Karine St-Onge (kstonge@ualberta.ca)

March 05, 2019

Appendix E: Literature Review

Collaborative Research

Sandoval et al. (2016) describe the concept of being aware of the power-imbalance between the researcher and the Indigenous community in the article entitled *Ancestral Knowledge Systems: A Conceptual Framework for Decolonizing Research in Social Science*. The authors invite the researchers to consider their position in regards to their ancestral homeland, and how that might affect their relationship to the Indigenous communities they seek to study (Sandoval et al. 2016, 24). In this way, they may start to decolonize their research by providing a context for themselves and the way they came about the research proposal (Sandoval et al. 2013, 26). Latulippe (2015) tackles this issue by proposing a new research methodology based on the Nation-to-Nation relationship present in Treaties. She calls it an "Indigenous research paradigm" in her article entitled *Bridging Parallel Rows: Epistemic Difference and Relational Accountability in Cross-Cultural Research* (Latulippe 2015, 1). Such a research paradigm challenges colonial attitudes by putting the two parties on equal footing.

Margaret Kovach's (2009) approach to mixing methodologies in order to decolonize the process, which she discusses in her book entitled *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts,* inspires Latulippe*.* Kovach (2009) discusses how "Indigenous peoples recognize that for their cultural knowledge to thrive it must live in many sites, including Western education and research" (p.12). If academic institutions want to be allies, they need to respect and recognize Indigenous research methodologies as they do any Western research framework (Kovach 2009, 13). Indigenous methodologies focus on self-study, not unlike other qualitative methodologies, and on the process itself (Kovach 2009, 32). They are relevant to the decolonization of academic institutions in many ways. Since it is about the process itself, it gifts us of a framework for decolonizing other academic fractions. This is particularly evident in the researcher's preparation, which includes cultural protocols and giving back (Kovach 2009, 45).

A consequence of colonialism is how the transmission of Indigenous Knowledges is harder to do. Kovach (2009) lists a few ethical considerations for the researcher, which applies to institutions in general as well. These considerations include "that the research methodology be in line with Indigenous

values, that there is some form of community accountability, that the research gives back to and benefits the community in some manner, and that the researcher is an ally and will not do harm" (Kovach 2009, 48). The academic library can ensure that they have a solid relationship with Indigenous students, staff and faculty by being transparent about their decolonizing process and making the library staff accessible throughout the journey (Kovach 2009, 52). As theorists need to make space for Indigenous protocols and ethics (Kovach 2009, 86), the academic library needs to make space for Indigenous resources and Indigenous patrons. Kovach (2009) states that the bottom line is for Indigenous research to benefit Indigenous Peoples (93). In the same vein, the academic library needs to benefit its Indigenous patrons. The academic library needs to self-locate, assess its own motivations and be self-aware of the ways it is perpetuating colonialism, or at the very least, not actively decolonizing. It needs to be aware of its power relationship with its Indigenous patrons and Indigenous staff in order to take action towards social justice (Kovach 2009, 119). The library has to be non-directive in its approach: it cannot force researchers to adopt a certain protocol or push towards a certain research methodology. Rather, the library has to remain supportive and offer the appropriate resources and spaces for the Indigenous patron to make an informed choice (Kovach 2009, 165).

Latulippe (2019) recommends "relational accountability" or turning the critical gaze at one self as a part of the methodology that respects Indigenous Knowledges (p. 6-7). This enables non-Indigenous researchers to consider research methodologies outside of their comfort zone. This research methodology needs to meet three criteria: "It should be accountable to Indigenous communities, appreciate Indigenous epistemologies as distinct, and work to bridge epistemic difference" (Latulippe 2015, 6). Latulippe (2015) gives an example from her research to demonstrate how it can be positive to use the treaty approach: a treaty perspective allows the researcher to use both a "critical Western qualitative methodology" and the First Nation's ways of knowing (p. 7-8). The author has guiding principles for research agreements between researchers and Indigenous communities. They need to "prioritize the need to give back to communities in ways that are relevant, grounded in existing needs, and accessible" (Latulippe 2015, 11). Research agreements are a good way of getting to know the research partner, of taking the time to understand their values, to discuss and agree upon the concrete benefits of this research, and they are the standard for the rest of the collaboration (Latulippe 2015, 11). Guidelines that guide a researcher or an institution during their collaborative research with an Indigenous community must use that community's protocols and be respectful (Cole 2002, 448). When creating these guidelines or research frameworks, it is useful to remember it is not always necessary to use fixed vocabularies as these are culturally binding (Cole 2002, 449). These frameworks will be

different from Indigenous community to Indigenous community, and the relationships formed with these communities will be different as well (Cole 2002, 452). As Cole (2002) explains: "A framework is a journey/ing   with" (p. 453).

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) revolutionized research methodologies with her book entitled *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* As she puts it: "*Decolonizing Methodologies* is not a method for revolution in a political sense but provokes some revolutionary thinking about the roles that knowledge, knowledge production, knowledge hierarchies and knowledge institutions play in decolonization and social transformation" (Smith 2012, xii). To decolonize research, the researchers need to ask themselves questions that uncover their motive: who owns this research? Whom does it benefit? Who is asking these research questions? Who shares it and how? (Smith 2012, 10). Instead of looking at Indigenous communities' protocols and belief systems as barriers to their research, researchers can embrace Indigenous research methodologies and use these cultural protocols as part of their methodology (Smith 2012, 1-16). "They are 'factors' to be built into research explicitly, to be thought about reflexively, to be declared openly as part of the research design, to be discussed back as part of the final results of a study and to be disseminated back to the people in culturally appropriate ways and in a language that can be understood" (Smith 2012, 16). Instead of sharing only the information gathered during the data collection, researchers should share the knowledge gathered: that is, they should also share the process and the theories that shape this information. This helps in decolonizing as it demonstrates the path used to inform the result of the research (Smith 2012, 17). Smith (2012) challenges us to ask ourselves more questions to analyze our motives and goals: "For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so? What knowledge will the community gain from this study? What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?" (p. 175).

Research involving Indigenous Peoples is particularly concerned with ethics and the issues regarding intellectual property since research has historically placed them outside of the research process. The use of Indigenous research methodologies has emerged to place Indigenous Peoples in the research process (Lyons 2011, 2-3). Using digital spaces to have a continuous discussion about the research process, the research data and the shared knowledge is desirable (Lyons 2011, 12). Lyons (2011) describes the project that reunited the MacFarlane Collection to the Inuvialuit as an example of a project that used Indigenous research methodologies. This project produced research data and the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre holds the copyright of this research data as an attempt to follow Inuvialuit protocols for research (Lyons 2011, 10). As with any relationship, the relationship between the research team and the community will have issues and they will make mistakes. It is better to admit to

them and face the consequence because it shows accountability and a willingness to improve (Lyons 2011, 10). Community engagement during research means no longer seeing the community as the 'subject', but rather moving towards research that is grounded in "[…] thinking about accountability, building trust and, ultimately, striving for relevancy" (Waterton 2015, 59).

The researchers need to understand what is Traditional Knowledge, what is intangible cultural heritage, how it is situated within the Traditional Knowledge System, and make efforts to protect it during the research project. It is also important to know that some tangible and intangible cultural heritage are connected. For example, a song linked to a belonging cannot be easily separated (Bannister 2009, 281). Academic codes of ethics and standards of practice can offer protection to intangible cultural heritage in a simpler way than intellectual property laws can. These codes of ethics should advocate for the respect of cultural protocols and community values (Bannister 2009, 283). Cultural protocols are part of the community's cultural belief system. It is important to note that, after the legacy of colonization, only some codified cultural protocols exist. An outsider, such as a non-Indigenous archivist or librarian, may have a difficult time understanding the protocols and may breach them by accident. Therefore, it is highly recommended to use the guidance of an Elder or other cultural advisor that is from within the community (Bannister 2009, 288). Some cultural protocols are easily available but some are not and many researchers may not be aware of them. A database of research protocols, if the community wants them to be more accessible, would be useful to researchers and communities (Bannister 2009, 299). Bannister (2009) goes on to compare several research agreements, template agreements and standards to see how they tackle the issue of consent, ownership, participation and other rights. For example, the language project agreements examined state explicitly that the First Nation owns and possesses the original recordings, while the researcher will have copies (Bannister 2009, 294).

Traditional Knowledge is a complex and cross-disciplinary concept. Therefore, it is both crucial to develop guidelines in order to protect it and extremely difficult to do so. According to Geary et al. (2013), one of the important facets of collaboration with Indigenous communities is the necessity for the research to benefit both parties. The authors describe the concept of benefits as more than monetary and can include "incorporating knowledge exchange with communities; implementing mechanisms to protect cultural heritage and artefacts; developing infrastructure; and/or providing training opportunities" (Geary et al. 2013, 2). Institutions such as universities need to challenge the way they think about intellectual property rights when it comes to Traditional Knowledge. Intellectual property rights offer limited protection in nature and this is not sufficient when it comes to Traditional

Knowledge, which needs protection in a different way. Generation to generation passes such knowledge and with purpose, which is not the same as having it in the public domain, free to use (Geary et al. 2013, 4-5).

