Building Collections for All Time: The Issue of Significance

BOB PYMM

ABSTRACT One of the major roles adopted by libraries is the long-term preservation of selected material within their collections. Traditionally, this role comprised identifying individual physical objects or collections based upon the library's own view of its role and the significance of items in its collections. With the rapid growth of digital materials there has been a blurring of the divide between museum, archive and library collections, with a growing concern amongst all cultural heritage sectors about the identification and ongoing preservation of digital objects. Due to the size and complexity of the issues and, in particular, the volume of digital material and costs involved in its long-term preservation, there has been a resurgence in the debate on identifying significance in materials and thus their priority in preservation programs. This debate has sparked widespread discussion in the museum, archives and record-keeping professions which can inform the more recent concerns now being voiced within librarianship. This paper looks at the concept of significance within all of the 'memory institutions' and considers how the theory is shaped, how it has been put into practice and the applicability of such a notion to digital preservation.

With only a small percentage of libraries building collections for permanent retention the issue of what these collections should, or should not, comprise has been debated only intermittently in the professional literature. With the hugely increased focus on delivery of information to clients in recent years, this is not surprising. With the move from physical ownership of resources to remote access priorities have been elsewhere, with the result that debate over selection of material of enduring value for long-term preservation and retention has received limited attention. However, the issue has recently come to the fore with the explosion in the nature and amount of digital material being acquired by libraries, raising concerns over its long-term preservation and continued accessibility.

In addition, projects such as the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme, started in 1992, recognise that the documentary heritage, reflecting the 'memory of the world', is a fragile thing, requiring a sustained campaign to ensure the longer-term survival of valuable archive holdings and library collections from around the world.[1] This program is very much concerned with identifying significant materials which countries nominate for inclusion in the Memory of the World Register, in the hope that this recognition of their significance as a cultural artefact of world importance will help ensure their ongoing preservation.

With a growing concern focused on digital preservation, and through major international projects such as the Memory of the World, the question of

Bob Pymm, Lecturer, School of Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2678. Email: rpymm@csu.edu.au

acquiring, selecting and preserving our documentary heritage, in whatever form, has reawakened the debate into how libraries, as one of the institutions charged with the responsibility for preserving the cultural memory of their society, select material for permanent retention. Traditionally, this has meant identifying physical items (books, papers, maps etc) and conserving the original item in some way in order to ensure the object's long-term survival. At the same time, access issues have been addressed via digitisation, microfilming or other forms of copying. This relatively straightforward preservation process becomes more complex for digital objects, given the virtual impossibility of preserving the 'original' item for the long term, and the need to migrate the data or otherwise copy the content due to the technological imperatives of changing software and hardware. Issues of authenticity, the transience of the original item, context, formats, storage media, standards and so on all impact upon the preservation equation, as well as the sheer volume of material being produced. As Harvey notes,[2] with digital materials, as well as their quantity there is likely to be a wider range of quality issues, with many digital objects free from any quality control process traditionally imposed on print materials by publishers. With concerns like these, it is not surprising that the question of priorities for digital preservation, and thus the need to readily assess levels of significance in material, has become a major contemporary issue for librarians and others.

Thus Lehmann,[3] in a wide-ranging discussion of cultural tradition and the new digital objects, is concerned that 'long term availability is a major criterion for the creation of cultural memory' but that the features of the emergent digital media mitigates against this. Eastwood,[4] in a discussion relating to archival records, makes the point that the long-term preservation of digital objects will be a challenging task, even for relatively simple items, 'placing a premium on the capability of identifying those materials of enduring value', and thus worthy of the effort required for long-term preservation. He goes on to note that for digital objects, an additional complication arises in the determination of 'continuing value' which must include an assessment of the authenticity of the item and thus knowledge of its creation and chain of custody since that time.[5] For unpublished records in particular, the creation of audit trails or similar processes will be essential in providing information to assist in the assessment or appraisal stage of determining a digital item's value. Eastwood concludes that for any of the memory institutions, building and preserving collections of electronic records will require effective selection or appraisal processes to 'a greater extent than does preservation of traditional materials.'[6]

This need for increased attention to the identification of digital objects for long-term preservation is supported by Harvey who argues that the traditional criteria and paradigms used by libraries to identify material for retention may need to be revisited[7] and that guidance may be found in appraisal theory and practice as developed by the record-keeping discipline.[8] In particular, the decision over the significance of an item, which for materials in traditional forms may be undertaken at any time in their existence, needs to be made much earlier for digital records. This early decision making is essential to ensure that they are acquired and stored in a manner which protects their integrity and limits, as far as possible, concerns over the use of proprietary software and other file- or hardware-specific devices that may make longer term access difficult or impossible. This need to make decisions on significance very early in an object's life brings added urgency and complexity to an already difficult task.

