

**Section Chairs Meeting (SCM)**  
**22 October 2011, 14:10 – 19:27**  
**Hotel Beatriz, Toledo, Spain**  
**Minutes**

Present: Jens Boel (SIO, VP Sections), Paola Caroli and María José Justo Martin (SAN), Deborah Jenkins (SLMT), Emilie Leumas (SKR), William Maher (SUV), Kenth Sjöblom (SPO), David Sutton (SLA), Geir Walderhaug (SAE), João Vieira (SAR, starting with agenda item 7), Henri Zuber (SPA)

Andreas Kellerhals Vice-President for Finance, (for agenda item 5)  
Martin Berendse, President and David Leitch, Secretary General (for agenda item 10)

Apologies: Didier Bondue (SBL), Marietta Minotos (SPP)

1. Call to order. After members introduced themselves, Chair Boel determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order. He announced that Secretary Walderhaug had asked to be relieved of the responsibility of recording the minutes. Boel has asked Maher, who prepared minutes for the Panama meeting, to take the minutes for this meeting, and Maher had agreed to do so, but that he would like to defer a decision on formally taking on the role of Secretary. Boel asked the members whether they would agree to the appointment of Maher as Secretary if Maher later indicated a willingness to do so, and the members so agreed.

2. Adoption of the agenda. The agenda as distributed by Boel in advance of the meeting was approved with only minor adjustments to the times at which certain items would be discussed.

3. Approval of the Report of the Panama Meeting. Boel noted that draft minutes of the Panama meeting had been completed by Maher. Because they had just been sent out, Boel recommended that we defer approval for two weeks to give time for anyone to suggest amendments or additions. Sutton moved that the Section Chairs Meeting (SCM) provisionally approve the Panama minutes today subject to any comments that come in by e-mail within one month's time. At that time, Boel will issue an electronic call for formal approval. Jenkins further suggested that once approved, the minutes should be sent to the Secretariat and posted on the SCM's page on the ICA website (Members Only section). Sutton suggested the drafting of a short paragraph on "Introducing the Section Chairs Meeting" for presentation on the SCM's page along with the minutes. Agreed by consensus.

4. Report on Developments of Common Interest. Boel reported the following:

A) The Section on Notarial Archives (ICA/SAN) had been recognized as a member of the Executive Board.

B) The report of the July MCOM meeting in The Hague had been circulated in late July.

C) The project on international archival statistics may be raised at the Executive Board.

There is the sense that this is an issue for PCOM consideration and oversight. It has been proposed that Digital Archives Consultants (DAC) should be contracted to look into the process so that ICA does not do this in a way that would "reinvent the wheel".

D) SPP Chair Marietta Minotos has asked for a special issue of *Comma* to be dedicated to parliamentary archives, and this is being considered at the *Comma* editorial Board meeting. Other sections should look at this model to call attention to their areas of specialization (SPO has already worked with the Comma Board on a special issue on sports archives).

E) Following discussion and action at the Panama meeting, a revised version of a statement on the need for inclusiveness in meeting site selection was submitted to the July Management Commission. Discussion at MCOM resulted in some minor amendments to the statement before its adoption. Maher thanked the SCM for the support they provided for this initiative from the SUV

F) Although our Panama meeting had reached the consensus that, given its very small size and the nature of its work and constitution, the Provisional Section on Sigillography (SSG) should not be considered a section, but instead a working group. This observation was communicated to the EB-meeting in Panama, but Boel noted that in the working documents presented to the Toledo-meeting of EB this modification of status was not yet reflected. He would again transmit the position of section chairs to the ICA Secretariat.

G) Plans for how the Sections would be involved in the Brisbane 2012 Congress were still not clear. There has been a call for papers with an early November deadline, but it appears there may be no room for workshops at the Congress. It was suggested that sections could come together to propose some joint sessions. In terms of how much Sections might be able to plan for joint sessions at Brisbane, it was agreed to defer that discussion until after SCM members could meet with Congress planner Margaret Kenna over the next week. Meanwhile, to begin to generate possibilities for joint sessions, it was agreed that each Section Chair should poll their section and then send an e-mail to Walderhaug to inform him of which ideas had arisen, and then Walderhaug would see what he could do to identify and develop any cooperative proposals.

