10.17953/A3.43531

Global Information Resurgence: Transforming Indigenous Archival Sovereignty through Trans-Indigenous Relationality

Jennifer R. O'Neal

Indigenous peoples have been and will always be the keepers and protectors of our sacred knowledge, whether in oral (intangible) or written (tangible) forms, according to Indigenous laws and protocols. Indigenous information holds immense power when it is within our control, but can cause significant harm when used incorrectly or without our consent, causing misinformation, misappropriation, and misuse of sacred knowledges, cultures, and histories. Thus, with historic salvage collecting and extraction of our knowledges, resources, and cultures, Indigenous peoples have continually fought to protect, defend, and return information to our communities, often expending extensive time and resources in the defense of Indigenous political, cultural, and information sovereignty. Since the passage of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007, there has been a significant surge in the global development and collaboration to protect Indigenous information and knowledge, especially in the growing field of Indigenous archival sovereignty and data sovereignty. Involving thirty years of activism, the passage of the declaration was indeed a historic moment in finally recognizing the international rights of Indigenous peoples. For the nonbinding document to have legal standing, however, it must be enacted and incorporated into national, regional, and local policies and laws, including within organizations and institutions who want to build ethical, respectful, and reciprocal relationships with Indigenous communities. Similarly, the fight to protect Indigenous information has foundational roots in the effort to reverse the termination policy of the 1950s and the rise of the Red Power movement in the 1960s, as tribal communities fought for increased access to historical and legal records as they documented their

own histories in the fight for federal recognition. Over the last twenty years, some of the most powerful resurgence activism has occurred in the alliances and collaborations created by Indigenous organizations, leaders, and activists who fought for information sovereignty rights, including the *Right to Know, Right of Reply,* and *Right to Govern* in the management of Native collections—to assert Indigenous political sovereignty.

Building on this foundational activist legacy, Indigenous peoples have, over the last three decades, increasingly fought for increased restorative justice and for power to control our information in archives, libraries, and museums, particularly at non-Indigenous collections and repositories, through the development of formal global and national protocols, guidelines, and legal mechanisms. Foundational to this work are the archivists, curators, and informational professionals who have dedicated their careers to fighting to protect Indigenous peoples' information, including culture, language, traditional knowledge, and intellectual property. Central to this work are the relational partnerships, alliances, and collaborations activists created to enact these changes at both a global and local level. This article critically examines the global trans-Indigenous alliances built during the development of the following policies within the United States, Australia, and Canada: the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Protocols for Libraries, Archives, and Information Services* (1995); *International Indigenous Librarians' Forum Guide* (2001); *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* (2006); the American Library Association's *Librarianship and Traditional Cultural Expressions: Nurturing Understanding and Respect* (2010); *Guidelines for Collaboration* (2019); and the *Tandanya-Adelaide Declaration* (2020). These are only some of the guidelines developed for the care and protection of Indigenous collections and the information they contain in these countries. These were selected to represent and highlight the breadth and scope of trans-Indigenous alliances in Indigenous information resurgence over the past twenty-five years. This article serves two purposes: first, to examine the development of global and national information policies grounded in relational partnerships that provided support and care for each other; and second, to place this activism in the larger conversation of Indigenous archival and data sovereignty. These trans-Indigenous alliances point to the importance of relationality on a global scale to assert Indigenous resurgence and information sovereignty at a local level. It concludes by proposing suggested ways forward in the continual fight for Indigenous archival sovereignty by activating global and national protocols and declarations at the local level, rooted in relationality. Activating protocols at a local level includes the return of collections, an increase in Indigenous cohort trainings, the centering of Indigenous research methods, and care for Indigenous information professionals in the field. Prior to examining the trans-Indigenous alliances within the context of global and national protocols and guidelines, I first provide a foundational overview of Indigenous archival sovereignty and its intersection with the field of Indigenous data sovereignty, particularly within the context of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Central to my analysis is the view of resurgence grounded in the concept of Indigenous relationality. Rather than a traditional definition of resurgence as a reawakening or revival, I specifically apply Gina Starblanket's (Cree-Saulteaux) definition of

Indigenous resurgence that is an ongoing, dynamic relational practice grounded in the restoration of our ability to engage in relationships with people, places, and practices that were disrupted through colonialism. This also involves cultural and political meaning, as well as "healing and strengthening of our communities on our own terms." She reminds us that through this relational approach, change can be enacted through everyday acts (i.e., how we live our lives, who we connect with, what care we provide to others), revealing how change and consciousness-raising can come in small, meaningful daily actions, not just large-scale activities. Further, this process occurs alongside relations with other people, places, ideas, and practices.[1] This relationality guides the Indigenous information resurgence throughout the past twenty-five years.