The Significance Debate in Museums and Archives

While many of the technical issues surrounding digital preservation are new, requiring the development and implementation of new processes and policies, the fundamentals regarding selection for long-term preservation have traditionally had a higher profile in the museum and archive world than in libraries, with archives and museums developing a number of strategies in order to determine significance. These strategies have mainly focused on physical materials, but it is worth revisiting them in order to inform the debate with regard to library collections generally, including digital objects.

Archivists have grappled with the issue for many years in their efforts to develop systematic appraisal principles to assist in identifying records of continuing value. Schellenberg's development of an appraisal taxonomy in the 1950s, based on primary, and secondary values, provides an approach which has stood the test of time and become the framework within which most record appraisal work takes place.[9] However, it has been argued that such a framework, based upon a commonly-held paradigm or view of a material's significance, can be seen as a straightjacket, detrimental to the range of items being identified for permanent retention. By allowing more room for personal idiosyncrasy, a form of natural selection will occur which should ensure a wide and diverse range of material survives.[10] The randomness of this approach suggests that overlaps and gaps could occur on a wide-ranging basis, and while its simplicity may be attractive, it has not been a widely accepted approach within the archival community.

In addition, there has been considerable discussion of the issues in the museum context going back many years. In Australia the Burra Charter, adopted in 1979, provides practical guidance in assessing the cultural significance of material comprising the built environment, covering such criteria as the aesthetic, historical, scientific or social value of the site.[11]

The AMOL (Australian Museums On Line) guidelines note that significance can be geographically based, that is local, national or international in scope, temporally based in that what appears to be important a generation ago may not be today and vice versa, and of keen importance to one sector of society but marginal to others, makes determining overarching criteria, acceptable to the vast majority, a demanding and probably impossible task. They conclude that 'something that is significant to one group of people may have little or no meaning at all to other … [or] an object may have no significance to one museum yet be quite significant to another.'[12]

In a major contribution to the training of museum professionals, a guide sponsored by the Heritage Collections Council in Australia set out to provide guidelines on significance that could be used by a wide range of museums. The aim was to assist those involved with significance assessment to make 'informed and broadly consistent decisions.'[13] The authors note the importance of a standardised process to enable public and professional understanding of the framework within which decisions relating to priorities for preservation were taken.[14] Their use of examples and check lists made this document a highly practical resource for the Australian museum community.

Elsewhere, a proposal put forward in a discussion paper produced by the Scottish Museums Council considered significance as comprising two major components, importance and quality.[15] They note that 'importance' relates to the size of a collection and its role as a record in the cultural, scientific or technological development of a region. 'Quality' is a comparative dimension, covering comprehensiveness, depth, uniqueness and authenticity and reputation. In the preamble to this discussion paper the Council raise the difficulty of trying to develop precise criteria with the risk of then excluding material, versus more broadly drawn criteria that leaves more judgment to the individual.[16]

A similarly focused report produced in New Zealand goes into some detail in trying to assist small organisations in identifying 'national significance', while accepting that the concept is variable, depending upon the context.[17] It discusses various forms of significance (cultural, technological, historical) and outlines criteria to help in identifying material that may have national significance, noting the importance of Maori culture and spiritual values in this decision. The authors leave open an option for institutions to add their own local criteria to assist in their determinations.

Given the emergence of this discussion into a broader debate associated with the concerns raised by the 'fragile' digital world, it seems timely to revisit the questions of just what does constitute significance, and how and when do we make decisions regarding material of perceived enduring value? These are basic issues for librarians if we are to provide the appropriate resources to enable future generations to construct their view of the past. Yet consideration of such points are inevitably influenced, not only by technical issues, but also by our prevailing understanding of what society values as important. It is therefore useful to consider first the context within which this decision making occurs and which shapes an understanding of these issues.

The Collecting Context

Libraries have been described as having the long-range responsibility to document our times. Stevenson calls this a commitment to 'constructing that social memory which has long been considered to be one of the more enduring cultural functions of the library'[18] and more recently, Burns described the library network across Australia as an 'elaborate national public memory system.'[19] Given that collecting and preservation activities are always to some degree value-driven tasks, undertaken within a broader framework or paradigm that assigns worth to some material and not others, it is surprising that there has not been more debate on the issue within the profession, or concerns raised by those outside. Cyzyk,[20] in discussing this an ethical concern, talks of an absolute 'realm of values' as being no longer applicable, with 'the controversy endemic to theories of value – namely the conflict between absolute and relativistic theories of value' in no way resolved. Stepping outside an existing paradigm based upon contemporary values is no simple matter and it is not only within librarianship that the issue provokes debate.