5. Proposed New Membership Dues System. Vice-President for Finance, Andreas Kellerhals joined the meeting to present the latest information on a proposed revised system for the assessment of Category 1.A members. Kellerhals provided a preview of what he would be presenting to the meeting of the Branch heads as well as to the Annual General Meeting on 28 October. He noted that the Working Group on Membership Dues had been mandated to develop a system that would be easy to understand, sustainable, equitable, obtain closure between lowest and highest paying A.1 members and the definition of a maximum due (in the near future, probably in the neighborhood of 50.000 Euros a year). Presently, ICA's budget has a high dependency on income from Category A.1 members, but the amounts paid per member vary greatly and there has been concern both by some members at the high end of the dues scale and some countries at the lower end which have not been able to meet their dues requirements. To bring some equity and balance into the system, the project has looked at use of two measures to determine dues rates—population size and the World Bank's national wealth assessment in a system where the minimal dues would be 70€ and the maximum would be 70,000€. By applying and these rates to the current ICA members some countries would see a reduction in their dues while others would see an increase. If approved by the AGM, these changes would take effect with the 2013 year.

In discussion by the Section Chairs, it was speculated that the eight separate gradations of population size might be too fine. Andreas noted that making fine distinctions may not be all that fruitful but that if the scale were “flattened” too much, some significant distortions would

result with one category covering countries with over one billion in population all the way down to 100 million with the result that many more countries would see an increase in their rates. Sutton noted that in using the two criteria of wealth and population size, some useful refinements and balance could be added by changing the relative weight give each from 50:50 to 60:40 or 65:35, and he encouraged Kellerhals to do some trial calculations. Kellerhals explained that in his model, wealth was weighted more than population size, but he could not say whether it was 55:45 or 60:40. Jenkins noted that an important factor not being considered was size of archives. Unfortunately, until we get better statistics, it is not possible to apply this factor.

Boel suggested another approach might be to have a basic dues rate calculated by the matrix of what it costs to run ICA's governance and administrative program plus a supplemental dues (based on a wealth ratio) to cover the professional program. Maher inquired about plans for Category D members and Boel asked about Categories B and C. Jenkins noted that the AGM had charged the working group to focus only on Category A.1 and that for now, Categories B-D would remain the same. Sutton emphasized that questions of changes in rates for those other than A.1 might be considered, and that obtaining new sources of revenue by doing more member recruitment (e.g., for Category D) were all quite interesting and promising but that not much could happen until the complex business of A.1 is resolved. Walderhaug agreed but stated that if Sections are to do mass recruitment, then there needed to be an understanding that a small amount of such new revenue should be coming back to the Sections. Jenkins agreed, but cautioned that the membership information system in the Secretariat was not quite up to coping with large numbers of additional members.

Jens closed the discussion by indicating that Andreas could count on the Sections' support for the intentions of the plan he was advancing even it is it not yet a perfect plan. Kellerhals thanked the group for the support and noted that the issue raised matters of more than just finances such as overall power relationships within ICA.

6. Section Budget Allocations. Boel reminded the SCM that we had agreed in Panama to not consider any alteration in the partitioning of Section funds until October, once the current year's finances were clearer. Sutton noted that based on Kellerhals' report, it would appear that there could be major budget changes in 2013 and 2014, and thus it would be better to wait until then before restructuring the allocations that had been decided in Seoul. The SCM agreed.

Boel noted that he has not needed to ask for ICA funds to support travel of the Vice-President, Sections, but Walderhaug stated that it was important that the allocation table indicate the possibility of such support as a precedent for a future time when the SCM chair may not be in such a good position for travel coverage. Caroli noted that her Section (SAN) did not really know how to make use of the funds available, partly because of the small size of the allocation. Boel explained that within the framework of the allocation provided, the Section only needed to determine on what it wished to spend money, e.g., keynote speak honoraria, issue a publication, etc. then just do the task, incur the expense, and submit documentation of payment to request reimbursement. Jenkins, Boel, and others noted that in the meantime, any surplus could be used to support the project on international archival statistics. After this was agreed, Sutton requested that it be clearly reflected in the minutes and communicated to Kellerhals that the Sections' anticipated 2011 surplus was intended for the DAC fees in support of the archival statistics

assessment project. Agreed without dissent.

Several members of the group then moved on to express concerns about financial consequences of planning of Annual Meetings. In particular, it was noted that the number of days from beginning to end, including all administration and governance sessions needed to be kept to a minimum. The current meeting, requiring presence from a Saturday through the following Friday places significant cost and absence-from-work demands on anyone active in Section or ICA matters. Maher noted that for anyone needing to do transcontinental travel a further two days were needed before the beginning of the meetings as well as a full day to return to their home base. Zuber indicated that it should be possible to have the meetings structured so they could begin on the weekend and be concluded by the end of the day Tuesday. The consensus of the meeting was that these concerns and recommendation should be incorporated into the minutes of the meeting.

