ICA Section Chairs Meeting (SCM)
27 March 2011
Panama City, Panama

Present: Jens Boel (SIO) (Chair), Esther Cruces Blanco (SAR), Kenth Sjöblom (SPO), Geir Valderhaug (SAE), Didier Bondue (SBL), Deborah Jenkins (SLMT), Henri Zuber (SPA), Maria José Justo Martin (SAN), David Sutton (SLA), William Maher (SUV)

1-2 Chair Boel convened the meeting and called upon attendees to introduce themselves. In regard to the sigillography section (SSG), Boel noted that because of its very small size it was really no longer a section but a working group and therefore should use that name, especially since the Section Chairs had already agreed last year to not include it in voting.

3. Minutes/Report of the prior meeting (Oslo, September, 2010). Boel stated that it was understood that these were already approved following their e-mail presentation last October. Jenkins suggested that if there is some decision point in the minutes then there should be a two-week period for reaction, and then we should reach a decision via e-mail. Sutton agreed but noted that any such decisions/actions needed to be recorded when they occur, perhaps in the minutes of the next Section Chairs meeting.

   A) Attendance Estimates. The Congress organizers have asked Sections to provide, within the few weeks, an estimate of how many of our members will likely be at the Brisbane congress. Given the earlier date, the consensus of the Chairs was that the best we could do is provide a rough estimate based on the 1996 and 2008 congresses. An alternative would be to just use an estimate based on 10 to 25 people, typical of most conference and committee rooms and that for any given time, we would need three rooms simultaneously, especially for two successive days (Section Bureaus on the first day, and Section AGMs on the second day).

   B) Ideas for Joint Section Sessions. Several of the chairs noted potential topics for joint sessions of their Section along with one or more other Sections. Also discussed were the possibility of a “cafeteria style” session or poster sessions to highlight the PCOM.

5. Budget.
   A) Membership Fees. Institutional fees will be recalculated based on World Bank rankings plus a few other factors such as population and size of national debt. Meanwhile, with the continued world economic slump, several national archives may want to reduce their contributions to ICA. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that there will not be carry-forward money in the next few years, and there may also be reduced allocations to Sections. A “Repartition Key for Section Money” was distributed. None present expressed any discontent with the distribution it showed, and if the total available for sections were to be reduced from its present 50,000 Euros then the allocations would have to be adjusted accordingly, with a first draft proposal being created by the Secretary applying the percentage across the board. Also, it was stated that the ICA auditors remain concerned that there should not be carry-forward funds. MCOM has suggested
that it could manage the carry-forward monies as a special fund to be used for emergency and disaster recovery. However, it was agreed that the better time to be discussing this was not at the Spring SCM but at the fall meetings (i.e., at CITRA).

B) Carry-Forward. There was a general discussion of possible uses of carry-forward funds (4,000?) for activities such as the copyright project, Vice-President of Sections travel, or any joint section proposals that come forward before the October SCM. Overall, it is difficult for the Sections or Section Chairs to plan because of the occasional past directive from ICA of adhering to an underspending objective through mid-year and then not being able to know about extra monies available until so late into the fall that it is not possible to plan appropriate projects to use the funds.

7. Working Group on Copyright. Sutton noted that he would provide a more detailed report at Monday’s Executive Board meeting. Presently, the Working Group had commissioned Tim Padfield to provide a “White Paper” outlining what are the general copyright issues of concern to archivists. This would then be disseminated to ICA members for comment, and the group will create some means to obtain a measure of members’ concern about particular issues. There will be an open forum work-in-progress session on the copyright project at the Brisbane Congress.

8. Joint Projects. Valderhaug noted that there is the prospect of an Africa project in which SAE might become interested, although it is too soon to determine if this should be just an SAE collaboration or many/all sections with the Africa Branch. Discussion of a possible joint project on statistics noted that it might be appropriate to use some of the carry-over balance to fund a consultant(s) to do a scoping analysis on which bodies should be contacted to obtain data that could be compared. It was agreed to take this up in EB.

9. Universal Declaration on Archives. Since the Declaration was approved at the Oslo AGM, the goal has been to obtain approval by UNESCO, and it is expected that a resolution on its behalf will be presented to UNESCO in Fall 2011. However, some edits that have been proposed, ostensibly to put it in compliance with UNESCO policy might limit the stakeholders to only archivists rather than the universality desired by the Declaration. Jenkins noted that the issue before the SCM now is whether, if it is not possible to have the undiluted text adopted should we hold it back or not.

10. CITRA Review and the Sections. Boel asked the SCM to focus their discussion of the forthcoming proposal to revise CITRA on the issue of the role of the Sections in CITRA. Valderhaug noted that it was not clear if Sections could mount a full Annual Meeting either singly or jointly, and he suggested the model of IFLA which uses its pre-conference for the Sections. Zuber noted that SPA has been doing its conferences in connection with the national conferences of other associations and that it might make more sense for the lead on Annual Meeting planning to be taken by the Branches rather than the Sections. Cruces Blanco and Jenkins expressed similar concerns that the geographic concentration needed to support a meeting would mean that relying on any group, whether a Section or a Branch would only work when the Annual Meeting would
be in a region with a concentration of members of such a group. Instead, it would make more sense for the Annual Meeting planning to be the function of a standing committee.

