

Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions (CARFI)

Final Project Report

Prepared by: CARFI Working Group
Recordkeeping Innovations
Government Records Branch
Library and Archives Canada
31 May 2007

File No: 1135-C92

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	2
1.1 Impetus for CARFI project	2
1.2 Addressing the Issue of “Records at Risk”	3
1.3 Development of the Survey Questionnaire and an On-line Version.....	3
1.4 Formation of an Advisory Group.....	4
1.5 Survey Methodology.....	4
2. FINDINGS	5
2.1 Participation Rate - General Counts for Questionnaire Distributed and Completed	5
2.2 Responses to Survey Questions	5
2.3 Interpreting Survey Results.....	7
2.4 Findings and Observations.....	10
3. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
3.1 Issue: Archival records exposed to various risks in GC institutions	15
3.2 Issue: Need to provide information on RDAs that reflect operational requirements.....	15
3.3 Issue: Factors influencing the less than desired response rate to CARFI survey may affect future LAC monitoring initiative with GC institutions.....	16
3.4 Advisory Group Feedback	16
ANNEXES	
Annex A Assessment of the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions.....	18
Annex B Advisory Group Terms of Reference.....	39
Annex C Sample for the CARFI Survey	41
Annex D List of Problematic RDAs dropped from the Sample.....	48
Annex E CARFI Surveys completed	50
Annex F CARFI Survey Results - Response Rate by Characteristics of Authorities.....	51
Annex G CARFI Survey Questions and Results.....	52
Annex H Risk Factors	74
Annex I Post-Survey Evaluation Form and Summary of Responses	80

Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions (CARFI) Final Project Report

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide highlights and recommendations of the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions (CARFI) project which was established in order to gather information required to respond to the Auditor General's Report (November 2003, released February 2004) and to provide insight into the issue of "Records at Risk" within the Government of Canada.

Generally, GC institutions are taking reasonable care of their archival records (25% low risk for both recordkeeping and storage) if they are considered to be of on-going business value. However, as the business value diminishes, these records are consulted less frequently and eventually their retention periods expire; the records are put aside, often with less attention to records management, storage and handling considerations, and are therefore placed at risk (28% face high risks with regard to either recordkeeping or storage). In addition, federal institutions easily lose track of archival records when they no longer have business value if these records remain in the offices of the staff who created them and are not filed in corporate systems. This situation extends to records in all media including paper, electronic and other formats. As well, it was found that the majority of archival records are located in close proximity to the department's Headquarters operations and for a large number of GC institutions this means the National Capital Region.

The main issue highlighted by these findings is the risk that archival records are not appropriately safeguarded and managed by GC institutions once they lose their operational importance. It is recommended that LAC provide support to its GC clients through an increased awareness of the importance of managing and protecting archival records until they can be transferred to LAC, to facilitate the timely transfer of archival records, and to provide better storage alternatives within a cost-effective framework. Notably, the survey results showed that only 10% of GC institutions' archival records are stored in LAC's Regional Service Centres, with the bulk held in headquarters buildings.

Associated with this inattention to maintaining archival records once they no longer have continuing business value are the following situations:

- the lack of electronic corporate filing in GC institutions, and continued reliance on the paper record as the official corporate record;
- the inconsistent migration of electronic data in systems containing archival records; and
- preservation issues, arising from the low use of permanent paper in paper records and the quantity and improper storage of nitrate film. These records will require treatment to ensure long-term preservation once transferred to LAC.

It is recommended that LAC take a leadership role to increase the GC capacity to understand the importance of recordkeeping and to instill good recordkeeping and preservation practices by all public servants, through LAC provision of training and support to the GC institutions' records management operations.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions (CARFI) project is an inter-branch initiative of Library and Archives Canada (LAC) with working group members representing the Government Records Branch, Corporate Management Branch, Care of Collections Branch, and Information Technology Branch.¹

1.1 Impetus for CARFI project

A number of initiatives within LAC led to the formation of the CARFI Working Group in 2006. In particular, there were two primary drivers:

- The need to respond to the *Auditor General's Report* on the condition of cultural heritage (November 2003, released February 2004)

and

- The need for clarification of Section 13.3 of the *Library and Archives of Canada Act* (enacted 21 May 2004)

The Auditor General recommended that the then National Archives of Canada (NA) should implement mechanisms to obtain comprehensive information on the nature and condition of archival heritage, whether it is under their control or not (6.91), because it was found that the NA did not have specific information on the nature or condition of archival records kept on departmental premises or in the Regional Service Centres (6.89).

To address the issues raised in the *Auditor General's Report*, LAC's Corporate Performance and Information Division prepared a Planning Report to conduct an "Assessment of the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions, Planning Report" in July 2005. (See Annex A for a copy of this report.) The methodology outlined in this plan involved a documentation review, interviews with departmental officials at LAC and in federal institutions, and a survey of records in federal institutions. The information gathered as a result of this assessment would then become the basis for LAC's response to the Auditor General.

Shortly after the release of the *Auditor General's Report*, the new *Library and Archives of Canada Act (LAC Act)* came into force. Section 13.3 of the Act gives additional powers to the Librarian and Archivist of Canada:

If the government records referred to in subsection (1) are, in the opinion of the Librarian and Archivist of Canada at risk of serious damage or destruction, the Librarian and Archivist may require their transfer in the manner and at the time that the Librarian and Archivist specifies.

¹ Members of the CARFI Working Group include: Judith Roberts-Moore, Paul Touesnard, Margaret Dixon, Scott Valentine, and Cathy Craig-Bullen. Other members include: Joanne Pagé-Gauthier, and Sylvie Charron. Former members included: Roderick McFall, Alison Bullock, Bonnie Clark, and Paul Beauséjour.

In January 2006, the then Government Archives Division (GAD) acknowledged that although LAC had some knowledge of “records at risk” because of its Government Records Appraisal and Disposition (GRAD) Program, this knowledge was not comprehensive for all archival records of the Government of Canada in all media. Richard Brown, the Director of GAD, recommended the undertaking of a comprehensive multi-media Impact Study to address the policy and program issues regarding section 13.3 of the *LAC Act*.

1.2 Addressing the Issue of “Records at Risk”

Although LAC has discussed the issue of risk, it has never defined risk to archival records in federal institutions in any qualitative or quantitative way. The CARFI project was primarily tasked with obtaining information concerning the condition of archival records in federal institutions and to identify the risk factors. The CARFI Project determined the nature of risk principally through the development of a survey questionnaire.

1.3 Development of the Survey Questionnaire and an On-line Version

The main focus of the CARFI Working Group during 2006/2007 was the development of a survey questionnaire to obtain an overview of the condition of archival records in the Government of Canada (GC). The survey questions covered three main areas:

- general requirements for recordkeeping;
- specific criteria for storage and handling; and
- requirements for specific media including text (paper), electronic, microform, photographs, maps, plans and technical drawings, audio-video, art, and motion picture film.

To facilitate the completion of the survey, the questionnaire was developed as an electronic survey.²

Decima Research was contracted to program and manage the data collection of the survey for the CARFI project.³ The questionnaire was launched as an electronic survey to a select group of Government of Canada institutions on 22nd February 2007. The on-line data collection period ended on 24th March 2007, at which time Decima forwarded the data file to LAC.

The CARFI project continued to receive surveys in paper and Microsoft Word versions from

² CARFI consulted ITB and Web Services regarding the development of an electronic version of the survey. In an exchange of e-mails, the Chief of Web Services outlined why they felt the CARFI questionnaire was beyond their in-house capacity (16 October 2006 e-mail from Sue Globensky to Paul Beauséjour):

- Current software (PHP-Easy Survey Package) did not support the level of multi-branched complexity in the survey
- If attempted in-house, the project cost was estimated at more than \$40,000 for the technical work
- Insufficient resources to monitor the data work and
- Inability to meet the deadline for the CARFI survey

Web Services recommended the services of Decima Research since they had undertaken previous work for LAC and possessed the tools and capacity for the work the survey required.

³ This contract had to clear Public Works and Government Services Canada Public Opinion Research Directorate before LAC could proceed with the contract. GRB provided the financial support through RDIMS funding.

survey participants until 7 May 2007. All the results of the surveys received were incorporated into the analysis of the survey data for this report.

1.4 Formation of an Advisory Group

The CARFI Working Group held consultations inside and outside of LAC to assist the development and testing of its questionnaire. In December 2006, the Working Group established an Advisory Group consisting of records management representatives from eight federal institutions:

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Correctional Services Canada
Department of Finance
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Department of National Defence⁴
Privy Council Office
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Transport Canada, and
Treasury Board Secretariat

The Advisory Group provided advice and comments on the content of the questionnaire, and tested the electronic version of the survey prior to its launch. The advice has been important to the CARFI project because of the valuable feedback on the feasibility of the project and also for the Group's contribution to the project report. (See Annex B for Advisory Group Terms of reference.)

1.5 Survey Methodology

The survey was the primary means through which LAC collected data from a stratified sample of 61 federal institutions⁵. GC institutions were selected to participate in the survey based on the size of the institution (small, medium and large) and the media types identified in the specific Records Disposition Authorities (RDAs) which combined to form part of the stratified sample. Included in the sample were 210 RDAs which were selected on the basis of media type and representativeness of the Office of Primary Interest, Location, Size, Status of Authority, and Age of Authority. The results of the survey were intended to be a snapshot, of the condition of archival records in the Government of Canada: that is, to provide an overview and a baseline of information which when combined with other data would form the basis of the LAC response to the Auditor General.

⁴ Department of National Defence (DND) participated in the Advisory Group (AG) prior to the launch of the CARFI survey to the GC sample group. DND is no longer a member of the AG, as the department opted out of completing the survey.

⁵ Originally CARFI had selected 61 GC institutions for its sample. The size of the sample changed as some institutions were dropped for various reasons. There were 54 GC institutions that were sent electronic versions of the survey in February 2007. See Annex C for a listing of the sample. See part 2.1 of this report concerning changes to the survey sample.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 Participation Rate - General Counts for Questionnaire Distributed and Completed

Although LAC originally planned to survey 210 Records Disposition Authorities covering archival records in 61 institutions, some RDAs had to be dropped and others needed to be replaced because the Authorities were no longer in force, they had been superseded by a newer Authority, responsibility for the records had been delegated to another GC institution not included in the sample, the archival records had already been transferred to LAC, or no archival records were identified in the Authority because the Authority gave permission to destroy specified non-archival records. (See Annex D for a List of Problematic RDAs.)

The CARFI project held information/launch sessions in order to answer any questions and to encourage participation prior to distributing the on-line version of the survey. On 26 February 2007, 173 surveys were distributed electronically to 54 Government of Canada institutions. Seven of these 54 institutions did not participate. In the end, 104 surveys were received from 47 institutions – a response rate of 60%. Of these 58% contained useable answers. (See Annex E for CARFI Surveys Completed.)

The institutions were given four weeks to submit their completed questionnaires on-line; the deadline was subsequently extended to April 13. Up to 7 May 2007, LAC accepted completed questionnaires in Microsoft Word or in hard copy in the hope of encouraging institutions to complete what they had started.

The CARFI project had aimed for a response rate of 80% or better from the GC institutions who were included in its sample. Reasons for non-participation were given by the five institutions⁶ that informed LAC in writing of their decision not to participate in the survey, as well the remaining GC institutions that were sent the on-line version were asked to complete a post-survey evaluation form that requested comments on the survey process in general, the ease of completing the questionnaire and the information asked for in the questions, as well as for any additional comments. The reasons for not participating cited by the five institutions included staff shortages, year end commitments and time constraints. However, the majority of the post-survey evaluation respondents answered that they had sufficient time to complete the survey, the survey was of value to their institutions, and they would participate in future surveys of this kind. A further discussion of the participation rate is found in the Findings and Observations, section 2.4 of this report. (See Annex H for a copy of the post-survey evaluation form and a summary of the responses.)

2.2 Responses to Survey Questions

The questionnaire was divided into three parts:

- Part I General Requirements for Recordkeeping
- Part II Specific Criteria for Records Storage, and
- Part III Requirements for Specific Media.

⁶ These five institutions included National Defence, Canada Post, Industry Canada, Status of Women as well as Agriculture and Agri-Food.

A comments box appeared at the end of each part to give participants a chance to explain their responses and/or comment on the questions. Annex C is a table which summarizes the counts of completed CARFI surveys, broken down by part and section as well as location.

In terms of what proportion of the survey was completed by GC institutions, the following information is of note. LAC received 98 answers to the first part on recordkeeping. For Part II, the survey asked institutions to provide answers for each of their three (3) top locations where archival records are stored. We received 96 responses for the first location, 36 for the second and 15 for the third. Part III was divided into 7 sections, representing each media type as indicated below:

- Paper
- Electronic
- Microform
- Photographs
- maps, plans and technical drawings
- Audio-video
- Art, and
- Motion picture film

We received insufficient responses for art and motion picture film. There were few valid RDAs to choose from in the stratified sample and thus we were counting on a small number to provide us with sufficient information to draw conclusions. Unfortunately, we cannot provide any comments on the condition of archival records for those media types. However, we have adequate data to comment on paper, electronic, photographic, audio-video, maps, plans and technical drawings, and microform archival records.

