

Workshop Structure

10.30- 10.40 Introduction and Grounding of workshop

10.40- 12.00 Critical mapping

12.15-13.00 Assessing Risk

LUNCH BREAK

14.00 – 15.30 Instructions for harvesters & editors

15.40 – 17.00 Designing for new formats and closing discussion

Axes (access, use, risk, labour)

- How to document with integrity? (questions of access)
- Why archive? (questions of use)
- How to do it safely? (questions of risk)
- How to keep archiving sustainable? (questions of labour)
- How to use the archive to move towards equity of power (information, knowledge, access to resources, decision-making)?

Keep 3 lists throughout the day to add:
values, purpose, risk factors, questions around labour
to reflect on during the last session of the day.

- ▷ **Reject Neutrality, Embrace Transparency (be mindful of asymmetries)**
- ▷ **Radical Access (physical/digital, intellectual, formats, audiences)**
- ▷ **Radical use & transformation ((re)use/copyrights, legibility, activation, formats, audiences)**
- ▷ **Safety first (balancing transparency with anonymity, how to weave in consent?)**
- ▷ **Share the labour (skillsharing, changing perspectives, maintenance)**

Critical Mapping (80 min)

Goal:

- Identify the problems and bottlenecks with current formats
- Identify elements that work well and why per format.

Preparation:

A timeline of past events and harvests is already in the room. Spend the first 20 minutes, adding unsorted harvests in the timeline. There needs to be at least 1 of each format of harvest in the timelines so all formats are assessed.

Critical Mapping

Round 1: (20 min)

Each participant to pick a harvest they find is a good practice in terms of equitable access and explain why. Try to make a list of what works and what does not work in this format of harvest.

- For whom was the harvest? (audiences)
- How does the format serve the audience?
- Where is it stored?
- What would help the right audience find it? (title, keywords, description, context)
 - What aspects make the harvest inaccessible? (language, format, missing information, not easily transmissible)

In a short plenary do a round of what worked for specific formats.

Critical Mapping

Round 2: (20 min)

Each participant to pick a harvest they find is a good practice in terms of use (being able to be re-used or editorialised). Try to make a list of what works and what does not work in this format of harvest.

- Is it “accurate”? Is the language and information representative of what happened?
 - How does it hold the memory of the event/lesson/meeting?
 - How can this harvest be made available to other audiences? What would be the use of that?
 - What aspects could be improved and how?

In plenary do a round of what worked for specific formats.

Critical Mapping

Cycle 3: (15 min)

Each participant to pick a harvest they find is a good practice in terms of assessing risk.

- Where is it stored?
- To whom is it accessible?
- Are there any sensitive or private information shared?
- Has there been a process of consent?

In plenary do a round of what worked for specific formats.

Assessing Risk

Goal: To collectively develop a protocol for assessing and handling sensitive information while maintaining trust and transparency.

Round 1: (10 min)

In groups of 2-3 build 1-2 case studies of existing examples from the participants experience of dealing with risk.

- As harvesters, where there moments where you hesitated in writing down information?
- As editors, did you ever omit information to protect privacy?
- How can we assess our personal risk and keep each other safe?
- If you did not have any experience of that can you imagine a scenario here risk would be an issue?

Organise the risk escalating from benign, to personal or more serious. For example a film of a public event, an education event where copyrighted material is shared, meetings notes where personal information is added, an audio/livestream where information is overheard that can put someone at risk.

Assessing Risk

Round 2 : (15 min)

In your small groups, each take 1-2 case studies of the cases that were developed in round 1.

Discuss:

- What is the specific risk (legal, personal, emotional etc) and for whom?
- Where is the information stored and to whom it is accessible?
- Can the material be reused? Are there rules?
- Who decides the level of risk? Is it a collective or individual decision?
- When is the decision taken? At what stage of the process?
- What can the action plan be once some information poses a risk? Do you redact content, do you anonymise, do you destroy the file, do you restrict the access?
- What are the consequences for potential audiences when taking each of these decisions?
- In which cases a consent form or disclaimer could mitigate risk?

Round 3: (15 min)

Groups present their case and decision and their proposed decision making structures are collected.

Instructions for...

Goal: The exercise aims to trace connections between inputs, and appropriate formats and outputs for different audiences.

