaire for FIAF Statistics, deploring the questions were most of the time inadequately answered, which made the compilation very difficult.

Should we carry on with this project? Should we keep the same questions? What is the use of such a questionnaire? Those questions were broadly debated.

In the frame of the 100th Anniversary’s celebration, we would need to develop another type of questionnaire, in order to establish an international image of our achievements in basic areas. This questionnaire should include more global questions than the yearly questionnaire (e.g. "how many titles from your national production has your archive ever restored?") and should be built upon the analysis of Ms AUBERT’s questionnaire for the FIAF leaflet.

The questionnaire for the yearly statistical report could remain unchanged in its contents. However, when the Secretariat sends it out, it should clearly indicate that:

a) statistics are a vital complement to the annual report;
b) the questionnaire must be answered according to the specified instructions, as precisely as possible.

This letter should be signed by the Secretary General.

INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS

7.7. World Directory of Audiovisual Archives (NGO Roundtable/W. Klaue)

Ms VAN DER ELST reported the publication of the Directory had been delayed for several reasons, mainly because the task had proved bigger than foreseen. This delay was likely to deprive FIAF from Unesco’s financial support for this publication.

Mr DAUDELIN firmly insisted we should not return to Unesco the money already paid for this contract at which we had already devoted so much work. He offered to discuss this directly with Ms Springer at Unesco, but Ms VAN DER ELST thought that Ms Springer had no influence on this decision.

7.8. Feasibility Study for Upgrading the Vietnamese Film Archive

Ms WIBOM explained this project had been taken over by the Swedish Film Institute. The mission would take place in December. A written report would be sent to all EC members.

7.9. Cinémathèque africaine

Ms AUBERT circulated and commented a report by the CNC about their project in Ouagadougou.

7.10. Preservation Center for Latin-America in Sao Paulo

Ms GALVAO reported a general lack of money was slowing down the progress of all projects related to the implementation of the Preservation Center.
Since last year however, many Latin-American archives had been equipped with computers but were now waiting for the common network to be established. They were ready to start working and/or to send someone to Sao Paulo to learn how to use the system.

7.11. Glossary of Audiovisual Archiving Terms

This IASA conducted project had requested the participation of FIAF; Ms HARRISON described the Cataloguing Commission's costless contribution and asked the EC members if this kind of collaboration should request that the Cataloguing Commission be officially associated with the project. Ms ORBANZ said they should be.

7.12. SAUR

Referring to the arguments raised against the cooperation with Saur, Ms ORBANZ explained that when she and Wolfgang Klaue had negotiated a cooperation with Saur, it was on the basis to save money from FIAF's annual budget for publications. If FIAF felt it did not save money, or that the collaboration with Saur was altogether not satisfactory, then there was no need to continue that cooperation.

She then reported on a meeting which had taken place in Berlin between Saur (Mr Link) and FIAF (W. Klaue and herself). In this meeting FIAF's complaints concerning the slow production processes, the loss of manuscripts in the past and the slow delivery of the free copies were articulated. Mr Link made his apologies and said that he hoped for a better cooperation in the future. The following conditions were then offered by Saur to FIAF:

a) Saur would distribute 1 free copy to each FIAF affiliate under condition that FIAF gives the addresses and pays DM 1,50- per copy (these being the actual costs for packing material) and the mailing costs.

b) all FIAF affiliates could buy all SAUR's publications with a 35% discount.

Mr KLAUE and Ms ORBANZ had agreed to submit these proposals to FIAF. It was now up to FIAF to decide what the relationship with Saur should be.

7.13. EEC/FORCE Project

Mr DAUDELIN reported that in the frame of the FORCE project, a sum of 5,000 US$ would be granted to FIAF in settlement of the permission to use some of Mr Harold Brown's publications for the Preservation Commission. This amount was accepted as an extra-income to FIAF's annual budget.

Referring to the Minutes of the last EC meeting, Ms ORBANZ recalled Eileen BOWSER's proposal to develop a disaster action plan. She thought this project needed further attention.

8. 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CINEMA: REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP

The working group (Bob Rosen, Clyde Jeavons and David Francis) had elaborated a series of proposals that were presented by Mr ROSEN:

A. Creation of a Bi-annual Calendar which would include two kinds of activities associated with FIAF's logo:
1) a list of activities (books, exhibitions, programs,...) that each FIAF archive will devote to the centenary between 1993 and 1996. The criteria for these activities would require an unusual significance that focuses on the origins of cinema, on preservation related issues or on a particular national approach to the centenary. These activities should be organized by the archive itself, and some of them could be especially dedicated to the Federation.

2) for each six-months period, a list of other centennial-related activities organized by other or larger entities than strictly individual archives all around the world.