The majority of the data (about 80%) can be derived from the first location where archival records are stored since the figures indicate that most records are stored with the responsible institution on site in a headquarters building. This suggests that institutions store large amounts of archival records in expensive office space. Considering all three locations where archival records are stored, only about 10 % of archival records are stored in Regional Service Centres across Canada. Less are stored in private facilities such as those operated by Iron Mountain.

Overall response rates for the survey were about 60% which was lower than expected but which still allowed for analysis of issues with regard to recordkeeping and storage and the identification of various risk factors. Response rates by characteristics of the authorities were sufficient in most categories. Response rates were lower for older (pre-1993) authorities and those where the status indicated that they needed to be replaced. It may have been that institutions had difficulty in locating these records and could not complete the questionnaire. With regard to the various media types the results should be used with caution since the number of responses is often quite small.

See Annex F for Response Rates by Characteristics of Authorities.
See Annex G for CARFI Survey Questions and Results.

2.3 Interpreting Survey Results

Based on about 100 responses from a population of approximately 1000 valid RDAs the standard error of the sample is about 4.5%. This means that we can be 95% confident that the true values lie within an interval that is plus or minus 9% of the estimated values. In practical terms if 16% answered yes to a particular question then we are 95% confident that the true value lies between 7% and 25%. This does not of course apply to the media specific questions where far fewer answers were provided. In this area our confidence in the results would be much lower and should be treated as notional only (for example, more said yes than no) and not as statistically significant.

How has risk been defined for purposes of the CARFI survey?

- Risk is potential for realization of unwanted, adverse consequences to (collections) archival records.⁷
- Two aspects of risk identified in the CARFI Survey are:
 - 1) Recordkeeping—Intellectual Control
 - 2) Storage Conditions and Environments—Physical Management

Can the CARFI survey results be used to identify risk factors affecting archival records in federal institutions?

For the purposes of our analysis, the CARFI Working Group identified from a larger series of questions approximately 20, in relation to both recordkeeping and storage, where negative answers would indicate risk to archival records. These questions were then grouped under six factors that would contribute to increased risk. The table below shows the six factors and their risk rating.

Recordkeeping

Risk	Rating
1) The archival records cannot be transferred to LAC and they stay indefinitely in the GC institution	LOW (2 questions)
2) Problems with maintaining control over the archival records in the GC institution	MEDIUM (7 questions)

Storage

Risk	Rating
3) GC institution is not prepared to handle potential incidents	HIGH (2 questions)
4) Storage environments are not designed for the preservation of archival records	HIGH (5 questions)
5) Incidents where potential damage and loss have incurred	MEDIUM (2 questions)
6) More than one media type is stored in the same storage container	MEDIUM (1 question)

⁷ Society for Risk Analysis

Note the highest risks are in emergency preparedness and recovery (factor 4), as well as storage environments not designed for preservation (factor 3). Respondents were asked to answer questions in section II and III of the survey for up to 3 locations. Results indicated that the bulk of records are stored in headquarters buildings, primarily in the National Capital Region.

It is important in practice to distinguish between identifying potential risks to archival records and cases where damage had already occurred or where damage was narrowly averted. There were some survey questions that were designed to ascertain if archival records had been damaged as a result of various types of incidents. Once these were identified it was found that there was no correlation between these incidents and unfavourable conditions or risk factors that could lead to potential damage of archival records. For example, no correlation was found between institutions that reported water damage to records and the storage conditions that one would expect to heighten the risk of water damage (such as records stored in rooms with overhead pipes, etc.) The frequency of incidents was reported at around 10%, and the incidents in which archival records were damaged were even lower.

Importantly, analysis of the survey responses indicates that there is no single factor that contributes to a risk but a combination of factors; nor is there any overall pattern that would lead to an easy identification of records at risk. However, the CARFI survey responses resulted in a rich data source from which we can identify areas of concern. In the event of an incident, the survey results indicate that the greatest potential risk for damage to archival records will occur because GC institutions are not prepared to handle potential incidents (54% for factor 3). The next highest source of risk to archival records is from storage environments that are not designed for the preservation of archival records (35% for factor 4). See Annex H for a complete set of questions identified as indicating risk factors and the risk rating scale for these risks.

Can the CARFI survey results identify those archival records which are now at risk in GC institutions?

- From the survey results we cannot identify those specific records in specific GC institutions that are at risk, but we can identify types of records that are potentially at risk.
- For reasons of confidentiality of survey responses, the identity of individual institutions is not linked to responses.
- Since the survey was based on a sample of RDAs in government institutions the methodology does not allow for a comprehensive list of GC institutions or RDAs in which records are at risk.

What types of archival records are potentially at risk in GC institutions?

- Electronic Records
 - There is a lack of electronic corporate filing in GC institutions.
 - There is a continued reliance on the paper record as the official corporate record.
 - There is inconsistent migration of electronic data in systems containing archival records.

- Paper Records
 - There are preservation issues, arising from the low use of permanent paper in paper records. These records will require treatment to ensure long-term preservation once transferred to LAC
- Photographs (nitrate film and colour film)
 - There are preservation issues, arising from the quantity and improper storage of nitrate film and colour film. These records will require treatment to ensure long-term preservation once transferred to LAC.

2.4 Findings and Observations

Findings and observations are based on analysis of the survey responses and fall under the following categories: General Observations; Recordkeeping; Record Storage; and Media Specific.

General Observations

2.4.1 While a significant portion of the archival records are in institutions with high standards and practices, some are clearly at risk and others face enough risks to suggest that there is significant room for improvement.

As a result of an analysis of the various risk factors identified from the survey questions it was found that in about 25% of the cases where archival records at low risk for both recordkeeping and storage factors (see table below):

Levels of risk to archival records (number and % of RDAs)				
Recordkeeping	Storage			
	Low	Med	High	Total
Low	24 (25)	22 (23)	12 (13)	58 (61)
Med	10 (11)	12 (13)	5 (5)	27 (29)
High	1 (1)	7 (8)	1 (1)	9 (10)
Total	35 (37)	41 (44)	18 (19)	94 (100)

It can also be seen that a slightly higher proportion (28%) faced high risks with regard to either one factor or the other, with the remainder (47%) facing predominantly medium levels of risk.

2.4.2 Overall response rates to the survey were moderate (60%) which was sufficient for analysis of recordkeeping and storage issues, however, results for the various media types should be used with caution.

Despite efforts to get a higher response rate to the survey through the participation of an advisory group, an official launch that was well attended, an on-line survey, answers provided for those who stored records at Regional Service Centres, and an extension to the deadline to include surveys that had been completed in other formats, the overall response rate was only 60%. While this permitted analysis of the larger questions on recordkeeping and storage it was more problematic once the responses were divided into the various media types and this data should be used with caution.

2.4.3 Gathering information on older authorities was challenging suggesting that many are out of date and need to be replaced or revoked.

While about 40% of the original sample included older (pre-1993) Records Disposition Authorities, it turned out to be difficult to achieve this proportion of responses. Further investigation of the continuing validity of these agreements demonstrated that many were no

longer valid because the records had already been transferred, the agreements no longer identified archival records, or the custody of the records no longer resided with the institution named in the agreement. As a result, many could not be replaced in the sample. This situation was compounded further by lower response rates for this group of RDAs than for the more recent ones perhaps because the institutions themselves were having difficulty in locating the records associated with the agreements. As a result, only 21% of the survey responses involve older agreements.

2.4.4 Processes do not appear to be in place to protect archival records once they cease to be of business value.

While there was no response to any particular question that led to this finding, there were indications in a number of areas that the treatment of archival records benefits from the fact that they are normally of business value and this treatment declines once they are no longer so. The fact that so many archival records are stored in headquarters locations suggests that this is the case. These records do over time make their way to areas of these buildings where they are exposed to various risks (basements, unclean areas, water pipes, etc). With various media types it was found that procedures were in place to keep the records accessible, however, there were seldom any procedures to look after their long-term preservation. Some examples below include the lack of processes to refresh and migrate electronic records, the lack of playback equipment for audio-video records and the number of paper records that continue to be photocopied.

Recordkeeping

2.4.5 The overall situation with regard to recordkeeping is mixed, with some aspects such as applying RDAs and setting retention periods well done and others such as capture and management of records not so.

Of those who responded to the survey, many (84%) indicated that they had no problems in applying the Record Disposition Authority in question and that retention periods had been set (83%) for the archival records. In other areas the situation was not so good. Only 59% of the archival records were captured in a single records management system standard to the institution while a slightly higher proportion (68%) was captured in a single classification system standard to the institution.

2.4.6 Those responsible for handling and storage of archival records in institutions are often working without up-to-date guidelines or are not well trained.

In only 65% of the RDAs do the institutions have up-to-date documented guidelines for storage and handling of the archival records. In the remaining cases the guidelines either do not exist or do not reflect current practice. Those who access the records are not always trained. In only 58% of the cases are 80% or more of the records management personnel trained, and in only 22% of the cases are other personnel trained.

Record Storage

2.4.7 Archival records are most often stored in buildings that were designed for people and not records.

Based on answers provided to the survey questions it was concluded that most archival records (about 80%) are stored in buildings which are not designed to house records exclusively but are primarily working offices. Often these were the headquarters buildings of the various institutions. Aside from issues of the cost of space it should be pointed out that the storage of records in the midst of people and equipment means that the needs of the records often come last. This is illustrated by such responses that show that physical security of the buildings is strong while emergency response plans, training in and testing of such plans, and recovery priorities for archival records are weak. As well, HVAC systems tend to be run during working hours which satisfies the needs of staff but can cause temperature fluctuations for records. Records are often stored in locations that workers don't want to occupy such as basements and areas exposed to plumbing (34% indicated that over 80% of their records were exposed to potential water damage). Finally there are signs that records storage areas are approaching full capacity (in fact 16% indicated that the capacity has already been exceeded).

2.4.8 Specific incidents (such as pests and contaminants as well as water damage) while not at an alarming level occur frequently enough to cause concern.

While the number of reported incidents was in the acceptable range (about 10% for insects, rodents, mould, and water damage, less for light and fire), they do occur with enough frequency to cause concern. To date, few of these incidents have resulted in the loss of any significant number of archival records but if they continue to occur it is only a matter of time, given the number of records exposed to potential water damage in particular. Related to this finding and the previous one is that storage areas are cleaned less than monthly in 24% of the cases and food and drinks are allowed in the storage areas in 60% of the cases.

2.4.9 While most institutions do monitor temperatures in the storage areas many do not measure humidity levels.

The questions regarding the monitoring of temperatures and humidity levels were asked at several points in the survey with regard to storage conditions and the treatment of various media types. In general, temperatures are monitored and fall within acceptable ranges, however, it became clear from the pattern of answers provided that humidity levels are simply not monitored on an on-going basis and it cannot be concluded whether they fall within acceptable ranges or not.

Media-Specific

Paper

2.4.10 While most paper archival records are in folders and filled properly they are not boxed, and originals are often used to make copies.

Responses to the survey revealed that several good practices are in place such as storing paper records in folders and filling those folders properly, however, it was also found that the folders are seldom stored in boxes on shelves (only 28% said that over 80% of the records were stored this way) and that making photocopies is the most frequently used method of copying (86%) the records for use.

2.4.11 A surprisingly high portion of archival paper records is not on permanent paper.

In response to the question about the portion of archival records printed on low-acid or permanent paper some 45% indicated that less than 20% of the archival paper records were printed on such paper. Although this is balanced somewhat by others (31%) who indicated that over 80% were on permanent paper, on the whole it would appear that less than half of all paper archival records are printed on permanent paper, which could result in significant preservation issues when those records are transferred to LAC in the future.

Electronic

2.4.12 While many electronic archival records are stored on servers and backed up off-site, many institutions also reported that there were no procedures in place to migrate/refresh these records.

Based on responses to the survey it would appear that the vast majority of archival electronic records are stored on servers, backed up on servers off-site and in the same format as the originals, all of which are positive results. One troubling result, however, is that 75% indicated that they had no procedures in place to refresh and migrate these electronic records to ensure that they continue to be readable. While 90% indicated that they believed the records could still be read there is still cause for concern in today's rapidly changing environment.

2.4.13 While the widespread presence of ERDMS was encouraging most archival records still remain outside these systems.

While most respondents (65%) indicated that they have an Electronic Records/Document Management System (ERDMS) in place they also indicated that staff do not file their archival records there. As a result it is estimated that less than half of the archival records are currently in these systems.

Microform

2.4.14 Microform records are usually stored in appropriate containers but equipment is not well maintained.

Respondents indicated that microform records were stored in appropriate containers (78% indicated that over 80% of records were in appropriate containers). The institutions also indicated that viewing equipment was available (89%), however, those with viewing equipment did not clean and maintain it regularly (only 37%).

Photos

2.4.15 A surprisingly high portion of photographs are on nitrate film

One of the most surprising findings was the one-third of those institutions with archival photos indicated that the photographs were on nitrate film, and the majority of these indicated that nitrate film represented more than 10% of the holdings of archival photographs.

2.4.16 The high proportion of colour film held in institutions requires special storage conditions that are not currently being met.

Based on responses from the survey it is estimated that approximately 66% of archival photos are in colour. Long-term preservation of colour film, however, requires storage conditions which are much colder than normal room temperature (18-24 degrees), a condition which is not currently being met by any of the institutions in the sample.