11. **Section Statutes.** Boel stated that there was not anything much to note on this topic except that some Sections are updating their statutes/bylaws to reconcile with the ICA constitution.

12. **Archives Situation in Hungary.** It was agreed to defer this discussion until Martin Berendse and David Leitch came to the SCM.

13. **Archives in Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya.** The matter of archives in societies in conflict is related to the group working on Archives and Human Rights and the ICA’s ability to respond to emergency situations.

14. **2nd Congress of Associations, Edinburgh.** The Conference is scheduled for late August/early September and is of particular interest to SPA but involves broader issues of archival practice as well.

15. **Translation Arrangements.** Sutton and Jenkins made it clear that they did not wish to be critical of the work of the Paris office, but that they were concerned about the fact that obtaining French and other translations of ICA documents was overly dependent on personal volunteer service. SCM members noted that a few years ago we had called for Paris office investing in an arrangement with a professional service to provide translations.

16. **Membership Records.** In regard to periodic ICA office calls to Section Chairs to track down members with dues in arrears, it was noted that this function is not effectively fulfilled by Section Chairs. While recognizing the good work of the office staff in managing membership, there simply is not enough capacity to be able to stay abreast of changing membership rolls. By the time that someone appears on a list of past-due members, it is generally too late for effective recruitment and encouragement by the Section chairs. Too often, much time is spent only to discover that by this stage the member is long-since retired or deceased. The office simply needs a much better membership database system that is easier to maintain, more timely in its notifications, and less demanding of staff time.

17. **Section Websites and Blogs.** Sutton inquired what the Sections were doing to manage their websites. Were they doing them independent of the ICA’s site or as part of the ICA’s web management? He encourage the Sections to look at [http://oke.ica.org/](http://oke.ica.org/) which is a new space established by ICA to support Section Blogs.

18. **Proposed Amendment to the ICA Constitution.** Maher presented a resolution from SUV and requested SCM support for a proposal to amend the ICA constitution to make more explicit the fact that ICA Congresses and CITRA/Annual Meetings should be open to those of all persuasions. Discussion revealed a shared concern with some of the problems that have arisen in the past when archivists from certain countries were
prevented from, or faced with significant obstacles, traveling to countries where some ICA meetings had been held. However, it also revealed that strict adherence to the range of categories for inclusiveness could result in there being very few places where ICA could meet. Furthermore, the proposal would be certain to raise controversy as a constitutional amendment and unlikely to succeed. Instead, it was proposed that we first get the principle of inclusiveness established as a management matter by having it approved by MCOM as soon as possible. Then it could be used as a benchmark or ruler to assess whether the goal is being met. Moreover, if this is handled as a guideline for MCOM to adopt in its review of meeting sites, then it would have the possibility of being adopted immediately rather than having to take the chance of a more extended time table required for a constitutional amendment. Maher agreed that he could support this more pragmatic approach. Jenkins noted that this not just a concern of SUV but of all sections, and Boel stressed the full SCM was behind Maher/SUV on this concern.

19. **Items for Discussion with Regional Branches.** The SCM noted that it would be appropriate to talk about the draft Access Principles in the joint session with Regional Branch leadership and that we needed to attend to the call from ALA for greater support and collaboration.

20. **Executive Board Items of Interest to SCM.** Topics for the following days EB meeting were reviewed.

21. **Format for Proposals to the Executive Board.** Jenkins presented a template for recommendations to the Executive Board. She noted that the form was an effort to address the difficulty of getting things acknowledged and embedded in the ICA unless there is a written statement. For example, it could be used for making the membership database recommendations. Given the lack of time for detailed discussion of the template, Jenkins encouraged SCM members to send any comments they may have within the next four weeks.

22. **Other Business.** Boel asked whether we should continue to allocate a block of time for meeting with the Secretary-General and the President or should we instead use that time to have a roundtable/round robin of reports from each Section on activities and projects? Discussion noted that doing a good round robin requires at least one hour. In response to the suggestion that we consider using a wiki with each Section Chair posting in his/her native language, it was noted that the ICA’s current wiki does not work very well for commentary. Sutton and Valderhaug will investigate other options for the right platform for this resource.

23. **Discussion with President and Secretary-General.** (Only major issues and action items are minuted.) President Berendse noted that he wanted ICA to change from a top-down to a bottom-up organization. He noted the importance of the Sections having an active role in trying to get ICA to be more involved in and with Latin America. Boel reported the SCM action on the SUV’s call for a constitutional amendment (See item 18 above) and asked whether the Secretary-General agreed with the idea of MCOM formalizing such a policy. Leitch indicated agreement, and Berendse noted that it should be mentioned.
when the EB deals with item 2011 1.36, “The Selection of Hosts for ICA Annual Conferences.”
In regard to SCM Agenda item 12, Leitch and Berendse noted the delicacy of speaking out on the issue because of local concerns and the need to do it only at the right time. This led to a philosophical exchange about the difficulty of balancing between the right to remember and the right to be forgotten and the extent of need for responsiveness to human rights issues.

In response to the need to build a translation capacity in the ICA offices, Leitch noted that ICA is committed to providing policy documents in six languages. It is interested in using networks and volunteers. Several Section Chairs commented that reliance on volunteers has not worked too well in the past in terms of quality, consistency, or efficiency and thus there is the need to allocate resources for a more robust support of translation.