Concern with the influence that a particular world view had on the shape of research led Kuhn, in his seminal work on the nature of scientific research, to argue that most research is blinkered by the prevailing values, interests, focus and concerns at a particular point in time, leading 'to an immense restriction of the scientist's vision and to a considerable resistance to paradigm change. The science has become increasingly rigid.'[21] While Kuhn was mainly concerned with the physical sciences he also applied the same arguments to social or, as he termed them, quasi-sciences, with a direct relevance to the paradigms favoured by our profession.

Writing on research and publication within the library profession, Michael Harris has acknowledged this question of a received framework within which research is conducted, and the need to acknowledge the strictures this places on the outcomes. Harris emphasises the need to acknowledge that it is 'impossible to separate the subject (the researcher) from the object (those being studied)'[22] with the result that findings will always be coloured by the 'social, political and economic context in which libraries as institutions operate and in which librarians as professionals work.'[23] Buschman and Carbone discuss the systems of power, class interest and technology which influence, directly and indirectly, the direction of work and research within libraries as in other organisations.[24] Another writer in this area, Stephens, discusses problems of identifying quality and value in any given item and thus its place inside or outside the 'canon' as depending upon:

> a conjecture at a particular historical moment and within a particular culture of social values, aspirations and ideologies, of notions about what readers do, what is understood to be everyday reality and of the constitution of social groups empowered to make judgments about books.[25]

By implication these concerns also apply to building collections where values and subjectivity inevitably play a role. This still applies even though for the larger institutional libraries there has been a significant move from print-based ownership to accessing remotely held digital files which, whether we like it or not, has proved to be a dramatic paradigm shift with, as yet, uncertain results on long-term preservation outcomes. Given this move from a collection-centred to a client-centred focus, and consequent concerns with service delivery and related issues, debate on the preservation role of libraries has moved in recent years, with the focus changing from traditional issues to concentrate on the challenges posed by digital materials. This change in attention has concentrated on the technological problems of digital preservation, with little comment on the problem of appraisal and selection for permanent retention, which is still very much influenced by the earlier collection-centred paradigm and associated values and subjectivities.

Thus the shape of existing collections can be seen as representing a particular world view at a particular time. Collections are not 'neutral' but reflect the society which created them. With the additional challenges being posed by large numbers of often complex digital artifacts needing to be assessed, and a growing acceptance that there is a multitude of viewpoints on what constitutes significance, it is timely to raise the level of debate on this wide-ranging issue.

Views of Significance

Schellenberg, in outlining his appraisal taxonomy for those responsible for record keeping and archives, created a two-tiered approach to determining the selection and retention of material. The primary values referred to a record's role in supporting the activities of an organisation – its legal basis, responsibilities, and so on. Secondary values referred to the sometimes unforeseen value of a record to parties other than the creator. There may be evidential value in proving the basis for decisions made and policies undertaken, or informational value in providing details and statistics. In addition, Schellenberg called for consideration of the item's intrinsic worth through such values as its aesthetic quality, association, significance, and uniqueness.[26]

Given that a record meets either the primary or secondary values, Ham[27] suggested that in determining significance the archivist should weigh:

- the functional characteristics of a record – what was its purpose, who created it
- the quality and significance of the information in the record
- the record in context – is it part of a series, informing and supporting other material
- potential use that may be made of the record and its possible limitations, and

- the cost of preserving the record against the benefits accrued from its existence.

The UK National Archives developed their appraisal policies using Schellenberg's approach of considering a record's primary and secondary values. Using a system of reviews, records were assessed five years after being closed, principally on their primary value, and at this stage were either discarded or retained. A second review was conducted after 25 years using clearly defined criteria developed from Schellenberg's taxonomy in order to identify material of continuing value. The timing of these appraisals means that records could be considered with the benefit of hindsight to assist in making the preservation decision. This question of reappraisal, with its potential for present-oriented values driving decisions, has been questioned by some as a potential threat to the integrity of collections.[28] However, for electronic records a recent report from the UK National Archives notes that these time periods are no longer valid and that decisions need to be made much earlier in identifying records of enduring value if we are to have any chance of ensuring their survival.[29]

While these approaches are aimed specifically at archival collections, many of the principles have an equal applicability to library collections, both physical and digital.