Maps, Plans and Technical Drawings

2.4.17 Most of the archival records in this category are supported and/or covered and are rarely handled for access.

Respondents have indicated that a maps, plans and technical drawings are stored in a variety of ways, the most frequent being rolled (53%). They are however supported (60%) and covered (70%) and rarely handled for access (60%).

Audio-video

2.4.18 While these records are often stored in containers and under appropriate conditions, the existence and on-going maintenance of playback equipment is an area of concern.

The majority (64%) of respondents with archival audio-video records indicated that a significant portion of these records (over 80%) are stored in protective containers, however, 29% also indicated that they do not have procedures to ensure that the records remain accessible which is further supported by the response that 36% do not have playback equipment, and of the 64% that do, 44% indicated that they do not clean and maintain this equipment.

3. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Issue

Records which cease to have ongoing business value but which are deemed to have archival value are not being transferred to LAC in an expedient fashion, and are likely to be exposed to various risks over time.

3.1.1 Recommendation

LAC to determine why archival records are not being transferred to LAC and to work with GC institutions to remedy this situation.

3.1.2 Suggested Actions

- to monitor GC institutions' adherence to the terms and conditions of specific Records Disposition Authorities including the setting of retention periods; the protection of archival records under the GC institution's care and control; and the timely transfer of archival records to LAC
- to develop standards for managing archival records in all media over time and provide these guidelines, checklists and other tools to GC institutions to ensure that archival records are safeguarded until they can be transferred to LAC
- to increase awareness for recordkeeping responsibilities and practices by providing recordkeeping support and training to the GC institution to ensure that archival records are filed in corporate filing systems and managed appropriately
- to provide alternate, cost-effective, and environmentally controlled storage options to GC institutions so that costly space and areas not appropriate for records storage are not used for semi-dormant and dormant records storage
- to increase LAC capacity to accept the transfer of records in all media into appropriate storage facilities, in particular the capacity to transfer electronic records into a trusted digital repository.

3.2 Issue

Information on the status of Records Disposition Authorities (RDA) is not readily available throughout the GC even though LAC has developed a Records Disposition Authorities Control System (RDACS). The problem is two-fold: RDACS is currently available to many but not all GC institutions under the LAC Act; and the information on RDACS does not always reflect the operational status of the RDAs.

3.2.1 Recommendation

LAC needs to ensure that all GC institutions are provided with the appropriate RDACS access and that the information provided through RDACS is reflective of the operational status of the specific RDA.

3.2.2 Suggested Actions

- LAC needs to develop procedures to ensure that Records Disposition Authorities are revoked in a timely manner: when they are superseded by a new Authority, and when all archival records under the Authority have been transferred to LAC
- LAC needs to review the status of RDAs on RDACS on a regular basis and make recommendations as appropriate. Portfolio archivists need to make recommendations to replace/revoke the out-dated RDAs or issue new RDAs
- LAC needs to ensure that all GC institutions under the *LAC Act* are provided with the appropriate access and necessary passwords for RDACS from their headquarters and regional locations.
- GC institutions need to inform LAC when responsibility for records that are covered under a specific RDA have been transferred to another GC institution.

3.3 Issue

Factors influencing the moderate response rate to the CARFI survey may affect future LAC attempts to survey or monitor GC institutions on recordkeeping practices and adherence to RDA Terms and Conditions.

3.3.1 Recommendation

LAC to determine why GC institutions are not responding to LAC requests for information and to devise strategies to encourage a higher participation rate.

3.3.2 Suggested Actions

- LAC to consult with GC institutions on the timing of future surveys and consider their resource capacity constraints
- LAC to request that participation be incorporated into the institutional business plan
- To increase GC capacity to understand the roles and responsibilities of LAC and GC institutions with respect to recordkeeping. LAC needs to take a leadership role in instilling good recordkeeping practices in all public servants, by providing training and support.

3.4 Advisory Group Feedback

The biggest problems identified by the Advisory Group were the lack of awareness in the Government of Canada concerning archival records and the need to train personnel in good recordkeeping practices and the importance of preserving archival records which are part of all Canadians' documentary heritage. The Advisory Group is looking to LAC to take a leadership role in establishing rules and standards for preservation and recordkeeping before records are transferred to LAC. This information should be readily available to Government of Canada institutions through training and on the Web.

The Advisory Group is looking to LAC for greater consultation. In particular Advisory Group requested greater involvement in the process to revoke RDAs, and in establishing procedures for notifying LAC of changes in responsibilities for the custody and control of archival records in Government institutions.

The Advisory Group suggested that in the event LAC conducts future surveys, greater consideration be given to the demands and capacity of GC institutions to plan and carry out the work associated with completing the survey.

The Advisory Group was very interested in the survey results and hopeful that follow-up actions will take place. In particular, they recommended that all Senior Executives responsible for MGI be made aware of the CARFI survey results on the state of archival records in the Government of Canada in order to increase support and resource capacities for recordkeeping operations.

**Assessment of the Condition of Archival Records
in Federal Institutions**

Planning Report

Prepared by: Corporate Performance Division

Table of Contents

Purpose.....	20
Approach.....	20
Background	21
Objectives	22
Profile of Federal Institutions	22
Questions and Methodologies.....	23
Outline of the Work	24
Schedule	26
List of Appendices	26
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference.....	27
Appendix 2: Selected Samples.....	29
Appendix 3: Working definitions and criteria to assess the condition of records	38

Purpose

This report outlines a plan for assessing the condition of archival records in federal institutions. It includes a brief description of the program along with the planned approach, issues and questions, methodologies to address these questions and a schedule of activities.

The reason for assessing the condition of archival records in federal institutions at this time is partially to respond to observations made by the Auditor General in its November 2003 report (released in February 2004) and partially to assist in the development of policies and advise for federal institutions in the area of information management.

Approach

Within Library and Archives Canada the assessment will be managed jointly by the Government Archives Division of the Documentary Heritage Sector and the Corporate Performance Division of Corporate Management with the assistance of the Government Information Management Office, Care of Collections, and an Advisory Committee and external consultants as required. The Advisory Committee will be composed of Library and Archives staff as well as staff from other federal departments. This Advisory Committee will assist in the development of the methodology to be used in the assessment, assist the assessment team with documentation, facilitate contact with federal institutions chosen as part of the sample, and will review the draft reports when completed including the communications strategy.

The primary assessment methods will consist of documentation review, interviews with departmental officials at LAC and in federal institutions, and an on-site survey of records in federal institutions (see attached Appendix 2 for an overview of the proposed methodology and the sample of approximately 200 Record Disposition Authorities chosen as part of the sample).

The approach will include a communications strategy to outline how Library and Archives Canada will inform federal institutions of the assessment study being undertaken. Initially, this may simply take the form of a letter from the Librarian and Archivist of Canada to the Senior Executive designated under the *Management of Government Information Policy*.

Background

For almost 100 years now the federal government has been preoccupied with preserving government records of historical and archival value and destroying those that were no longer of use.⁸ This began with the compilation of extensive inventories of records and the “scheduling” the timing of their destruction. From 1945 to 1965 this process was overseen by the Public Records Committee that consisted of several senior bureaucrats including the Dominion Archivist. In 1966 the current system of records management was established by the Public Records Order which delegated the responsibility for “records scheduling” to departments in consultation with the Dominion Archivist. This structure was supported by chapters devoted to record keeping in Treasury Board’s Administrative Policy Manual and subsequent legislation including the *Access to Information and Privacy Acts* (1983), the *National Archives of Canada Act* (1987), and the *Management of Government Information Holdings Policy* (1989). The recent passage of the *Library and Archives of Canada Act* (2004) confirms the role of the Librarian and Archivist of Canada to issue Records Disposition Authorities to federal institutions.

Government records that have archival value are identified during the process of the disposition of government records. This process is administered at Library and Archives by the Documentary Heritage Collection Sector through the Government Records Appraisal and Disposition (GRAD) Program which involves the negotiation of agreements (Records Disposition Authorities) with federal institutions to govern the disposal of government records in those institutions either by destruction, alienation from the Government of Canada, or future transfer to the Library and Archives. In most cases there is a significant time lag between the identification of records as archival and their eventual transfer to Library and Archives. Little information is currently being gathered about the condition of archival records in federal institutions with the exception of observations that were made in Archival Assessment reports at the time that the agreement was negotiated.

This situation was echoed in a recent report by the Auditor General (November 2003, released in February 2004) which observed:

6.89 We found that the National Archives does not have specific information on the nature or condition of archival records kept on departmental premises or in the Regional Service Centres.

As a result, the report recommended that:

6.91 The National Archives of Canada should implement mechanisms to obtain comprehensive information on the nature and condition of archival heritage, whether it is under their own control or that of departments and agencies.

⁸ Much of the information in the paragraph that follows is taken from a speech by Mr. Ian E. Wilson “The fine art of destruction”, May 1, 2000.

Objectives

The transfer of government archival records from federal institutions to the Library and Archives is administered under the Government Records Appraisal and Disposition Program (GRAD). The mechanism through which this is done is the granting of Records Disposition Authorities by the Librarian and Archivist of Canada to federal institutions. As such the GRAD Program has two main objectives:

1. The orderly disposition of government records by federal institutions at the end of their information management life cycle, and,
2. The acquisition of government records of archival and historical value by LAC from federal institutions.

Profile of Federal Institutions

For the purpose of classifying the federal institutions named in the Library and Archives of Canada Act these are classified by Office of Primary Interest (Ministry) and Office of Collateral Interest (Agencies, Boards, etc.). There are some 24 Offices of Primary Interest under the current configuration of government departments and the remaining 162 institutions are considered Offices of Collateral Interest.⁹ These federal institutions can be further described by size according to their number of employees and relative budgets (see tables below).

Number of Federal Institutions (by interest and size) As of March 2005				
Interest	Size			Total
	Large	Medium	Small	
Primary	7	12	5	24
Collateral	3	8	151	162
Total	10	20	156	186

Just over 1600 Records Disposition Authorities¹⁰ have been signed with these 186 institutions as of March 2005 but the number of authorities varies considerably with the size of the institution and the complexity of its functions. On average Offices of Primary Interest have nearly 40 RDAs per institution which is about 8 times as many as for Offices of Collateral Interest (see table below).

⁹ This number changes periodically with those that are newly created, those that become defunct as well as those that change their names. The primary source for this list is <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/est-pre/estime.asp>.

¹⁰ Because some RDAs apply to different types and media of records the numbers described here apply to units which describe a unique authority and type of record. The actual number of RDAs is somewhat lower.

Number of RDAs (by interest and size of Institution) As of March 2005				
Interest	Size			Total
	Large	Medium	Small	
Primary	234	600	53	887
Collateral	68	260	397	725
Total	302	860	450	1612

The number of RDAs containing archival records is roughly proportional to the overall number of RDAs with Offices of Primary Interest holding about 55% of the RDAs with archival records (see table below.)

Number of RDAs with Archival records (by interest and size of Institution) As of March 2005				
Interest	Size			Total
	Large	Medium	Small	
Primary	127	432	46	605
Collateral	43	135	290	468
Total	170	567	336	1073

Questions and Methodologies

Questions	Methodologies	Responsible
What is the present condition of records deemed to be of archival value in federal institutions	Interviews with staff at LAC and in federal institutions	See work outline below and Terms of Reference (Appendix 1) for specific responsibilities for each aspect of the project
What are the key factors that are likely to affect the future condition of archival records	File review of Record Disposition Authorities	
	On site survey of a sample of records in federal institutions	
To what extent is the presence of these factors likely to threaten the future condition of archival records	Survey of a sample of records received by LAC in last two years for a sample of Record Disposition Authorities	

Outline of the Work

Step 1: Determine the universe of records identified as archival, define “condition of archival records”, and identify factors that are likely to cause the condition of the records to deteriorate in the future	
Tasks	Responsible
1A. Based on the number of institutions with existing records disposition agreements determine the universe of government records that have been identified as archival as of March 31, 2005	Corporate Services
1B. Develop a working definition of “condition of archival records”	Government Archives Division Care of Collections
1C. Identification of factors likely to cause the archival records to deteriorate in the future	Government Archives Division Care of Collections Government Information Management Office
Step 2: Review of agreements	
Tasks	Responsible
2A. Examine a selected sample of the documentation (Archival Appraisals, Terms and Conditions of transfer agreements, briefing package for the Librarian and Archivist) for references to conditions of the records at the time when these document were written	Government Archives Division Consultant
2B. Examine RDACS and other documentation (if available) for references to the condition of the archival records concerned	Government Archives Division Consultant
Step 3: Stratified sample of archival records in federal institutions	
Tasks	Responsible
3A. From the universe of authorities that specify transfer of records to LAC (identified in Step 1) draw a defined stratified sample of authorities from across federal institutions based on type and medium of records which is representative of institutions by size, location, age of agreement, status of agreement, importance of the institution and Office of Primary/Collateral Interest	Corporate Services
3B. For each authority in the sample, after reviewing the relevant documentation, perform an on-site visit to assess the present condition of the archival records and see if any factors exist which might cause their condition to deteriorate in the future	Consultant with assistance from Government Archives Division, Care of Collections, Government Information Management Office as required
3C. Apply the results of the stratified sample to infer the situation with regards to the condition of archival records in the universe of archival records	Consultant