Geary et al. (2013) explain the process involved in collaborative research with Indigenous communities in their article entitled *Access and Benefits Sharing Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Northern Canada: Understanding the Legal Environment and Creating Effective Research Agreements.* Legally, researchers are often required to produce research agreements with their Indigenous partners, which work as permits (Geary et al. 2013, 4). An example of a First Nation producing their own research agreement that researchers should use is the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation. They have an ethics review board as well as a repository for the data resulting from the research (Geary et al. 2013, 4). Questions found in the researcher's application form written by the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation include questions on the significance of the project, on where the information will be stored, and how this research will benefit the community. They also ask for a copy of the consent form if the researcher plans to make contact with the members of the community at that location (Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, *Researcher's Application Form*).

So what should a research agreement between a researcher and an Indigenous community involve? It needs to "respect and meet the needs of research partners, while acknowledging the power-imbalance inherent in their negotiation" (Geary et al. 2013, 2). In addressing the power imbalance during the negotiations, one of the parties may find themselves making concessions that benefit the other in order to tip the balance in the other's favour. The goal is to establish a research agreement that is mutually beneficial but that is aware of the societal context in which it was negotiated (Geary et al. 2013, 4-5). Geary et al. (2013) used the norms of relational contracts and applied them to Indigenous research agreements (p. 6). I will briefly summarize these norms:

- Non-Indigenous researchers have misused data in the past. They might have to address that mistrust.
- Both parties should benefit from this collaboration and discuss the benefits/possible benefits. This will help manage expectations.
- Instead of predicting future decisions, the agreement should state how to make decisions (Geary et al. 2013, 6).
- The research agreement should discuss how to share this research. The researcher has to be prepared that the freedom to share will not be as great as when working on a project alone.
- The negotiators need to be flexible and willing to change the research agreement if necessary.

- The research agreement needs to address the possibility of conflict and its resolution.
- Both parties need to discuss the power dynamic and its manifestations. For example, one researcher having access to all of the funds creates a power-imbalance.
- The research agreement should state what both parties can do with the research individually, and how to deal with the distribution of benefits (Geary et al. 2013, 7).

Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation called in researchers from the University of Alberta to conduct research, in collaboration with their own researchers, into substance abuse effects on the community's children and families. This research partnership was community-driven and an excellent example of following ethical research principles. The result of the partnership was an "evidence-based life skills program" (Baydala et al. 2013, 136). Elders supported the project from the beginning and advised the researchers throughout. "Elder involvement is essential to most research projects conducted in First Nations and other aboriginal communities" (Baydala et al. 2013, 136). The team members first obtained community consent for the research project from the Elders in order to follow cultural protocols, and then from the Band Council. Through community meetings and Working Group Meetings, they agreed on the allocation of funding and other research project decisions.

Getting informed consent from the Elders in accordance with the Research Ethics Board approval was a challenge since the Elders made it clear that signing a consent form was inappropriate: instead, the researchers recorded the Elders stating that they gave their consent, as evidenced by accepting the tobacco gifting (Baydala et al. 2013, 137). As the researchers realized that following cultural protocols was the ethical way to move forward, they got an alternative approach to tracking informed consent approved by the Research Ethics Board. From then on, they would track the activity (such as gift giving or facilitating a focus group), the date and the Elder who consented to attend (Baydala et al. 2013, 138) as evidence of consent.

The Data Archive

The article entitled *Respect, Trust and Engagement: Creating an Australian Indigenous Data Archive* is about the process behind creating the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Data Archive (ATSIDA). ATSIDA exists because of an agreement followed by a collaboration between the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), a leader in research about the Indigenous population of Australia, and the Australian Data Archive (Gardiner et al. 2011, 148). Research data is not often available to other researchers or anyone else who may benefit from it. ATSIDA acts as a long-term data repository for research data that concerns Indigenous communities. It also works

towards the digital repatriation of research data, in collaboration with Indigenous communities (Gardiner et al. 2011, 148).

ATSIDA deals exclusively with Indigenous research data and there are challenges with a project such as this one. For example, it is difficult to locate data that deals with Indigenous Peoples in datasets that do not exclusively deal with the latter. The data is scattered across disciplines and subjects. Another challenge is the sensitivity of much of this data. ATSIDA wants to be careful about not breaching confidentiality or privacy rights of the people involved (Gardiner et al. 2011, 149). There is also the issue of the depositors: researchers are not always enthusiastic about depositing their data in ATSIDA. This is perfectly understandable, as these researchers have entered into agreements with Indigenous communities that spell out how to use, store and access the data and they do not want to risk hurting the relationships or break their trust (Gardiner et al. 2011, 149).

A successful Indigenous data archive cannot assume the Western scientific paradigm of data nor the Western idea of intellectual property. For these reasons, the creators of ATSIDA have aimed to consider the following questions: "Who has authority to deposit the datasets? How should they be described? Who can authorize access and reuse? […] Should the subjects of the research data be informed of the existence of the record, and consulted about its use?" (Gardiner et al. 2011, 150). Researchers are unlikely to disregard cultural protocols on this issue and dealing with sensitive data is not a new subject. However, the epistemic differences between Indigenous worldviews and the Western worldview, and the history of colonization make these questions particularly relevant (Gardiner et al. 2011, 150).

ATSIDA has responded to these challenges by collaborating with Indigenous communities in order to ensure that the practices follow Indigenous law. The relationships built between ATSIDA and Indigenous communities influenced the guidelines and protocols they established. Gardiner et al. (2011) point out that this is not simply a challenge of reconciling Western views with Indigenous views, but it is also challenging because of how different Indigenous communities are from one another. Each community is unique and has its own set of values and beliefs. Therefore, the categorization of the datasets needs to reflect the differences such as by linguistic group, clan, geographically and thematically (Gardiner et al. 2011, 150). Context is one of the most important pieces of information the depositor can provide ATSIDA as well as the access conditions so that other researchers can properly use the data according to the Indigenous community's wishes (Gardiner et al. 2011, 150).

Another point that makes ATSIDA a unique data archive is their mission to repatriate research data to the Indigenous community it concerns. For example, through a partnership with a local museum,

research data stored in ATSIDA as well as digitized photographs and contextual material are stored together as a dataset for the researchers and the public to enjoy. Indigenous community members can contribute to the dataset by providing their own knowledge on the subject (Gardiner et al. 2011, 151). Another challenge, as ATSIDA aims to serve all of the Indigenous communities whose data they have, is providing a website simple enough to be accessible in remote locations with low quality Internet access but with a professional interface (Gardiner et al. 2011, 151). ATSIDA's data archivist team is also working on providing tools for researchers so that they carefully manage their data during the entirety of the research cycle, therefore increasing the chances of its long-term preservation (Gardiner et al. 2011, 152).

An example of Indigenous data sovereignty is found in the community of Kahnawà:ke, which is working with the First Nations Education Council to create a data management system so that they can access and use community data. This initiative is partly in response to the Assembly of First Nations' e-Community strategy, which focuses on the importance of information management (AFN, First Nations E-Community). The digital data management system CANO has come out of this partnership (McMahon et al. 2015, 1). Universities should support initiatives to bring data into Indigenous control because "[...] community data management provides another tool that Indigenous peoples are using to counter settler colonialism and enact self-determination" (McMahon et al. 2015, 3). Community data management supports Indigenous communities in presenting evidence-based arguments for policies, reporting and proposals because they have control over their data (McMahon et al. 2015, 13).

Decolonizing the Archives

The Response to the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Taskforce of the Steering Committee on Canada's Archives (2018) wrote a report on the results from the survey, sent in 2017, on Reconciliation Action & Awareness in Canadian Archives. For the purpose of this literature review, I will focus on the executive summary of the English survey responses. While three quarters of the respondents were aware of Indigenous or relating-to records in their archives, the majority said that they do not have a formal procedure in place for the acquisition of or for access protocols to Indigenous materials (TRC Taskforce 2018, 5). The majority are not repatriating Indigenous materials nor are they creating storage and access agreements with Indigenous communities. The respondents were on the most part well read on the subject and aware of the issues but simply did not have the resources, budget or time for this kind of project (TRC Taskforce 2018, 6). This survey demonstrates the need for formal procedures and guidelines for repatriation, access agreements and other archival decolonization activities.

There is a lack of connection between what is ethical and what researchers and institutions are legally able to do with Indigenous Knowledge and materials. In *Decolonising Indigenous intellectual and cultural rights in heritage institutions: A survey of policy and protocol in South Africa*, Chisa and Hoskins (2015) remind us that colonizers often took Indigenous belongings during the colonization period. Indigenous communities did not necessarily provide their full consent during that period (Chisa & Hoskins 2015, 57). If decolonization "is concerned with having 'a more critical understanding of the underlying assumptions, motivations and values that inform research practices'" (Chisa & Hoskins 2015, 58), then we need to be conscious that what we have accepted as public domain is not necessarily considered the same in other cultures (Chisa & Hoskins 2015, 61). The authors have identified guidelines for starting the process of decolonization:

- Consultation is vital. Policy documents or standards will include the importance of consultation with Indigenous stakeholders.
- Availability is important: the institution should make itself available for discussions and it should be easy to contact the staff.
- Heritage institutions should realize they are "socio-cultural agents for change" (Chisa & Hoskins 2015, 65-66).
- Finally, the guidelines, protocols and policies should be easy to find (Chisa & Hoskins 2015, 69).

