

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vienna, 4 - 5 April, 1984

Members	Wolfgang Klaue	President
	Robert Daudelin	Secretary General
	Jan de Vaal	Treasurer
	Raymond Borde	Vice President
	Eileen Bowser	Vice President
	David Francis	Vice President
	Cosme Alves-Netto	Deputy Secretary General
	Guido Cincotti	
	Hector Garcia-Mesa	
	Eva Orbanz	
	Anna-Lena Wibom *	
Reserve Members	Sam Kula	Deputy Treasurer
	P K Nair	
	Paul Spehr	
Honorary Members	Einar Lauritzen	Absent
	Vladimir Pogacic	
	M Svoboda	
	Jerzy Toeplitz	
Commission Heads	Harriet Harrison	Cataloguing
	Henning Schou *	Preservation
	Milka Staykova	Documentation

Executive Secretary Brigitte van der Elst
 Interpreter Jill Johnson

Representatives invited for specific items, from:

New York, Museum of Modern Art	1985 Congress
Vienna, Oesterreiches Filmarchiv	1984 Congress
Vienna, Oesterreiches Filmmuseum	1984 Congress
Istanbul, Sinema-TV Enstitusu	Membership
Sao Paolo, Fundacao Cine. Bras.	Membership

* Mrs WIBOM was absent on Day 2

Mr SCHOU was absent much of the time, chairing the Preservation Commission Meeting which was held in parallel

MINUTES

Mr KLAUE opened the meeting with a welcome to all present, especially the three Honorary Members, MM TOEPLITZ, LAURITZEN and POGACIC. As Reserve Member, Mr KULA had the right to vote until the delayed arrival of Mr CINCOTTI.

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted as presented, subject to the inclusion of Point 5.2, Sao Paolo's candidature as Members, and changes in the sequence to meet the availability of various participants. (See Agenda for record of actual discussion sequence)

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE TOULOUSE MEETING

The Minutes were approved unanimously, subject to the following corrections:

- p15 (Mrs BOWSER on behalf of Mr SCHOU):
Under (1) Preservation Manual, the first sentence should begin:
'The proofreading of the film section had been completed, ..'
Under (3) 'china girl' should be substituted for 'logo'
- p30 (Mrs BOWSER):
Under 7.11, DECISIONS to be added at end:
'Deadline for reply to be extended.'
'Further discussion at EC Autumn meeting.'
- p35 (Mrs BOWSER):
Under 7.14, name correction: should read 'Madeline Matz'.
- p20 (Mr FRANCIS)
Middle para: delete 'legal' from 'deposit agreement used in London'.
It was the depositors' agreement only.
- p4 (Mr DAUDELIN)
Middle para: should read 'national' heritage (not 'natural')
- p17 (Mrs STAYKOVA)
Under 5.3 1985 Budget, item 1.5: should read 1985 (not 1984)
- p22 (Mr KLAUE)
Under DECISIONS (b), Mr CINCOTTI to be asked for clarification.

3 FINAL REPORT ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE VIENNA CONGRESS

Mr KONLECHNER and Mr BIENERT welcomed the EC on behalf of the two Archives and confirmed that all the arrangements were satisfactorily underway.

Mr KLAUE asked for decisions on the following:

- Voting Rights of members who had not paid their subscriptions
Mr DAUDELIN felt discussion was not necessary as before the last Congress it had been agreed they should follow the Rules. Mr TOEPLITZ agreed. The three archives involved were: Bucharest, Madrid and Rio de Janeiro.

- Chairmen for the 5 Sessions of the GM
Agreed as follows: MM KLAUE, FRANCIS, MRS BOWSER, MM BORDE, DAUDELIN

- List of participants
After discussion of the formal opening arrangements and representatives expected from other international organisations, the EC was asked to formally approve the presence of the following non-FIAF archives:

Iran (2)	re membership situation
Thailand Ministry of Culture (2)	paid by Unesco
Philippines National Archive (2)	
UNO (Mr Sydenham)	formal Visitor status
Cinémathèque Gaumont (Mme Forestier)	approved by M. BORDE
Smithsonian Institution (Mrs Johnson)	approved by Mrs BOWSER
Mr Bob Rosen (UCLA, AFI or Visitor?)	status to be discussed
Mrs Pam Wintle (Pelliculas Archives of Latin American Policy/John Allen Inc)	approved by Mrs BOWSER

The following were expected for the Symposium only: Mr Bernadini, Ms Engberg, Mr Jim Munro (Canada), Mr & Mrs Osorio (Puebla).

Mr KLAUE closed this Agenda Item by congratulating the Vienna Archives on their efficient organisation.

4 EXAMINATION OF THE MAIN POINTS OF THE GM AGENDA
NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE

GM5 President's Report on behalf of the EC

Mr KLAUE's draft Report was reviewed page by page by the EC but only very minor changes to wording were suggested. It was noted that on page 4 reference had been made to one archive by name. Mr FRANCIS felt it was a nice idea and it would make the report more interesting if in future they made a point of naming noteworthy achievements of one or two archives every year, preferably from different parts of the world. Mrs BOWSER supported the idea of citing archives for special achievements but felt there was no need to seek an artificial international balance.

GM10 Projects and Publications Underway

The list of Projects was reviewed to check that written or verbal Reports were available on each item and identify any matters needing discussion before the GM.

GM10.3 Unesco Courier: Special issue on film preservation

Mr DAUDELIN suggested telephone contact should be made with the Editor, Mr Glissant, before the GM to clarify the latest position on both sides.

Mr KULA reported he had had a long conversation in Paris with Olga Rödel who is now responsible for editing and getting the Special Issue ready for publication. He understood she wanted to include the following items and had approached the sources mentioned for material which she would edit:

- Main article: 8 page version of Mr BORDE's paper for the Unesco experts' meeting on preservation
- Lost Films: Mr KULA to submit the stills (submitted by FIAF members) with captions and a brief introduction, as support to Mr BORDE's paper on reasons for loss, with illustrations of specific examples from different parts of the world.
- Reconstruction of 'Napoleon' to be written by Mr Kevin Brownlow
- Relationship of developed and developing archives and help in reconstruction of cinematic heritage that would have been lost: submissions requested from Mrs WIBOM (cf Thailand), Mr Schmitt, Mr Buache and others. Mrs Rödel used the term 'secret' archives, presumably to refer to film relating to developing countries held, often unwittingly, by developed archives.
- Selection problems from vast production as in India: Mr NAIR
- History of African cinema and its major losses: Senegal
- Passage of the Unesco 1988 Recommendation: Mr KLAUE

Her deadline was ambitious (end April/mid May) but he felt her plans would form the basis for an interesting issue. He felt FIAF should have the right to see the final versions of the articles before they went to press but understood this might be a problem.

In response to Mr BORDE who asked what had happened to the original dossier submitted to Unesco, Mr DAUDELIN reported on his meeting with Mr Glissant and introduction to Mrs Rödel, immediately following the EC meeting in Toulouse, and their conflicting views of the situation.

Mr FRANCIS was happy to see an article by Mr Brownlow on the restoration of Napoleon. However, this was one of the great cooperative ventures between FIAF members, a fact which he felt was not fully reflected in Mr Brownlow's book. For a report appearing in this context, he felt it was vital to be accurate but this would mean entering into correspondence with those who did cooperate, especially in the early days. He asked how this might be done as he felt it would be a disaster to continue the myth that has been created about Napoleon. Mr DAUDELIN agreed, noting that the fact that they had chosen this topic was part of the myth.

Mrs WIBOM reported that Mrs Rödel had telephoned her for a contribution and when pressed had said that the articles already submitted were "too scientific, too dry". Mrs WIBOM felt that unless there was an original agreement to the contrary, then they were bound by publishing convention that contributors accept the editors' and publishers' conditions or withdraw altogether. She had expressed willingness to cooperate but asked for sample of the magazine and a written statement of what was required: she had been amazed to receive a request to write the article on the history of the archives which had already been done !

Mr KULA agreed that journalists had every right to determine what should be published and what their readers would find meaningful, so there was a limit to what we could enforce. For instance, Mrs Rödel felt readers would appreciate a report on the vulnerability of nitrate but not the article from Thailand. Nevertheless, he felt we should have the right to see the final versions of, for instance, the articles by Mr BORDE and Mr BROWNLOW to check that factual accuracy had been maintained or restored. He felt that Mr BORDE's article alone, with the supporting stills on lost films, was sufficient to make the Issue worthwhile as publicity for the work of the Federation; anything else they could consider as bonus. In his view, the major problem was the proposed timescale.

Mr DAUDELIN reminded the EC for the record that it was Unesco themselves, in the person of Mrs Van Vliet, who had extended the original invitation in Rapallo, and to which we responded with written proposals in July 1982. Yet we first heard of Mrs Rödel at the end of January 1984. In the meantime, we had submitted the articles to schedule and the only response from Mr Glissant had been the request for the 3 additional articles which were submitted in September 1983. On the question of restoration of films, back in November 1982 we had written that an article would be on the history of restoration considering particularly the examples of 'Lost Horizon' and 'Metropolis'. On the question of nitrate, we were sensitive to their general readership by including Mr DE VAAL's brief report on treasure found within a nitrate deposit, to be included alongside the more technical report by Mr SCHOU. He was disappointed that after all FIAF's efforts and the lack of Unesco response, the whole project was in the melting pot again.

Mr KULA felt that we just had to accept the fact that someone else with different ideas was now in charge and making decisions in the light of her view of what the readership wanted. She was determined to have the article on 'Napoleon' as that is the best publicised restoration in recent years that everyone knows about, even though the films we chose may be more interesting from our point of view. He felt the article by Mr KLAUE on the Unesco 1980 Recommendation, the work of FIAF in getting it passed, and the impact it is likely to have on developing archives, together with a digest of Mr BORDE's excellent report which would make a very interesting journal article and a spread on lost films, would be extremely valuable and would achieve the initial objectives that FIAF had in planning participation in a Special Issue of Courier. He felt the remainder of the Contents was 'negotiable' as long as it did no harm to the relationships between archives and was factually correct.