Step 4: Assessment of records received by LAC	
Tasks	Responsible
4A. From records which have been recently received by LAC from federal institutions (during Fiscal years 2003-04 and 2004-05) draw a sample of accessions from across federal institutions based on type and medium of records, which is representative of institutions by size, location, age of agreement, status of agreement, importance of the institution and Office of Primary/Collateral Interest	Corporate Services
4B. Link the accessions to their respective agreements and examine the documentation to see if observations about the condition of archival records were previously identified and actions taken	Consultant with assistance from Government Archives Division
4C. Examine the present condition of the records and associated documentation to see any action has been taken since the records were received by LAC	Consultant with assistance from Government Archives Division, Care of Collections as required
4D. Apply the results of the sample to infer the situation with regards to records received by LAC over the last two years	Consultant

Step 5: Compilation of results	
Tasks	Responsible
Combine the results from Steps 3 and 4 to produce an assessment of the present condition of archival records in federal institutions and the presence of factors which are likely to cause their condition to deteriorate in the future. High risk areas would be targeted for future action by LAC and results would be communicated to federal institutions for follow-up as required	Consultant, Government Archives Division, Care of Collections, Government Information Management Office

Schedule

Task/Phase	Q2 05/06	Q3 05/06	Q4 05/06	Q1 06/07	Q2 06/07	Q3 06/07	Q4 06/07
Development of Terms of Reference	x						
Development of a Project Plan	x	x					
Development of Tools	x	x					
Communication Plan		x					
Advisory Committee Meetings		x		x			x
First Interim Report		x					
Data Collection Phase I		x	x	x			
Second Interim Report				x			
Data Collection Phase II				x	x	x	
Final Report							x

List of Appendices:

1. Terms of Reference
2. Selected Samples
3. Working definitions and criteria to assess the condition of records

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Assessment of the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions

Background:

Government records that have archival value are identified during the process of the disposition of government records. This process is administered at Library and Archives by the Documentary Heritage Collection Sector through the Government Records Appraisal and Disposition (GRAD) Program which involves the negotiation of agreements (Records Disposition Authorities) with federal institutions to govern the disposal of government records in those institutions either by destruction, alienation from the Government of Canada, or future transfer to the Library and Archives. In most cases there is a significant time lag between the identification of records as archival and their eventual transfer to Library and Archives. Little information is currently being gathered about the condition of archival records in federal institutions with the exception of observations that were made in Archival Assessment reports at the time that the agreement was negotiated.

This situation was echoed in a recent report by the Auditor General (November 2003, released in February 2004) which observed:

6.89 We found that the National Archives does not have specific information on the nature or condition of archival records kept on departmental premises or in the Regional Service Centres.

As a result, the report recommended that:

6.91 The National Archives of Canada should implement mechanisms to obtain comprehensive information on the nature and condition of archival heritage, whether it is under their own control or that of departments and agencies.

Need:

In order to obtain information about the condition of archival records in federal institutions and respond to observations made by the Auditor General an assessment of the current state of archival records in federal institutions must be made. As well, the lack of current information about the condition of records in federal institutions has hampered the analysis needed to develop policies and advise institutions about actions that should be taken.

Scope:

This study will assess the present condition of records in federal institutions which have been identified as archival through an agreement between LAC and the institution. It will also examine the factors that are likely to cause the conditions of these records to deteriorate in the future. While it is recognized that there are many more records in federal institutions that will in the future be considered archival, it is beyond the scope of this study to consider the condition of these records at this time.

Issues:

The assessment will address the following issues:

- What is the present condition of records deemed to be of archival value in federal institutions?
- What are the key factors that are likely to affect the future condition of archival records?
- To what extent is the presence of these factors likely to threaten the future condition of archival records?

Approach:

The assessment will be led by the Corporate Management Branch of Library and Archives of Canada with the assistance of the Government Archives Division and Care of Collections of the Documentary Heritage Sector, the Government Information Management Office, an Advisory Committee and consultants as required. The Advisory Committee will be composed of Library and Archives staff and staff from other federal departments.

The primary assessment methods will consist of documentation review, interviews with departmental officials, and a survey of records in federal institutions (see attached annex for an overview of the proposed methodology).

The approach will include a communications strategy to outline how Library and Archives Canada will inform federal institutions of the assessment study being undertaken by LAC. Initially, this may simply take the form of a letter from the Librarian and Archivist of Canada to the Senior Executive designated under the *Management of Government Information Policy*.

Estimated Resources and Timeframes:

A preliminary budget for the assessment has been set at \$150,000 provided by LAC with resources related to access and coordination provided by other federal institutions. The project will be divided into a number of phases which will include the following:

Phase	Start – End Dates	Cost	Responsible
Development of Terms of Reference	July 2005	0	CS/GAD
Development of a Project Plan and Tools	July 2005 - Oct 2005	0	CS/GAD/CC/GIMO
First Interim Report	Oct 2005	0	CS/GAD/CC/GIMO
Data Collection and Analysis	Nov 2005 - Dec 2006	125,000	Consultant/GAD/CC/GIMO Other Federal Institutions
Second Interim Report	Sept 2006	10,000	Consultant/CS
Final Report	Mar 2007	15,000	Consultant/CS

Appendix 2: Selected Samples

Introduction

The assessment of the condition of archival records will have as its key tool a survey of Records Disposition Authorities in federal institutions.

Methodology

The selection of Records Disposition Authorities (RDAs) as part of the sample is done on a random basis so that the results will be broadly representative of all RDAs that LAC has with federal institutions as of March 2005. The sample size of 200 represents 18.6% of all RDAs which are thought to contain archival records. The characteristics of the sample were then checked against the population to ensure that the sample was representative across the main variables listed below.

Variable	Key Characteristics of Population
Office of Interest	Primary 56%, Collateral 44%
Location	NHQ 74%, Region 26%
Size of Institution	Small 31%, Medium 53%, Large 16%
Status of Agreement	Amend 10%, Okay 59%, Replace 31%
Age of Authority	1993 or later 56%, Pre-1993 44%

Sample Selection

The list of RDAs chosen to be part of the sample is shown in Appendix 2A.

Comparison of Sample Coverage

Preliminary examination of LAC authorities reveals that once the type and medium of records is taken into account there are 1612 combinations of types and media¹¹ for authorities that are currently active. This can be reduced to 1073 combinations if only authorities where transfer is indicated are included as shown in the table below).

¹¹ Types of records include textual, maps, drawings, photos, videos, audio, etc., while medium includes electronic, microform or native (usually paper but sometimes other such as magnetic tape are also possible).

Type	Medium				
	All	Electronic	Microform	Native	Total
All	3	0	0	0	3
Art	0	1	0	15	16
Audio	0	4	0	34	38
Drawings	0	5	9	32	46
Film	0	0	0	13	13
Maps	0	8	7	32	47
Other	0	3	0	7	10
Philately	0	0	0	2	2
Photos	0	6	2	62	70
Text	0	122	113	542	777
Video	0	2	0	49	51
Total	3	151	131	788	1073

Based on this number of authorities a 20% random sample is proposed. This sample would then be tested for to see to what extent it is representative of each of the critical variables. The results of this examination are shown below for each of the key variables.

Office of Interest			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Primary	90	45	44
Collateral	110	55	56
Total	200	100	100

Location			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Headquarters	139	70	74
Regions	61	30	26
Total	200	100	100

Size of Institution			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Small	58	29	31
Medium	103	52	53
Large	39	20	16
Total	200	100	100

Status of Agreement			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Amend	20	10	10
Okay	120	60	59
Replace	60	30	31
Total	200	100	100

Age of Authority			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Older (Pre-1993)	90	45	44
Recent	110	55	56
Total	200	100	100

If, for whatever reason, it becomes necessary to replace authorities that have been selected as part of the sample they would then be replaced by others with similar characteristics to ensure that the overall sample was representative for each of the key variables.

Appendix 2A: Sample of Record Disposition Authorities

Sample of 200 Record Disposition Authorities by Federal Institution

Institution	Int	Stat	Year	Auth	Type	Med	Reg	Size
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2001	2001/019	Photo	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2003	2002/012	Maps	Elec	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2003	2002/012	Photo	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2004	2004/010	Text	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ra	1973	M-20-73	Draw	Native	0	M
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	1993	93/006	Text	Native	0	L
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	1997	96/052	Text	Elec	0	L
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	2001	2000/033	Text	Native	1	L
Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation	C	ok	2000	2000/007	Text	Native	0	S
Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation	C	ok	2000	2000/007	Vid	Native	0	S
Canada Industrial Relations Board	C	aa	1997	97/011	Text	Elec	0	S
Canada Lands Company Limited	C	ok	2004	2003/014	Photo	Native	0	S
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation	C	ra	1995	95/018	Text	Elec	1	M
Canada Ports Corporation	C	ok	1999	98/029	Text	Micro	0	S
Canada Post Corporation	C	aa	1991	91/020	Text	Native	1	L
Canada Post Corporation	C	ok	1969	69/043	Text	Native	0	L
Canada Post Corporation	C	ok	1979	69/142-1	Text	Native	0	L
Canada Post Corporation	C	ok	2004	2004/006	Text	Native	1	L
Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety	C	ok	2002	2002/006	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board	C	ra	1994	94/010	Text	Elec	0	S
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	C	ok	2004	2003/015	Text	Elec	1	M
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	C	ra	1993	93/023	Text	Native	1	M
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	C	ra	1993	93/023	Photo	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	aa	1997	97/032	Text	Native	1	M
Canadian Heritage	P	aa	1997	97/032	Text	Elec	1	M
Canadian Heritage	P	aa	1999	99/012	Text	Native	1	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1984	M-12-83	Text	Micro	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1993	93/002	Text	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1997	97/009	Text	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ra	1969	69/079	Text	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ra	1992	92/019	Aud	Native	0	M
Canadian Institutes of Health Research	C	ra	1995	95/020	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian International Development Agency	C	ok	1969	69/045	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian International Trade Tribunal	C	aa	1993	93/036	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	C	ra	1983	M-24-71-1	Text	Micro	0	S
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	C	ra	1983	M-24-71-1	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Security Intelligence Service	C	aa	2002	2001/026	Text	Native	1	M
Canadian Space Agency	C	ok	2003	2002/003	Text	Native	1	S
Canadian Tourism Commission	C	ra	1969	69/103	Text	Native	1	S

Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1994	94/014	Aud	Elec	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/015	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Aud	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Maps	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Text	Elec	0	S
Canadian Transportation Agency	C	ok	1997	97/031	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Wheat Board	C	ra	1974	74/008	Text	Native	0	S
Citizenship and Immigration	P	ra	1983	M-4-83	Text	Native	0	M
Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP	C	ok	1996	96/011	Vid	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2002	2002/011	Photo	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Maps	Elec	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Vid	Elec	0	S
Correctional Service of Canada	C	ok	1980	M-38-79	Draw	Native	1	L
Correctional Service of Canada	C	ra	1996	96/007	Vid	Native	1	L
Correctional Service of Canada	C	ra	1997	96/048	Text	Native	0	L
Elections Canada	C	aa	2001	2001/017	Aud	Native	0	S
Environment	P	ra	1977	M-8-77	Text	Micro	1	M
Export Development Canada	C	ra	1966	49	Text	Native	0	S
Finance	P	ok	1992	92/009	Text	Elec	0	S
Finance	P	ok	1993	93/035	Text	Elec	0	S
Finance	P	ok	1993	93/035	Text	Native	0	S
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ok	1986	85/017	Maps	Native	1	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ok	2000	2000/005	Text	Native	1	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ra	1969	69/070	Text	Native	1	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ra	1969	69/011	Maps	Native	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	aa	1970	M-2-70	Text	Micro	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1969	69/122	Text	Native	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1969	69/101	Text	Native	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1977	75/023-1	Text	Native	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1982	75/023-3	Text	Native	0	L
Health	P	aa	1996	96/038	Photo	Native	1	M
Health	P	aa	1996	96/038	Text	Native	1	M
Health	P	aa	1998	98/019	Text	Elec	1	M
Health	P	ok	1983	83/005	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ok	1991	91/007	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1963	616090	Text	Native	1	M
Health	P	ra	1978	78/014	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1987	87/012	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1989	89/014	Text	Native	0	M
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ok	1962	592189	Text	Native	0	L

Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ok	1994	93/021-1	Text	Elec	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1968	68/057	Text	Native	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1968	68/011	Text	Native	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1975	69/136-1	Text	Native	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1994	93/040	Art	Native	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1996	95/019	Art	Native	0	L
Immigration and Refugee Board	C	ok	2004	2004/009	Photo	Native	1	S
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	1994	94/008	Text	Native	0	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/028	Text	Micro	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Photo	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	99/026	Text	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Text	Micro	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ra	1988	88/003	Text	Micro	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ra	1995	88/003-1	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	aa	2000	2000/017	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	ok	1977	M-5-77	Text	Micro	0	M
Industry	P	ok	1999	97/002-1	Text	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1968	68/066	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	ra	1969	69/119	Text	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1971	70/040	Text	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1976	75/033	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	ra	1982	M-1-81	Text	Micro	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1985	85/008	Text	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1989	89/023	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	ra	1991	91/017	Text	Native	0	M
Laurentian Pilotage Authority	C	ok	2000	99/024L	Text	Native	1	S
Library and Archives of Canada	C	ok	1979	M-12-79	Text	Micro	0	S
Library and Archives of Canada	C	ok	2002	2001/027	Text	Elec	1	S
National Capital Commission	C	ok	2002	2001/009	Text	Elec	0	S
National Defence	P	aa	1970	M-2-70	Text	Micro	0	L
National Defence	P	ok	1998	98/017	Text	Native	0	L
National Defence	P	ok	2001	2000/014	Photo	Native	1	L
National Defence	P	ok	2001	2000/014	Draw	Native	1	L
National Energy Board	C	ok	1984	M-13-83	Text	Micro	0	S
National Energy Board	C	ok	1997	96/042	Text	Native	0	S
National Energy Board	C	ok	1998	98/020	Text	Native	0	S
National Farm Products Council	C	aa	1983	83/028	Aud	Native	0	S
National Film Board	C	ra	1969	69/092	Photo	Native	0	S
National Film Board	C	ra	1969	69/092	Film	Native	0	S
National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy	C	ok	2003	2003/008	Text	Native	0	S
Natural Resources	P	ok	1969	69/016	Text	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1974	74/019	Maps	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1988	88/011	Text	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1989	89/007	Text	Micro	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1989	89/015	Text	Native	0	M

Natural Resources	P	ok	1992	92/008	Other	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1997	96/055	Text	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2000/020	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/022	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Maps	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Text	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ra	1993	93/024	Text	Elec	0	M
Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages	C	ok	1996	95/026	Vid	Native	1	S
Office of the Coordinator, Status of Women	C	ok	2000	2000/006	Vid	Native	1	S
Office of the Coordinator, Status of Women	C	ra	1994	90/022-1	Text	Native	0	S
Office of the Superintendent of Financial Transactions	C	ok	2001	2001/015	Text	Native	1	S
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1976	M-6-76	Text	Micro	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1976	M-24-76	Photo	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1976	M-24-76	Maps	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1984	M-14-83	Text	Native	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1984	M-14-83	Draw	Native	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1971	M-11-71	Maps	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1973	72/010-1	Text	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1973	73/013	Text	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1984	84/006	Photo	Native	0	M
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Art	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Draw	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	ok	1969	69/075	Text	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	ok	1969	69/074	Text	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	ok	2003	2003/009	Text	Native	0	S
Public Service Commission	C	ok	2001	2001/025	All	All	1	S
				M-31-				
Public Works and Government Services	P	aa	1974	74-1	Text	Native	0	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	aa	1997	97/005	Draw	Native	1	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	ok	1978	M-9-78	Maps	Native	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	1994	91/015-1	Text	Micro	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	1995	95/011	Art	Native	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	1995	95/003	Text	Native	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	1995	95/003	Text	Elec	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	2000	2000/030	Text	Native	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	2001	89/025-1	Text	Native	0	L
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council	C	ra	1969	69/024	Text	Native	0	S
Solicitor General	P	ok	2003	2003/013	Text	Native	0	S
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1971	71/009	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1972	M-30-72	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1973	M-12-73	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1975	M-29-75	Text	Micro	0	M

Statistics Canada	C	ra	1975	M-16-75	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	M-20-76	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	76/013	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	75/006-1	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1978	M-12-78	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1979	72/011-2	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1980	80/003	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1983	M-6-83	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1984	83/034	Text	Native	0	M
The Federal Bridge Corporation Limited	C	ok	1998	98/028	Draw	Elec	0	S
The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	C	ok	1998	98/025	Text	Elec	0	S
The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	C	ok	1998	98/026	Draw	Native	0	S
Transport	P	aa	1994	94/015	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1964	M-3-64	Text	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1972	M-2-72	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1978	M-22-77	Photo	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1980	M-4-80	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1980	M-2-80-				
Transport	P	ok	1980	1	Text	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1995	95/010	Text	Native	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/031	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/032	Text	Elec	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/026	Text	Native	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/017	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/032	Text	Native	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/026	Text	Elec	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1999	99/021	Vid	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1987	87/009	Text	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	93/038	Text	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	93/015	Text	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	94/004	Maps	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/002	Text	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/011	Aud	Native	0	M
Vancouver Port Authority	C	ok	2003	2002/001	All	All	1	S
Veterans Affairs	P	ok	2000	2000/022	Text	Native	1	M

Legend

Institution: the federal institution

Intr: Interest (Primary or Collateral)

Stat: Status of the Agreement (Amend, Okay, or Replace)

Year: Year in which the agreement came into effect

Auth: Authority reference number

Type: Type of materials covered by the Authority

Med: Medium of these materials

Reg: Location of the documents (1 indicates that they are held in a region)

Size: Size of the institution (small, medium or large)

Appendix 3: Working definitions and criteria to assess the condition of records

To be completed by LAC Working Group.

Filename and Path

C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Application
Data\Fabasoft\DOCDIR\{Services}\W3WP.1_CONV\mimeattach594.bin

Terms of Reference for the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions Advisory Group

Background

A number of initiatives within Library and Archives Canada (LAC) led to the formation of the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions (CARFI) Working Group in 2005. In particular, there were two primary drivers:

- The need to respond to the Auditor General's Report (November 2003, released February 2004)
- The need for clarification of Section 13.3 of the *Library and Archives of Canada Act* (enacted 22 April 2004)

Requirement for the Assessment

In her November 2003 report *Protection of Cultural Heritage in the Federal Government*, the Auditor General of Canada found that the Government of Canada has incomplete information on the nature and condition of archival records, and "has no assurance of obtaining all government records that are of historic interest or archival importance". The Auditor General recommended that the National Archives of Canada (now Library and Archives Canada)

should implement mechanisms to obtain comprehensive information on the nature and condition of archival heritage, whether it is under their own control or that of departments and agencies.

As part of its response to this recommendation, LAC is working with our colleagues in federal departments and agencies to gather the required information on the condition of archival records held across the government. The development of a questionnaire for the Assessment of the Condition of Archival Records held in Federal Institutions is a key step in this information-gathering process.

The questionnaire will be administered in 60 federal departments and agencies (including LAC itself), to provide baseline data on the condition of archival records held across the Government of Canada. The questionnaire will assist LAC in developing policies and in advising federal institutions with respect to records management issues. The questionnaire will form the basis of an ongoing monitoring instrument that will be used to provide regular updates on the condition of archival records held in all federal institutions.

Mandate of the Advisory Group

The Advisory Group (AG) is mandated to:

- assist LAC with the development of the questionnaire prior to distribution to the 60 federal institutions included in the sample group,

- provide general recommendations to the Working Group on administering the questionnaire, and
- provide comments on the Working Group's recommendations based on the data collected from the questionnaire.

Membership

The AG will consist of 6-8 representatives from a larger sample of 60 federal institutions selected to participate in completing the questionnaire for the Condition of Archival Records in Federal Institutions.

Scope of Advisory Group Participation

- The AG will participate in the questionnaire development phase which will include a **review** of the questionnaire content and format, as well as, the **pre-testing** of selected portions of the questionnaire on specific archival records under their care and control.
- Once the questionnaire is finalized the AG will be asked to participate with the remaining 60 institutions included in the sample, to **complete the questionnaire** on selected archival records in their institutions.
- On an ongoing basis, the AG will provide **feedback** on the ease of administering the questionnaire and the appropriateness of the questions.
- When the questionnaire has been completed by the sample group, the AG will be asked to **comment** on the CARFI Working Group's findings and recommendations.
- See also, the CARFI Working Group **time-line**.

Governance

The AG will work in conjunction with the CARFI Working Group, as well as with their corresponding portfolio archivists. The CARFI Working Group will chair the AG.

Annex C: Sample of Record Disposition Authorities (2A Revised)

Institution	Intr	Stat	Year	Auth	Type	Med	Reg	Size
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2004	2004/010	Text	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2003	2002/012	Maps	Elec	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2003	2002/012	Draw	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2001	2001/019	Film	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2004	2004/010	Vid	Elec	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2001	2001/019	Photo	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ok	2003	2002/012	Photo	Native	1	M
Agriculture and Agri-Food	P	ra	1973	M-20-73	Draw	Native	0	M
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	P	ra	1971	70/041	Draw	Native	0	S
Canada Council for the Arts	C	ra	1998	98/007	Photo	Elec	0	S
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	1997	96/052	Text	Elec	0	L
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	1998	98/011	Text	Elec	0	L
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	2001	2000/033	Text	Native	1	L
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	P	ok	1993	93/006	Text	Native	0	L
Canada Industrial Relations Board	C	aa	1997	97/011	Text	Elec	0	S
Canada Lands Company Limited	C	ok	2004	2003/014	Photo	Native	0	S
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation	C	ra	1995	95/018	Text	Elec	1	M
Canada Ports Corporation	C	ok	1999	98/029	Vid	Native	0	S
Canada Ports Corporation	C	ok	1997	97/008	Text	Micro	0	S
Canada Post Corporation	C	ok	1969	69/043	Text	Native	0	L
Canada Post Corporation	C	ok	1979	69/142-1	Text	Native	0	L
Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board	C	ra	1994	94/010	Text	Elec	0	S
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	C	ra	1993	93/023	Text	Native	1	M
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	C	ok	2004	2003/015	Text	Elec	1	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1997	97/009	Text	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ra	1992	92/019	Aud	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	aa	1997	97/032	Text	Elec	1	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1993	93/002	Text	Native	0	M
Canadian Heritage	P	ok	1984	M-12-83	Text	Micro	0	M
Canadian Human Rights Commission	C	ok	2003	2003/004	Vid	Native	1	S
Canadian Institutes of Health Research	C	ra	1995	95/020	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian International Development Agency	C	ok	1969	69/045	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	C	ra	1983	M-24-71-1	Text	Micro	0	S
Canadian Security Intelligence Service	C	aa	2002	2001/026	Photo	Elec	1	M
Canadian Security Intelligence Service	C	ok	2003	2003/007	Text	Micro	1	M
Canadian Space Agency	C	ok	2003	2002/003	Text	Native	1	S
Canadian Space Agency	C	ok	2003	2002/003	Photo	Native	1	S
Canadian Tourism Commission	C	ra	1969	69/103	Text	Native	1	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Aud	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1994	94/014	Aud	Elec	0	S

Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Text	Elec	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/015	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board	C	ok	1995	95/021	Maps	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Agency	C	ok	1996	95/023	Art	Native	0	S
Canadian Transportation Agency	C	ok	1997	97/031	Text	Native	0	S
Canadian Wheat Board	C	ra	1974	74/008	Text	Native	0	S
Citizenship and Immigration	P	ok	2003	2002/004	Photo	Native	1	M
Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP	C	ok	1996	96/011	Vid	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2002	2002/011	Vid	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Maps	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2002	2002/011	Text	Elec	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Aud	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Draw	Elec	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Vid	Elec	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Vid	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2002	2002/011	Photo	Native	0	S
Communications Security Establishment	C	ok	2004	2004/004	Maps	Elec	0	S
Correctional Service of Canada	C	ra	1996	96/007	Vid	Native	1	L
Correctional Service of Canada	C	ok	1980	M-38-79	Draw	Native	1	L
Elections Canada	C	aa	2001	2001/017	Aud	Native	0	S
Elections Canada	C	aa	2001	2001/017	Maps	Elec	0	S
Elections Canada	C	aa	2001	2001/017	Maps	Native	0	S
Environment	P	ra	1968	68/017	Photo	Native	0	M
Environment	P	ra	1977	M-8-77	Text	Micro	1	M
Environment	P	ok	1996	96/033	Text	Elec	0	M
Export Development Canada	C	ra	1966	49	Text	Native	0	S
Finance	P	ok	1992	92/009	Text	Elec	0	S
Finance	P	ok	1993	93/035	Text	Elec	0	S
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ra	1982	M-8-82	Maps	Micro	1	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ra	1969	69/011	Maps	Native	0	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ok	1986	85/017	Maps	Native	1	L
Fisheries and Oceans	P	ok	2000	2000/005	Text	Native	1	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	aa	1970	M-2-70	Text	Micro	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1977	75/023-1	Text	Native	0	L
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	P	ok	1969	69/122	Text	Native	0	L
Health	P	aa	1998	98/019	Text	Elec	1	M
Health	P	ok	1983	83/005	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1981	77/027-2	Draw	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1989	89/014	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ra	1978	78/014	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	ok	1991	91/007	Text	Native	0	M
Health	P	aa	1997	97/025	Vid	Native	0	M
Health	P	aa	1996	96/038	Photo	Native	1	M

Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1996	95/019	Text	Elec	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1996	95/019	Art	Native	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ok	1994	93/021-1	Text	Elec	0	L
Human Resources and Skills Development	P	ra	1968	68/057	Text	Native	0	L
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/028	Other	Elec	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Text	Micro	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/028	Text	Micro	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	99/026	Text	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	1996	96/006	Text	Elec	0	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Photo	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Vid	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Maps	Native	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Maps	Elec	1	M
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	P	ok	2000	2000/015	Text	Elec	1	M
Industry	P	ok	1977	M-5-77	Text	Micro	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1968	68/066	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	ra	1985	85/008	Photo	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1989	89/023	Text	Native	1	M
Industry	P	aa	2000	97/024	Text	Micro	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1985	85/008	Aud	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1983	83/030	Maps	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ok	1994	94/007	Aud	Native	0	M
Industry	P	ra	1969	69/119	Text	Native	0	M
International Development Research Centre	C	ok	1998	97/034	Vid	Native	0	S
Library and Archives of Canada	C	ok	2002	2001/027	Text	Elec	1	S
Library and Archives of Canada	C	ok	1979	M-12-79	Text	Micro	0	S
Library and Archives of Canada	C	ok	1997	97/016	Photo	Native	0	S
National Capital Commission	C	ok	2002	2001/009	Text	Elec	0	S
National Defence	P	ok	2001	2000/014	Maps	Native	1	L
National Defence	P	ok	1998	98/017	Vid	Native	0	L
National Defence	P	ok	2001	2000/014	Photo	Native	1	L
National Defence	P	aa	1970	M-2-70	Text	Micro	0	L
National Defence	P	ok	2001	2000/014	Draw	Native	1	L
National Energy Board	C	ok	1997	96/042	Photo	Native	0	S
National Energy Board	C	ok	1997	96/042	Maps	Native	0	S
National Energy Board	C	ok	1997	96/042	Text	Native	0	S
National Energy Board	C	ok	1998	98/020	Text	Native	0	S
National Farm Products Council	C	aa	1983	83/028	Aud	Native	0	S
National Film Board	C	ra	1969	69/092	Film	Native	0	S
National Research Council of Canada	C	aa	1995	94/024	Photo	Native	0	M
National Research Council of Canada	C	aa	1995	94/024	Vid	Native	0	M
National Research Council of Canada	C	ok	1999	99/005	Draw	Native	0	M
National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy	C	ok	2003	2003/008	Text	Native	0	S
Natural Resources	P	ok	1974	74/019	Maps	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	aa	1992	92/002	Text	Elec	0	M

Natural Resources	P	ra	1993	93/024	Text	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/020	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1989	89/007	Text	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1997	96/055	Text	Elec	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1992	92/008	Other	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1969	M-16-69	Maps	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	1989	89/007	Text	Micro	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Text	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/022	Photo	Native	1	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2000	98/033	Vid	Native	0	M
Natural Resources	P	ok	2002	2001/021	Maps	Native	1	M
NAV Canada	C	ok	1996	96/026	Text	Elec	1	S
Office of the Coordinator, Status of Women	C	ra	1994	90/022-1	Text	Native	0	S
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1976	M-24-76	Maps	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1984	M-14-83	Draw	Native	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1976	M-6-76	Text	Micro	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1984	84/006	Photo	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1984	M-14-83	Text	Native	1	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1973	73/013	Text	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1973	72/010-1	Text	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ra	1971	M-11-71	Maps	Native	0	M
Parks Canada Agency	C	ok	1984	M-14-83	Photo	Micro	1	M
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Maps	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Vid	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Art	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	aa	1993	93/001	Draw	Native	0	S
Privy Council Office	P	ok	2003	2003/009	Text	Native	0	S
Public Service Staff Relations Board	C	ok	1991	91/022	Text	Elec	0	S
Public Service Staff Relations Board	C	ok	1991	91/022	Text	Micro	0	S
Public Works and Government Services	P	ok	1978	M-9-78	Maps	Native	0	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	aa	1969	69/105	Draw	Native	1	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	aa	1997	97/005	Draw	Native	1	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	aa	1997	97/005	Photo	Native	1	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	ok	1997	97/006	Draw	Native	0	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	ok	1978	M-9-78	Draw	Native	0	L
Public Works and Government Services	P	ok	1985	M-22-84	Draw	Micro	0	L
Royal Canadian Mint	C	ok	2000	2000/027	Vid	Native	1	S
Royal Canadian Mint	C	ok	2000	2000/027	Draw	Native	1	S
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	1995	95/003	Text	Elec	0	L
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	C	ok	2000	2000/030	Text	Native	0	L
Solicitor General	P	ok	2003	2003/013	Text	Native	0	S
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	75/006-1	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1973	M-12-73	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1980	79/001-1	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1980	80/003	Text	Native	0	M

				M-15-				
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1985	76-1	Maps	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	M-20-76	Text	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1972	M-5-72	Maps	Micro	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1976	75/006-1	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1971	71/009	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1978	M-12-78	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1975	M-16-75	Text	Elec	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1984	83/034	Text	Native	0	M
Statistics Canada	C	ra	1975	M-29-75	Text	Micro	0	M
The Federal Bridge Corporation Limited	C	ok	1998	98/028	Draw	Elec	0	S
The Federal Bridge Corporation Limited	C	ok	1998	98/028	Draw	Micro	0	S
The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	C	ok	1998	98/025	Text	Elec	0	S
The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	C	ok	1998	98/025	Photo	Native	0	S
The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	C	ok	1998	98/026	Draw	Native	0	S
Transport	P	ok	1978	M-22-77	Photo	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	aa	1994	94/015	Vid	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/032	Text	Elec	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1972	M-2-72	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	aa	1994	94/015	Film	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1972	M-13-72	Draw	Micro	1	M
Transport	P	ok	1976	M-1-76	Draw	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1964	M-3-64	Text	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1996	96/026	Text	Elec	1	M
				M-2-80-				
Transport	P	ok	1980	1	Text	Micro	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1972	M-13-72	Maps	Micro	1	M
Transport	P	aa	1994	94/015	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1980	M-4-80	Text	Native	0	M
Transport	P	ok	1995	95/010	Text	Native	1	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	94/004	Maps	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/002	Text	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/011	Text	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/002	Art	Elec	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	2003	2003/011	Aud	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	93/015	Text	Native	0	M
Treasury Board Secretariat	P	ok	1994	93/038	Text	Native	0	M
Veterans Affairs	P	ok	2000	2000/022	Text	Native	1	M

Office of Interest			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Primary	94	45	44
Colateral	116	55	56
Total	210	100	100

Location			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Headquarters	147	70	74
Regions	63	30	26
Total	210	100	100

Size			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Small	67	32	31
Medium	110	52	53
Large	33	16	16
Total	210	100	100

Status			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Amend	26	12	10
Okay	135	64	59
Replace	49	33	31
Total	210	100	100

Age of Authority			
	Number in Sample	Percent Distribution	Distribution of Population
Older (Pre-1993)	80	38	44
Recent	130	62	56
Total	210	100	100

Population by Type and Medium

Type	Medium									
	All		Electronic		Microform		Native		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All	3	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	<1
Art	0	0	1	<1	0	0	15	1	16	1
Audio	0	0	4	<1	0	0	34	3	38	4
Drawings	0	0	5	<1	9	<1	32	3	46	4
Film	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	13	1
Maps	0	0	8	<1	7	<1	32	3	47	4
Other	0	0	3	<1	0	0	7	<1	10	1
Philately	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	<1	2	<1
Photos	0	0	6	<1	2	<1	62	6	70	7
Text	0	0	122	11	113	11	542	51	777	72
Video	0	0	2	<1	0	0	49	5	51	5
Total	3	<1	151	14	131	12	788	73	1073	100

Note: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Sample by Type and Medium

Type	Medium									
	All		Electronic		Microform		Native		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Art	0	0	1	<1	0	0	3	1	4	2
Audio	0	0	1	<1	0	0	8	4	9	4
Drawings	0	0	2	1	4	2	15	7	21	10
Film	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	1
Maps	0	0	6	3	4	2	15	7	25	12
Other	0	0	1	<1	0	0	1	<1	2	1
Philately	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Photos	0	0	2	1	2	1	20	10	24	11
Text	0	0	35	17	20	10	50	24	105	50
Video	0	0	2	1	0	0	15	7	17	8
Total	0	0	50	24	30	14	130	62	210	100

Note: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Annex D

**CARFI Sample of Record Disposition Authorities
(did not meet criteria and could not be used)**

Institution	Stat	Year	Auth	TM	C1AR	C2CC	C3SS	Notes
Agriculture and Agri-Food	ok	2004	2004/010	VE	N			
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	ra	1971	70/041	DN			Y	USE 98-012
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	ra	1993	93/023	TN			Y	USE 2003-015
Canadian Heritage	ok	1993	93/002	TN		N		Single Application
Canadian Heritage	ok	1984	M-12-83	TM			Y	No longer archival
Correctional Service of Canada	ok	1980	M-38-79	DN			Y	USE 2004-015
Finance	ok	1992	92/009	TE	N			
Finance	ok	1993	93/035	TE	N			
Fisheries and Oceans	ra	1982	M-8-82	MM			Y	No longer archival
Fisheries and Oceans	ra	1969	69/011	MN			Y	No longer archival
Fisheries and Oceans	ok	1986	85/017	MN			Y	USE 2005-007
Health	ok	1991	91/007	TN			Y	USE 97-025
				TE				soon to be
Human Resources and Skills Development	ok	1994	93/021-1					superseded by a
				TN				pending RDA
Human Resources and Skills Development	ra	1968	68/057					soon to be
			69/115	TN				superseded by a
Human Resources and Skills Development					N			pending RDA
Human Resources and Skills Development			68/136	TN				
Human Resources and Skills Development					N			
Human Resources and Skills Development			93/021	TE				
Human Resources and Skills Development					N			
Human Resources and Skills Development			94/002	TE				
					N			
Industry	ra	1985	85/008	PN		N		Single Application
Industry	ra	1985	85/008	AN		N		Single Application
Industry	ra	1983	83/030	MN		N		NOW COMM
Industry	ok	1994	94/007	AN		N		Single Application
Industry	ra	1969	69/119	TN		N		NOW DFAIT
International Development Research Centre	ok	1998	97/034	VN				
						N		
National Defence	ok	1998	98/017	VN		N		Already transferred
National Defence	aa	1970	M-2-70	TM		N		Now someone else
National Film Board	ra	1969	69/092	FN	N			
National Research Council of Canada	ok	1999	99/005	DN				
					N			
Natural Resources	ok	1974	74/019	ME		N		Single Application
Office of the Coordinator, Status of	ra	1994	90/022-1	TN			Y	USE 2005-005

Women

Public Service Staff Relations Board	ok	1991	91/022	TE		Y	No longer archival
Public Service Staff Relations Board	ok	1991	91/022	TN		Y	No longer archival
Public Works and Government Services DR	ok	1997	97/006	DN			
Statistics Canada	ra	1976	75/006-1	TE	N		Single Application
Statistics Canada	ra	1980	79/001-1	TE		Y	USE 79-001
Statistics Canada	ra	1976	M-20-76	TM	N		
Statistics Canada	ra	1976	75/006-1	TN	N		
Transport	ok	1978	M-22-77	PM		Y	USE 98-010
Transport			M-1-76	DM	N		Single Application
Transport			M-2-72	TN	N		Single Application
Transport			M-3-64	TM	N		Single Application
Transport			M-4-80	TN	N		Single Application
Treasury Board Secretariat	ok	1994	94/004	ME	N		NOW PSHRMAC
Treasury Board Secretariat	ok	2003	2003/011	TE	N		NOW PSHRMAC
Treasury Board Secretariat	ok	2003	2003/011	AN	N		NOW PSHRMAC
Treasury Board Secretariat	ok	1994	93/015	TN		Y	USE 2003-002
Treasury Board Secretariat	ok	1994	93/038	TN		Y	USE 2000-010
Treasury Board Secretariat			90/016	TE		Y	USE 2004-007
Treasury Board Secretariat			93/031	TN		Y	USE 2004-007

Annex E

CARFI Surveys Completed (May 10, 2007)				
	1 st Location	2 nd Location	3 rd Location	Total
Overall				104
Part I				98
Part II	96	36	15	
Part III				
Paper	29	17	10	
Electronic	20	2	0	
Microform	9	0	0	
Photographs	13	3	0	
Maps, Plans and Technical Drawings	10	3	1	
Audio-Video	14	6	2	
Art	2	1	0	
Motion Picture Film	0	0	0	

CARFI Survey Results
Response Rates by Characteristics of Authorities

Office of Interest				
	Sample		Respondents¹²	
Category	Freq	Percent	Freq	Response Rate
Primary	93	54	56	60
Collateral	80	46	44	55
Total	173	100	100	58

Status of Agreements				
	Sample		Respondents	
Category	Freq	Percent	Freq	Response Rate
Okay	112	65	66	54
Amend	27	15	20	60
Replace	34	20	14	36
Total	173	100	100	58

Age of Authority				
	Sample		Respondents	
Category	Freq	Percent	Freq	Response Rate
Before 1993	57	33	21	37
1993 or later	116	67	79	68
Total	173	100	100	58

Location of Records				
	Sample		Respondents	
Category	Freq	Percent	Freq	Response Rate
NHQ only	122	71	66	54
Regions	51	29	34	67
Total	173	100	100	58

Size of Institution				
	Sample		Respondents	
Category	Freq	Percent	Freq	Response Rate
Small	56	32	41	73
Medium	93	54	42	45
Large	24	14	17	71
Total	173	100	100	58

¹² Based on 104 surveys submitted to LAC by May 10, 2007 of which 100 had complete enough information to perform the analysis.