7. “Shaping the Future Programme of ICA”(MCOM document 2011.2.18 by Christine Martinez and Lew Bellardo). Sutton opened the discussion by noting that the July MCOM meeting had been presented with two related documents relating to the ICA programme and internal relations. An Audit Commission (ACOM) had been very positive on the accomplishments of the Programme Commission, although it had noted that PCOM’s success was very dependent on the current lead individuals—Lew Bellardo and Christine Martinez, and this dependence was a potential vulnerability.

On the other hand, the ACOM’s report on the relation of the Executive Board and MCOM was somewhat radical in outlining a structure that would have the Executive Board becoming the supreme executive body with MCOM being just an implementation body. He wondered: if the EB is to be the prime commissioning body, then should it not also be such for the Programme Commission, and if this is so, then it would seem PCOM should take oversight of other bodies, such as the Copyright Working Group. Walderhaug noted that if one looked at the discussion paper that Secretary General Leitch had just had delivered to the SCM (EB.2011.2.16) it was unclear how all of this might relate to the sections and branches. He mentioned the example of the ATOM project being something that would logically fall within the scope of PCOM although it had been put forward through MCOM because it first arose as a budgetary issue. Overall, there was too much that seemed be accidental about what happens where in ICA. There really is a need for the SCM to examine what it wants sections to be doing. Jenkins agreed that it was sensible for PCOM to be reporting to the Executive Board, but that it was in the sections where one finds those who know about the technical aspects of archival work. Thus, we need to look at how PCOM interacts with sections and section chairs. There should be a structured connection between PCOM and sections.

Boel agreed that the ACOM document was very clear because it provided well-defined goals, but he asked the group for its thoughts on the ACOM suggestion that the EB consider meeting only once per year. It was agreed that such a change would reduce meeting expenses, but only with some significant complications. Sutton noted that reducing the EB to one meeting per year runs counter to the idea that it could both provide direction for the agenda of the Annual General Meeting as well as general oversight. If the EB met only a few days before the AGM, then there would not be enough of an interval for it to provide appropriate notice on AGM issues for voting

members. And if it only met immediately after the AGM, there would be too great an interval for it to provide timely advice on the preparation of the next year's agenda. Sutton noted that, at the least, the EB would need to meet before the AGM to set its agenda and then again for at least an hour or two after the AGM to consider whether it would also need a mid-year meeting. Boel summarized the SCM's consensus as an agreement that the PCOM should play a role in oversight of a broad range of programmes (e.g. working groups) but that Sections and Section Chairs could and should play a key role in the process as well.

In regard to the EB.2011.2.16 Discussion Paper, members speculated on what it is that is perceived to be the problem with Sections. Is it that some Sections are based on a type of institution whereas others are more centered around topics? Or is it the overall number of Sections and the varying size of Sections? However, it was the overall sense of the group that there is not really a constitutional problem with Sections. To ensure that the vision of the current leadership of Sections is well-represented in discussions of future structure, the group agreed that it needed to take the initiative of writing a set of formal terms of reference for Sections and also examine the relation of other bodies such as committees or working groups. Pending the outcome of the discussion with the Secretary General and President, scheduled for later in the afternoon, Walderhaug volunteered to prepare a preliminary draft of a discussion paper for such terms of reference.

8. Universal Declaration on Archives. Boel informed the SCM that a draft resolution submitted by Senegal to UNESCO's General Conference, suggesting UNESCO's endorsement of the Declaration, would be considered for adoption next week. If adopted, this will be a major step forward to have the unique value of archives, their preservation and the rights of citizens to consult them universally recognized. Archival institutions and associations will in the future be able to refer to UNESCO's endorsement of the principles of the Declaration in order to get them accepted and respected by national authorities.

9. Copyright Working Group. Sutton reported that the Working Group was proceeding by e-mail. A white paper outlining the nature of copyright issues for archivists had been prepared on commission by Tim Padfield, ICA's delegate to the WIPO Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR), and the report was being circulated. It had also been shared with President Berendse who, along with Padfield, will be attending the November meeting of WIPO-SCCR. Meanwhile, an open forum on copyright is being planned for the Brisbane Congress to report on progress and obtain comments to help shape policy positions.