Mr KLAUE said there had never been any firm agreement with Unesco or the Courier about the extent of our contribution or responsibilities. We should use this opportunity to have our work publicised in this publication which reaches people in the cultural field all over the world, in many different languages. However, we could only offer advice and not interfere with their concepts. He would like to see Mr DAUDELIN continuing as coordinator of the project and we should try to talk in Vienna with all the invited contributors to ask if they agree to participate. Perhaps, if we felt there would be problems with 'Napoleon', we should offer contributions on other restorations of classical films, but we cannot do more than give advice.

Mr KULA said the proposal for the covers was a black and white still from a lost film on the front and a colour film to represent problems of fading colour, on the back. He asked members to put forward suggestions.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt we should telephone Mrs Rödel and identify which articles can be delivered, and suggesting a more realistic deadline, perhaps 15 May. As a former Editor, he stressed that the content of an article was a matter to be settled between the Editor and the author only, so FIAF could not interfere in any article written by Mr Brownlow. However, we could submit our own account of the cooperation of FIAF members in the restoration of Napoleon which would supplement his version, as a separate article or a mention in connection with, for instance, the lost films. He felt Courier was an interesting paper and the project was extremely worthwhile, even if it was incomplete and contained mistakes; and there was always the possibility to submit rectifications for publication in a subsequent issue. We should not miss the opportunity in spite of the delays and frustrations.

In response to a question from Mr DAUDELIN, Mr KULA confirmed that there were plans for a short introductory paper on FIAF, its organisation and role, by the Secretary General or the President of the Federation.

In response to a reminder from Mr DE VAAL, it was formally confirmed that Mr DAUDELIN should continue as Coordinator. Mr KLAUE suggested there should be a meeting in Vienna of all those who had been asked to contribute to ensure there were no outstanding misunderstandings on who was doing what and then telephone Mrs Rödel with the latest position.

GM10.7 International Bibliography on the Cinema (Bucharest)

Mr KLAUE suggested that, as the Roumanians had no money to attend the Congress and had submitted no Report on this project, their circular letter of 20 March, inviting contributions for the years 1983 and 1984 by 1 July 1984, should be distributed to all delegates in Vienna. He was pleased to note that, in accordance with the EC suggestions, they were now planning to work on recent publications.

GM10.11 9.5mm Encyclopedia (London NFA)

Mr FRANCIS reported that the authors had not pursued a funding opportunity from outside FIAF which was offered at Stockholm and he felt therefore that until that opportunity was investigated, FIAF should put no further effort or funding into the project.

Decision: Deletion unless the situation changes.

GM10.13 Summer School 1984 (Berlin/DDR)

Mr KLAUE will give verbal report but would like further discussion at the EC Meeting after the GM, as he expected more nominations during the Congress. He was surprised and pleased at the number of nominations (17) received already.

GM10.14 50th FIAF Anniversary (Mr KLAUE)

Mr KLAUE reported that the small Working Group had not found time to meet as intended so he would simply make a verbal report at the GM on the initial discussions in Toulouse.

GM10.15 Statistics on film archives' activities
(MM KLAUE/KULA)

Mr KULA reported that he had found within Unesco a couple of models used in previous studies relating to archival statistics which he thought might be useful as a starting point.

Mr KLAUE reiterated that his recent study of the new Book of Reports and the diversity of measures used (reels, documents, titles, metres) had confirmed his view that it would be very useful to enable comparisons to be made and at least attempt to quantify how many films are acquired each year within the Federation; or how much preservation work was done. Figures could be the most impressive record of our preservation achievements.

GM14 Open Forum

Mr KLAUE reported that two proposals had been submitted so far (from Cineteca Nacional & I-MHIST) and there were the topics left over from Stockholm:

- Copyright law in different countries: Possible proposal for future symposia (G Cincotti)
- Balance between proper promotion of cultural heritage (making films available for public screening, leasing of prints, etc.) and unacceptable commercial activities (P Spehr)

Mr KLAUE said that the proposal for a Copyright Commission would be covered in the Report of the Executive Committee.

5 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

5.1a NEW MEMBERS: Seoul

Mr DAUDELIN summarised the position with special reference to Articles 2 and 3, as covered in three documents:

- Mrs WIBOM's Visit Report
- The Archive's own Annual Report for 1983
- The Archive's Application document distributed at Toulouse

Mr DAUDELIN drew attention to the fact that the Chairman of the umbrella organisation, the Korean Motion Picture Production Corporation (KMPPC) was also Chairman of the Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation (KFAIF) as indicated on page 2 of Mrs WIBOM's Report and he asked Mrs WIBOM if there was any individual responsible for the running of the Archive itself, who would represent the Archive within FIAF. Mrs WIBOM reported that she had explained to them that the close relationship of the two organisations presented a problem and asked them to identify who was in charge of the Archive and which individuals were exclusively concerned with archive activities. They reported that a Mr Yun-Koo Chung was Director of the Korean Film Archive and he was the individual who would be coming to Vienna; she also met and had visiting cards from other Archive members, including another individual called a Supervisor.

Mr GARCIA-MESA pointed out that the problem remained as in their own publication Mr Yun-Koo Chung was listed also as Director of the KMPPC.

Mr DAUDELIN continued by stressing that if Seoul was accepted as Member, the designated member would be the Archive (KFAIF) and not the umbrella organisation (KMPPC).

Regarding Article 3 and the question of autonomy, he drew attention to the problems caused by the close relationship between the two organisations and the overlapping of budgets, personnel, etc. He felt that the objections raised in the letter dated March 5 from Pyong Yang addressed to members of the EC had been met by the comments in Mrs WIBOM's Report.

Mr KLAUE asked Mrs WIBOM to comment on the questions raised in the letter from Pyong Yang and to indicate whether she felt the objections were satisfactorily answered by her Visit. Mrs WIBOM said that she felt many existing members of the Federation had difficulties with Article 4.2 as a result of their formal links with a larger organisation and that there were perhaps only a handful of members who were truly autonomous. The situation in Korea was at one extreme of the spectrum but she felt that her Report had explained the historical background to this. She added that she herself had qualms about her own Archive when completing the Reconfirmation procedures and the problems of autonomy had been discussed repeatedly within the EC. In her Report she had noted that the duties and functions of MPPC were similar to those of the Swedish Film Institute, her own umbrella organisation. However, she acknowledged that strictly Seoul's lack of autonomy meant that they could not qualify as Members.

Mr FRANCIS agreed that there were other cases where FIAF members belonged to an organisation associated with the national film industry although Mrs WIBOM pointed out that a major difference in this case was the mix of personnel across the two organisations.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that an individual could very well be on the Board of the production organisation without actually working for it and it could be perfectly feasible that Mr Yun-Koo Chung was wholly concerned with the Archive.

The discussion was resumed after a coffee break.

Mr DAUDELIN summarised the situation. Mrs WIBOM had prepared a very positive report on the Archive but felt that strictly they did not meet FIAF's requirements; he was personally not sure and felt the claims in the Pyong Yang letter that they were 'merely a front organisation' were not justified as Mrs WIBOM's report indicated that they were doing a lot of valuable archive work. However, the Pyong Yang claim that Seoul had no contacts with FIAF members seemed to be true although there was certainly no justification for claiming that the Seoul archive 'didn't really exist'.

He felt three possibilities emerged from the discussions:

- recommend Seoul to consider the possibility of restructuring the archive to give it more obvious autonomy
- ask Seoul to define the individual staff responsibilities more clearly
- ask for formal statement of the name of the individual who is personally responsible for the archive and who would thus be the FIAF contact.

He asked whether these should be conditions to be complied with before they could be accepted as Members or whether, as in previous cases, one should include in the letter a statement accepting them 'provided that' they complied with these conditions.

Mrs WIBOM referred the EC to page 2 of her Report where she mentioned the proposed construction of a new building in 1986. She wished to add that the project was a real one and she had seen the plans. Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that the plans had also been submitted in the dossier.

Mrs WIBOM repeated that she had discussed these organisational problems at length with them but they had found it very difficult to understand the FIAF point of view. They have a very vertical structure in which one Director who is responsible for everything and signs every document which goes out of the organisation and a different arrangement would be contrary to their accepted culture.

Mr BORDE said the decision on this Archive was an important decision of principle affecting FIAF's basic policy. For years, we have been concerned with the question of autonomy and, as Mrs WIBOM had rightly said, total autonomy was rare among their members. It was inevitable that archives which wanted to develop their activities were obliged to seek financial support from government or other sources which would mean an inevitable loss of autonomy. The theoretical question was to

establish how far one should go; in his view, Seoul was an extreme example which could be very embarrassing for us because of the apparent fusion between a commercial organisation and an archive. This could create a precedent which could encourage organisations like, for instance, the Cinémathèque Gaumont in Paris or the Walt Disney Archives, to apply for membership. He therefore proposed that we should require the Seoul archive to change their structure so that their dossier made their autonomy quite clear (which he felt should not be difficult) and take the decision later.

Mr NAIR mentioned that, in addition to the problems of autonomy, he was concerned that their collection was confined almost entirely to recent production. They had not one of the 140 Korean films produced before 1945 and only 30 of those which were pre-1960 (page 2 of Mrs WIBOM's report). It was important for archives to be concerned with tracing and preserving their own national heritage and he felt they had not done much in this area, even though they had been Observers since 1976.

Mrs WIBOM replied to this point by referring to the recent political situation in the country and hoped that the earlier films were held in the North Korean Archives. It was a young country where the heritage was scattered and she had confirmed in her Report that they are actively searching for older films from private sources, laboratories, etc. It was also a young archive and she wanted to stress that their archival movement had got going only in the last four or five years; indeed it is their time as Observers which has inspired them and made them more and more aware of their tasks and duties. However, she pointed out that they are in need of guidance, encouragement and support as there are no staff who were fully trained in the sense that they understood it now in the more developed archives. They have been very fortunate in their beginnings, in being able to get the support of the producers and get the negatives and dupes into their holdings from the current production. It was not right to call the umbrella organisation primarily a commercial organisation; it was certainly a cultural organisation trying to promote Korean films. There was a voluntary agreement under the supervision of the government to try to support the Korean film in general. She felt several of the problems that had arisen in evaluating their application were linguistic problems; they have a different structure, they name things differently, they view them differently and the translation doesn't always come out very happily; but the function and the work being done was OK.