CARFI Survey Questions and Results

Section I Recordkeeping

1. Is your institution able to apply the Records Disposition Authority (RDA) for the identification and transfer of archival records to LAC?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	82	84
No	16	16
Total	98	100
If No, Terms and Conditions do not clearly identify which records are archival	0	
No Application Guide exists	3	
Other	14	

2. What percentage of the archival records included in the RDA has retention periods assigned?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	8	8
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	4	4
61-80%	5	5
Over 80%	81	83
Total	98	100

3. Does the institution have a centralized records management program that determines policy and work procedures to ensure consistency in recordkeeping practice?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	95	97
No	3	3
Total	98	100

4. Do the institution's regional operations have separate recordkeeping policies and procedures?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	18	18
No	53	54
No Regional operations	27	28
Total	98	100

5. If there are regional recordkeeping operations, do the regions apply the institution's Records Disposition Authorities to identify archival records for transfer to Library and Archives Canada?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	54	76
No	17	24
Total	71	100

6. What percentage of the archival records included in this Records Disposition Authority is captured:		
Responses	Freq	Percent¹³
in a single records management system that is standard in the institution (e.g. iRims, Foremost)	NA	59
in multiple records management systems	NA	20
Not captured in any system	NA	21
Total	NA	100

7. What percentage of the archival records included in this Records Disposition Authority is organized:		
Responses	Freq	Percent
under a single classification scheme that is standard in the institution	NA	68
under multiple classification schemes	NA	20
Not organized under any classification scheme	NA	12
Total	NA	100

8. What percentage of archival records covered by this RDA is under the custody and control of your institution's records management program?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	19	20
21-40%	5	5
41-60%	16	16
61-80%	10	10
Over 80%	48	49
Total	98	100

¹³ Answers for questions 6, 7 and 9 represent the average of responses for each category adjusted so the totals add to 100 percent.

9. What percentage of archival records created electronically is:		
Responses		Percent
filed electronically as the official corporate record		28
printed to paper for filing as the official corporate record		72
Total		100

10. Can the institution's records management staff identify, locate and retrieve the archival records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	83	84
No	16	16
Total	99	100
If No, Location of records not known (e.g., loss of corporate memory due to staff leaving; records moved without documentation)	12	
No listing exists for these records	7	
No procedures for retrieving records from off-site locations	2	
Other	8	

11. What percentage of record containers is clearly labelled to identify contents?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	9	9
21-40%	2	2
41-60%	7	7
61-80%	8	8
Over 80%	72	74
Total	98	100

12. Does the institution have up-to-date documented guidelines for the physical handling and storage of its archival records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	64	65
No – no documented guidelines	13	13
No – documentation is outdated, does not reflect current practice	22	22
Total	98	100

13. What percentage of personnel (including contractors, temporary help, etc.) who access the archival records is trained in the institutional guidelines for handling and storage of archival records:				
	Records management personnel		Other personnel	
Responses	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
0-20%	29	30	56	60
21-40%	3	3	2	2
41-60%	4	4	12	13
61-80%	5	5	3	3
Over 80%	57	58	21	22
Total	98	100	94	100

14. Are there procedures in place for tracking the archival records when they are removed from a storage location that is under the control of the institution's records management program?			
Responses	Freq		Percent
Yes	92		93
No	7		7
Total	99		100

Section II (Location 1: normally where largest amount of records are stored)

Building Security

1.1 Identify all building security measures that are in place:		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Security Guards	80	85
Controlled access to the building	91	97
In-house alarm	75	80
Alarm system linked to outside agency or police	54	57
Video cameras	64	68
Key control	79	84
ID tags for staff and visitors	80	85
Sign-in register for visitors	78	83
Separate controlled access to storage areas	72	77
Other	8	9
Total	94	100

1.2. Does the building have a current emergency response plan for document recovery?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	41	43
No	55	57
Total	96	100

1.3. What percentage of records management personnel is trained in the emergency response plan?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	19	46
21-40%	10	25
41-60%	5	12
61-80%	4	10
Over 80%	3	7
Total	41	100

1.4. Has the emergency response plan been tested?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	22	54
No	19	46
Total	41	100

1.5. In the event of an emergency, are recovery priorities identified among the archival record holdings?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	30	73
No	11	27
Total	41	100

1.6. Does the local fire department have a copy of the building's emergency response plan and recovery priorities?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	20	49
No	21	51
Total	41	100

1.7 Have arrangements been made for recovery operations should there be water damage to the records:						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Drying Space	23	24	71	76	94	100
Disaster supplies	35	37	59	63	94	100
Freezing facilities	24	26	70	74	94	100
Human resources assigned	44	47	50	53	94	100

Facilities

2.1. Does the building have a centralized HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning) system?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	93	99
No	1	1
Total	94	100

2.2. Does the HVAC system run on a 24-hour / 7-day basis?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	66	70
No	28	30
Total	94	100

2.3. Do the records storage areas have a dedicated HVAC system?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	28	30
No	66	70
Total	94	100

2.4. Is the HVAC system for the records storage areas regularly monitored and adjusted when required to maintain an appropriate storage environment		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	21	75
No	7	25
Total	28	100

2.5. Are doors and windows in the records storage areas opened to control temperature and ventilation?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	6	6
No	88	94
Total	94	100

2.6. When maintenance or renovations are undertaken in the building, are measures taken to protect the archival records in the affected areas (e.g., covering or moving the records)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	71	79
No	19	21
Total	90	100

Lighting

3.1. Do the records storage areas have exterior windows?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	48	51
No	46	49
Total	94	100

3.2. If yes, are the windows covered with blinds to prevent damage to archival records from light and heat?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	43	90
No	5	10
Total	48	100

3.3. How long are the lights in the storage areas on?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
24/7	16	17
Daytime only	56	60
Only when a person enters the storage area	22	23
Total	94	100

Pests and Contaminants

4.1. Describe any pest infestation or contaminants found in the storage areas where archival records are kept						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Insects	8	9	86	91	94	100
Rodents	10	11	84	89	94	100
Mould	7	7	87	93	94	100

4.2. Are food and beverages banned in the records storage areas?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	36	40
No	55	60
Total	91	100

Deterioration

5.1. Indicate any damage caused to archival records by natural or artificial agents						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Water	14	15	80	85	94	100
Fire	1	1	93	99	94	100
Light	0	0	94	100	94	100

Storage

6.1. What percentage of archival records is located in areas protected from flooding, i.e. NOT in basements, top floors of buildings (roof leaks), and rooms with overhead water pipes:		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	32	34
21-40%	1	1
41-60%	8	8
61-80%	3	3
Over 80%	51	54
Total	95	100

6.2. How often are the records storage areas cleaned?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Weekly	44	46
Monthly	22	23
Annually	7	7
Less Frequently	23	24
Total	96	100

6.3. Are the storage areas used exclusively to house records, or is the space also used to store other items – e.g. office supplies, cleaning products, computing equipment – that reduce storage space availability and could potentially damage archival records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes – storage areas are used for records only	72	75
No	24	25
Total	96	100

6.4. Are the archival records separated by media type, e.g. text--paper, audio-video, electronic, maps, etc.?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes – record containers hold only one medium type	68	71
No – record containers hold mixed media	28	29
Total	96	100

6.5. In your archival records storage area, what percentage of shelving units have at least 2 inches of space between the floor and the bottom shelf?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	3	3
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	1	1
61-80%	3	3
Over 80%	89	93
Total	96	100

6.6. In your archival records storage area, what percentage of shelving units has at least 500 millimetres (20 inches) of space between the top shelf and the ceiling, including sprinkler system nozzles?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	12	13
21-40%	1	1
41-60%	1	1
61-80%	6	6
Over 80%	76	79
Total	96	100

6.7. What percentage of containers holding archival records is stored on the floor in the storage area?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	90	95
21-40%	2	2
41-60%	1	1
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	2	2
Total	95	100

6.8. What percentage of containers holding archival records is stored on top of shelving units?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	87	91
21-40%	7	7
41-60%	0	0
61-80%	1	1
Over 80%	1	1
Total	96	100

6.9. What proportion of space in the records storage areas is currently utilized?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-80%	30	31
80-100%	51	53
Over 100%	15	16
Total	96	100

Section III (Location 1: normally where largest amount of records are stored)

1. Paper

1.1. What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where paper archival records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	1	4
18 - 24°C	22	78
Above 24°C	1	4
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	4	14
Total	28	100

1.2. What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where paper archival records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	8	29
40 – 50%	7	25
More than 50%	2	7
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	11	39
Total	28	100

1.3. What proportion of the archival records is printed on permanent paper (i.e., low-acid paper that became generally available in the Government of Canada post-1990)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	13	45
21-40%	2	7
41-60%	5	17
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	9	31
Total	29	100

1.4. What percentage of the archival records is stored in file folders?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	0	0
21-40%	2	7
41-60%	2	7
61-80%	4	14
Over 80%	21	72
Total	29	100

1.5. Are the file folders containing paper archival records properly filled, i.e.:						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
folders are no more than 1½ inches thick	25	89	3	11	28	100
enclosed items are the proper size	26	93	2	7	28	100
enclosed items are secured on spikes	25	89	3	11	28	100

1.5.(continued) If 'No' to any of above, what % of file folders are improperly filled/		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	2	40
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	2	40
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	1	20
Total	5	100

1.6. What percentage of the folders containing archival records is stored on shelves in boxes?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	14	50
21-40%	1	4
41-60%	4	14
61-80%	1	4
Over 80%	8	28
Total	28	100

1.7. What percentage of the boxes containing archival records is properly filled:		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	8	28
21-40%	1	4
41-60%	0	0
61-80%	3	11
Over 80%	16	57
Total	28	100

1.8. What percentage of oversized material is stored in appropriately sized containers?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	11	39
21-40%	1	4
41-60%	1	4
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	15	53
Total	28	100

1.9. What percentage of paper archival records has been copied to support other uses (e.g. access, security)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	22	78
21-40%	1	4
41-60%	3	10
61-80%	1	4
Over 80%	1	4
Total	28	100

1.10. Which method(s) does the institution use to copy paper archival records? (Please check all that apply:)		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Microfilm or microfiche	6	21
Digitization	8	29
Photocopying	24	86
Other	5	18
Total	28	100

2. Electronic

2.1. On which of the following physical formats does your institution store archival electronic records (please check all that apply)		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Server (including Web host servers)	17	85
Magnetic tape (including diskettes, reel-to-reel tape, cartridges, etc.)	12	60
Optical Disk (DVD, CD ROM)	7	35
Other	0	0
Total	20	NA

2.2. What methods are used to back up your archival electronic records? Please check all that apply:		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Server	17	85
Tangible electronic formats (diskettes, tapes, cartridges, CD, etc.)	14	70
Microforms (e.g., fiche)	2	10
Print-to-Paper	5	25
Other	0	0
Total	20	NA

2.3 Are the backups of archival electronic records stored off-site?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	16	80
No	4	20
Total	20	100

2.4 Are the backups of archival electronic records in the same physical format as the original records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	15	75
No	5	25
Total	20	100

2.5 Are the backup copies of archival electronic records compressed?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	7	35
No	13	65
Total	20	100

2.6 Are procedures in place to refresh and migrate electronic archival electronic records to ensure that they continue to be readable?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	5	25
No	15	75
Total	20	100

2.7 What percentage of archival electronic records can still be read?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	0	0
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	1	5
61-80%	1	5
Over 80%	18	90
Total	20	100

2.8 What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where electronic archival records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	0	0
18 - 24°C	15	75
Above 24°C	0	0
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	5	25
Total	20	100

2.9 What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where electronic archival records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	3	15
40 – 50%	5	25
More than 50%	0	0
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	12	60
Total	20	100

2.10 What proportion of archival electronic records stored on tangible formats (e.g., discs, tapes) are in appropriate protective containers?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	5	25
21-40%	1	5
41-60%	2	10
61-80%	1	5
Over 80%	11	55
Total	20	100

2.11 Does the institution have an Electronic Records/Document Management System (ERDMS)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	13	65
No	7	35
Total	20	100

2.12 If the institution has an ERDMS, do the staff who create records “e-file” their electronic archival records on a regular basis?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes - 100% of electronic archival records are in the ERDMS	3	23
No	10	77
Total	13	100

2.12 (continued) If ‘No’ above, what proportion of electronic archival records are in the ERDMS		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-25%	5	50
26-50%	3	30
51-75%	1	10
Over 75%	1	10
Total	10	100

2.13 In cases where paper archival documents have been converted to electronic form and the originals are destroyed after conversion, do the institution’s electronic systems meet the Canadian General Standards Board standards for imaging / EDRMS-type systems?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	6	35
No	11	65
Total	17	100

2.14 Is metadata normally preserved along with the corresponding archival electronic records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	17	85
No	3	15
Total	20	100

2.15 For this Records Disposition Authority, what is the size of the institution's collection of archival electronic records (in gigabytes):		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 10	7	39
10-99	5	28
100 or more	6	33
Total	18	100

3. Microform

3.1. What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where archival microform records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	2	29
18 - 24°C	3	42
Above 24°C	0	0
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	2	29
Total	7	100

3.2. What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where archival microform records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	3	42
40 – 50%	0	0
More than 50%	0	0
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	4	58
Total	7	100

3.3 What percentage of archival microform records is stored in appropriate protective containers?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	1	11
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	1	11
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	7	78
Total	9	100

3.4 Does your institution have equipment for viewing microforms?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	8	89
No	1	11
Total	9	100

3.5 Is viewing equipment regularly cleaned and maintained?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	3	37
No	5	63
Total	8	100

3.6 How frequently are the archival microform records handled for access (i.e. mounted and viewed)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Rarely	4	45
Occasionally (once per month or less)	2	22
Frequently (more than once per month)	3	33
Total	9	100