Outcome:

- Try to draft needs for different audiences
- List and blindspots of editors
- List blindspots for harvesters
- Draft instruction for readers, harvesters and editors

Instructions for harvesters

Round 1 (30 min) :

Each person to get assigned a different audience (future self, editorial, members in different localities, serendipitous audience/public) and try to pick a harvest or set of harvests that feels relevant to that audience. Try to answer:

(15 min)

- What information is relevant for that specific audience?
- What was the purpose/use of the harvest?
- What harvesting strategy was used and why?
- What does the format convey?
- What information or context is missing from the original harvest?
- What information does the format omit? What information does the format allow?
- What information is inaccessible because of the format?
- What information is necessary for this audience to be maintained? What is missing?
- Is there any information that needs to be omitted to mitigate risks?
- Where would this harvest be archived? (physical, digital)
- How would this be retrieved for the particular audience?

(15 min)

Participants that have similar format of harvest group together and discuss their findings, considering the dos and donts from the mapping and make a list of instructions for the harvester.

Instructions for editors

Round 2 (30 min)

Participants divide per the audiences they have been assigned. Thinking that you are that audience member, how would you editorialise the harvests you have chosen. Discuss in the groups and make a list of tips for the editors focusing on formats that relate to particular audiences.

- Why is the original event important for your particular audience?
- What is useful for each audience? What information is relevant to transmit?
- What information is missing? How can context be added?
- What kind of editorial labour can make it more legible or accessible?
- Who should take up that labour? Can parts be shared with the audience?
- What is the purpose of the editorial? (educational, for accountability, etc)
- What format can the editorial take (bingo, workflow, podcast, album, glossary, game, manual)?
- What information does the chosen format omit/allow?
- What information needs to be omitted?
- How would this editorial be disseminated?
- How can it be further activated or reused?

Plenary discussion sharing outcome. Consider a gradient for editorialising.

Instructions for the reader

Round 3 (30 min)

Try to sharpen the instructions gathered as a protocol.

- What format these instructions can take? (checklist, chart, workflow, template)
- Does it require a presentation or any training?
- What instructions would be useful to have to the reader (of the harvest or editorial)?

Designing for new formats

Goal: To draft a Yearly Plan with a timeline of formats + responsibilities and establish a draft for Collaborative Documentation Agreement

Reflection: (10 min)

Bring back values, why we archive and risks lists.

Bring back refresher of the instructions for haversers, editors and readers.

Participants break into groups and each is responsible to think of how to make the instructions concrete for all the different inputs in the timeline of next year.

Designing for new formats

Round 1 (20 min)

Consider the instructions for harvests you have from the previous workshop and pay attention to the labour of harvesting (who, when, how):

- Why is the event being documented?
- Which particular formats of documentation fit with each event?
- To which audiences are these harvests available to?
- What needs to be documented for each audience?
- How often do these events happen and what is the labour requiring for harvesting?

(break the process into steps harvesting during, cleaning up information, light editorial, adding context, uploading online)

- Who is responsible for each of these formats?
- Where are the harvests being stored?
- How are these being digitised?
- Which skills required to do so? Are people comfortable with doing that?

Come together and discuss your findings before you add them to a year calendar. Note the labour it takes and whether a working group, or collective is responsible. To whom are you accountable to? Reflect whether this workflow is realistic and whether it matches the ethics of the group.

Designing for new formats

Round 2 (20 min)

Now consider the material that requires more context, or more editorial labour to be shared. Consider the instructions for editors you have from the previous workshop and pay attention to the labour of editorials (who, when, how)

- Which audiences need editorialised content and why?
- What formats are appropriate for each audience?
- How often these editorials need to happen?
- What is the labour required?
- Who is responsible? how can it be collectivised?
- Can the audiences participate in the editorial labour?
- Where are the editorials stored?
- How can they be accessed?
- Which skills required to do so? Are people comfortable with doing that?

Come together and discuss your findings before you add them to a year calendar. Note the labour it takes and whether a working group, or collective is responsible. To whom are you accountable to? Reflect whether this workflow is realistic and whether it matches the ethics of the group.

Designing for new formats

Plenary reflecting on whether there is clarity on the following:

- What have been the common goals (why are we documenting specific events? (accountability, internal memory, sharing knowledge/skills etc,))
- Ethics (what are our principles for doing so?)
- Roles and responsibilities (who does what, and for how long, how to ensure sustainability and rotation)
- Safety protocol (do we need consent and for what, who has access to the archive)
- Outputs (what are our outputs and where do we store it)
- What are the next steps and protocols still needed? (digitisation protocol, storing protocol, templates)

THANK YOU!