Mr DAUDELIN felt that nevertheless he would take seriously Mr NAIR's comments about the balance of the films collected. They had been in existence for 10 years, an Observer within FIAF for 8 years and in that time had devoted very little effort to obtaining early films. Mrs WIBOM said that they had reported that they had done what they could.

Mr KLAUE felt it was not reasonable to expect more early films, in view of the history of the country which had been virtually a Japanese colony up until 1945 and was then devastated in both North and South by the Korean War.

Mr KLAUE asked Mrs WIBOM for clarification of Article 4 in the

Archives' Statutes, referring to the fact that Members had the right 'to use films kept in the archive for non-profit making purposes'. He asked whether this referred to their own deposits or to all films kept in the archives: if the latter, then he had doubts as it was against FIAF principles. Mrs WIBOM reported that the Members were film producers or film cultural organisations and on payment of their annual membership fee they had the right to deposit or give prints to the archive. The archive was very strict about recognising the idea of the unique print and they will never lend a print unless they have a negative, dupe or master. Subject to that reservation, it is understood that any member can have access to any films for non-commercial activities. It is somewhat unusual but it works very satisfactorily as if they have the money, they are able to print new material to meet members' requests. The circulation is however fairly limited, say 150 prints a year.

Mr KLAUE supported Mr BORDE's statement that we should be very careful and recalled the example of the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz where it had taken two or three years to get a statement on the degree of autonomy they had. He felt we should try to get a more satisfactory statement before taking a formal decision as there was no possibility of insisting on it afterwards.

Mr SPEHR referred back to the time when the South Koreans first wanted to join FIAF and visited various archives in the States, leaving most of them with the impression that their prime reason for joining was the fact that the North Koreans had joined. It was a political, face-saving move, and rather hasty at a time when they simply had a distribution mechanism for the commercial film industry. He felt that Mrs WIBOM's report indicated they had made considerable progress since those early days.

Mrs BOWSER agreed with Mr BORDE and Mr KLAUE and felt FIAF had worked too hard over too many years over autonomy to let it go lightly. She was aware of the difficulties, not least the communication problems, but on the basis of present information, she did not see how they could be accepted as Members.

Mr DAUDELIN suggested that it might provide a face-saving solution if members of the EC discussed the situation in Vienna with the representative from Seoul and suggest they postpone their candidature for a year. It would be important to explain that it was not a political decision against them but a basic principle for FIAF to insist on a demonstrable degree of autonomy.

Mr KLAUE felt that however objectively FIAF presented the case in terms of its Rules and Statutes, their decision would be seen against the political background, but this was not a reason for FIAF to abandon its established principles. He therefore welcomed this solution as more satisfactory than a formal decision by the EC at this stage which would have to be reported to the GM.

He suggested two or three people meet with them: Mrs WIBOM, Mr DAUDELIN, and perhaps Mrs BOWSER or Mr SPEHR. Mr DAUDELIN suggested Mr KULA.

Mr KULA wanted to clarify the nature of the proposed conversation: was

it restricted to the question of autonomy or was it to propose radical restructuring of the archival operation, which seemed rather extreme. He felt it was perfectly legitimate to ask for clarification on who it was that was responsible for the Archive (exchanges, national collection) as this did not emerge from the documentation supplied or from Mrs WIBOM's Report. If it was the active Director of the production company then there was a clear conflict on the question of autonomy which needed to be resolved; but it might turn out that somebody else was already responsible for the archival operation and a clear statement could be produced confirming that, in which case FIAF requirements would have been met.

Mr KLAUE said we could only ask for a clear statement on the degree of autonomy; it was up to them to decide whether that required restructuring.

Mrs WIBOM referred to the full dossier setting out the functions and goals of the Archive and it was agreed that these were in accord with the main tasks as seen by FIAF. The Director had said that he would be sending to the Congress the person responsible for running the Archive and appeared very willing to do this. However, out of the 8 directors of the archive, not one of them had a working knowledge of English, French or German, which made communication extremely difficult. In her view, it was a miracle they had made so much progress as most of the points discussed about the FIAF Rules and Statutes appeared to be completely new to them and they had been simply guessing at FIAF's objectives and ambitions. At her suggestion, they had agreed to translate the FIAF Statutes and Rules so that they could think about them and make them available to the staff as well.

Mr FRANCIS had not seen the main dossier but was struck by paragraph 2 of Mrs WIBOM's report: the name Korean Motion Picture Corporation sounded like a film production organisation but the description of its Articles of Association made it sound exactly like the British Film Institute. He felt a closer study of the parent organisation might resolve the matter and perhaps indicate that the English translation of its title was misleading.

Mr KLAUE felt it was probably closer to the Swedish Film Institute than the British Film Institute because production and promotion of the Korean industry came first.

Mrs WIBOM pointed out that for the first ten years of the Swedish Film Institute there was no production at all; the Film Institute intervened in production simply because the industry was having difficulties surviving. Similarly, in London, the BFI was getting more and more involved in production, distribution, import and sales. There were several governmental or semi-governmental bodies engaged in this type of support. Similarly, Seoul is not a production or distribution company and on the Board the representatives from the motion picture industry sit alongside members from the University, the Film School and the Ministry of Education. The set-up was very similar to that of EC members.

Decision

- Ask the Seoul delegate in Vienna to withdraw the formal

application for one year

- Have a friendly discussion clarifying what was wanted in the application, with clear statement of autonomy
- Group to consist of Mr DAUDELIN, Mrs WIBOM, Mrs BOWSER, Mr KLAUE, Mrs VAN DER ELST
- No mention at the GM

5.1b NEW MEMBERS: Sao Paolo

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that the archive had been Members from 1947 until 1968 when they left for financial reasons, recently rejoining as Observers. The archive's activities and the quality of its work were well-known through their Annual Reports, the many contacts over the years, and the visits of Mr KLAUE and Mr FRANCIS in 1977 and 1978 respectively. He reported that the Membership documents were very well-prepared but the 1983 Annual Report had not arrived.

Mr ALVES-NETTO, who is also a member of their Board of Directors, supported the candidature, pointing out that it was the oldest and the most important archive in Brazil. There was a new team but they had been trained by and continued in the spirit of Mr Sales Gomez. The two archives in Rio and Sao Paolo work closely together to avoid duplication and have a number of joint projects, including a communal classification system, and both archives use the restoration facilities at Sao Paolo. Their standing agreement to cooperate dates back ten years and the document required by Article 9 was submitted when they rejoined as Observers.

Like Rio, they have provided proof of deposit of their subscription although they have the same problems on exporting currency.

Mr KLAUE mentioned that for him Sao Paolo was the best example of an archive being developed in dialogue and cooperation with FIAF.

Mr FRANCIS supported Mr KLAUE's comment and mentioned that, in view of the many difficulties associated with setting up a laboratory in Latin America, he was positively excited by their achievements.

Mr GARCIA MESA hoped to visit them for the first time this year but confirmed that Sao Paolo was one of the oldest and most prestigious archives in Latin America and respect for their work was shared throughout the continent.

Mr TOEPLITZ wanted to express his pleasure at their return to the Federation as full Members as they had been so important to it in the early days; their prestige extended throughout the world.

As no-one felt it necessary to put any questions to Mrs GALVAO, the EC proceeded to a secret vote, with Mr KULA voting in Mrs WIBOM's absence.

DECISIONS

- Unanimously in favour.
- Mr GARICA-MESA will undertake the official visit on the occasion of the Latin American Seminar.

Mrs GALVAD was invited in to hear the decisions and was warmly congratulated by all.

5.2 NEW OBSERVERS: Manila/ Film Archive of the Philippines

Mr DAUDELIN reported that he had written at length on February 17 as agreed in Toulouse but had had no reply. He understood Mr KLAUE had spent a weekend with Mr DE PEDRO and Mr KULA had seen him a number of times.

Mr KLAUE confirmed that he had spent most of his visit with Mr DE PEDRO and his staff and, although he had asked him to reply formally to the letter, he felt he could answer most of the points raised:

- Film collection

The list of films supplied covered films under the Archive control but which were not yet deposited there because the air conditioning plant was not working and there were no shelves. He had a grant from the Association of Film Producers for installing shelves.

- Legal deposit system for films

This system came into force in the Philippines from February 15, 1984, by Presidential decree and the Archive is responsible for its operation.

- Archive personnel

There are 18 employees but no technicians. The organisation chart had been supplied, showing the concept for future development, with collection and preservation seen as the most important tasks.

- Archive equipment

During Mr KLAUE's visit, a Mr Seaburn from London had also been there negotiating sales of equipment and providing technical consultancy in selecting second-hand equipment from various sources.

- Budget

There are three sources of finance: a regular budget mostly from the umbrella organisation, an independent fundraising organisation set up by the archive (including banks, airline company, established personalities), and certain monies from funds controlled directly by the President or his wife.

- Autonomy

Mr DE PEDRO is trying to get more and more independent from the Manila Film Centre, which being under close control of the World Bank may possibly disappear. At the moment they are legally separate but have offices and storage areas in the same building.

- Activities

At the moment the Archive has two active areas: a Documentation Department & Library and a computer project for Cataloguing and Filmographic work; there is also some archive Publication activity (film catalogues, national filmographies, and related research work). They are discussing with Mr Seaburn plans to set aside and equip areas for technical inspection and restoration work.

Mr DE PEDRO is not an archivist but is recognised in his country as a film critic and journalist and has the support of the film producers. Two General Directors of the Film Academy of the Philippines had expressed to Mr KLAUE their support of the archive and its work in collecting and preserving their films; he mentioned in passing that they were very critical of the University Film Centre.

Mr DAUDELIN referred also to a single page xerox sheet describing the work of the Archive and a Reference Guide of the Filipino Films.

- Relations with other archives in the Philippines
 - University of the Philippines Film Centre (UPFC)

FIAF had at present no members in the Philippines but Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that a formal application for Observership had recently been received from Mrs Moreno of UPFC who had been in contact with several FIAF members over the years and had made an informal application in Lausanne (1981). The two individuals were obviously not very good friends.