Maina (2012), for the article *Traditional Knowledge Management and Preservations: Intersections with Library and Information Science,* interviewed Elders from four different First Nations to answer questions related to the preservation and management of Indigenous Knowledge (p.14). Defining Traditional Knowledge is no easy feat as different communities and scholars have defined it in different ways (Maina 2012, 15). Instead of trying to define it, it is better to understand that Traditional Knowledge exists within the context of Indigenous ways of knowing and is ongoing. The loss of language and traditional ways of passing on Traditional Knowledge because of colonization means that there is a concern regarding its preservation. The loss of language poses a great threat to the preservation of Traditional Knowledge, as some things can be lost in translation to English (Maina 2012, 16). For the library and information science professionals and institutions to take an active role in preserving Traditional Knowledges, they need to take an active part in the debate surrounding these issues. Their absence from the debate is ironic considering that they are already managing Indigenous Knowledges, albeit often inappropriately (Maina 2012, 17).

One of the issues regarding access and ownership when it comes to archival records with Indigenous content is that often, Indigenous Peoples do not own these records nor do they have

copyright (A-Anderson 2005, 3-4). Indigenous Peoples are increasingly becoming the users of these archives; therefore, the archives' access policies must change accordingly. For example, at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), from the 1990s to the mid-2000s, the percentage of Indigenous users went from 1% to 75%. According to Anderson (2005), this is partly because of an interest in revitalizing Indigenous languages (A-p.19). AIATSIS consults Indigenous Peoples regarding the digitization of their collections regardless of where the legal rights lie. Anderson (2005) admits this is a slow process but it saves time in the sense of resulting in fewer contestations down the line (A-p.21). However, there are still issues regarding copyright. For example, a copyright owner can refuse to let the recorded Indigenous community get a digital copy for their community website (A-Anderson 2005, 25-26). In such a case, there is nothing the archives can do about it except try to facilitate a conversation between the Indigenous community and the copyright holder. Another issue is the short-term relationships between researchers and Indigenous communities (A-Anderson 2005, 27). However, through thorough research agreements, the issue of not being able to keep track of the documentation will diminish as Indigenous communities increasingly retain ownership and possession over their cultural heritage.

Once asked to act as the stewards of the collection, the archivists become accountable to what is in their archives (Pantazatos 2015, 129). Archives depend on their stakeholders; therefore conducting ethical stewardship is crucial (Pantazatos 2015, 135). Archives also respect their stakeholders, which means they are accountable to each other and therefore, care and respect drives their ethical conduct (Pantazatos 2015, 139). The establishment of protocols is important for dealing with issues of access, control, ownership and possession (Anderson 2010, 3.4.1.1). The flexibility of protocols in responding to community needs, since they exist through a partnership between the archives and the community, makes them a great tool in partnerships (Anderson 2010, 3.4.1.4). Protocols informed by ethics are important for giving guidelines on doing the right thing. For decision-making, ethics seek to help choose the decision that will have the best result according to the values and principles associated with the context in which the decision-making is taking place (Mackay & Palmer 2015, 165). There needs to be an ethical space for this kind of decision-making. Brunger et al. (2014) define ethical space as referring "[…] to understanding the strengths and challenges of bringing together different ways of knowing and applying that understanding to practice" (p. 5). The open space technique (which acknowledges how every participant will have something to contribute) facilitates the ethical space concept by providing an open space for dialogue and discussion (Brunger et al. 2014, 10).

The Archives of New Zealand, which is mandated to respect the Treaty of Waitangi (the treaty between the colonizers and Māori), provides us with an example of utilizing an ethical space. Respecting the Treaty signifies that there are processes in place for consultation with Māori and that a minimum of archivists need to have knowledge of tikanga Māori (Māori culture – in a sense) (Morse 2012, 24). In addition, there is a Māori consultative group (Morse 2012, 25). In what we now call Canada, since the 1992 Report by the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, museums have made an effort to repatriate human remains and cultural belongings, to improve access for Indigenous Peoples to the museum collections, and to promote their participation in the interpretation of these collections. This effort includes a modification of their policies and approaches in order to include Indigenous Peoples (Morse 2012, 27). In any case, Canada's museums, archives and libraries have more to do in order to adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Morse 2012, 34).

In order to look critically at issues of access to Indigenous cultural belongings, the past offers some insight: who has copyright, who has deposited it, what is the provenance and who has the power over the access (B-Anderson 2005, 85-86). "As the recording of Indigenous knowledge and information has predominantly been conducted by non-Indigenous people, the making of the material into tangible form, photographs, sound recordings, films, etc. means that ownership tends to lie with the non-Indigenous researcher or creator of the work" (B-Anderson 2005, 87). It is crucial to understand that the intangible cultural material belongs to Indigenous Peoples. Understanding the ownership issues relating to the tangible and intangible Indigenous cultural material helps archivists navigate the added complication of digitization. When the depositor has made the provenance and copyright clear with informed consent, it reduces these challenges (B-Anderson 2005, 93). It is hard to reach a balance between copyright interests and Indigenous interests. However, reaching this balance is important in order to follow legislation and to respect Indigenous customary rights (Nakata et al. 2008, 227).

Libraries and archives can help make sure that any project involving Indigenous Knowledges follows Indigenous protocols, includes members of the community as partners, and is paying Indigenous Knowledge Holders for their time and knowledge. Indigenous collective rights and intellectual property rights over their intangible and Traditional Knowledge need to be recognized and respected (Sentance, 2018). How can the library and the archives help First Nations to access their cultural materials stored in archives and libraries? They can increase discoverability by using culturally appropriate names, thesauri, and terms that have been determined through a collaboration with the community and by asking questions such as: How would they search for their own cultural material in a collection? What terms would they use? They can perform outreach to the communities represented in their holdings. Libraries

and archives can make it easier for Indigenous Peoples to access their culture found across institutions. They can support the creation of programs or projects that help make sure the culture will never be lost again. For example, libraries can support oral history projects, they can incorporate Indigenous languages in their spaces and they can infuse Indigenous perspectives/methodologies into information literacy instruction (Sentance, 2018).

On November 06, 2018, the producers of *So What?*, a podcast created by students in the Library and Information Science program at the University of Western Ontario, interviewed the librarian Camille Callison who is the chair of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee of the Canadian Federation of Library Associations (CFLA). Callison described how the CFLA Truth and Reconciliation Committee set forth ten overarching recommendations for libraries, archives and cultural institutions as a response to the TRC's *Calls to Action*. The recommendations include creating a national voice for Indigenous matters, endorsing the policy statement on services to Indigenous people, following the TRC's *Calls to Action* and encouraging equitable access (FIMS Interview 2018, 4). The need to decolonize classification and the need to decolonize the physical spaces are crucial. Staff need appropriate cultural training and the institutions need to implement UNDRIP as well as become aware of the best practices in the field (FIMS Interview 2018, 5). Finally, the last recommendation is to have an Indigenous library, archives and cultural institution association (FIMS Interview 2018, 6).

Institutional archives should rethink their acquisitions policy and start supporting community-based archives. Using their resources, knowledge and staff, the archives should support communities through workshops and toolkits, to preserve their own collections based on the cultural heritage they themselves find valuable (Madokoro 2014, 158). Alternatively, the archives can ask the community to identify which materials need preserving at the institution's archives (Madokoro 2014, 159). In both cases, the community identifies what is valuable, not the archives. There is a barrier to Indigenous ownership over records that involve them because of the concept of authors being the owners, regardless of the Indigenous Knowledge found in these records (Iacovino 2010, 354). There a various ways archives can bypass these barriers. For example, parallel provenance recognizes multiple provenances that co-exist for one record. The provenance of the record according to the settler may be different from the provenance according to the Indigenous person recorded, but both provenance entities should be available to the user in order to provide them with the context. Essentially, this is co-creatorship (Iacovino 2010, 360). The participatory archiving model discussed by Iacovino (2010) suggests collaborating with the community for all aspects of archival work; that is, complete participation in the archives (p. 362) and is another way to bypass these barriers. "A participant model in

which provenance is defined through the plurality of archival voices enhances a government policy which recognizes social inclusion as essential to a democratic society" (Iacovino 2010, 362).

The Digital Archives and Marginalized Communities Project (DAMC) includes three separate participatory archives at the University of Manitoba (U of M). These archives touch on very sensitive subjects such as Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and sex workers. The participatory approach places the stakeholders at the center of the process. In this way, the community creates and arranges the knowledge in a way that resonates with it (Allard & Ferris 2015, 361). "Collection development and record appraisal are driven by priorities established in conjunction with community partners" (Allard & Ferris 2015, 362). Community-led participatory archiving means that the community is involved at every stage of the process, from designing the digital archive to description and arrangement (Allard & Ferris 2015, 370). However, researchers at U of M, and not the communities or stakeholders themselves, initiated the project. A key aspect of this initiative is the hiring of community members as consultants. Building relationships with the communities and focusing on them was crucial to the process (Allard & Ferris 2015, 371). The participatory approach also means supporting the communities and engaging with them outside of the archives (Allard & Ferries 2015, 377).

Before starting the collaboration between archives and Indigenous communities, Reyes-Escudero and Cox (2017) argue that archivists need to know their collections deeply (p.131). A wide-ranging survey of the collections might be better suited than starting small, depending on the size of the institution. The University of Arizona Libraries Special Collections took nine months to complete a survey of their manuscript collections for Indigenous content (Reyes-Escudero & Cox 2017, 131). The survey resulted in a guide to the collections, spreadsheets divided by ethnicity, proposals for projects and additional notes. The archivists used the catalog and finding aids to identify which collections to survey for Indigenous content, taking into account the subject headings and ethnonyms used (Reyes-Escudero & Cox 2017, 132). Reyes-Escudero and Cox (2017) state that "Surveying and coming to some understanding of what we hold in our collections is an integral part of the ethical stewardship of Indigenous materials" (p.134). This survey also taught the team of archivists that although their collections did not hold much sensitive or sacred cultural material, it did have many records that had potential political use as well as many records that had the potential to demonstrate Indigenous perspectives on the history (Reyes-Escudero & Cox 2017, 134). These records should be accessible to the Indigenous communities they represent.