Lyall, in a paper primarily concerned with prioritising library materials for preservation purposes, describes the Australian context, providing broad categories for assessing national significance and determining that 'material is of national significance if it constitutes an authoritative significant record of Australia as a country and of the people, events and influences which have affected it.[30] The categories developed were then expanded with further detail and examples in order to assist in their application which, it was acknowledged, could be problematic.[31] Lyall proposed a three-tier system for ranking and prioritising materials that provides a useful framework for considering the significance issue and its practical implementation. Later, the number of tiers was increased to four, following further consideration of their practical implementation. The tiers comprised national treasures or material of exceptional significance, material of high national significance, material of national significance and material of significance.[32]

For the 'national treasures, exceptional significance' category, it is likely there is a relatively common understanding of what attributes make an item of exceptional significance to the mainstream values of society today, and by implication, for all time. They are described in the promotional material for the National Library of Australia's Great Libraries exhibition as items that 'have helped define our nation – where we come from, who we are, what sets us apart.'[33] There is little temporality about these materials – they would stand out as important in virtually any context and application of the Memory of the

World criteria noted below would generally see a high level of agreement. Only a small number of items fit this category.

For this material preservation of the artefact itself, as well as its information content, is seen as highly desirable. For digital objects where this aim is not so achievable, a clear audit trail recording the evolution of the object would be a prerequisite to ensure this high level of preservation priority.

The *Australian Memory of the World Committee*,[34] primarily concerned with national treasures, note that making judgments regarding significance is an invidious and arguable process that, by definition, is a challenging course of action. To assist in the assessment process they suggest that there must be evidence of one or more of the following to distinguish an item of 'demonstrated historic, aesthetic, spiritual, community or research significance.'[35] Thus for an item or collection to be considered under this rationale there needs to be evidence that an item of documentary heritage is:

- unique
- irreplaceable and as a consequence its loss would impoverish Australia's heritage
- has a high level of impact – over time or place
- has a high level of influence – for good or bad
- is representative of a type, but not have a direct equal, and
- has comparative value – rarity, completeness, integrity relative to others of its kind.

The traditional material deemed to fit into this highest level tier is well illustrated by the Treasures of the State Library link (http://www.slsa.sa.gov.au/exhibitions/treasures/list.htm) where the South Australian State Library has placed examples of what would generally be accepted as iconic material from their collections.

For levels two, three and four, there can be considerable leeway in interpretation. There are no clear criteria for tier one, and the interpretation as to what constitutes 'generic' or lower value items will be far more subjective, depending upon the time, place and background of those making the decisions and the aims of the institution.

The second tier, of high national importance, places less emphasis on preservation of the original carrier, accepting that as long as the content is preserved, there may be less effort made in preserving all carriers, as long as examples are retained. One collecting sector proposed by Lyall[36] that fits this category is newspapers, where one institution may dispose of original copies after microfilming if it is understood that a paper version does reside somewhere else for reference as required. Thus the decision regarding significance and the resultant action is not made alone, but is seen as part of a cooperative decision-making process where the guidelines are clearly spelled out. Many countries have taken this approach to the preservation of newspaper collections with regional or nationwide cooperative ventures to microfilm back runs and maintain current collections (for instance, Newsplan in the United Kingdom). This second tier, with less emphasis on the original carrier, is a particularly useful approach to dealing with very large collections or collections that are expensive or difficult to preserve and/or store in their original format.

Lyall's third category is material of national significance for which only samples will be retained – sometimes in original formats, sometimes in another format (for example digitised or microfilm). This category comprises generic material containing large numbers of similar items from which a proportion will be selected.

A fourth tier, called 'material of significance' was introduced to cover materials where there was significant duplication and low intrinsic value. Again, only samples in either the original or copied format will be retained.[37]

The difficulties of categorising materials in these lower levels can never be completely overcome but does need to be acknowledged, and the obvious place to do this is within the collection development policy itself. Harvey[38] provides a useful summary of key actions and questions that need to be addressed when developing an appraisal and selection policy for digital acquisitions that is also useful when considering traditional materials. He suggests consideration needs to be given to three broad areas before getting to the specifics of identifying individual items or collections:

- the context (the institution's mission, relationships with others, resources)
- technical capabilities – knowledge and equipment, and
- legal obligations and rights.