Mr KLAUE mentioned that the Film Archive was represented at the Poona Seminar and had nominated a candidate for the FIAF Summer School in Berlin. He felt they had a clear concept and basis for their work and it would probably help them to be affiliated to FIAF as Observers. They would need further education before they could qualify for Membership although they were already clear that preservation must have a priority in archive activities.

Mr DAUDELIN wanted to stress 2 points:

- they had not one technician among 18 staff
- they had no film collection (films are "committed" but still held at the studios). The collection seems to consist only of portions cut from films following censorship by the Board of Review between 1978-81.

Mr KULA referred to the APEX (Asian Pacific Exchange data base on regional production) centered on the Manila Film Archive being built with Unesco funding which gave an indication of the Archive's intentions of becoming an important archive not only in the Philippines but in the whole region.

Mr NAIR asked for clarification of FIAF's attitude to these two would-be Observers:

- one had good intentions, good resources but no films
- the other had limited resources but had at least succeeded in building a small collection (280 films, mostly 16mm).

Mr KULA pointed out that the Archive did have films committed to it and FIAF would presumably approve the decision as sensible archival practice that the films should be retained by the film producers until such time as the Archive itself had operational storage facilities. He cited the fact that the National Film Board of Canada had been holding films designated for his archive for three years simply because their vaults were better than his. He felt that, as long as films were being held under appropriate conditions, the physical location or ownership of the vaults should not be the qualifying factor for admission to the Federation.

Mr KLAUE said that although he felt from his visit that Mr de Pedro could answer the questions posed in our letter of February 17, he should nevertheless be pressed to put his response in writing before a formal decision was made.

DECISION

- Postpone decision till autumn EC meeting.
- MM KLAUE and DAUDELIN to meet with Mr de Pedro in Vienna and explain need for formal reply in writing to our letter of February 17.
- Candidature of UPFC (university of the Philippines Film Center) to be examined at the next EC meeting as well.

5.3 RECONFIRMATION OF OBSERVERS

There were 24 Observers to be reconfirmed; most raised no problem but 10 cases needed some comment. Mr DAUDELIN referred to Reports from 5 of those Observers contained in the Book of Reports and recommended that the five Archives concerned (5.3a-e below) should be reconfirmed.

5.3a Algeria

He regretted that the Report was very short on information about the collection and preservation work. He felt it would be useful to talk to them about this in Vienna and would try to do so himself.

5.3b Cinémathèque Française

This had an extensive and impressive section on the preservation work undertaken in 1983.

5.3c Luanda

He regretted that they were unable to come to Vienna but felt the report was very encouraging and they were doing a lot of useful work.

5.3d Wellington, New Zealand

Very impressive report.

5.3e Comité de Fondation du Musée du Cinéma de Lyon

He felt it was very cheeky of them to put on their letterhead that they were "Members" of FIAF and suggested that Mr Genard should be asked to correct this, perhaps to "Affiliated to FIAF".

Later in the discussion, Mr BORDE mentioned that he was rather embarrassed by the situation in Lyon as although they had submitted an Annual Report and paid their Subscription, they had sold their collection of equipment to the City of Lyons, they had had no meeting for four or five years and no cultural activity. Eventually, the Institut Lumière was expected to apply to join FIAF. In the meantime, he accepted that they should be reconfirmed this year but felt that for 1985 much more information should be supplied and he volunteered to provide a detailed report on the situation.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the Report did mention that their activities continued, including loan of films and documents, lectures and screenings. He suggested that we could write straightaway asking them to supply more information in next year's Report. Mr BORDE agreed, stressing that we should ask about developments in the collections and for information about the Institution's activities as opposed to those of Mr Genard.

DECISION

- The Secretary-General to write to Mr Genard.
- All 5 reconfirmed.

Mr DAUDELIN reported that there were problems with five other Observers, including three in Latin America with whom we seemed to have lost contact. He asked Mr GARCIA MESA and Mr ALVES NETTO if they had any information or advice on these three situations.

5.3f Caracas

In spite of frequent letters there had been no response from them in recent years, no Report for 2 years and no Subscription for 3 years. There had also been no response to the "ultimatum" sent after Toulouse.

5.3g Bogota

They had not sent their Annual Report or Subscription for the last year.

5.3h Lima

They were two years late on Subscription and one year on their Annual Report.

Mr GARCIA MESA said he had telephoned Caracas, asking them to reply to the letters, submit the Annual Reports, and try to come to the congress in Vienna. They had told him they had enormous difficulties with the export of hard currency but promised to try to make an effort. Some weeks later, a member of the archive staff visiting Havana made a further promise.

He had also telephoned Mr Salcedo Silva in Bogota who said he would try to send a report but it was impossible to come to the congress or pay the subscription as they could not export hard currency.

He was sorry that in spite of all these promises neither archive had even written a letter.

Mr ALVES-NETTO had also written to Mr Salcedo Silva but with no response. He confirmed that the archive in Caracas was still operational although they had financial problems and the common problem of not being able to export hard currency; in Bogota and Lima, however, they were no longer active for various reasons.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that if they wanted to remain within the Federation they had to observe their obligations and should at least reply to letters and explain their situation. He felt it was time to give them a formal warning as had been done for Istanbul.

Mr DAUDELIN reported that Caracas had already been advised on June 17 1983 that service would cease and similarly Bogota had been advised in February 1984.

Mr GARCIA MESA reminded the EC of the Latin American seminar sponsored by Unesco to be held in October 1984 in Rio de Janeiro. They wanted to use the occasion to re-activate UCAL, the Regional Federation of Latin American Film Archives, and also put on the Agenda more active

collaboration with FIAF colleagues and especially a better understanding and cooperation with the Federation itself. He hoped therefore they would have better news to report to the EC meeting in Rome.

Mr KLAUE reiterated that difficulties over subscriptions might be resolved but total silence could not be ignored. Mr DAUDELIN read out the relevant Article 13 from the Rules and suggested that, administratively, the three cases should be treated together even though, as Mr CINCOTTI pointed out, the silence of Caracas, an archive that was still active, was more serious. There was some discussion as to whether the requirements of the Article had been properly observed and it was agreed that the Treasurer's request to the EC for deletion as a result of non-payment need not be in writing. The Treasurer formally requested deletion, subject to supplementary period of 3 further months for settlement.

DECISIONS

- Lima: Formal warning to be sent after Vienna.
- Caracas: Deletion, subject to supplementary period, approved by 9 votes, and 2 abstentions (Mrs ORBANZ, Mr GARCIA-MESA; Mr KULA voting in Mr ALVES-NETTO's temporary absence)
- Bogota: Deletion, subject to supplementary period, approved unanimously.

!! WORDING OF FIAF STATUTES & INTERNAL RULES: Future Project

After the voting, Mr CINCOTTI noted that there was a difference of terminology between the Statutes and the Internal Rules. The Statutes mentioned four ways of leaving the Federation under Article 9: Resignation, Deletion, Expulsion and Non-Confirmation whereas the Internal Rules mention Suspension instead of Non-Confirmation.

Mr KLAUE agreed this should be added to a list of problems to be resolved.

- 5.3i Hanoi
- 5.3j Brazzaville

Mr DAUDELIN reported that no Annual Report had been received from these two Archives, which prevented them from being reconfirmed.

Mr KLAUE mentioned he had heard from Hanoi at the beginning of February, asking for tickets for their participation in the Poona seminar and asking FIAF and Unesco for support to come to Vienna. Finally, they reported it was very difficult for them to pay the membership subscription but they planned to pay 1983 and 1984 together.

Mr CINCOTTI mentioned as a sign of Hanoi's activity that a cinematographic delegation from Hanoi which had visited Rome in the last year had included a Vice-Minister, and a representative from the archive. They had exchanged 6 films.

DECISIONS

- Mrs VAN DER ELST to send reminder to Hanoi and Brazzaville, explaining that Annual Reports are needed for reconfirmation requirements.
- All Observers were reconfirmed with the exception of the 5 discussed above (5.3f-i).

5.4 SPECIAL SITUATION: Istanbul

Before inviting Mr Sekeroglu and his interpreter into the EC meeting, Mr DAUDELIN reminded the EC of the latest situation by reading out his letter of June 13 which

- advised them of their suspension which would last until it would be reviewed by the GM again in Vienna,
 - hoped that a normal relationship might be restored, perhaps with the help of an informal meeting with an EC member, and
 - noted that the money mentioned in their telex would be applied to the earliest subscription year outstanding, ie 1981, and subsequent subscriptions were awaited.
- There had been no reply.

Mrs VAN DER ELST explained that they still owed subscriptions for 1982 onwards and had asked for an invoice stating the total amount as if for 1984 as they could not otherwise pay back years. They had said they would bring with them their Annual Report for 1983.

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that some minor matters concerning the Reconfirmation procedure needed sorting out but the main problem had been their persistent silence. It was suggested that they could be asked for an overall Report to cover the missing years.

In response to a question from Mr ALVES-NETTO, Mr KLAUE explained that two weeks previously Mr Sekeroglu had asked to come to Vienna and make a statement at the GM. In consultation, it had been decided that he should first be invited to explain the situation to the EC.

Mr Sekeroglu then joined the meeting together with a Turkish/German interpreter. Mrs DRBANZ provided the additional German/English interpreting link.

Mr KLAUE welcomed them to the EC and Mr DAUDELIN explained the EC's concern at the almost total silence since the reconfirmation procedure began some 4 years ago. There had been:

- no information had been received from the archive
- no replies to letters for three years
- no Annual Reports for 1981, 1982 or 1983
- no subscription for 1982, 1983, 1984
- no follow-up to promise in telex to Stockholm (27 May 1983) to send 1982 subscription and detailed information about activities.

One initial solution would be for Mr Sekeroglu to give a brief verbal report to the EC about what had been happening.

As far as could be understood from the multi-link translations, Mr Sekeroglu made the following points:

- he had been unable to attend the Congress for 9 years and he wanted to explain to FIAF what had been happening
- when the Archive was first an Observer it was a private organisation founded by him personally while still a student
- in 1970 it became a state organisation and for 3 years he continued to act as Director but he was not paid
- all the developments in the archive took place in that period, including establishing a modern organisation and a collection of 3000 films
- he was then (in 1973?) asked to become a civil servant or leave the archive; initially he stayed as the archive needed him as there was no one else trained. However he had to fight against increasing bureaucracy to keep the archive going and eventually he was asked to leave (in 19 ??)