In the article entitled *Kwayask itôtamowin: Indigenous Research Ethics,* Ermine et al. (2005) list their ethical framework for collaborators:

- It is key to address that Indigenous worldviews and the Western worldview are fundamentally different when it comes to relationships with others and the land, what humanity is, and our accountability to others and the land. An important difference is in knowledge sharing (Ermine et al. 2005, 30).

- It is crucial to know what respect and ethical treatment means to the community itself, in order to act accordingly. What is ethical management of materials in one community may not be in another (Ermine et al. 2005, 34). We need to stop looking at it from the concept of Western ethics (Ermine et al. 2005, 39).

- If the intent of the archivist is simply a means to an end, the community will feel it and treat the project or collaboration accordingly. The archivist must come in good faith with good intentions (Ermine et al. 2005, 35).

- Not all communities will accept a general policy statement. It needs to be clear that the policy statement needs to be adapted to the diversity of Indigenous communities. The archivist will always aim to follow the community's own protocols and ethics (Ermine et al. 2005, 35).

- Local protocols on the management of archival materials will trump the institution's protocols. For example, you cannot enter a community and start asking questions. There are processes to follow, such as gift giving and others, before even considering asking questions (Ermine et al. 2005, 39).

- Standards should be set concerning the ethical treatment of Indigenous materials so that it is necessary for future archivists and archives staff to follow those (Ermine et al. 2005, 41).

- These new ethical standards may slow down the process and perhaps completely halt the acquisitioning of Indigenous belongings, but "so be it" (Ermine et al. 2005, 41).

The Digital Archive

Increasingly, Indigenous communities are documenting their own Traditional Knowledge through recording oral histories. This is for a myriad of reasons including to share oral histories widely, with Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, and to ensure the passing of oral histories onto future generations in the Indigenous community. Maina (2012) posits that libraries can play a role in the documentation of Traditional Knowledge (p.17). To ensure accuracy and authority, however, it is better that communities document their own Traditional Knowledge within the community. Libraries and archives can support those initiatives. There is also concerns regarding misrepresentations of Traditional Knowledge if it is available to a wider population. If the community records its own oral history, it is easier to leave out culturally sensitive information that is not for a wide dissemination. By documenting

oral histories in the communities by community members, concerns around ownership, access, and control are easier to navigate. Content management systems that have room for cultural protocols (such as Mukurtu CMS) help navigate the concerns regarding possession by providing the community with a platform for the oral histories that they can control (Maina 2012, 18).

There are threats to passing Indigenous Knowledges down to younger generations because of the disruptions caused by the Residential Schools such as lower levels of fluency in Indigenous languages which makes communication with Elders harder and how many Indigenous community members do not live near their communities. Therefore, there can be a clear advantage to recording and digitizing oral histories and other forms of Indigenous Knowledge, in order to preserve them and make them accessible (Stevens 2008, 26). To satisfy cultural protocols on restricted access and use, the community needs to control the access. It is also helpful if the content management system is easy to use and in plain language (Stevens 2008, 29).

Librarians are often at the forefront of digital technologies and these technologies can be ideal for the preservation of Traditional Knowledge. Digital libraries and archives can effectively preserve Traditional Knowledge and provide access and control to the communities (Maina 2012, 20). Digital libraries and archives have the advantage of breaking down geographical barriers by being accessible if the community has access to the Internet. Maina (2012) reminds us that digital technologies have great potential but can also lead to a greater misappropriation of Indigenous Traditional Knowledge by virtue of being so widely accessible (p.21). Another crucial concern is that if Traditional Knowledge is accessible, the public may use it in whichever way they please. A solution to this problem has often been to create research agreements, protocols and memorandums of understanding that spell out Indigenous governance over their Traditional Knowledge (Maina 2012, 22). These agreements are what archives and libraries use to manage the collections therefore the negotiation that results in them is extremely important. Many Indigenous communities have written protocols for using and sharing Traditional Knowledge in order to protect their communal intellectual property rights (Maina 2012, 22). The call for different levels of access by Indigenous communities is a challenge for libraries and archives as they are champions of open access, and so is the need to seek consent before providing access since ownership of Indigenous cultural heritage is not usually by one individual. Maina (2012) concludes by calling for a higher level of cultural competency among librarians and information professionals (p.24).

Repatriation of the Indigenous records should be the archives' goal, in order to return the control and possession of the belongings to the Indigenous community. The Royal Saskatchewan Museum Aboriginal History Unit does just that by following the three principles in its policy on the

management and repatriation of culturally sensitive or sacred Indigenous materials (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 1). These principles acknowledge that Indigenous Peoples have a connection to their belongings wherever they are located, these belongings are crucial for cultural purposes and that the members of the communities are the only ones to know the deeper Traditional Knowledge associated with the belongings to which they relate (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 1). The Royal Saskatchewan Museum (2010) defines culturally sensitive Indigenous materials as belongings, often used in ceremonies or are associated with them, that represent the spiritual power of a person, and that have ongoing cultural significance (p. 2). The policy states that ceremonial belongings either will be available to use in ceremonies or returned to the Peoples that have clear ties to them (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 2-3). If the Elder would prefer using a replica instead of the original belonging and communal ties to the belonging are clear, the Elder will obtain special permission (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 3). To start the repatriation process, the community or individual needs to submit a *Request for Action* (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 3). The individual or community have different options regarding the sacred materials: shared stewardship (a collaboration between the museum and the community/individual in the management of the material), the return of the material, or the replication of the material for educational or artistic purposes. Temporary storage is available for repatriated materials under storage agreements (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 4). The process is complete with a signed formal agreement (Royal Saskatchewan Museum 2010, 5).

The *Our Story* database at the Northern Territory Library in Australia manages Indigenous data and improves Indigenous access to their information by committing to digital repatriation (Gibson 2009, 4). The database system used for *Our Story* is the same template used for the *Ara Irititja Project* because of its appropriateness for remote Indigenous community-based archives, with a few modifications. Each community managed their own database locally and uploaded digitized material to it (Gibson 2009, 6). The Northern Territory Library system trained the community members responsible for the database. In terms of description, the original description (prior to repatriation) accompanies annotations from community members, therefore including an Indigenous perspective on the local history (Gibson 2009, 7). There are advantages to having a digital copy instead of the original material: for example, a digital photograph is printable, even frequently, while an original photograph needs a lot of care to remain preserved (Gibson 2009, 9). This type of project encourages communities to seek out their belongings in non-Indigenous institutions and request digital repatriation (Gibson 2009, 9).

If the institution has not made the collections available online, this signifies that the community members researching their heritage have to come to the institution in order to delineate the materials

that are relevant to the community (Gibson 2009, 11). This is often inconvenient and possibly expensive. The institution can mitigate that problem by either making their collection available online (although, it is possible that there are culturally sensitive materials that should not be widely accessible) or, the institution itself can visit the communities. In order to have a digital copy of the collections returned to the communities, the copyright holder agrees to the digitization, the request of copies and the harvesting of metadata, and possibly signs an agreement. This agreement can take the form of a MOU, a form letter or a data-use agreement that describes exactly what the community intends on doing with the digital copies (Gibson 2009, 11). At this point, it is also a great time to discuss culturally sensitive materials in the collections and what kind of access restrictions are appropriate, so that the copyright holding institution can make the appropriate changes.

The *Our Story* database adheres to five important principles: the emphasis on local access, the emphasis of local management, the control over the dissemination of the returned materials, encouraging community annotations to the material and providing a safe space. Ethically, the control and ownership of these databases and the materials they hold should remain with the communities, and adhere to their cultural protocols regarding access and dissemination (Gibson 2009, 13). If the data cannot be stored at the community level, then the institution that does hold the data should follow community protocols and guidelines regarding the preservation and access of the data (Gibson 2009, 14). A downside of the *Our Story* database software is that there are no proper annotations fields therefore, contextual or additional information is always entered in the same field and it is difficult to accurately credit or attribute it to the proper sources (engendering intellectual property rights issues) (Gibson 2009, 16). The information professionals train the community members responsible for the management of the database in order to build capacity and ensure that the control remains in the community (Gibson 2009, 19). These trainees have either administrator or operator privileges of the database, with passwords that give them access to sensitive collections. The general user does not have access to these collections and needs a password to gain access (Gibson 2009, 19). The database does not provide access to restricted and sacred digitized materials since there should be no access to it at all from the public (Gibson 2009, 20).

One of the brains behind the content management system (CMS) Mukurtu explores how Indigenous Knowledge Systems and open access can reconcile. For example, an Australian archive gets users to create profiles that lists their age, gender and standing within their community, as well as their community so that they cannot view women's rituals if they are men, as an example, and if that is part of their culture's protocols (Christen

2012, 2871). In this sense, the content is open to the community and to the people it concerns, but not to the whole of society. Mukurtu CMS, as mentioned above, is a content management tool, but it is also an open source digital archive meant for Indigenous Knowledge. Mukurtu CMS allows the Indigenous community to input its own cultural protocols for the appropriate management and access of their Indigenous Knowledge (Christen 2012, 2873). Christen (2012) points out that we are stuck thinking about access in binary terms (open or close) when these barely exist in our usual online lives (p. 2874). "In many indigenous communities, cultural knowledge is conferred and transferred based on systems of obligation and reciprocity that [...] should [...] be respected and merged into a pluralistic understanding of information's circulation routes" (Christen 2012, 2875).