3.7 Does the institution have multiple copies of archival microform records (please check all that apply):						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Master (preservation copy only)	5	71	2	29	7	100
Print master (to make copies)	3	42	4	58	7	100
Reference copy (for consultation)	4	58	3	42	7	100
Other	1	13	7	87	8	100

4. Photos

4.1. What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where archival photographs are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	0	0
18 - 24°C	12	100
Above 24°C	0	0
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	0	0
Total	12	100

4.2. What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where archival photographs are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	2	17
40 – 50%	6	50
More than 50%	0	0
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	4	33
Total	12	100

4.3 What percentage of archival photographs is stored in protective containers (e.g. sleeves, folders, boxes)?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	2	15
21-40%	1	8
41-60%	1	8
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	9	69
Total	13	100

4.4 What percentage of oversized archival photographs is stored in appropriately sized containers?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	4	33
21-40%	1	8
41-60%	0	0
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	7	59
Total	12	100

4.5 What percentage of the institution's archival photographs is?		
Responses	Percent	
On black and white film	34	
On color film	66	
Total	100	

4.6 What percentage of the institution's archival photographs is on acetate film?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0%	4	36
1-10%	1	9
More than 10%	6	55
Total	11	100

4.7 What percentage of the institution's archival photographs is on nitrate film?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0%	8	67
1-10%	1	8
More than 10%	3	25
Total	12	100

4.8 If there are archival photographs on nitrate film, what proportion of these have been segregated from the rest of the archival photograph collection?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	2	50
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	1	25
61-80%	0	0
Over 80%	1	25
Total	4	100

4.9 How frequently are the archival photographs handled for access?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Rarely	8	62
Occasionally (once per month or less)	5	38
Frequently (more than once per month)	0	0
Total	13	100

5. Maps, Plans and Technical Drawings

5.1. What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where archival maps, plans and technical drawings are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	0	0
18 - 24°C	8	89
Above 24°C	0	0
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	1	11
Total	9	100

5.2. What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where archival maps, plans and technical drawings are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	4	45
40 – 50%	2	22
More than 50%	0	0
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	3	33
Total	9	100

5.3 What percentage of the archival maps, plans and technical drawing is stored in the following ways:	
Responses	Percent
Rolled	53
Folded	16
Flat	18
Hanging	13
Total	100

5.4 What percentage of the archival maps, plans and technical drawing is contained in the following:	
Responses	Percent
Vertical cabinets	17
Horizontal cabinets	26
Open shelving	20
Other	37
Total	100

5.5. Are the archival maps, plans and techical drawings:						
	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Supported	6	60	4	40	10	100
Covered	7	70	3	30	10	100

5.6 How frequently are the archival maps, plans and technical drawings handled for access?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Rarely	6	60
Occasionally (once per month or less)	3	30
Frequently (more than once per month)	1	10
Total	10	100

5.7 Does your institution make photocopies of archival maps, plans and technical drawings?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	3	30
No	7	70
Total	10	100

6. Audio-Video

6.1. What is the normal temperature in the storage areas where archival audio-video records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Below 18°C	0	0
18 - 24°C	11	79
Above 24°C	0	0
Don't know – temperature not measured/monitored	3	21
Total	14	100

6.2. What is the normal relative humidity in the storage areas where archival audio-video records are kept?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Less than 40%	4	29
40 – 50%	3	21
More than 50%	1	7
Don't know – humidity not measured/monitored	6	43
Total	14	100

6.3 What percentage of archival audio-video records is stored in appropriate protective containers?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
0-20%	3	22
21-40%	0	0
41-60%	0	0
61-80%	2	14
Over 80%	9	64
Total	14	100

6.4 Does the institution have procedures in place to ensure that all archival audio-video records continue to be accessible?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	10	71
No	4	29
Total	14	100

6.5 Does the institution have playback equipment for all archival audio-video records?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	9	64
No	5	36
Total	14	100

6.6 Is playback equipment regularly cleaned and maintained?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Yes	5	56
No	4	44
Total	9	100

6.7 How frequently are archival audio-video records handled for access, i.e. mounted and viewed / listened?		
Responses	Freq	Percent
Rarely	10	72
Occasionally (once per month or less)	2	14
Frequently (more than once per month)	2	14
Total	14	100

7. Art

(Insufficient number of responses)

8. Motion Picture Film

(Insufficient number of responses)

Risk Factors

The table below identifies the six risk factors as well as the corresponding questions and circumstances contributing to the risk.

Recordkeeping – Intellectual Control	
Risk Factor	Situation Identified as Contributing to Risk
1. The archival records cannot be transferred to LAC and they stay indefinitely in the GC institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to apply RDA for specified archival records —and as a result cannot transfer the archival records to LAC (Section I, question 1.1) • No retention periods — there is no date established for transfer of the records to LAC (Section I, question 1.2)
2. Problems with maintaining control over the archival records in the GC institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decentralized recordkeeping with little or no central control from HQ over the application of RDAs in regional (Section I, questions 1.4 and 1.5) • Archival records are not under intellectual control or are under poor intellectual control as indicated by problems with records management system (Section I, question 1.6), classification system (Section I, question 1.7), and records management program (Section I, question 1.8) • Records management staff cannot identify, locate and retrieve archival records (Section I, question 1.10) • Record containers are not clearly labeled —there is the potential for losing track of the archival records (Section I, question 1.11) • Lack of procedures for tracking archival records when removed from a storage location (Section I, question 1.14)
Storage Conditions and Environments – Physical Management	
Risk Factor	Situation Identified as Contributing to Risk
3. GC institution is not prepared to handle potential incidents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of emergency preparedness and lack of training in carrying out the response plan (Section II, questions 1.2 and 1.3) • Lack of recovery procedures to deal with potential incidents including water damage (Section II, question 1.7)
4. Storage environments are not designed for the preservation of archival records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent operation of HVAC systems (Section II, question 2.2) • Food and beverages are allowed in areas where archival records are stored (Section II, question 4.2) • Archival records located in areas not protected from potential water damage (Section II, question 6.1) • Records storage areas are not cleaned on a regular basis

	(Section II, question 6.2) • Storage areas are overcrowded (Section II, question 6.9)
5. Incidents where damage to or potential damage to and loss of records have occurred	• Pest infestations and contaminants (Section II, question 4.1) • Water, fire, light (Section II, question 5.1)
6. More than one media type is stored in the same storage container	• Different media require different storage conditions & containers (Section II, question 6.4)

Interpreting the Risk Factor Rating

The table below provides a scale for interpreting risk rating.

Scale	Percentage
Low	less than 15%
Medium	15-30%
High	Greater than 30%

CARFI survey questions identified as indicating risk

For the purposes of our analysis, the CARFI Working Group identified from a larger series of questions approximately 20, in relation to recordkeeping and storage where negative answers would indicate risk to archival records.

Section I—Institutional Level—General Requirements for Records Management

1.1 Is your institution able to apply the Records Disposition Authority (RDA) for the identification and transfer of archival records to LAC?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No – please describe problems in applying the RDA:
 - ☐ Terms and Conditions do not clearly identify which records are archival
 - ☐ No Application Guide exists
 - ☐ Other – please specify:

Note: A no answer to question 1.1 indicates risk to archival records.

1.2 What percentage of the archival records included in the RDA has retention periods assigned?

- ☐ 0 – 20%
 ☐ 21 - 40%
 ☐ 41 – 60%
 ☐ 61 – 80%
 ☐ over 80%

1.4 Do the institution's regional operations have separate recordkeeping policies and procedures?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No regional operations

Note: A yes answer to question 1.4 indicates risk if considered in relation to a yes answer to question 1.5

1.5 If there are regional recordkeeping operations, do the regions apply the institution's Records Disposition Authorities to identify archival records for transfer to Library and Archives Canada?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No regional operations

1.6 What percentage of the archival records included in this Records Disposition Authority is captured:

- ☐ in a single records management system
that is standard in the institution (e.g. iRims, Foremost) _____ %
- ☐ in multiple records management systems _____ %
- ☐ not captured in any system _____ %
- Total: 100%

Note: Risk is indicated in question 1.5, if archival records are captured in more than one system or no system.

1.7 What percentage of the archival records included in this Records Disposition Authority is organized:

- ☐ under a single classification scheme
that is standard in the institution _____ %
- ☐ under multiple classification schemes _____ %
- ☐ not organized under any classification scheme _____ %
- Total: 100%

Note: Risk is indicated in question 1.7, if archival records are classified under multiple classification schemes or no classification scheme.

1.8 What percentage of archival records covered by this RDA is under the custody and control of your institution's records management program?

- ☐ 0 – 20% ☐ 21 - 40% ☐ 41 – 60% ☐ 61 – 80% ☐ over 80%

Note: Risk is indicated if the answer to question 1.8 is less than 60%

1.10 Can the institution's records management staff identify, locate and retrieve the archival records?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No – please identify problems in identifying, locating, and retrieving archival records (check all that apply):
 - ☐ Location of records not known (e.g., loss of corporate memory due to staff leaving; records moved without documentation)
 - ☐ No listing exists for these records
 - ☐ No procedures for retrieving records from off-site locations
 - ☐ Other – please specify: _____

Note: A no answer to question 1.10 indicates risk to the archival records.

1.11 What percentage of record containers is clearly labelled to identify contents?

- ☐ 0 – 20% ☐ 21 - 40% ☐ 41 – 60% ☐ 61 – 80% ☐ over 80%

Note: Risk is indicated if the answer to question 1.11 is less than 60%

1.14 Are there procedures in place for tracking the archival records when they are removed from a storage location that is under the control of the institution's records management program?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Note: A no answer to question 1.14 indicates risk to the archival records

Section II—Specific Criteria for Records Storage

II.1.2 Does the building have a current emergency response plan for document recovery?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

II.1.3 What percentage of records management personnel is trained in the emergency response plan?

- ☐ 0 – 20% ☐ 21 - 40% ☐ 41 – 60% ☐ 61 – 80% ☐ over 80%

Note: Risk is indicated when the answers to questions II.1.2 and II.1.3 are considered together.

II.1.7 Have arrangements been made for recovery operations should there be water damage to the records:

- drying space ☐ Yes ☐ No

- disaster supplies ☐ Yes ☐ No
- freezing facilities ☐ Yes ☐ No
- human resources assigned ☐ Yes ☐ No

II.2.2 Does the HVAC system run on a 24-hour / 7-day basis?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

II.4.1 Describe any pest infestation or contaminants found in the storage areas where archival records are kept:

<i>Pests</i>	<i>Year of most recent incident</i>	<i>Were archival records damaged?</i>	<i>Scope of damage (% of records affected)</i>	<i>Were corrective actions taken?</i>
Insects <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Rodents <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Mould <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

II.4.2 Are food and beverages banned in the records storage areas?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

II.5.1 Indicate any damage caused to archival records by natural or artificial agents:

<i>Cause</i>	<i>Year of most recent incident</i>	<i>Were archival records damaged?</i>	<i>Scope of damage (% of records affected)</i>	<i>Were corrective actions taken?</i>
Water <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Fire <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Light <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 41 - 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 61 – 80% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 80%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

II.6.1 What percentage of archival records is located in areas protected from flooding, i.e. NOT in basements, top floors of buildings (roof leaks), and rooms with overhead water pipes:

- ☐ 0 – 20%
 ☐ 21 - 40%
 ☐ 41 – 60%
 ☐ 61 – 80%
 ☐ over 80%

II.6.2 How often are the records storage areas cleaned?

- ☐ weekly
 ☐ monthly
 ☐ annually
 ☐ less frequently

II.6.4 Are the archival records separated by media type, e.g. text--paper, audio-video, electronic, maps, etc.?

- ☐ Yes – record containers hold only one medium type
☐ No – record containers hold mixed media

II.6.9 What proportion of space in the records storage areas is currently utilized?

- ☐ < 80%
☐ 80 – 100%
☐ > 100% (i.e., storage area is overcrowded)

Post-Survey Evaluation Form and Summary of Responses

Launch of the CARFI Survey		
	Yes	No
Did the invitation reach the right person(s)?	19	0
Did a representative from your institution attend?	18	1
If you attended, was the session useful?	15	1
If you did not attend, did you receive enough information to complete the survey?	1	0

CARFI Survey (Numbers in Brackets represent the average for that question)					
	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither disagree nor agree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
On-line Survey					
Easy to Access (4.5)	0	0	1	8	11
Easy to Navigate (4.2)	0	1	2	9	8
FAQs useful (4.1)	0	0	5	7	7
Glossary useful (4.0)	0	0	5	10	4
Decima help line accessible and supportive (3.8)	0	0	6	5	3
LAC help line accessible and supportive (3.9)	0	2	3	7	6
Sufficient time to complete (3.3)	1	7	3	4	5
Questionnaire					
Level of detail appropriate (3.7)	1	2	3	8	5
Simple and straightforward to complete (3.7)	1	3	3	8	5
Instructions were clear and sufficient (4.1)	0	0	2	14	4
Easy to obtain information to complete (3.5)	0	4	5	8	3

Next Steps		
	Yes	No
Interested in being informed of the survey results and recommendations?	18	1
Willing to participate in future surveys of this kind?	15	2

Was the survey of value to your institution? Yes 14 No 2