!! Later, it emerged that his interpreter had misunderstood: he was never away from the Archive but simply deprived of his post as Director.

- he preferred not to talk about the political situation in Turkey in the last three years but mentioned that his situation was always changing, sometimes he was wanted at the archive, sometimes not. This was not due to national politics but because of the different groups aspiring to power in the University. However, he continued at the Film & TV Institute, both as a teacher and with the archive work, even when he was not officially in office.
- he had been reappointed Director three weeks ago and at that time had renewed contact with FIAF and had already signed documents for the subscriptions to be paid.
- quite a lot had been achieved in the archive in spite of these problems; 300,000 metres of historical documentary film on nitrate had been given to the Archive by the State which had previously kept them in poor storage conditions.

Mr KLAUE asked for further clarification on three main points. He added that he appreciated the difficult political situation in Turkey but asked Mr Sekeroglu to understand that FIAF as an international body had Statutes and Rules which had to be observed by all Members and Observers, but the Turkish Film Archive had not observed them in recent years. FIAF wanted to welcome the Turkish Film Archive back in the Federation but could only do so within the constraints of its regulations. He repeated the three points :

- why had there been such a long silence and lack of response to the many letters from FIAF ?
- why were there no Annual Reports on the activities of the archive even though he may have been absent ? This was a duty for every Archive within FIAF and, as all members were institutions, should not be dependent on the presence of one individual
- why were the promises made in the telegram signed by him as Director never kept ? could he produce any bank document to demonstrate that this time the subscription had been paid as it had still not been received ?

Mr Sekeroglu confirmed that he had always been working at the archive but said that in the past he had "no possibilities" to reply to FIAF questions. However he had invited someone from FIAF to visit the Archive in Turkey and see their activities; this invitation was still open.

On the question of the Subscriptions, he said that he personally had issued instructions to pay the monies for all the years outstanding but, within the University bureaucracy, only the Finance Department would deal with the Bank. He had no documents with him to prove it but, before leaving, he had been personally assured that the transaction had been completed. In view of previous unkept promises, Mr DE VAAL regretted he had not brought the proof with him and Mr Sekeroglu volunteered that they could obtain the proof before the Congress was over.

On the question of their silence and the lack of Annual Reports, he reminded the EC that in the last 3 years in Turkey there had been no possibility for anyone to participate in international activities, either by attending conferences or submitting reports. He had however brought a written Report to Vienna.

Mr TOEPLITZ expressed his sympathy to Mr Sekeroglu for his past difficulties. It was not reasonable to have expected him to sort out everything in the three weeks since he had been reappointed Director. FIAF would welcome the Archive back as Members but he suggested Mr Sekeroglu should take a longer period to assemble the documents and answer the questions needed to satisfy the membership requirements and re-apply next year when everything was in order.

At this point, there was a COFFEE BREAK during which Mr KLAUE met informally with the two representatives from Turkey. The meeting then resumed in their absence.

Mr KLAUE reported back to the EC that he had stressed that FIAF had always wanted the Archive to continue as Members but all sides were bound by the Rules. In addition, all appreciated from press reports that government institutions had not been allowed to send abroad information about their activities. It was clear that Mr Sekeroglu had hoped and expected that his presence in Vienna together with his explanations, the Annual Report and confirmation that outstanding Subscriptions had been paid, would be sufficient. However, Mr KLAUE had explained to him that, even if proof of payment could be supplied, the Report was inadequate in its coverage of the Archive's activities, working programmes and results. However, a decision could be taken at the next EC meeting in November.

They had again suggested that someone should visit Istanbul and he had stressed that it should not be seen as a formal inspection visit, but simply to give advice and guidance and have some first-hand information about the archive.

Mr KLAUE suggested the EC had 3 immediate decisions to make:

- whether a decision could be made in Vienna
- what specific requirements should be set out for the Archive to comply with before a favourable decision could be taken in November
- whether someone should visit the Archive before the EC decision was taken.

Meanwhile, the Archive could participate in the GM in Vienna as Visitors.

In discussion, Mr FRANCIS pointed out that they had been suspended until the Vienna Congress so if the decision was postponed till November, some interim definition of their status was required. He suggested it might be better for them to be re-established first as Observers rather than as full Members. He felt, in view of the unfortunate history of the case and if we accepted their explanations, it might be a friendly gesture towards them to formally admit them as Observers during this interim period. While appreciating the intention, Mr KLAUE felt this would not be possible under the FIAF regulations which only provided for "reinstatement" of the previous status. Mr DAUDELIN felt that the offer of a visit to help them complete the dossier would itself be a friendly gesture.

Mr TDEPLITZ saw no reason for a friendly gesture: there had been similar problems with this Archive for the last twenty years and it was time for FIAF to insist that they demonstrate they are a serious archive, not simply a screening organisation. There was no provision in the Rules for them to be reinstated as Observers.

Mrs ORBANZ did not feel it was necessary to define an interim status as the EC could simply extend the suspension period. Mr KLAUE pointed out that they were still within the two year period mentioned in the Rules. He felt however, that the "friendly gesture" of a visit was for the EC a new inspection to enable them to assess the situation before taking a decision. Mr DE VAAL felt that taking the decision in November instead of waiting a full year was in itself a "friendly gesture". Mr FRANCIS stressed that, although suspension could be up to two years, the GM had formally decided in this case after extensive discussion that suspension would be "up until Vienna". If they wished to extend the suspension period, then they should take another formal decision to do so. Mr KLAUE agreed that the GM Members' Only session should therefore be formally asked to approve the extension till November.

It was agreed that the Archive should be asked to provide:

- a Information on their activities
 - detailed Report for 1983, using the FIAF model for guidance on content, with specific reference to archival as distinct from merely cultural activities
 - summary Report for previous years
- b Proof of Subscription payment for all missing years
- c Proof of autonomy
 - confirmation of autonomy following change of title to Turkish Cinema TV Institute and directorial changes
 - identification of the Chief Executive within the Archive, with formal statement of his responsibilities and authority
 - definition of the relationships between the Archive and the larger organisation
- d Formal presentation of complete dossier

integration of responses to FIAF questions set out in their letter of April 9, 1981 and all other items required by Membership Confirmation procedures.

On the question of the Visit, it was pointed out that no-one had been there since MM KLAUE and KULA's visit after Varna in 1977. Mr POGACIC mentioned he had visited them twice in the past and pointed out that at that time the archive laboratory was providing a commercial service; it was important that they should be inspected in accordance with the Rules even though they might not like it. At the same time, it was important for FIAF to be represented in Turkey even though the Archive might not be all that we would wish. Mr KLAUE stressed that in the present situation it would be against the Rules for the visit to be called an Inspection Visit even though in fact the EC would be reluctant to take a decision without a visit. It was agreed that Mr DAUDELIN should therefore visit them en route to Rome.

The Turkish members were then invited to rejoin the meeting.

Mr DAUDELIN, with Mrs ORBANZ as interpreter, formally reported to them the EC decisions:

- i Recommendation to the GM that suspension be maintained until the next EC meeting in November
- ii Request to Archive to provide before the November meeting:
 - detailed report on activities in 1983, covering all archive activity with special reference to preservation, using FIAF's recommended model which will be mailed to them by the Secretariat
 - normalisation of the financial situation
 - clarification in writing on status of autonomy of Archive and status of Mr Sekeroglu as Director, as described verbally to the EC

Mr DAUDELIN stressed that the EC had tried to find ways to help the Archive comply with FIAF's strict Rules and felt that, if a member of the EC accepted their invitation and visited them en route to Rome, he would be able to help ensure that the dossier was in good order in readiness for the meeting.

He also confirmed that Mr Sekeroglu would be welcome to attend the Vienna GM with Visitor status and hoped that he would participate in the GM and both the Symposia.

Mr Sekeroglu thanked the EC and confirmed he would be happy to receive whoever wished to visit the Archive. He would however prefer not to stay for the meetings in Vienna.

Mr KLAUE thanked him for coming to Vienna and assured him once more that FIAF was very keen to receive the Turkish Archive back into the Federation. He was very pleased that dialogue with the Archive had been reestablished after such a long time.

!! Outside the EC meeting, Mr ALVES-NETTO was able to persuade Mr Sekeroglu to remain in Vienna and participate in the Congress.

5.5 MISCELLANEOUS

5.5a UCLA/AFI

Mr DAUDELIN assumed everyone had received the letter from UCLA confirming that during Mr Rosen's leave of absence he would be replaced by Mr Richmond. He pointed out however that no-one had informed FIAF officially of the situation at AFI. There had also been no response to the letter sent in January 1984 to Ms Jean Firstenberg at AFI, with copy to UCLA, which may have gone astray since in early March some American colleagues had reported that she had never received it.

Mrs BOWSER reported she had had a long discussion with Mr Rosen in New York two weeks after he took up his new position in February. He was not aware of the letter and she had pointed out that it needed a reply as his position in Vienna needed to be resolved. He had convinced her that although there was a new organisation the actual work would be similar to that of the AFI Archive Programme. Initially, they were vague about the programme of the new Preservation Center but, in response to requests, had produced descriptive documents, both for the Archives Advisory Committee meeting and in a booklet on the occasion of the Life Achievement Award to Lillian Gish.

She did not anticipate any problem but was extremely annoyed that they had not been courteous enough to supply FIAF with an explanation, especially following her discussion with Mr Rosen who was of course familiar with FIAF. As it stood at the moment, the change of name without notification to FIAF meant that they were no longer voting members of FIAF.

Mr SPEHR agreed but understood that the changes would not be confirmed until they had appointed the proposed new Board of Directors which would be separate from the Board of the AFI.

ACTION

Day 1

Mr DAUDELIN to ask Mr Rosen before the GM if he had brought a document for FIAF, indicating who he was representing.

Day 2

Mr DAUDELIN reported he had met Mr Rosen who had brought copy of a 4-page letter to the Secretariat dated March 19, together with an Organisation Chart, explaining the details of the Name Change and associated Administrative Changes. The overall effect would mean greater autonomy and expansion of the preservation activities, with a national mandate.