The Western idea of open access is very different from the reality of it. An archive may have an Indigenous collection on display and free for all to observe but "Still, many indigenous people have limited access to their own cultural heritage and may be excluded also from interpreting these objects even when publicly displayed" (Christen 2012, 2876). While not in the control of the Peoples who have created it or have a spiritual and cultural attachment to it, Indigenous materials are on display for others to benefit from it (Christen 2012, 2879-2880). Christen (2012) goes on to describe what Indigenous communities want out of Mukurtu CMS, and how different that looks from common Western archives, digital archives or even each other:

> "The Squamish Nation in Canada wanted an archive whose protocols could accommodate their intricate clan and family system; the Citizen Potawatomi Nation in Oklahoma wanted a digital archive that could ground use and access within the 47 families to which all community members belong; in New Zealand, some Māori archivists wanted a system that could deal with extensive kin-based social networks; the Zuni libraries wanted to be able to exchange content and metadata with the Library of Congress through their own cultural-based standards; and in Kenya, the Maasai wanted a system that would allow them to differentiate materials meant for commercial purposes from those meant only for internal circulation through intellectual property management tools" (Christen 2012, 2881).

The ideal of open and free access rarely takes into consideration the issue of the digital divide. Not only do some Indigenous communities not have access to the Internet or computers, but there is also the issue of having the skills to take advantage of open access. Mukurtu CMS educates the community in using the program and using the results. It is not about just providing the technological tools, but also training so that the community can effectively use them (Christen 2012, 2882).

Mukurtu CMS strives to work within the equilibrium of sharing knowledge and protecting cultural materials: "Elders and novices must interact: The system does not work if knowledge or cultural materials are closed off or hidden from all. Knowledge can (and does) die if it is not used. But it also needs to be used and circulated properly within an articulated ethical system" (Christen 2012, 2883). Mukurtu CMS achieves just that by allowing cultural protocols for content management, by allowing very specific levels of access and licensing, by having a higher volume of metadata fields for Indigenous Knowledge, and allowing the sharing of materials or descriptions with other communities while still following the community's cultural protocols (Christen 2012, 2884-2885). How does a community member use Mukurtu CMS to see cultural materials? They create a user profile that identifies important attributes for the cultural protocols such as gender and standing in the community, and the system will be able to identify which materials are available for viewing according to the cultural protocols (Christen 2012, 2885). In this way, Mukurtu CMS avoids making breaches in the protocol like other digital archives or museums that allow the viewing of sacred sites with no mention of the connected ancestors, as an example (Christen 2012, 2885). Mukurtu CMS answers the question about previously circulating digital material as well: the Local Context Traditional Knowledge licenses and labels are a solution to this issue as they show which cultural protocol should be followed (Christen 2012, 2887).

The thesis entitled *The Sacred and the Digital: Managing Heritage in an Open Access World* by Lison (2017) covers interviews about content management systems and their usability in Indigenous contexts. An interesting downfall of Mukurtu CMS, according to Lison (2017), is that it is for Indigenous Australians' cultural protocols (p.80). That is, divisions mostly according to gender, age, and so on, while local Indigenous communities are more likely to have restrictions according to individual knowledge and rights (Lison 2017, 80). However, Mukurtu is flexible and does not need to have someone with full access to the information in the database which is an advantage for collaborative projects or if there are restrictions which does not allow one person to have access to everything (Lison 2017, 113). The use of Traditional Knowledge Labels as licensing or rights statements can make a CMS like PastPerfect as culturally appropriate as any other (Lison 2017, 115).

The reiteration that Indigenous Peoples have the right to control their own cultural heritage has come out of Indigenous activism, and this helped bring about the idea of repatriation (Dickerson & Ceeney 2015, 91). Although the idea of repatriation of Indigenous cultural heritage is widely accepted in what is now Canada, there are concerns over how repatriation will affect access to these materials for future research use. This concern has yet to materialize, as communities are willing to share their cultural heritage with researchers who are willing to collaborate (Dickerson & Ceeney 2015, 97-98).

Repatriation of such materials increases the chances of using the material with the informed consent of the community and with more decision-making power (Dickerson & Ceeney 2015, 102). The relationship between the researcher and the Indigenous community becomes more balanced and reciprocal.

The Museum of Anthropology (MOA) (2000) at the University of British Columbia has created guidelines for the repatriation process. The repatriation process is on a case-by-case basis and can result in the sharing of the cultural materials or in their return to the community. If the belongings have a questionable provenance or contain sacred or secret knowledge, repatriation is often the answer. For cultural heritage obtained with public funds, MOA is committed to preserving these belongings through a collaborative approach. MOA considers repatriation claims with the community and/or the individual being involved in the process, in a timely manner. There are other arrangements to consider such as special access, stewardship arrangements, collaborative displays or the replication of the materials (MOA, 2000).

The Stó:lō People have participated in digital repatriation through the Reciprocal Research Network initiative, which enables them to have a connection to the intangible cultural heritage that is stored in museums. Most importantly, there is "a two-way flow of information. It's not just bringing things home or returning knowledge to where it comes from; information flows back again through the family system to those who are taking care of these things on behalf of the people they come from, to whom they belong. It's that family connection" (Schaepe 2018, 29). The Stó:lō House of Respect Caretaking Committee is a guiding group established by the Stó:lō Tribes to work on the process of returning ancestors home. Out of this necessary need to work out the repatriation process, came the possibility of a Stó:lō heritage policy and heritage legislation (Schaepe 2018, 31), furthering their ownership and control over their belongings.

Korero Kitea is a research project that looks at the use of digitized archival collections so that digitization projects can adapt accordingly in the future (Crookston et al. 2016, 4). One of the findings is that there is a sense of obligation to share the digitized archives with family and community members (Crookston et al. 2016, 6). The research also looked into how users felt this digitized collection affected the spirit and power of the information. Most of the respondents felt that this was an appropriate way of sharing it (Crookston et al. 2016, 7). The digitized collection helps with language revitalization initiatives as well as with treaty settlement processes (Crookston et al. 2016, 8). The study analyzes the answers of this survey in depth, in effect analyzing whether the targeted audiences are using digitized collections, and if these audiences believe the spirit and power of the material changes because of

digitization. The majority of the audience do not believe the spirit of the material has been altered (Crookston et al. 2016).

One of the issues with digitizing collections or publishing them online is that sensitive, cultural or heritage materials may become widely shared and cause problems for the creators, the family members, and so on. In *Managing the Digitization and Online Publication of Sensitive Heritage Material in the Dúchas Project,* the authors write about the formulation of guidelines for restricting access to sensitive material. What makes a story too sensitive to put online? The answer lies with the people whom the story is about (Ó Cleircín et al. 2015, 196-197). The choice between open access and restricted access to Indigenous cultural materials is not always in favour of restricted access. For some communities, open access to digitized collections is perfectly acceptable (Taylor & Gibson 2016, 411). Cowan and Rault (2018) argue that restricting access (or limiting it) to online materials means restricting exposure (the latter can be negative) and it means following the values of the community. Providing restrictions can in fact provide context to the materials (p.126-127). To provide an idea of what these restrictions can look like in agreements, Cowan & Rault (2018) provide a few examples such as:

- The participant can agree to sharing the material online only if it is accompanied by an essay contextualizing it;
- Some participants may want a part in curating the online exhibition;
- Some participants may want only other participants to have access, etc. (p.135).

Tara Robertson, in *Not All Information Wants to be Free: The Case Study of* On Our Backs (OOB)*,* uses OOB as an example of where digitization and open access is inappropriate. OOB is a lesbian porn magazine from the 80s to the early 2000s (Robertson 2018, 225). One of the ethical issues is that people appeared in the magazine before the internet existed. This means that they never gave their permission to reach a wider audience other than the niche readers of a lesbian porn magazine (Robertson 2018, 226). It is a real concern to the some of the people in the magazine that they are searchable in a search engine and these photographs will come up. As one woman who was in one of the issues said: "These are uses I never intended and I still don't want" (Robertson 2018, 227). One of the women only participated in the original project because she felt she could directly interact with the curator, she understood the audience and their values, and she had the ability to connect with the audience. Digitizing this project actually affected negatively all three reasons (Robertson 2018, 228). The community needs to be consulted about the digitization of the magazine and the different viewpoints need to be respected, instead of forcing the participants to track down the copyright holder themselves and asking them to take down the collection (Robertson 2018, 229). As Robertson (2018) puts it: "I

believe that for ethical digitization of culturally sensitive material, we have a duty to go beyond the legal framework of copyright and to consider consent, privacy, and each community's access protocols" (p. 232).

For ethical digitization, the author states four principles she recommends adhering to: conduct an environmental scan of other digitization projects, state your contact information clearly and be accessible, use ethically-inclined technology, and develop relationships with the communities to determine what should be digitized (Robertson 2018, 233). Colley (2015) posits that using digital technologies on Indigenous cultural heritage raises similar ethical issues to research that was not community-driven. A way to restrict access to collections posted online is to make it unavailable for downloads or copying. In this way, the digital technology itself is an ethical choice (Colley 2015, 17). In order to ensure that using digital technology does not emulate the same problems that unethical research did, Indigenous communities should look into using digital technologies on their cultural heritage themselves before giving access to others (Ireland & Schofield 2015, 4).