With this as a basis, a policy can then be developed which targets specific areas, providing detailed criteria and supporting argument for the approaches adopted.

The collection development policy needs to indicate clearly categories of material that are designated for permanent retention and, importantly, provide an outline of the discussion and analysis that underpins the foundation for this decision and how it relates to the overall objectives of the organisation. This should be done in straightforward, simple language, enabling anyone, not just heritage professionals, to understand why this approach has been taken. The Australian Memory of the World Committee suggests including a succinct statement of significance that gets down to specifics in articulating why a certain item, collection or collecting sector has been nominated.[39] In developing these arguments it is important to be aware of what other, comparable, organisations are doing to ensure, as far as possible, that limited resources are concentrated on material not being covered elsewhere.

For institutions not normally associated with long-term preservation of significant material, such as school, public or special libraries, it is still likely that they will hold some items, even if only the records created by the organisation itself, that they will wish to retain permanently. Or it may be that there is a local history collection relating to the area, the development of the school or the evolution of the company. These are typically the type of material that would receive a level one rating requiring keeping and preserving the original items wherever possible, which needs to be spelt out in their collecting policy.

Larger institutions will have more wide-ranging materials designated for permanent retention and should therefore devote considerably more space in their policy to explaining the process and rationale behind such a designation. Use of a taxonomy such as that proposed by Lyall may provide a useful framework to help explain the strategy to staff, funding bodies and clients.

For large publicly funded organisations there should be involvement from stakeholders outside of the institution in order to arrive at these decisions, which will have a significant impact on both current and future users of the collections. The use of focus groups, identification of key users, discussions with professional bodies whose members are likely to use the collections, liaison with relevant collectors or associations and public calls for input into the policy will help ensure that decisions are reached that have been widely considered and debated. This should make for a better understanding of the issues, better criteria for determining level two, three or four material, and greater consensus as to what comprises these categories. This leaves the institution less vulnerable to negative publicity should there be complaints or argument over the prioritising of its collections.

In addition, for many institutions, actually adding 'significance information' to the catalogue record for an item can be a useful approach. This may be as simple as applying a code from a predetermined set of tables, all the way to a detailed curatorial explanation as to why this particular item has been assigned a particular significance level. Usually such a high level of detail would only be applied to level one or equivalent material.

However, as was noted earlier, there is a temporal dimension to significance that inevitably leads to a revisiting of the provisions within the collection development policy. If the arguments underpinning the earlier decisions have been well articulated in the current policy, it makes any demands for revision or change easier to address and easier to decide in the light of this information.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is not to propose concrete solutions – there are none. It is to encourage discussion and debate upon an issue crucial to the role and influence of libraries, now and into the future. This issue is one which Ham has described for archivists as their most 'intellectually demanding task.'[40] The burgeoning growth in the production of material (both traditional and digital) over the last twenty years has been phenomenal and makes the need for clarity in our selection for retention policies more important than ever before. A good example of this growth in numbers and complexity is the move from film to videotape. For institutions acquiring home movies, popular from the 1920s to the 1970s, the numbers involved are modest (the cost of the equipment and film processing limited their use to middle and upper classes) and the number of formats limited (primarily 8mm, super8 and 16mm). Compare this to video, commonly available from the 1970s on. The numbers involved are enormous due to its ease of use and relatively low cost. There is a larger variety of formats (Beta, VHS, Hi-8, digital and so on) bringing their own individual preservation issues. For any organisation collecting and preserving such material, the selection and long-term retention criteria used when acquiring films may no longer be appropriate. Far more stringent measures of significance may be necessary in order to select manageable numbers of home videos.

In addition to the sheer volume of material, the nature of distributed digital resources suggests that there may be a dilution of responsibility regarding preservation. After all, if the material is not physically yours, but only leased for a period of time with clearly delineated rights, then someone else (database vendor, IT specialist, other institution) will be preserving it – won't they? As preservation becomes technically more challenging than it has ever been in the past, with the consequent need for increased resourcing, limits will quickly be reached and it may be that some forms of material just will not be preserved in any rational manner, but rather on an ad hoc basis.

In a discussion of archival appraisal, Jimerson makes the point that 'in a time of scarce resources for cultural and historical pursuits, the decisions to save one group of manuscripts or archives almost invariably means that some other materials cannot be saved. These decisions require difficult choices.'[41] In reaching these decisions, institutions need to ensure that the rationale behind their approach and the detail of its implementation are clearly delineated and made publicly available in their policies.