Mrs BOWSER and Mr SPEHR confirmed they were both satisfied now they had written confirmation of the new situation.

Mr KULA asked if the change of structure, with the creating of a separate Board, was such that FIAF rules required them to make a new application for membership. Mr DAUDELIN stressed that it was primarily a name change and they remained within the AFI.

6 REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

6.1 PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Mr SCHOU introduced the Commission Report which covered work in progress and reports from the two Regional Sub-Commissions, and asked in particular if the EC felt there was too much technical information.

On item 2.2, he was particularly pleased to report that the FIAF test film on assessment of picture and sound quality had been accepted by the SMPTE for presentation at their first International Conference in Sydney.

Following a question from Mrs BOWSER noting there was no mention of their plans for Revision of the Basic Handbook for Film Archives, it was decided the Total List of Projects should be included as an Annex to the main Report.

Mr SCHOU said they had had no response to their paper in the Bulletin on Quality Control so, in order to make better contact with technicians, they would like to ask delegates at the GM for the names and mailing addresses of their Chief Technicians.

Video tape discussion

Mr FRANCIS was concerned about FIAF's involvement in video tape preservation, especially as there were so many aspects of film to be covered. He would like discussion of FIAF's policy.

Mr SCHOU said he had raised the question himself at the Toulouse EC as he felt members of the GM might well want help and at the moment the Commission had no expertise to offer. There was so little overlap they would need to have two separate Working Groups so, as a more satisfactory solution, he had consulted with Mr KULA in his capacity as Chairman of the FIAT Technical Commission to establish a working relationship and exchange of information.

When asked if the FIAT Technical Commission was a reality, Mr KULA explained that the structure of the industry was such that the members of FIAT did not have the engineering skills within the archives in the same way as within FIAF. He agreed that FIAF had plenty to do already on the film side but thought that if video preservation matters became a concern of members in the future they might have to set up a separate Group within the Preservation Commission.

Mr FRANCIS was concerned that if FIAF started to publish information on video acquired at second hand rather than from members' practical experiences and if it was not to their same high standards, they could damage their international reputation in the area of film in which they were the acknowledged experts.

Mr SPEHR mentioned that with video they were concerned with the area of magnetic recording which was of interest to all members and institutions concerned with sound.

Mr KULA mentioned that this point was relevant to their plans for organising a joint Technical Symposium in Berlin in 1987 when they hoped to cooperate with the Technical Committees of the EBU, SMPTE, BKSTS and other international organisations involved with the technology of magnetic recording. In film, FIAF members ran their own laboratories and set the standards; in television the situation was totally different. He agreed with Mr FRANCIS' point about the potential for damaging FIAF's reputation.

Mr SCHOU suggested one should therefore consider whether to remove the video section from the Preservation Manual altogether. Mr FRANCIS agreed and felt it merited serious consideration. He felt it important to retain the historical part on magnetic recording but thought one might indicate that the question of video preservation was still under consideration as it was such a new media. One could also mention that the topic was being studied in collaboration with FIAT.

Mr KULA thought a change might be difficult in view of the long history of the project and the repeated negotiations with Unesco. He and Mr SCHOU explained that, following the BKSTS criticisms and because of FIAF's own lack of expertise, they had submitted the video section to one commercial specialist and were now seeking a second opinion. They were expecting final changes within three months and Mr SCHOU was already concerned at the extended time scale.

Mr SPEHR felt that there were some video topics the Preservation Commission should address, particularly the transfer of film formatted material to video. They could provide members with useful information on the available systems, the resolutions, the formatting of video material. There would be economic pressures on archives to use video rather than film transfer and the questions of quality, durability, image registration, image comparisons, would need to be addressed. Mr SCHOU confirmed that they intended to work in this area of overlap and their principal role would be to act as an Information Centre. They did have some relevant expertise already: for instance, as a chemist, he could advise on the stability of video tape.

Mr KLAUE suggested that comparisons of transfer results could be the subject of a Technical Symposium, as a follow-up to the Brighton Congress. Mr KULA confirmed that the topic was a serious contender for the Joint Symposium.

Other topics

Mr SPEHR asked for clarification of the Commission's work on quality control and evaluation of laboratory work. In the last few years, they had established a separate Quality Control Unit within their archive which was independent of the laboratory and management was asking for information on standards. Mr SCHOU referred to the paper on Quality Control in the Bulletin and described their plans to try and draw up Guidelines for FIAF standards.

Mr KULA asked when they hoped to publish the expanded version of Notes on Basic Film Handling prepared for the Stockholm Conference by Harold Brown and Kevin Patton. Mr SCHOU said the Notes already existed but

because of Mr Brown's illness he did not know why there was a delay. Mrs BOWSER asked if the notes could be incorporated in the Basic Handbook. Mr SCHOU thought they were too detailed but they would certainly prepare a summary for the Handbook.

6.2 DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION

Mrs STAYKOVA reviewed and updated the Commission's written Report which had been prepared before the Commission's meetings in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, the previous week:

1.1 Microfiche Service

The new service had been successfully introduced without complaints or cancellations. Two new subscriptions had been received: Cineteca Nacional, Mexico, and Bibliotheque Andre Malraux, Paris.

1.2 Film Volumes

These were being published sooner each year. For 1983, the first year using computer output, they will have to hire someone to add accents and diacritical marks by hand and have asked the Treasurer if FIAF can provide some funds for this purpose. For later years, they hope to find a computer service that can handle all the accents and diacritical marks needed.

1.3 Television Volumes

Sales of the first volume have been disappointing so far (55 sold to date, 180 needed to break even), principally because the American market was not developed following Mr Karr's departure from AFI. The second volume is due out in six weeks. At the moment they had no cash flow problems so would not need to take up Mr CINCOTTI's offer of a loan but Mrs STAYKOVA thanked him for keeping the offer open in case it was needed in the future.

1.4 10-year microfiche cumulation of Film Index

Even though 133 fiches were needed instead of the estimated 85 and even though they had only sold 35 sets, this publication was already in profit. The publication of the accompanying booklet is in abeyance as they felt they could not justify spending the estimated £700 until more copies were sold.

1.5 Promotion

Because AFI was no longer able to help with order handling in the American market, payment is still awaited for 200 standing orders; in addition, a US mailing sent out from Europe may well have generated new orders which AFI has not processed. The Editor will be approaching a professional distribution service, Ebsco Publications Inc., to handle the US market.

1.6 PIP Supporters' Meetings

There had been no response to the mass appeal at the Stockholm GM for additional support from "richer" archives so it had been decided to try the personal approach to specific archives.

1.7 Budget

In 1983, postage had exceeded budget because of the brochure mailing (the FIAF grant of £1000 had covered printing only).

2 PIP Indexers Meetings

Mrs STAYKOVA reiterated the comments in the Report that the indexers had found the meetings very helpful and would welcome the opportunity to meet periodically. This was of course dependent on the availability of funds and a willing host. Meanwhile, they were very grateful to those who made the three meetings possible.

3 International Directory of Cinematographers,
Set & Costume Designers

Mrs STAYKOVA added that Volume 6 would probably cover 4 countries (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Switzerland) and that the archives in each country had already promised to prepare the material.

They had an excellent arrangement with the publisher Saur who published at no cost to FIAF and in addition provided them with 100 complimentary copies; Saur had also suggested publishing 5 year supplements with additions and corrections.

4 International Bibliography of Dissertations on Cinema

Mrs BOWSER is continuing with this project and has already sent out the circular letter. The data base is being held on a computer base.

5 International Directory of Film and TV Documentation Sources

The questionnaire was discussed at Plovdiv and the revised version will be mailed in June 1984 with a September 30 deadline.

6 Other projects

6.1 Revision of FIAF Classification Scheme

It may not be possible to hold the October 1984 Classification Workshop in Lisbon as the Librarian is leaving. Mrs STAYKOVA would be exploring alternatives in Vienna: they needed access to a large library in a place that was not too expensive.

6.2 Revision of Documentation chapter, Handbook for Film Archives

Tasks had been assigned and they expected to meet the deadline easily.

Projects suggested by the GM in Stockholm :

6.3 PIP Indexing of an Indian periodical

Mr Moulds will choose one from the two suggested by Mr NAIR and it is hoped Mr NAIR will be able to undertake the indexing. Mr NAIR pointed out that one had since stopped publication.

6.4 PIP Indexing of articles in non-film/TV periodicals

6.5 Bibliographical file of articles on film archive activities
Initially, they were assembling a list of indexes and abstracts in printed or computerised form of non film/TV periodicals and this bibliography might be included with the Documentation Chapter of the revised Handbook. Mr Moulds will then review the periodicals (and possibly newspapers) and decide which were worth indexing. This would then also provide input for 6.5, the project suggested by Mr KULA.

6.6 Survey of Film Title Equivalences, for film identification
This is a major project which would require considerable research work by archives and was outside the scope of the Documentation Commission at the moment.

6.7 Central Registry of Duplicates of Books and Other Materials
The Commission had already been considering this important and desirable project for a long time but it was beyond their present capabilities.

6.8 Ideas to mark FIAF 50th Anniversary
They proposed to write the history of the Documentation Commission and organise a major exhibition of FIAF and PIP publications.

7 Meetings

In reviewing the meetings, Mrs STAYKOVA mentioned that the joint meeting with the Cataloguing Commission had been particularly successful and several of the proposed joint projects had already been initiated by various volunteers.

Mrs STAYKOVA closed with 3 additional items not covered in the Report:

- Two additional publications envisaged by PIP: the revised Subject Headings for the Film index (TV will not be revised) and revised Guidelines for Indexers. These had not been budgeted for in 1984 but they would welcome help from the Treasurer if any funds were available.

Following the suggestion at Stockholm, the EC were asked to review a draft letter asking developing countries to appeal to Unesco to subsidise the provision of the PIP Film Service on microfiche.

Finally, at the meeting in Plovdiv, they had accepted with deep regret the resignation of Mrs BOWSER from the Commission and thanked her for all her work and for saving the PIP on so many occasions. It was their first full Commission meeting since 1981 so they had also formally accepted the resignation of John Luyckx who had left the Nederlands Filmmuseum in 1982.

