

**Meeting of ICA branches**

**Oslo, 11 September 2010**

**Draft minutes**

**Present:**

Setareki Tale (Chair PARBICA, VP Branches)

Veno Akauaria (Chair ESARBICA)

Abdelmajid Chikhi (Chair ARBICA)

Bryan Corbett (Coordinator NAANICA)

Hamidou Diallo (Treasurer WARBICA)

Helena Leonce (Chair CARBICA)

Angelika Menne-Haritz (Chair EURBICA)

Michael Ngwang Ngwany (Secretary CENARBICA)

Pitt Kuan Wah (Chair SARBICA)

Masaya Takayama (Chair EASTICA)

**Observers:**

Sharon Alexander-Gooding (Vice-President CARBICA)

Kazuhiko Araki ((National Archives of Japan)

Elizabeth Bahoum (WARBICA)

Karla Hayward (CARBICA)

Christophe Jacobs (ICA Secretariat)

Siham Krika (National Archives of Algeria)

Christine Martinez (ICA Secretariat, Minutes)

Megumi Motomura (National Archives of Japan)

Yuki Ota (National Archives of Japan)

The Chair welcomed the participants and proposed that they introduced themselves.

He explained that the agenda was set up according to the reports received from the branches. The order of the items was modified. A point was added to the agenda about the CITRA 2013.

## **1. Governance**

The Chair insisted on the need for the branches to develop strategic planning, as it was requested in Kuala Lumpur. This should ultimately be the basis for money allocation, either from PCOM or from branches funds. As a result of some of the branches not developing business plans, there was a large amount of unused Branch funds.

Pitt Kuan Wah added that certain plans were not expected to function, and that there was a need to find out how to activate some branches. Setareki Tale said that we should focus on those branches which were not active at all, while Pitt Kuan Wah suggested to go on observing and finding out why some branches could not support activities. There was maybe a need for reconfiguring of branches to enhance compatibility within the branch.

The chair added that in some branches there were political issues.

Veno Akauaria suggested providing the branches with advice about how to do a strategic plan.

Abdelmajid Chikhi pointed out that reconfiguring was not a solution, but reorganizing the activities. Why not extend successful activities to other branches, for instance training activities? Branches should work together.

Setareki Tale mentioned among the identified problems that of different languages spoken in a single branch. For Pitt Kuan Wah, language was not an issue (example of SARBICA), and he insisted on political issues.

Michael Ngwang Ngwanyi, Secretary of CENARBICA was attending his first branches' meeting. He underlined how difficult coordination and communication were within the branch. The WARBICA Dakar conference in 2009 enabled some members of CENARBICA to meet and to consider how to reactivate the branch. He was himself proposing that a meeting could be held in 2011 in Cameroon.

Setareki Tale welcomed the encouraging news from CENARBICA and expressed his best wishes for the meeting.

## **2. Budget**

The Chair reminded that 3 funding streams were available, and that it was not easy to make a difference between them. He thought that it was worth providing the participants with explanations:

- PCOM:

Christine Martinez, PCOM secretary, underlined that PCOM support was about international projects (that is with partners from different countries, or having an international impact); the projects should have a reusable or adaptable product, for the benefit of the membership. Responding to Bryan Corbett, she added that the support was available to ICA members only, or to applicants having an ICA member as a partner for the project.

Abdelmajid Chikhi thought there was a problem with the projects; the maximum amount allocated to projects (5000 euros, 10 000 euros for core projects) was insufficient to develop properly a serious project. An allocation should be defined for all the branches for a two or three years' period. When the amount had grown sufficiently, then an important project could be developed. He thought that there should be only one funding stream.

Pitt Kuan Wah agreed with Mr. Chikhi. He added that criteria were the same for all the branches, so the implementation was difficult.

- Branches allocation

Setareki Tale asked why there are different funding streams. The key issue for him was the branches funding; there were huge projects going on, which would consume the ICA budget. Abdelmajid Chikhi said that there was a need to find sponsors, and Bryan Corbett insisted on co-funding.

Pitt Kuan Wah said that branches funding should be retained and increased.

Setareki Tale was concerned about evidence to be provided that the fund had been used. He was wondering if in some cases there had been some problems. Christine Martinez said that in one case, the money was given back (PCOM project).

Setareki Tale then said that maybe the criteria for allocating money should be revised. Some years ago, the idea of a special allocation for supporting the branches' administration had been considered. Helena Leonce said that CARBICA had been trying to develop a secretariat, but there was not funding for this.

Bryan Corbett said that criteria could be interpreted (improving communication, organizing a conference) in a more generous way; it would help, but one had to be careful in terms of balancing out the availability of money for the branches. Branches which were active should not be favoured; on the other hand, not all the money should be allocated to non active branches. Then, if money was remaining, branches should be informed.

Christine Martinez said that several reminders had been sent to branches which did not ask for their money, but as previously mentioned, some of them were not able to present any project.

Bryan Corbett suggested that money would be equally divided, and that there would be a deadline to spend it; in case money would remain, it should become available for other branches.

Setareki Tale pointed out that if the money was divided equally, the amount allocated to each of the branches would be very small.

Pitt Kuan Wah was not in favor of funding secretaries, but thought that the money should better be used to organize conferences or meetings;

The Chair then asked if all were agreeing on the existing criteria. The participants agreed not to change them.