10. Discussion with ICA President and the Secretary-General. In regard to the document (EB.2011.2.16) about the role of branches and sections in the future ICA, Boel opened the discussion by asking President Berendse what exactly are the concerns with the Sections that suggest the need for constitutional revision, and he noted that the Section Chairs Meeting would be drafting a statement of terms of reference for Sections. Berendse provided general background noting that a reading of the constitution suggested that we needed to find a way to be able to make changes without having to amend the constitution every year. He would like to see the constitution simplified with more of the details moved to bylaws. This is necessary so that we can expand the professional network and do more to lobby bodies. Thus, we might need to create a top body that would do the lobbying part and then have another body (e.g., PCOM) that

would be focused on the professional programme, and a further body connecting to the Sections and branches. In this way, he would hope to bring greater focus to the energy that already exists within the overall network of ICA. He noted that some of this concern arose during his visit to Eastern Europe when he wondered whether we have policy statements on issues and or ways of identifying issues on which we need such statements, as we are doing now on copyright. Perhaps committees could be a way to address this need.

Boel, Sutton, and others responded by making several related points. We need to explore the mechanisms that would allow the sections to play a role in the linkage of MCOM and PCOM to ICA activities. There is not really a substantive problem in the fact that some sections are institutionally defined while others are more topically defined. Sections represent the coming-together of mutually interested and engaged professional archivists. Berendse expressed some concern about not being able to know who is doing what and where. Jenkins noted that sections offer ICA a great means to extend its reach. Walderhaug stressed that the question of institutions vs. themes is off-point. Many of the sections' members are more interested in their own section than the ICA as a whole, and the overall behavior of sections might be best managed less by constitution and regulation than inspiration and timely mandates.

SCM members also noted that sections are not committees, and rather than having standing committees, we needed more Working Groups that would exist for pre-stated, limited periods of time with very specific charges. Once created, the Working Groups should have a reporting line to PCOM.

Berendse offered a comparison of ICA to IFLA, noting that IFLA is a bottom-up organization that generates revenue and moves it upward. In ICA we do not use the possibility that our sections can raise or create money, and he wondered if we could afford this in the future or afford as large and as complex an organization as ICA now is in the future.

Boel noted that he was not sure that he would advise the President to dedicate the remainder of his mandate to a major constitutional change and instead he suggested that Berendse consider Walderhaug's idea of focusing on vision and culture. In fact, the current constitution presently allowed us to develop stronger mechanisms for section involvement in making the ICA more effective.

When asked for comment, Leitch noted that ICA would soon be publishing the ACOM report, and the Secretariat was committed to implementing its recommendations. In his view, the issue with the sections is where they exist now, they work, but where there are gaps, interests, and needs there should be a means to create them. He characterized the 2004 constitution as a "ramshackle" affair and said that what was needed was a document that provided a general outline of the ICA structure with details provided by bylaws that could be amended without going to the AGM. He would like to get this done.

Maher cautioned that no matter how much benefit there might be in a simplified constitution, it would be very hard to obtain "buy-in," credibility, and support in the short time before the Brisbane Congress. Experience in organizational change such as this suggests that efforts to rush will only delay and defeat the process. Leitch responded that we needed a leaner, meaner, and

keener constitution, and it was to get the process going now that the Discussion document (EB.2011.2.16) had been prepared and distributed. Boel closed the discussion by commenting that we all wanted to move in the same direction but that the concerns focused on the road map to the destination.

The Section Chairs Meeting continued the discussion after Berendse and Leitch departed. Boel asked what should be our action with regard to the drafting of terms of reference (noted above in item 7)? Maher stated that the document was even more important in light of the clear impression that the constitutional change is a matter of a train already having left the station before all the passengers are on board. Walderhaug noted that if the President and Secretary General are serious about a leaner document, we will be better off by giving them a document on the sections to which they can refer to as they develop a new structure. Zuber asked what the difference is between the work of recent years on model “statutes” for sections and the kind of terms of reference being proposed? Boel noted that the terms of reference would be at a higher level, that of concept or strategy. Jenkins indicated that as a group of professionals we needed to say more than that we meet to discuss important matters. For example, we need to say how we define the work we do, and this would help us articulate how a section is different from a branch, working group, or a committee. Walderhaug said it was important to define the essence of a section as a member-initiated group as opposed to a working group being an appointed body with a fixed time line.

It was agreed that members of the SCM would initiate and complete work on a draft statement of terms of reference for sections and working groups over the course of the coming week so that by the end of the CITRA meeting there would be a text that could then be circulated for final comment and e-mail approval.

11. Closure. There being no further business, Boel adjourned the meeting at 19:27.