In the subsequent discussion, Mrs BOWSER felt it should be mentioned that Bob Rosen had formally written to PIP saying that AFI could no longer afford to carry the distribution of the publications which was taking the time of one half-person.

Mr DE VAAL had already discussed with Mrs STAYKOVA the various requests for financial support. Mrs ORBANZ felt that no decisions involving money for PIP projects should be made before the PIP Supporters meeting in Vienna and Mr KLAUE suggested that the matter should be postponed until the second EC meeting

In the discussion of the draft letter asking Unesco to fund the PIP microfiche service for developing countries, Mr KLAUE and Mr POGACIC both suggested it was important to discuss the idea first with Unesco at the Experts' Meeting. In response to Mr ALVES-NETTO who understood that it had already been discussed with Unesco, Mr KLAUE explained that it had only been in general terms: Unesco had some

money to provide archives in developing countries with literature but FIAF needed advice on what was possible. In response to Mr KLAUE'S further point that Unesco could make no continuing commitments over more than one year, Mrs STAYKOVA suggested it would therefore be better to ask for the 12-year microfiche cumulation. Mrs ORBANZ pointed out that the readers were also very expensive; murmurs suggested disagreement.

6.3 CATALOGUING COMMISSION

Mrs HARRISON presented two Reports, one for the GM and one for the EC only, and opened by referring to the useful meetings in Plovdiv, the hospitality of the Bulgarian archive and their appearance on Bulgarian television.

Three projects were nearing completion (1A of GM Report):

- Bibliography of National Filmographies

They also had problems with accents etc but had decided not to delay publication further.

- Polyglot Glossary for Film Cataloguing Terms

They were sad to have had no response from Moscow and will therefore publish without Russian, in English, French, German and Spanish only. They were pleased to report that the draft lists were already being used as standards for computerised credit terms.

- Computer Survey

Substantial progress had been made recently and replies now totalled 34, of which 5 use computers and 21 are planning to. The responses reflected considerable change since the last survey, reflecting the rapid developments in technology. She asked the EC for help in soliciting replies from the 19 archives who had not yet replied including several members of the EC itself. They aim to publish by the end of December 1984. A preliminary draft has already been shown to Unesco.

Problems had arisen because of the absence of standards for recording the size of collections and she suggested Roger Smither would be willing to assist Mr KULA in his work in this area.

Continuing Projects (1B of GM Report) included:

- Standard rules for cataloging

Various queries had been discussed at the recent meeting and work was continuing.

- Union List of Nitrate Holdings

At Stockholm they had agreed to use the ISBD country codes but the Documentation Commission had pointed out there were no codes for countries that no longer existed, eg unified Germany, or had changed their name, so Mr Smither was working further on it.

They also still had to decide on individual archive codes: they would prefer to use the 2-letter ISBD country code with a single character mnemonic for the archive, rather than the cities used by FIAF current practice but would like advice from the EC. The ISBD country code would be more useful than the cities as a sorting code.

Mrs HARRISON closed by mentioning three further points:

- In all their work, they were concerned with standards to simplify exchanges of computer information.
- A draft list of proposed projects was prepared for submission to Unesco
- The draft of the Cataloguing Chapter for the Revised Handbook has already been prepared by Jon Gartenberg. There was no time to discuss it at their meeting so Commission members would be sending written comments to the author.

On the question of codes, Mrs ORBANZ felt it would be useful to use the same codes as in Embryo and the Silent Feature Film Catalogue. Mr KLAUE said he thought these projects had used the FIAF convention of city codes and the archives' own abbreviations but it might be more professional to use the more widely accepted ISBD codes. He didn't think FIAF had particularly strong feelings either way and it would be best for the Commission to find a solution. Mrs HARRISON stressed that the archive name and address would remain unchanged and the list could be arranged by city; they were simply concerned with the code for computer sorting. As no-one was against it, the EC agreed to leave the decisions on details to the Commission.

7 FINANCIAL REPORT : INTERIM STATEMENT

Mr DE VAAL reminded the EC that the Budget Report for the GM had already been discussed at Toulouse so he simply had to introduce the Interim Statement for the first quarter of 1984.

He and Mrs VAN DER ELST pointed out that the postage and telephone was high because of the preparations for the early Congress. On the positive side, the publicity campaign had brought results in increased sales for publications so that in three months their sales had exceeded the whole of the sales for 1983.

8 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER NGO'S

8.1 Regional Seminar in Poona

Mr NAIR read out his draft report giving details of the First Asian Seminar on Developing Film Archives, the background to its planning and the results of contacts with 18 countries to identify potential participants.

Participants came from 9 countries (Bangladesh, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Iran, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Sri Lanka & Thailand) and of the 6 experts, 4 came from FIAF (MM KLAUE, KULA, SCHOU and Mrs WIBOM). There were also delegates from various organisations connected with film and television in India.

The following needs and priorities were identified:

- 1 Technical advice in the planning & development of audio-visual archives
- 2 Technical training in the handling of nitrate films
- 3 Search for lost films
- 4 Technical information & familiarisation with film archive processes
- 5 Training for archive personnel

In the ensuing discussion, Mr KULA reported that he felt it had been a very successful seminar. He felt that the experience Mr NAIR had in identifying potential candidates for the seminar was an important factor in organising future regional seminars. Working through the Unesco mechanism can be unrewarding as the invitations have to go through the Unesco High Commission in the country concerned and it is difficult to get the invitation to the right people, even when you know who they are. In this case, there had been the additional handicap of Unesco delays in giving the go ahead. He was glad that Mr KLAUE had drawn attention to Mr NAIR's mention that it was the First Asian Seminar, implying that others would follow.

Mr KLAUE felt it was a very good example of close cooperation with Unesco. He felt it also raised the problem of the regionalisation of the Federations's work: there were many archives who with Unesco or other help might be able to attend a regional seminar but had no possibility to attend a FIAF Congress and it was necessary to consider how a working relationship with such archives could be maintained. There was an increasing number of archives in remote regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America who had no possibility of regular contact with FIAF activities. He felt this matter should be discussed at some time in the future after the next Regional Seminar in Latin America. At one stage, they had a rule of regional representation on the EC which might be useful. Finally he found it a fascinating and pleasant surprise to find young people with a personal commitment for archive work which called to mind the enthusiasm of the early archive pioneers.

DECISION

Mr NAIR to give shortened version of the Report at GM under point 12.

B.2 Preparation for the Experts' Meeting, 11-12 April

This item was held over to the EC2 meeting on April 7.

B.3 Other Unesco-FIAF Projects

Mr KLAUE reported on the following contracts and projects:

- two contracts signed for the preparation of the Experts' Meeting, with most of the preparation being undertaken by Mr BORDE and Mrs VAN DER ELST.

- a contract signed for the bilateral exchange of trainees, with specific mention of Tanzania/Pyong Yang and Sri Lanka/Ottawa. The sum allocated was more than needed for these two so other exchanges

could be arranged.

- the publication of the Preservation Manual was not yet part of a contract because of the new problem of combining it with Dr Roads' publication. Mr KULA reported that both he and the Preservation Commission understood they were already bound by contract. Mr KLAUE said there were two offers: printing of the Manual as it stands (\$10,000) or an increased contribution if the two publications can be combined perhaps as two volumes. Mr KULA mentioned that this gave them the opportunity of publishing in both English and French and perhaps also Spanish. The matter would be discussed at the Experts' Meeting

- discussions were continuing on the two Regional Seminars. Confirmation had been given for both Brazil and Mozambique.

- following the Poona Seminar, FIAF had been invited to draft a proposal to send an expert to the Asian countries who wanted advice on the future development of their film archives. Official requests had already been submitted by Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Hong Kong and Bangladesh and would also be discussed at the Experts' Meeting.

8.4 Relations with other NGO's

- Liaison Group

Mr KLAUE reported that FIAF had hosted a Liaison Group meeting in Brussels two weeks previously and interest to cooperate and exchange information remained. CICT (Conseil International du Cinema et de la Television) were invited for the first time and although three people attended at various sessions it was felt they made no contribution. Unesco was also represented, by Mr Evans from PGI and Mr Naidenov from the Division of Book Promotion & International Exchange.

The main discussion concerned possible proposals for the Experts Meeting in Vienna, including:

- Directory of archival institutions
- strong support for a new Technical Symposium
- international survey of situation of archives in moving images
- pilot project for audio-visual archive to be supported not by Communications sector but by PGI (probably a FIAF project)
- regional seminar on television archives, perhaps in Kuala Lumpur, autumn 1984
- training and model curriculum for archive staff

It was clear that the Communications sector was now responsible for audio-visual archives and PGI for paper archives, libraries and information documentation.

Mr KULA mentioned that through the French TV archive, l'Institut National de l'Audio-visuel, FIAT planned to publish by the end of 1984 a manual on basic television archiving, called 'Panorama', which paralleled the FIAF Manual for Film Archives. It would be in French but Unesco was being asked to support publication in other languages.

- ICA

Mr KLAUE mentioned that FIAF had been invited to the ICA meeting in

Bonn. Mr KULA would not be attending and Mr KAHLENBERG was the host so at the EC2 they should decide who should represent FIAF.

9 FUTURE CONGRESSES

9.1 1985: New York

NB This item was taken out of sequence during the first morning, to enable Mrs Mary Lea Bandy, Director of the Museum of Modern Art, Department of Film, and responsible for the financial side, to participate in the discussion.

Mrs BOWSER introduced the 6-page Status Report distributed to the EC, noting in particular:

- The GM would be held in the University Club nearby which had to be vacated at 4.30, so the Members Only session, including the elections, was scheduled for the evening of April 30, in MMA.
- The Technical Symposium (in the new preservation screening room permitting side by side comparisons) and the Computer Cataloguing Workshop would be repeated; and, subject to demand, there would be one Basic Film Cataloguing Workshop. (All 3-hour sessions, May 1)
- Display of FIAF & other publications (May 1)
- Two-day Slapstick Symposium (4 x 3-hour sessions, May 2/3)
- Excursion (perhaps to new vaults) still to be arranged (May 4)
- Information on the two Symposia would be circulated to all members, to ask for help and material, and to clarify what was wanted for the Slapstick Identification Seminar to be held beforehand.
- Block reservations had been taken at the Salisbury Hotel; cheaper accommodation was offered by the Pickwick Hotel
- The State Department had been asked for support for delegates from many countries, in particular those attending the Basic Needs sessions in Stockholm.