- FIDA

Setareki Tale and Christine Martinez explained that FIDA was about funding the development of individuals or institutions. About 10 applications had been received, but the FIDA trustees had decided not to spend more than 25000 euros for this call.

Setareki Tale said that the branches should encourage their members to identify the areas that they wanted to improve in their archives and to identify their specific needs.

Veno Akauaria asked about the projects which had been rejected.

Setareki Tale said that advice was provided to the applicants; the projects should have a clear budget and be supported by referees.

Pitt Kuan Wah added that the money could be used for conservation supplies, but not for buying general equipment such as computers.

Setareki Tale insisted on capacity building.

Bryan Corbett then came back to the branches money, and proposed an amendment to the criteria: “organize branches meetings and/or conferences”. All agreed.

### **3. Communications**

The Chair underlined the need to improve communications within the branches; He said that some branches were going in virtual meetings, and he was therefore encouraged the use of new mediums for Branch to utilize to meet including teleconferencing.

Bryan Corbett reminded that he was the manager of the ICA list-serve, which was used to communicate by the NAANICA network; the larger ICA community did not know what was happening and going on, and should therefore be more informed about the list-serve.

Christine Martinez added that the new ICA website would also provide functionalities and opportunities to facilitate and improve communications. She said that the branches would be able to find information about their common activities on a dedicated page called “branches coordination”, in addition to their own web page on the ICA website.

Bryan Corbett said that the community should be informed when something was added on the website, and the Chair suggested that the list-serve could be used for this.

Christophe Jacobs explained about the RSS functionality, which was available on the new ICA website. It was also possible to forward news from Facebook to the list-serve.

Michael Ngwang Ngwanyi added that representatives of the branches did not always properly disseminate the information.

#### **4. Training**

The Chair stressed the need for collaboration, as a lot of things were going on in the branches. Pitt Kuan Wah insisted on the need for branches to cooperate with sections.

Bryan Corbett suggested that there should be flexibility as far as funding was concerned. The Chair said that funding was flexible enough.

Michael Ngwang Ngwanyi raised the issue of National Archives which were coming up and specially needed training.

Setareki Tale reminded that the FIDA funding could be used for this.

Abdelmajid Chikhi said that training should include “train the trainers” opportunities.

Christine Martinez informed about a project aiming to develop a “train the trainers” methodology and collaborative platform, whose phase one had been completed; the second phase had started, under the leadership of the Norwegian and Dutch professional associations, which were developing a case study in Bangladesh.

She added that an experts’ register had been opened and that formal registration could be done through the ICA website.

#### **5. Membership**

Setareki Tale mentioned the difficulties in paying membership dues and in paying branches dues (this was not applicable to all the branches).

Bryan Corbett said that this was an issue for NAANICA: it was difficult for an institution or an individual to pay dues two or three times when you were a member of several associations or societies. The members of NAANICA should become members of ICA automatically.

Pitt Kuan Wah explained that SARBICA changed its constitution.

Bryan Corbett said he would come with a proposal.

## **6. Disaster response**

Christophe Jacobs explained about the Emergency Programme Management. The programme relies on three pillars:

- planning and prevention:

Foster an interdisciplinary approach (rescue services, emergency specialists, professionals in information and other cultural heritage areas) and promote professional exchanges between these areas;

Encourage initial and continuing archival training courses to take emergency management into account;

Urge governments to formulate public policy for the prevention of disasters incurred by archives or other parts of the cultural heritage.

- Coordination and mobilization:

Ensure a methodological support for the ICA membership;

Structure, lead and mobilize archival networks for the planning of interventions in emergency situations;

Coordinate, with the Blue Shield, the deployment of assistance to affected institutions.

- Research and training

Identify, document and promote best practices;

Participate in the development of standards and certification programmes;

Develop a programme of specialist training in the area of risk management.

Christophe Jacobs added that the programme aimed to encourage all archive conservation services at national level to put together protection plans and to develop the capability for training archivists on this subject on a national or regional basis.

Christine Martinez pointed out that in the framework of this programme, a pilot for a training programme would be tested. The idea was to develop a register of existing training opportunities proposed throughout the world, in addition to that developed by ICA. These training sessions or workshops would be distributed into three levels of competences. Members having attended successfully a given number of training sessions would be provided by a kind of ICA attestation.

M. Takayama then raised the issue of accreditation and asked about the credibility of this process.

Christine Martinez said that only accredited trainings would be included in the register, as well as training organized by branches and sections. The idea was not to accreditate the programme as a whole. As far as certification was concerned, the attestation would not be a real certification, but in countries where there was not any training opportunity, this system could help to support professional development.

Setareki Tale added that this would be relevant to all developing countries and would strengthen cooperation.

Christophe Jacobs pointed out that this should be discussed with SAE and that an assessment procedure would be developed. Sharon Alexander-Gooding suggested that academics who were involved in ICA could assess.

Angelika Menne-Haritz proposed to set up criteria and a special board.

The Chair then proposed that a paper could circulate for comments.

## **7. Others**

Veno Akauaria asked about the candidature of Zimbabwe for hosting the 2013 CITRA. Christine Martinez answered that it was not up to the branches meeting to decided, but to the CITRA Board to discuss the proposal, then to submit it to the Executive Board and to the AGM.