Notes

1 UNESCO Memory of the World Programme 2005, at http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=1538&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

2 R Harvey *Preserving Digital Materials* München KG Saur 2005 p62

3 K-D Lehmann *The Future of the Past: Remembering and Forgetting on the Threshold of the New Millennium* 2004, at http://www.h-quandt-stiftung.de/root/index.php?lang=en&page_id=540

4 T Eastwood 'Appraising Digital Materials for Preservation as Cultural Heritage' in *Preservation of Electronic Records: New Knowledge and Decision-Making* Ottawa Canadian Conservation Institute 2003 p7

5 ibid p9

6 ibid p11

7 R Harvey ‘Preserving Digital Documentary Heritage in Libraries: What Do We Select? in *Preservation of Electronic Records: New Knowledge and Decision-Making* Ottawa Canadian Conservation Institute 2003 p13

8 Harvey *Preserving Digital Materials* p57

9 G F Ham *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* Chicago Society of American Archivists 1993 p8

10 ibid p11

11 AMOL (Australian Museums OnLine) *ReCollections: Caring for Collections across Australia* 2005 p31, at http://amol.org.au/recollections/4/4/index.htm

12 ibid p31

13 Heritage Collections Council *Significance: A Guide to assessing the Significance of Cultural Heritage Objects and Collections* 2001 p8, at http://sector.amol.org.au/publications_archive/collections_management/significance

14 ibid p17

15 Scottish Museums Council *A Significance Recognition Scheme for Non-National Museums and Galleries in Scotland* 2005 p9, at http://www.scottishmuseums.org.uk/pdfs/Significance_cons.pdf

16 ibid p8

17 D Dorner and S Young *A Regional Approach to Identifying Items of National Significance held by Small Cultural Institutions in New Zealand*. 2004 p4, at http://www.natlib.govt.nz/files/initiatives/Final%20Report%20without%20Appendix%204%20-%20A4%20size.pdf

18 G Stevenson ‘Popular Culture and the Public Library’ in M J Voight and M H Harris (eds) *Advances in Librarianship* vol 7 New York Academic Press 1977 p782

19 M Burns cited in A Galligan *Libraries and Literary Outcomes: A Crucial Intersection in the Cultural Field* 2000, at http://conferences.alia.org.au/alia2000/proceedings/anne.galligan.html

20 M Cyzyk ‘Canon Formation, Library Collections and the Dilemma of Collection Development’ *College and Research Libraries* vol 54 no 1 1993 p59

21 T S Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* London University of Chicago Press 1970 p64

22 M H Harris ‘The Dialectic of Defeat: Antimonies in Research in Library and Information Science’ *Library Trends* Winter 1986 p521

23 J Buschman and M Carbone ‘A Critical Inquiry into Librarianship: Applications of the New Sociology of Education’ *Library Quarterly* vol 61 no 1 1991 p15

24 ibid p21

25 J Stephens ‘Children’s Literature, Value and Ideology’ *Australian Library Review* vol 12 no 3 1995 p255

26 Ham *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* p8

27 Ham *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* p51

28 Benedict cited in R C Jimerson ‘Deciding What to Save’ *OCLC Systems & Services* vol 19 no 4 2003 pp135-140

29 H Mercer *The National Archives Appraisal Policy: Background Paper – the Griggs System and Beyond* 2004 p4, at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/recordsmanagement/selection/pdf/background_appraisal.pdf

30 J Lyall 'Determining the Significance of Documentary Heritage Materials' *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* vol 24 no 2 1993 p71
31 ibid p72
32 ibid p74
33 National Library of Australia *National Treasures from Australia's Great Libraries* 2005, at http://www.nla.gov.au/apps/onlineshop?action=OLSDisplay&id=nla.int-ls27620-bk&mode=nocart&nonav=yes
34 Australian Memory of the World Committee *Draft Manual: Significance, Documentary Heritage, and the MOW Registers* 2005 p4, at http://www.amw.org.au/workshops/manual_01.pdf
35 ibid p7
36 Lyall 'Determining the Significance' p75
37 K Winkworth and Australian Heritage Projects *Review of Existing Criteria for assessing Significance Relevant to movable Heritage Collections and Objects* 1998 p44, http://sector.amol.org.au/__data/page/150/chapters1_3.pdf?MySourceSession=f8bc5d3651b58aa6544c3f50eb6f1815
38 R Harvey *Digital Curation Manual: Appraisal and Selection* (in publication)
39 Australian Memory of the World Committee *Draft Manual* p6
40 Ham *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* p1
41 Jimerson *Deciding What to Save*