The Southern Oregon Digital Archives is an example of a digital archive that contains many fully searchable items in its online collection from two related collections: the Bioregion Collection and the First Nations collection, supported by the collaboration with local branches of governmental agencies and local tribes (Face & Hollens 2004, 116). The vision of this initiative was to create a digital archive with full text searching (including Indigenous language words) and that is user-friendly. It includes research documents collected from other institutions such as Fish and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Reclamation for the Bioregion Collection (Face & Hollens 2004, 117). It was important for the success of the digital archive to collaborate with Indigenous communities (Face & Hollens 2004, 118). First, the project team contacted faculty from the Native American Studies program at the South Oregon University (Face & Hollens 2004, 118-119) and attended the University's Native American Advisory Council, which put the project team in touch with the First Nations. The collaboration took patience and a lot of outreach to many tribal departments. As with the Bioregion Collection, the team scoured other institutions for materials relating to their First Nations Collection. The project team invited feedback on the database and included disclaimers for documents with negative representations of Indigenous Peoples (Face & Hollens 2004, 119). This project dealt with culturally sensitive materials by including a note stating how it to use it. Reciprocity was an important component of this project and therefore, the database had to be useful to the First Nations and provide access to documents they did not have access to before (Face & Hollens 2004, 120).

A partnership between the Aboriginal Multi-Media Society (AMMSA) and the University of Alberta's Sound Studies Institute resulted in the *Digitizing the Ancestors* project. This digitization project is aiming at digitizing interviews, photographs, songs and other multimedia materials that feature Indigenous content. Because of the Residential Schools and the forcing of Indigenous cultures underground, these types of recordings and other media can help fill gaps. Such a large digitizing project is expensive since the machines break down with overuse, hiring translators is necessary and so is dealing with storage needs. One of the issues facing the project is making it available through online access. This will not happen until Indigenous advisory councils grant permission (McMaster 2019).

In *Beyond Clicks, Likes, and Downloads: Identifying Meaningful Impacts for Digitized Ethnographic Archives,* Punzalan, Marsh and Cools (2017) discuss the relevance and impacts of digitized ethnographic archives to its users. "Ethnographic archives, as we refer to them here, are records kept in libraries, archives, and museums that often present cultural sensitivity issues given the complicated nature of their content and the context of their creation" (Punzalan et al. 2017, 62). The authors are interested in the cultural implications of accessing these materials online (Punzalan et al. 2017, 63). The reason behind accessing these archives has changed as well. It is not only researchers interested in the subject who are accessing them but also "[Indigenous] communities [that] rely on these archival records for varied reasons, including revitalizing endangered languages and traditions, seeking legal reparations, facilitating claims to support federal acknowledgement applications, protecting sovereign resources and lands, and researching their own histories and cultures" (Punzalan et al. 2017, 65). However, negative consequences can happen when non-Indigenous members of the public see these collections. For example, derogatory terms and negative stereotypes are in some records (Punzalan et al. 2017, 86-87). These can be triggering to Indigenous community members. Institutions are learning to stop assuming what the Indigenous community wants and to start asking questions (Punzalan et al. 2017, 89). Hence the importance of consultation. Digitization projects help foster reciprocal relationships as Indigenous Peoples increasingly access the collection and provide the archivists with additional knowledge and context (Punzalan et al. 2017, 94).

The archives' right of possession needs to be proven by a receipt of donation or purchase, or the archives needs to be able to prove that it has come into their possession in another ethical way. There needs to be a clear provenance from the Indigenous community itself, a provenance that demonstrates removal from the community in an ethical way and with consent. Otherwise, the Indigenous community has a right to possession and the right to ask for the repatriation of the belonging (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 297). When searching for records pertaining to their own history and culture in non-Indigenous

archives, Indigenous Peoples may experience negative feelings because of the culturally inappropriate and generalized metadata (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 298). Policies that center around scholars can also be alienating (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 298). For example, charging for the reproduction of a photograph of an Indigenous person, when an Indigenous member of the same community asks for a copy, demonstrates the institution's control and ownership over the photograph, which should not be the case (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 299). Education on the ethical management of Indigenous cultural heritage is not enough, there needs to be an official framework in place that puts the Indigenous community in control of their heritage (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 300). A real concern about Indigenous collections in non-Indigenous repositories is the possibility of non-Indigenous researchers and general users perpetuating incorrect information about the material recorded in the metadata (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 301). The controlled vocabulary should reflect the Indigenous communities as well as any other user. For example, the traditional place name and the settler name should both be searchable (Karuk Tribe et al. 2017, 307).

Mills (2017) is a researcher for the Indian Residential School and Dialogue Centre at the University of British Columbia with a Master of Archival Studies as well as a Master of Library and Information Studies degrees. In the article *Learning to Listen: Archival Sound Recordings and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property,* the author discusses how archives can properly manage holdings linked to Indigenous communities. The idea of digitizing material without planning to provide access to it is unlikely unless funding is available. In addition, it is unlikely that archivists will want to digitize material with uncertain copyright status. However, Indigenous material such as sound recordings should be prime candidates for digitizing since it is a high priority to preserve their cultural heritage and history (Mills 2017, 110). In the case of Indigenous materials, the ethical context and the intention regarding sharing is important. Is the information sensitive, secret or sacred under Indigenous law? The best way to explore and understand the ethical context is to build relationships with the Indigenous communities (Mills 2017, 111). To understand this ethical context, it is important to understand the historical context of Indigenous communities. "In [the Canadian] context, the 'need for increased control [of cultural property] is connected to reparation of past injustice, survival of cultural identity, and respect for Indigenous legal and social orders'" (Mills 2017, 112).

It is important for archivists to recognize the importance of oral histories and intangible cultural heritage to Indigenous communities. These oral histories can contain secret and sacred information that enables the survival of the communities, and the survival of their culture, which is rooted in interconnectedness with the land and nature (Mills 2017, 113). The oral histories are passed down to the

next generations; therefore, the intangible cultural heritage made into the tangible and found in the archives needs to be passed back to the communities so that it can be reclaimed and passed down (Mills 2017, 113). It is time for archivists and institutions to challenge their colonialist ways of privileging academics over the Indigenous communities who need access to these materials for their survival (Mills 2017, 116). As researchers need to ask themselves who benefits from this project, so do archivists need to ask themselves who benefits from the inaccessibility of these materials.

Donor agreements that stipulate access remain the same but archival holdings that have unclear access stipulations should follow UNDRIP as well as the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* (Mills 2017, 117). These documents are not prescriptive as every Indigenous community deals with intellectual property differently (Mills 2017, 118). Indigenous communities have research protocols and research ethics that guide researchers and that can guide archivists in ensuring that the research data is not mistreated (Mills 2017, 119). In order to respect Indigenous intellectual property rights and to provide culturally appropriate access, the archives must reach out to the communities and build relationships based on reciprocity and respect (Mills 2017, 122).

The online publishing of Indigenous material means that Indigenous communities can not only connect with the material and provide context, but also connect with each other. The community members may be located outside of the community but a digital platform allows them to connect. It is preferable that this platform remains closed to non-members of the Indigenous community until it is permissible to publish it for all to see and interpret (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 689). These type of platforms need to respect the privacy of the members, the confidentiality and sacredness of the items and their ownership over them. For example, an intranet archive could do the trick (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 690). Even if some of the material in the archives is present with informed consent from the Indigenous community and/or individual, did they consent to it being widely distributed online? Did they consent for it to reach an audience that may know nothing about its context? This leaves the librarian or archivist with the need to make an ethical decision on whether or not to publish this material online (Dressler 2018, 3).

Dressler (2018) suggests two frameworks for ethical decision-making: consequentialism and deontology (p. 27-28). Consequentialism focuses on the potential consequences (Dressler 2018, 27). It aims at giving the individual whose private data is at stake, the greatest benefit and lowest harm. However, for consequentialism to work there needs to be all of the information needed to make a decision already present and enough time to identify all of the possible consequences, good or bad. Deontology, on the other hand, uses rules to judge the action itself, regardless of future consequences,

for the greater good (Dressler 2018, 28). However, these moral 'rules' may be hard to discern with different worldviews at play (Dressler 2018, 29). Ethical decision-making pushes the decision-maker to identify all potential outcomes and to choose the one that will most likely lead to the desired result with the least amount of harm to the individual or community (Dressler 2018, 32). Awareness and mindfulness are two important aspects of ethical decision-making (Dressler 2018, 33). Transparency helps librarians and archivists have ethical digital initiatives. For example, Dressler (2018) suggests openly displaying related policies, providing an option to opt-out and having consequences for violations (p.62). Takedown or privacy policies should accompany digital collections in order to provide a standard for good practice (Dressler 2018, 63). The main aspects of privacy pertaining to digital librarianship are "Context, purpose, audience, control, consent, and awareness" (Dressler 2018, 67).

The Charles Darwin University Library and a research team from the Northern Institute University collaborated to make accessible a collection of Indigenous language materials. These materials were digitized both for their long-term preservation and to provide access to these rare resources. The online repository is entitled *Living Archive of Aboriginal Languages* (Mamtora & Bow 2017, 29). This project started in order to provide access to these materials for researchers, but also to make them accessible to Indigenous communities, as a form of repatriation and with the collaboration of Indigenous community members (Mamtora & Bow 2017, 31). There were no issues surrounding secret or sacred knowledge in the materials but the team felt strongly about involving the Indigenous authors and creators in the process regardless, asking their permission for providing access, and letting them know how these materials were stored and preserved. The team followed the ATSILIRN *Protocols* and used a takedown policy (Mamtora & Bow 2017, 34). They hired a programmer to ensure that the interface worked not only for researchers, but also for the Indigenous public, some of which has limited literacy skills (Mamtora & Bow 2017, 35).