Those activities would meet the following criteria:
- to cover a broader (national) area of interest and concern;
- to share their possible income for the benefit of FIAF’s purposes, especially preservation;
- to have their final script approved by FIAF;

For those activities, FIAF would foster a positive collaboration from various archives.

Mr. ROSEN called for a FIAF Executive to participate in the formal determination of the various criteria for the activities to be mentioned in the calendar.

It was understood that the responsibility for providing information about this or that particular project listed in the calendar would rest with the concerned country/archive, in order to stop a lot of central inquiries to the Secretariat.

The calendar would be written in two languages (some articles in French, some in English – cfr. the FIAF Bulletin). Considering the calendar as an information paper, Mr. ROSEN thought it could remain modest in its look, while Mr. DAUDELIN did believe the leaflet should stand above the purely informative document.

Referring to other associations devoted to the centennial’s celebration, Mr. FRANCIS felt we should discuss the extent of FIAF’s readiness to let its listings appear in somebody else’s program. This question was not directly answered but Mr. DIMITRIU knew that initiatives similar to FIAF’s calendar were already underway in many places. Mr. JEAVONS said “double use” for this kind of listings was unavoidable; however, we should carefully keep to the way we wanted to develop our own project.

B. Implementation of this calendar:
- by next December, UCLA would draft a letter to all FIAF affiliates asking them to inform us on the activities they will dedicate to FIAF. They would also be asked to transmit the names of one or several magazines in their country that would be interested in the calendar, to insert in FIAF’s mailing list for the calendar. The meaning was to inform not only our affiliates but also a hundred key-magazines.

Ms WIBOM suggested to foresee 2,400 calendars to be inserted in the journalists’ pressboxes in the Cannes Festival, 1,600 for the Berlin Festival, insisting we had to benefit from those very hot “information spots”.

- UCLA would also prepare the design for the calendar for the first six months of 1993, possibly by next March.
- Mr. JEAVONS would compile the texts and lead the editorial work.
C. Towards a specific FIAF production around the centenary
The idea was to bring several filmschools in competition around the making of a film/video on the centenary, which would speak to FIAF’s concerns.
The reward of the competition would be a 1,000 US$ prize.

Another proposal was that FIAF would produce its own animation video.
Producing animation would make the video more universal and avoid language and clearance issues. Mr DAUDELIN suggested to talk to Don Mc Williams from the National Film Board of Canada about this project. Financial support for this attractive project could easily be asked to some companies such as Fuji.

D. Production of a logo
It was finally decided to adopt the logo proposed by Eva ORBANZ and designed by Volker Noth.
We should ask the designer to provide us with the logo’s brochures and some samples in various colours.

Letter of thanks to be written to the three designers who had conceived the other proposed logos.

9 FUTURE CONGRESSES

9.1. Mo i Rana (cfr. supra)

9.2. Bologna 1994
The first symposium would be devoted to Pre-cinema, as suggested by the host archive; the second symposium, FIAF’s symposium, would deal with “Copyright and relation with the film industry and the legal aspect of our work”, as suggested by Mr FRANCIS during the last EC. This still had to be accepted by Cineteca del Comune di Bologna.

Referring to the second topic, Mr JEVONS suggested to create a working group on legal deposit and copyright and accepted to initiate this working group.

9.3. Centennial Congress
Mr ROSEN reported he and his colleagues from AFI and the Academy Film Archive had been meeting to think about the project, but no firm proposal could be made before February 1993, since the National Endowment for the Arts’ grant would not be official before that date. Mr ROSEN said that besides the NEA’s grant (75,000 US$), the joint committee would have to raise additional funds to cover the expected costs of the project, i.e. 140,000 US$.

There were already two themes envisaged for the symposium:
1) the first hundred years of cinema;
2) the next hundred years of cinema.

The EC asked Mr ROSEN to accept the end of February 1993 to come up with the decision on whether the 1995 Congress could take place in Los Angeles. Mr ROSEN agreed.
9.4. Further years

Ms ORBANZ said FIAF had received written invitations from China and from London to hold the 1996 Congress.

Mr JEAVONS explained the motivation for their invitation lied in the fact that the year 1996 would mark the British cinema’s centenary. However, he understood the EC’s preference for Beijing in 1996 and indicated that the National Film Archive would agree to remain as a reserve venue for this Congress.

At the next General Assembly, Ms ORBANZ is to introduce the future congresses by saying that in order to underline the international character of the Federation, the EC suggests to accept Beijing’s invitation for the 1996 Congress.

10. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

10.1. Relations with Unesco

“MEMORY OF THE WORLD” : since no one from FIAF could participate in the meeting, Ms ORBANZ had written a letter to Unesco referring to possible film preservation projects for Memory of the World. Mr George Boston from IASA had attended the meeting on this Unesco project and had reported to Ms ORBANZ that so far their interest was devoted to the saving of papers and photos.