On the financial side, Mrs BANDY confirmed that the Museum would underwrite all the costs at their end; in addition, a proposal was being submitted to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) whose Chairman, Frank Hodson, was personally interested in film preservation, for a special grant for the Congress. She suggested it would be advisable if invitations (perhaps to the Slapstick Symposium) could be issued to members of the NEA and to the New York State Council on the Arts who fund film archive programmes throughout the United States so that some of the political funders might become more aware of the work undertaken within FIAF. She anticipated that the New York State Council would provide a grant and arrange events in New York City for some participants.

Mrs BANDY concluded by saying:

- Arrangements could be made for all lunches and dinners to be hosted but they were aware that delegates would also appreciate some free time.
- They looked forward to showing their new screening rooms, theatre, study centre in the Museum and hopefully the new storage facility
- They were working closely with David Francis on their 50th

Anniversary programme, The History of the British Cinema, which would be shown in the Museum's other theatre during the Congress.

Mrs BOWSER confirmed that the budgeted FIAF contribution would be put towards the costs of translation and recording. She assumed FIAF would be funding the costs of Mrs VAN DER ELST and Ms JOHNSON. MMA wanted the latter to stay for the whole congress and help during the Symposium so, if necessary, MMA could contribute to her additional staying costs.

During questions, Mrs BOWSER confirmed that their 5th floor theatre had nitrate facilities.

Mr KLAUE asked Mrs BOWSER to make particular mention to the GM of :

- languages for simultaneous translation (GM: English, French, Spanish; Symposium: English, French; Spanish if enough room)
- current accomodation prices for members' budgeting purposes

He also suggested private discussions with countries which might have visa difficulties, eg Cuba, N Korea (He thought financial reasons would rule out Vietnam's participation).

During a subsequent item, reference was made to the possibility of charging fees for Visitors. Mr KLAUE mentioned that for Vienna 80 - 100 delegates were expected but 150 were on the list; unfortunately, no plans had been made to charge Visitors.

DECISIONS

- EB to give extended verbal report at the GM.
- American archives to prepare list of useful governmental Visitors.
- Fees for Visitors, if necessary, to be costed out for next EC meeting.

9.2 1986: Canberra

Before discussing the Progress Report on Congress Preparations, sent with Mr Edmondson's March 30 letter to Mr KLAUE, Mr SCHOU mentioned the political situation in Australia. The Prime Minister had issued a statement in September 1983 that the Archive should have more resources including more people but they were still waiting for the Cabinet to make a decision, in spite of extensive lobbying by the film industry. The Archive was hopeful that its situation would be improved, that it would have greater autonomy (with its own letterhead for instance), but even without change, there were no problems about holding the Congress.

The document was then reviewed in detail and the following points made:

i Dates

The dates, chosen to keep travel costs down, were confirmed.

ii Travel subsidies

NFA sponsorship of Australian \$20,000 for travel gratefully accepted. (NFA were also exploring cultural exchange agreements to get further

assistance with air fares).

Mr DAUDELIN felt that the NFA suggestion that the FIAF budget of Australian \$10,000 should also be allocated to providing travel subsidies might create an unwelcome precedent. He felt it preferable for the the hosts to be paid the \$10,000 and then to increase their sponsorship offer accordingly if they wanted to. Mr DE VAAL pointed out that the present FIAF Congress Budget was intended to meet translation costs and should be paid as usual to the host country who could then decide how it should be used.

iii FIAF Budget headings for Congresses

In connection with the discussion concerning possible use of the FIAF Congress Budget for travel subsidy, Mr DE VAAL took up the point made in Mr Edmondson's report that FIAF should consider contributing towards travel costs for distant congresses. He felt FIAF had a duty to consider the possibility of an item in its Budget for supporting travel to Congresses. It should however be separate from the existing Congress Budget which was intended for translation costs.

Mr KULA agreed that it was important that the Congress Host should decide how the FIAF Congress Contribution should be spent. Some countries could easily pay for support in their own currency but had no possibility of providing travel subsidies which required the use of other currencies.

iv Allocation of travel subsidies

NFA had suggested the EC should be responsible for the allocation. Mrs ORBANZ felt some Guidelines would be needed and Mr SCHOU said that, if the EC preferred not to be responsible for the actual administration, NFA would like to call on the EC's greater knowledge of individual needs.

DECISIONS

- FIAF to pay the Congress Budget of Aust.\$10,000 to the host as usual
- FIAF to offer advice as required to help the NFA in allocation of travel subsidies, to help ensure a good balance of participation.

v Accommodation

Mr KLAUE suggested there should be 3 price categories for accommodation. There had been complaints that the accommodation in Vienna was relatively expensive and that there had been no choice.

vi Symposia

As a result of a meeting earlier in the day with Mrs HARRISON, Mr SCHOU asked for the following rewording of the text describing the objectives of the Symposium on Computer Applications in order to reflect the work already done under the auspices of the Cataloguing Commission:

"(a) to emphasise the subject as a matter for international concern within FIAF

(b) to provide a forum for facilitating the principles of standardisation and cooperation which FIAF has been working to establish and promulgate"

(c) unchanged

In response to a question from Mr KLAUE, Mr SCHOU confirmed that NFA took full responsibility for organising both Symposia but would appreciate any help FIAF could provide. Both topics were approved.

vii Seminar for developing archives

Mr SCHOU reported that they hoped the provision of the Seminar would make it easier for delegates to get economic justification for the trip and they would be seeking help from Unesco. It was agreed to put this proposal on the list to be discussed with Unesco at the Experts' Meeting in Vienna.

Mr KLAUE confirmed that FIAF could help with nominations. The financial side should be discussed in conjunction with Mr DE VAAL's proposal that a separate Budget item should be created for travel subsidies, either for Congresses only or for FIAF events (including the Summer School).

DECISIONS

- Mr SCHOU to give a verbal Report at the GM and a typed version would be distributed.
- At the suggestion of Mr SPEHR, archives wanting help with travel should be asked to apply in writing to NFA as soon as possible.
(Transcriber's Note: Not found in GM Report)

9.3 Future Congresses

Mr KLAUE suggested formal decisions should be made for the years 1987, 1988 and possibly 1989 if there was a firm invitation.

- 1987

Mr DAUDELIN reported that following the discussion at Toulouse, a formal invitation had been issued on March 30 by Dr Rath sack of the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, West Berlin. They hoped to combine the FIAF Congress with the formal opening of their new buildings.

Mrs DRBANZ explained they were willing to hold the joint Technical Symposium suggested as a follow-up to Stockholm but this would mean using the new Congress Centre in Berlin which, because of Berlin's 750th Anniversary that year, was only available March 16-21. If this was too early, then they would have to find an alternative location which would probably not be large enough for the joint Symposium. She would need a decision on the March date in Vienna.

Mr KLAUE and Mr KULA spoke of the interest in a second joint Symposium shared by members of the International Liaison Group, in particular, FIAT and IASA, and also by Unesco. It was felt that 1987, 4 years after Stockholm, was good timing and West Berlin a good location in view of the availability of radio and TV stations, film laboratories, etc. Both stressed that it would involve much more work and much more money than a regular FIAF Congress and would require the cooperation and active participation of these other organisations, and considerable advance planning.

Mr FRANCIS thought the early date might be a problem for some archives who would have to budget for two Congresses in one year but it was

felt most people could find a solution.

DECISIONS

- Formal decision at the GM.
- If approved, inform other NGO's and invite their proposals and possible financial contribution
- Discussion at next FIAF EC meeting
- Establish international working group in 1985 to prepare detailed plans.

- 1988

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that after Toulouse he had telephoned Mr Schmitt to confirm enthusiastic response of EC to have the 50th Anniversary in Paris. Mr Schmitt confirmed the contacts made with CNC and welcomed the idea that all the French archives in FIAF should participate in the organisation, with one archive responsible for coordination.

Mr BORDE mentioned that on his recent visit to Toulouse the General Secretary of CNC had confirmed that the FIAF members in France would be the joint hosts.

- 1989

Mr DAUDELIN reported he had not yet had a reply from Lisbon to his letter asking if their 1988 invitation could be transferred to 1989. He would meet with them in Vienna.

No other decisions would be made until formal invitations were received.

10 MISCELLANEOUS AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Next Meeting of the Executive Committee

Following the withdrawal of Rio de Janeiro, Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that they would be pleased to welcome the EC to Rome any time after November 10. He regretted that the new facilities would not be fully operational as he had hoped. He hoped they would be able to offer considerable hospitality but details would depend on several factors, including the number of visitors and the possible meeting of the Preservation Commission over the same period.

Mr ALVES-NETTO said the Latin American seminar in Rio, to which some EC members would be invited, was scheduled for the end of October and the Havana Festival was at the end of November; in response to a query from Mr FRANCIS, Mrs BOWSER thought the Perpignan event would be scheduled once the EC meeting had been arranged to avoid any clash.

DECISION

- Arrival Monday, November 12; meeting 13-14-15; departure Friday 16

Transcriber's Reminder:

- Dates later changed for meeting to start on 12th.
- Mr FRANCIS to try and arrange the Archive contribution to the London Film festival so it did not clash.
- Preliminary numbers: 11 certain; 5 doubtfuls (Mrs ORBANZ, Mr KULA ???)

10.2 Any Other Business

- Library of Congress
Mr SPEHR apologised for not formally announcing the appointment of Mr Robert Saudek as Chief of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division (in office from December 1983). He would ensure the announcement was sent to the next Bulletin.

- Havana
Mr GARCIA-MESA mentioned that in 1990 they would be celebrating their 30th Anniversary, hopefully in their new buildings, and would like to host the FIAF Congress in that year if possible.

Mr KLAUE asked him and Mr NAIR to mention both their proposals at the GM.

- EC Meeting schedules
Mr KLAUE suggested that two days were too short for the EC meetings as more time was needed for discussion. Two and a half or three days were preferable.

Mr KLAUE then closed the session thanking all for their contributions, including the interpreter, the recording technician and their joint hosts in Vienna.

E N D S