Decolonizing Description

In the article entitled *Reconciliation Through Description: Using Metadata to Realize the Vision of the National Research Centre for Truth and Reconciliation*, Lougheed, Moran & Callison (2015) write that in order to realize the Truth and Reconciliation (TRC)'s mission, archives and data-collecting institutions need to understand Indigenous cultures, histories and worldviews (p.606). It is also crucial that the information professionals working in these institutions are familiar with the research on decolonization. In their day-to-day work, information professionals take steps towards reconciliation by collaborating with the Indigenous communities represented in the institution. It is necessary to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in order to use the appropriate language when describing a

collection (Lougheed et al. 2015, 606). For example, should the collection describe the Band by using their traditional name or their commonly used name? The goal is to empower Indigenous communities by educating them in the way of archival science so that they can have their own archives and be custodians of their records. In this way, the process of decolonization starts as Indigenous communities reclaim their Indigenous Knowledges and belongings (Lougheed et al. 2015, 607). In *Metadata as Data: Exploring Ethical Metadata Sharing and Access for Indigenous Resources through OCAP Principles,* Farnel (2018) echoes this sentiment by approaching metadata as a type of data understood through the OCAP® framework, that is, data that should be possessed and controlled by Indigenous communities (p.3).

Western systems of knowledge conceived the library's classification system. Indigenous ways of knowing do not fit into these classes and therefore, alternative classification systems are necessary. In the case of academic libraries, this signifies alternative thesauri and subject headings that use Indigenous terms for place names, language groups, and subjects. To represent accurately the relationship between the terms, collaboration with Indigenous Peoples is crucial (Maina 2012, 19). The Brian Deer Classification Scheme (named after Brian Deer, a First Nations librarian who created a classification scheme for First Nations material while at the now Assembly of First Nations) means that libraries do not need to start from scratch when building a classification scheme that accurately represents Indigenous ways of knowing (Maina 2012, 20).

A study described by Deborah Lee in *Indigenous Knowledge Organization: A Study of Concepts, Terminology, Structure and (Mostly) Indigenous Voices* explores the preferred terminology for outdated Library of Congress (LOC) subject headings that refer to Indigenous Peoples through the results of surveys. This issue is challenging because of the different preferred terms for Indigenous Peoples, as well as figuring out a solution that works for Indigenous users discouraged by the Eurocentric research tools (Lee 2011, 2). Therefore, this study examines the need for a thesaurus or a tool to organize Indigenous materials that are culturally relevant (Lee 2011, 3). The results of the survey show that there is no consistent terminology for referring to Indigenous Peoples and neither is there a consistent idea for a database structure. However, it is clear that there is a need to update the terminology (Lee 2011, 27).

The Decolonizing Description Working Group, as a response to the TRC report, has recommendations on how to create new appropriate subject headings when referring to Indigenous Peoples, and discusses how building relationships with Indigenous communities is key (Laroque 2018, 2). The Decolonizing Description Project, based out of the University of Alberta, started with reaching out to other librarians doing similar work and to Indigenous communities across Alberta. Laroque (2018) reminds us that librarians are not experts on Indigenous Knowledge, therefore bringing in experts is

necessary (p. 3). The relationship building did not start from scratch, but rather built upon existing relationships with tribal college libraries through the First Nations Information Connection and through the Networking Edmonton's Online Systems library consortium. Through these relationships, Indigenous community Knowledge integrates into the library classification system, in a respectful and reciprocal manner (Laroque 2018, 4). Not only do the current classification systems reflect social biases but also biased subject headings have a real and negative effect on Indigenous students and researchers, and their academic work (Laroque 2018, 5).

The power to name, held by both the government and catalogers, is a way of organizing but also a way of erasing. Now categorized under a single term, the term "Native American" actually has a whole history behind it. This benefits a certain audience (such as the government) (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 681). A part of colonialism is to classify Indigenous Peoples as a lower class of humans (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 682). On the other hand, "When we are cognizant of the ways colonialism works through techniques of naming, describing, collocating, classifying, and standardizing, we can better appreciate, formulate, imagine, and support Indigenous approaches to knowledge organization" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 682). Libraries and archives legitimize Western text-based systems by making them more visible than any other voice. These institutions have been trying to include Indigenous voices in their collections for a while now but the classification systems have not kept up (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015, 683). "Subject access to all knowledge, including indigenous knowledge, is imperative for libraries and other knowledge institutions, and obstacles to intuitive subject access present a social justice problem" (Sandy & Bossaller 2017, 129). Users have not created the knowledge organization systems that are currently in use in public and academic libraries therefore they do not represent the users' needs (Sandy & Bossaller 2017, 134). It is not only the naming conventions used that are problematic but also the location within the hierarchies themselves. For example, LOC places Indigenous Peoples under History and further lists them alphabetically rather than by location (Sandy & Bossaler 2017, 136-137).

Christen (2011) in her article *Opening Archives: Respectful Repatriation* discusses the value of attributing the same importance to Indigenous Knowledge in metadata fields as the usual Dublin Core (or other) metadata scheme, which signifies that one does not override the other but rather, both should coexist (Christen 2011, 193). In the Plateau Peoples Web Portal, there is an institutional catalogue record as well as a tribal catalogue record; therefore, the Indigenous community has a platform for correcting the institutional record without erasing it. As the project collaborators said, "We all understood the multiple benefits to tribes, scholars, and public users of the site, of seeing that history

is indeed made, unmade, and negotiated over time; whereas "records" often seem official and irrefutable, they are malleable and susceptible to change over time. The current system highlights the dynamism of all knowledge, including metadata" (Christen 2011, 201).

Bibliography

Allard, Danielle, and Shawna Ferris. 2015. "Antiviolence and Marginalized Communities: Knowledge Creation, Community Mobilization, and Social Justice through a Participatory Archiving Approach." *Library Trends* 64 (2): 360–83. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2015.0043.

Anderson, Jane. 2010. "Indigenous/Traditional Knowledge & Intellectual Property | Duke University School of Law." Accessed October 22, 2018. https://law.duke.edu/cspd/itkpaper/.

A-Anderson, Jane. 2005. "Access and Control of Indigenous Knowledge in Libraries and Archives: Ownership and Future Use." https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a1c710fbce17620f861bf47/t/5b249d0ff950b7fedff16822/1529126160548/paper_anderson.pdf.

B-Anderson, Jane. 2005. "Indigenous Knowledge, Intellectual Property, Libraries and Archives: Crises of Access, Control and Future Utility." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 36 (2): 85–97.

Bannister, Kelly. 2009. "Non-Legal Instruments for the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Key Roles for Ethical Codes and Community Protocols." In *Protection of First Nations Cultural Heritage: Laws, Policy, and Reform*. Edited by Catherine E. Bell and Robert K. Paterson. 2008. Vancouver, CANADA: UBC Press. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uvic/detail.action?docID=3412621.

Baydala, Lola T., Stephanie Worrell, Fay Fletcher, Sherry Letendre, Liz Letendre, and Lia Ruttan. 2013. "'Making a Place of Respect': Lessons Learned in Carrying Out Consent Protocol With First Nations Elders." *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action* 7 (2): 135–43. https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2013.0015.

Brunger, Fern, Rebecca Schiff, Melody Morton-Ninomiya, and Julie Bull. 2014. "Animating the Concept of 'Ethical Space': The Labrador Aboriginal Health Research Committee Ethics Workshop." *International Journal of Indigenous Health* 10 (1): 3–15. https://doi.org/10.18357/ijih.101201513194.

Chisa, Ken, and Ruth Hoskins. 2015. "Decolonising Indigenous Intellectual and Cultural Rights in Heritage Institutions: A Survey of Policy and Protocol in South Africa." *Mousaion* 33 (3): 55–72.

Christen, Kimberly. 2011. "Opening Archives: Respectful Repatriation." *The American Archivist* 74 (1): 185–210.

Christen, Kimberly A. 2012. "Does Information Really Want to Be Free? Indigenous Knowledge Systems and the Question of Openness." *International Journal of Communication* 6 (0): 24.

Cole, Peter. 2002. "Aboriginalizing Methodology: Considering the Canoe." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 15 (4): 447–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390210145516.

Colley, Sarah. 2015. "Ethics and Digital Heritage." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 13–32. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_2.

Cowan, T. L., and Jasmine Rault. 2018. "Onlining Queer Acts: Digital Research Ethics and Caring for Risky Archives." *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 28 (2): 121–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/0740770X.2018.1473985.

Crookston, March and Dr. Gillian Oliver, Ariana Tikao, Paul Diamond, Dr. Chern Li Liew and Sarsha-Leigh Douglas. 2016. "Kōrero Kitea: Ngā hua o te whakamamatitanga." https://interparestrust.org/assets/public/dissemination/Korerokiteareport_final.pdf.

Dickerson, Adam B., and Erika R. Ceeney. 2015. "Repatriating Human Remains: Searching for an Acceptable Ethics." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 89–104. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_6.

Dressler, Virginia. 2018. "Framing Privacy in Digital Collections with Ethical Decision Making." *Synthesis Lectures on Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services* 10 (3): i–85. https://doi.org/10.2200/S00863ED1V01Y201807ICR064.

Duarte, Marisa Elena, and Miranda Belarde-Lewis. 2015. "Imagining: Creating Spaces for Indigenous Ontologies." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53 (5–6): 677–702. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396.