Referring to her conversation with Mr Wolfgang Löhner, Secretary of the Intergovernmental Council for the P.G.I. about the relation between FIAF and Unesco, Ms ORBANZ reported that:

- serious budget cuts were foreseen in the P.G.I. department, which would affect audiovisual archives as well as other institutions;
- FIAF could qualify to get into the A category given the variety of the countries represented by the Federation. Although she was aware that application for the A category did imply a great deal of administrative work, she suggested to proceed with the request, in order to give film archiving within Unesco – and therefore worldwide – a greater importance and create more awareness.

In order to make FIAF better known within Unesco, Ms ORBANZ suggested that:

- FIAF should attend not only Unesco’s NGO Round Tables but also the more important conferences within Unesco;
- maybe an event could be organized in Paris in parallel with Unesco’s General Conference, e.g. a film screening;
- Unesco’s Director General should be invited to a FIAF Congress;
- a letter should be sent to our membership recommending to address their national Unesco Commission to make FIAF known and search for some support. The EC agreed upon these suggestions, and Ms ORBANZ was asked to proceed with the application for the A category. Ms AUBERT said she would help to follow up the idea to create a filmic event in parallel with Unesco’s General Conference.
10.2. Relations with other international organizations

Mr ROSEN had attended the CILECT meeting, where a number of people had shown interest in collaborating with the FIAF working group on relations between film archives and film schools.

Mr DAUDELIN had not been able to attend the ICA conference in Montreal. Mr DIMITRIU reported they were willing to support an audiovisual union catalog and proposed FIAF to participate in this project. Ms HARRISON thought we should ask for more information on this project before any formal answer is made.

Mr JEVONs reported on the FIAT meeting he had attended on behalf of FIAF in Geneva, last September. Many participants had showed interest in preservation within a technical and philosophical sense, which was very rewarding. The importance of cooperation in technical training had also been underlined.

Mr JEVONs also reported on the AGCE's activities, including the Lumière and the FORCE projects (cfr. annex).

Mr SCHOU reported on the IASA's General Assembly he had attended in Canberra, last September. There had been a proposal to extend the name of the association in order to include all audiovisual archives (film and video), while maintaining their central interest in sound archives. Mr SCHOU had openly expressed his concern that this had not been effectively discussed with FIAF's board. The vote on this issue had been finally postponed to their next Congress planned in Helsinki in August 1993. Mr SCHOU believed that before this date, we should contact IASA's Executive Board to express our concern and try to continue the dialogue that had been started in 1990.

Decision: Mr DAUDELIN to write a letter in that sense to Mr Gerald Gibson, President of IASA.

Mr SCHOU then reported on the next Joint Technical Symposium, due on August 18-20 in Barcelona, entitled "Technology and our cultural heritage - Technology's role in preserving and accessing our cultural heritage". Mr SCHOU feared the organizing association, IFLA, did not have direct interest in audiovisual archiving. He reported the TCC had lost a few members, which made its work very difficult.

It was stressed by Ms ORBANZ and other EC members that the work of the TCC had been most valuable and that one should aim to continue this group.

11 NOMINATIONS FOR HONORARY MEMBERS OF FIAF

There was a general discussion about this status. Ms WIBOM thought that a special fund should be set up in our budget to support Honorary Members who continue to be actively involved in FIAF's work. Ms ORBANZ and Mr JEVONs were favourable to an expansion of Honorary Members when this was the only way of keeping in contact with former members we did not want to loose.
Referring to Mr ALBERTI's and Ms BANDY's recommendation letters, Mr DAUDELIN asked for a vote to be taken by secret ballot on the recommendation of the following persons as Honorary Members:

1) Mr GIANNI COMENCINI  
   Result of the vote: 3 yes - 5 no - 4 abstentions

2) Ms Eileen BOWSER  
   Result of the vote: 11 yes - 1 abstention

The nomination of Ms Eileen BOWSER as Honorary Member would be put to the vote of the next General Assembly.

12 FUTURE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ELIGIBILITY OF PRESENT MEMBERS)

Mr FRANCIS, Mr ROSEN and Ms GALVAO were reaching the end of 3 consecutive terms as members of the EC; they were therefore not eligible for the new term. Mr DIMITRIU had to leave the EC as he was no longer associated with a FIAF Member. Mr SCHOU would also step down since he was now in Berkhamsted, but he could still be present as Head of the Preservation Commission.

For future elections, Mr DAUDELIN stressed we should try to respect the geographical and ideological balance of the EC membership.

13 MISCELLANEOUS

Ms VAN DER ELST informed the EC members that FIAF Statutes and Rules had undergone some modifications according to the decision taken in Montevideo (cfr. page 8 of the minutes of the EC meeting in Montevideo - April 1992). The whole set would be reprinted with a detailed table of contents and sent to all FIAF affiliates.