Archive Service Accreditation

- The UK management standard for archive services
- Launched 2013, roll out to end 2017
- Co-created with the archives sector, owned by the archives sector
Accreditation scope and aims

“To improve the viability and visibility of UK archive services”

- Archive services are well managed
- Archive services plan to improve and develop
- Archive services contribute to their parent organisations and the wider public
Current eligibility for Accreditation

• Criteria give broad definition of who can participate: not constitution-specific
• Hold a reasonable quantity of archive material (ie unique, records)
• Have dedicated workforce and storage so they can develop
• Hold some analogue records

The last criterion has to change.
Scalability for Accreditation

• Given broad scope, need scaled expectations for different types of service
• Local authority/other public sector/private and third sector
• Big/medium/small – in holdings and audiences
• Affects guidance, expectations
Accreditation Standard

• Organisational Health
  Mission, governance, planning, resources

• Collections
  Management, development, info, care

• Stakeholders and their experiences
  Legal, effective, developing access, meeting designated community needs

• Focus: outcomes and users
1: Organisational Health

1.1 Mission statement
1.2 Governance
1.3 Planning
1.4 Spaces
1.5 Finance
1.6 People
2: Collections

Management
- How is management across all collections areas kept coherent?

Development
- Policies
- Plans

Information
- Policies
- Plans
- Procedures

Care
- Policies
- Plans
- Procedures /Emergency response
### 3: Stakeholders and their experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access policy</th>
<th>Stakeholders and their experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basis for access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access planning</th>
<th>Stakeholders and their experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning to improve/widen access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access on the ground</th>
<th>Stakeholders and their experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Information about the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedures for accessing archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repeated refrains:

“cover both analogue and digital”… “in line with the mission and purpose of your service”

During co-creation, the archives sector told us NOT to create separate digital requirements
1.4 Resources: buildings and storage

Requirement 1.4

Formal written terms of occupancy exist for all buildings and premises housing archives and archive services. Arrangements are sufficient to keep the collections physically secure and accessible. Arrangements also allow for effective forward planning, including the

S. If you do not have a plan in place for the storage and ingest of born-digital materials please provide details of your strategy to have this in place within the next 5 years, if relevant to the mission and purpose of your service. If this plan is included in a larger document (e.g. a wider preservation strategy), then please note, attach and list on the evidence table.
### 2.1 Collections Management

**Requirement 2.1**

The archive service has a co-ordinated approach to collections management activity, guided by coherent policies, plans and procedures. Policies should cover both analogue and digital materials, where relevant, and be approved by top management, or an appropriate delegated authority.

**Outcome**

The collections management policy level and clearly approaches mitigate digital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of analogue holdings which are unstable(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of analogue holdings with a surrogate (digital or microform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of digital holdings within a managed preservation system(^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to explain further, please do so here. (no more than 200 words)

---

\(^3\) ‘Unstable’ is defined by the Preservation Assessment Survey as material in poor or unusable condition.

\(^4\) A system which follows the OAIS model.
3.2 Access Plans and Planning

Requirement 3.2

The archive service demonstrates a good understanding of the needs and interests of stakeholders, and has plans in place to meet stakeholders’ needs, improve service delivery, and improve service delivery to the organisation’s collection.

Outcome 3.2

The archive service demonstrates evidence high quality evidence of meeting the needs of all stakeholders, and improving access arrangements.

W Please explain how your on-site and off-site access arrangements are designed to meet your users’ needs, with due regard to practical operational considerations. (no more than 300 words)

X Please describe how practical information on how to access collections and archive services, both on-site and off-site, is communicated to stakeholders.
Not enough for the long term. Next steps?

- DPC/Accreditation working group
- Info shared with digital standard users
- Mapping standards against Accreditation: extensive overlaps
- Identifying a pathway 2018-2023
- Approved for further work by Accreditation Committee 12 May 2016
Development pathway 2018-23

• Require all applicants to self-assess against NDSA Levels of Preservation
• Amend standard/application questions to reflect range of additional digital risks
• Accept digital-only archives from 2018
• NOT expecting applicants to have full certification against digital standard…
  • …but if they do, it supports an application
Pathway Rationale

• Unrealistic to leap straight to full certification
• Need development pathway to kickstart action, not an ultimate solution
• NDSA has built in scalability
• Mapping to other standards showed positive commonality of approach
• Standards landscape is shifting fast
e.g. “Community”

- “The concept of a community which the archive service is constituted to serve. In this specific sense the word ‘community’ does not necessarily refer simply to the population of a political unit or physical area (e.g. a local authority or town).
- “For many archive services the community will extend beyond the formal boundaries of its responsible body (government, educational institution, private or voluntary organisation).
- “The archive will probably serve multiple communities: local, national and international; different communities of researchers and of other types of direct and indirect users and of non-users.
- “Different elements of the community may attract different priorities, types and levels of service.”
Risks

• Limited offer to digital-only repositories, which may prefer full digital certification
• Might appear not to engage with existing standards landscape
• Shifting landscape includes NDSA
• We’re working long term. Standards could diverge meantime
  • Levels may not cover all key risks: further work needed?
What happens next, next?

- Comms and training: get the sector aware
- This is an interim solution: further work needed
- Accreditation continues to develop
- Digital standards continue to develop
- We keep in touch
- Accreditation looks different after 2023
TIME FOR A BREAK
Activity carousel

1. Mapping to a digital standard
2. Understanding digital scalability
3. Setting meaningful expectations against the Levels
4. Risks outside the Levels
5. Training needs

Please be legible – others will read…
Bonus question

• Reframing eligibility: how can we word a criterion to include digital-only repositories, but not analogue digitisers?
Feedback

• What have you got?
Thanks for your help

• Any questions about Accreditation?

• [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/accreditation](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/accreditation)

• [accreditation@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:accreditation@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)