Ermine, Willie, Raven Sinclair, and Bonnie Jeffery. 2004. "The Ethics of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples." Report of the Indigenous Peoples' Health Centre to the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics. http://iphrc.ca/pub/documents/ethics_review_iphrc.pdf.

Face, Mary Jane Cedar, and Deborah Hollens. 2004. "A Digital Library to Serve a Region: The Bioregion and First Nations Collections of the Southern Oregon Digital Archives." *Reference & User Services Quarterly; Chicago* 44 (2): 116–21.

Farnel, Sharon. 2018. "Metadata as Data: Exploring Ethical Metadata Sharing and Access for Indigenous Resources Through OCAP Principles." *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of CAIS / Actes Du Congrès Annuel de l'ACSI*. https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ojs.cais-acsi.ca/index.php/cais-asci/article/view/974.

"First Nations E-Community." n.d. *Assembly of First Nations* (blog). Accessed January 25, 2019. http://www.afn.ca/first-nations-e-community/.

Gardiner, Gabrielle, Jemima McDonald, Alex Byrne, and Kirsten Thorpe. 2011. "Respect, Trust and Engagement: Creating an Australian Indigenous Data Archive." *Collection Building* 30 (4): 148–52. https://doi.org/10.1108/01604951111181100.

Geary, Janis, Cynthia G. Jardine, Jenilee Guebert, and Tania Bubela. 2013. "Access and Benefits Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Northern Canada: Understanding the Legal Environment and Creating Effective Research Agreements."

International Journal of Circumpolar Health 72 (1): 21351.
https://doi.org/10.3402/ijch.v72i0.21351.

Gibson, Jason. 2009. "Managing Indigenous Digital Data: An Exploration of the Our Story Database in Indigenous Libraries and Knowledge Centres of the Northern Territory," *UTSePress*. https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/bitstream/10453/19485/1/2009%20-%20Gibson.pdf.

Iacovino, Livia. 2010. "Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities." *Archival Science; Dordrecht* 10 (4): 353–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-010-9120-3.

Ireland, Tracy, and John Schofield. 2015. "The Ethics of Cultural Heritage." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 1–10. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_1.

Karuk Tribe, Lisa Hillman, Leaf Hillman, Angela McLaughlin, Adrienne R. S. Harling, and Bari Talley. 2017. "Building Sípnuuk: A Digital Library, Archives, and Museum for Indigenous Peoples." *Collection Management* 42 (3/4): 294–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1331870.

Kovach, Margaret. 2009. "Indigenous Methodologies : Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts." Toronto: University of Toronto Press. http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzY4MjY1Ml9fQU41?sid=ee5a65f7-741d-4ee8-9a20-18bf414a28e8@sessionmgr4010&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1.

Laroque, Sheila. 2018. "Making Meaningful Connections and Relationships in Cataloguing Practices: The Decolonizing Description Project at University of Alberta Libraries." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 13 (4): 2–6. https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip29440.

Latulippe, Nicole. 2015. "Bridging Parallel Rows: Epistemic Difference and Relational Accountability in Cross-Cultural Research." *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 6 (2). https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2015.6.2.7.

Lee, Deborah. 2011. "Indigenous Knowledge Organization: A Study of Concepts, Terminology, Structure and (Mostly) Indigenous Voices." *Partnership : The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research; Toronto* 6 (1): 1–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v6i1.1427.

Lison, Sarah. 2017. "The Sacred and the Digital: Managing Heritage in an Open Access World," Thesis submitted in the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Environment, SFU. 1-154.

Lougheed, Brett, Ry Moran, and Camille Callison. 2015. "Reconciliation through Description: Using Metadata to Realize the Vision of the National Research Centre for Truth and Reconciliation." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53 (5–6): 596–614. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1008718.

Lyons, Natasha. 2011. "Creating Space for Negotiating the Nature and Outcomes of Collaborative Research Projects with Aboriginal Communities." *Études/Inuit/Studies* 35 (1–2): 83. https://doi.org/10.7202/1012836ar.

Mackay, Richard, and Stuart Palmer. 2015. "Tourism, World Heritage and Local Communities: An Ethical Framework in Practice at Angkor." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 165–83. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_10.

Madokoro, Laura. 2014. "From Settler Colonialism to the Age of Migration: Archives and the Renewal of Democracy in Canada." *Archivaria*, no. 78 (Fall): 153–60.

Maina, Charles Kamau. 2012. "Traditional Knowledge Management and Preservation: Intersections with Library and Information Science." *The International Information & Library Review* 44 (1): 13–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iilr.2012.01.004.

Mamtora, Jayshree, and Catherine Bow. 2017. "Towards a Unique Archive of Aboriginal Languages: A Collaborative Project." *Journal of the Australian Library & Information Association* 66 (1): 28–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049670.2017.1282845.

McMahon, Rob, Tim LaHache, and Tim Whiteduck. 2015. "Digital Data Management as Indigenous Resurgence in Kahnawà:Ke." *International Indigenous Policy Journal; London* 6 (3). http://dx.doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2015.6.3.6.

McMaster, Geoff. 2019. "Digitization Project Aims to Preserve Indigenous Voices." *Folio* (blog). January 3, 2019. https://www.folio.ca/digitization-project-aims-to-preserve-indigenous-voices/.

Mills, Allison. 2017. "Learning to Listen: Archival Sound Recordings and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property." *Archivaria* 83 (0): 109–24.

Morse, Bradford W. 2012. "Indigenous Human Rights and Knowledge in Archives, Museums, and Libraries: Some International Perspectives with Specific Reference to New Zealand and Canada." *Archival Science; Dordrecht* 12 (2): 113–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-011-9165-y.

Museum of Anthropology. 2000. "Guidelines for Repatriation." https://moa.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Resources-Repatriation-Guidelines.pdf.

Nakata, Martin, Vicky Nakata, Gabrielle Gardiner, Jill McKeough, Alex Byrne, and Jason Gibson. 2008. "Indigenous Digital Collections: An Early Look at the Organisation and Culture Interface." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 39 (4): 223–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2008.10721360.

Ó Cleircín, Gearóid, Conchúr Mag Eacháin, and Anna Bale. 2015. "Managing the Digitization and Online Publication of Sensitive Heritage Material in the Dúchas Project." *New Review of Information Networking* 20 (1–2): 194–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/13614576.2015.1112613.

Pantazatos, Andreas. 2015. "The Normative Foundations of Stewardship: Care and Respect." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 127–41. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_8.

Punzalan, Ricardo L., Diana E. Marsh, and Kyla Cools. 2017. "Beyond Clicks, Likes, and Downloads: Identifying Meaningful Impacts for Digitized Ethnographic Archives." *Archivaria* 84 (1): 61–102.

"Report on the Results from the Survey on Reconciliation Action & Awareness in Canadian Archives (2017)." 2018. Accessed October 23, 2018. https://archives2026.files.wordpress.com/2018/06/survey-report-1-june-2018.pdf.

Reyes-Escudero, Verónica, and J. Wendel Cox. 2017. "Survey, Understanding, and Ethical Stewardship of Indigenous Collections: A Case Study." *Collection Management* 42 (3/4): 130–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1336503.

Robertson, Tara. 2018. "Not All Information Wants to Be Free: The Case Study of On Our Backs." In *Applying Library Values to Emerging Technology: Decision-Making in the Age of Open Access, Maker Spaces, and the Ever-Changing Library (Publications in Librarianship #72)*, edited by Peter D. Fernandez and Kelly Tilton, 225–39. American Library Association. http://eprints.rclis.org/32463/.

Sandoval, Cueponcaxochitl D. Moreno, Rosalva Mojica Lagunas, Lydia T. Montelongo, and Marisol Juárez Díaz. 2016. "Ancestral Knowledge Systems: A Conceptual Framework for Decolonizing Research in Social Science." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 12 (1): 18–31. https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.1.2.

Sandy, Heather Moulaison, and Jenny Bossaller. 2017. "Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access to Indigenous Knowledge through Knowledge Organization Systems." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55 (3): 129–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1281858.

Sentance, Nathan (saywhatnathan). 2018. "Wirimbirra: How Libraries and Archives Can Support the Cultural Ecological Knowledge of First Nations People." *Indigenous Archives Collective* (blog). July 31, 2018. https://indigenousarchives.net/2018/07/31/wirimbirra-how-libraries-and-archives-can-support-the-cultural-ecological-knowledge-of-first-nations-people/.

Schaepe, David. 2018. "It's a Family Affair: Stó:Lō Experiences in Repatriation." *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly*, no. 199 (August): 27–32. https://doi.org/10.14288/bcs.v0i199.190750.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Second Edition. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd.

"So What? Interview with Camille Callison." 2018. *So What? (Blog).* Accessed November 9, 2018. http://sowhat.fims.uwo.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/interview-camillecallison.pdf.

Stevens, Amanda. 2008. "A Different Way of Knowing: Tools and Strategies for Managing Indigenous Knowledge." *Libri* 58 (1): 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1515/libr.2008.003.

Taylor, Joel, and Laura Kate Gibson. 2017. "Digitisation, Digital Interaction and Social Media: Embedded Barriers to Democratic Heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23 (5): 408–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1171245.

"Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation - Researcher's Application Form." n.d. Accessed February 7, 2019. https://www.vgfn.ca/pdf/research_form.pdf.

Waterton, Emma. 2015. "Heritage and Community Engagement." In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Tracy Ireland and John Schofield, 53–67. Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice. New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1649-8_4.