

Editorial

How should archivists respond to the increasingly widespread creation of data banks produced by researchers scanning large quantities of archival material to compress research trips to archives? The blurring of disciplinary boundaries between the work of historians and archivists when historians become ‘inexpert architects of digital archives’ (p. 3) by employing portable scanning technologies is explored in Julie McIntyre’s article on how one such micro-digitisation project led to the creation of a new archive. This case study employs an autoethnographic approach examining the practicalities and ethical decision-making involved in creating a new digital archive of wine history in the Hunter Valley. McIntyre’s discussion of the ethical issues encountered includes an account of her decision-making about the use of government funding to digitise a large number of blank pages as part of her digital archive creation.

Mpho Ngoepe and Amos Saurombe report on their study of archival legislation in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) ‘to assess the extent to which provision is made for the management and preservation of electronic records’ in the region (p. 28). The authors identify significant areas requiring urgent attention and make a number of recommendations, including the creation of new legal instruments, to facilitate the development of effective electronic records management frameworks and cultures within the member states of the SADC.

Isabel Taylor introduces English-speaking readers to ‘the extraordinary flowering of German appraisal theory since the introduction of archival legislation in the late 1980s and early 1990s’ (p. 15), with a focus squarely on German models and trends in this period, and the coordination and differentiation of approaches to appraisal among different levels of government administration within the German federation. The main initiatives Taylor identifies are: the development of the Federführungsmodell by the Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives), which focuses attention on records of the ‘lead administrative responsibility’; the horizontal and vertical appraisal approach of the Landesarchiv (State Archives) of Baden-Württemberg which resembles a form of macro-appraisal; and the documentation plans developed by municipal and university archives (p. 15).

Among the numerous book reviews in this issue is Julia Mant’s discussion of *Donors and Archives: A Guidebook for Successful Programs*. The management of donations and donor relations is an area that rarely receives attention in the archival literature it seems, though, as Mant observes, having to deal with ‘an ad hoc, unexpected donation foisted upon an archives by a donor with unrealistic expectations, of uncertain value yet requiring significant resources to manage, is perhaps more common than many archivists would care to admit’ (p. 42).

Sebastian Gurciullo