To examine these international connections, I do so by utilizing and building on the Indigenous methodologies of *trans-Indigenous* and *relationality* for addressing and analyzing Indigenous archival resurgence activism. *Trans-Indigenous*, as developed and defined by literary scholar Chadwick Allen (Chickasaw), provides a methodology for how to attend to both the compatibilities and juxtapositions of Indigenous peoples locally while also addressing the complexities of Indigenous peoples globally. Pivoting from a comparison framework, the trans-Indigenous approach promotes analysis *across* Indigenous peoples rather than a simple comparison, acknowledging both the global and local contexts that informs the activist work. This approach centers relationality, interpreting connections *across* organizations, nations, and communities rather than through a comparison that can often reduce similarities and differences from a comparative approach, which then foregrounds the dominant settler culture.[2] To be clear, the impact and paternalism of settler colonial structures colors and informs information and cultural heritage policy, yet through a trans-Indigenous relational approach, I center how activists stay connected to each other through the everyday acts of resurgence.

Through the use of Indigenous storywork and reflexivity, this article provides firsthand accounts of activists' work, suggesting ways forward in the continued fight for Indigenous archival sovereignty by activating global and national protocols and declarations at the local level. I utilize Indigenous storywork methodology, as developed by Jo-Ann Archibald (Stó:l), as it centers Indigenous perspectives and ways of knowing through deep respect, responsibility, and reverence, as holism and interrelatedness are central to activist work.[3] Storywork is inherently grounded in the Indigenous concept of relationality—that Indigenous peoples exist in reciprocal relation with the environment, land, people, ceremonies, stories, languages, and more-than-human relations. Prioritizing collective rights for social and ecological flourishing, Indigenous peoples acknowledge accountability in these relationships. Building upon the work of Shawn Wilson (Opaskwayak Cree), I apply relationality to this study as defined by Matthew Wildcat (Ermineskin Cree) and Daniel Voth (Métis Nation of the Red River Valley), who have a three-part definition focused on global identity, particular traditions of Indigenous nations, and inter-Indigenous connections. Further, Sandra Littletree (Diné and Eastern Shoshone), Miranda Belarde-Lewis (Zuni-Tlingit), and Marisa Duarte (Pascua Yaqui), argue that relationality is a central theoretical tool in our understanding of Indigenous knowledge organization and dissemination, especially

within libraries, archives, and museum spaces. Thus, the use of relationality provides a key lens to examine the interconnectedness of Indigenous information activists across countries and regions, while also honoring their specific local traditions.[4]

The Rise of International Indigenous Archival Sovereignty

Before examining these trans-Indigenous alliances, it is important to first provide an overview of the growing field of Indigenous archival sovereignty and its intersection with Indigenous data sovereignty, as these partnerships are rooted in this work. The protection and access to information and collections by and for Indigenous peoples has always been a global right that Indigenous peoples have been fighting for internationally. Over the last fifteen years, Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars have contributed significantly to the growing scholarship at the intersection of Indigenous archives and Indigenous data sovereignty, creating a bourgeoning area of study we refer to as Indigenous archival sovereignty. Since this is a growing field, international scholars have each defined this in their own way based on their areas of research and study that influence their work. I define *Indigenous archival sovereignty* as the power to protect, control, and manage Indigenous knowledge and information generated about and within our sovereign communities according to Indigenous protocols, laws, and traditional knowledge. This definition is grounded in the larger global advocacy movement that Indigenous peoples have been engaged in since the rise of the Red Power movement of the 1960s and 1970s to protect Indigenous information, knowledge, and data in the quest for self-determination and sovereignty. Indeed, while Indigenous peoples have always been the caretakers and preservers of their histories and memories, this role became especially crucial for Native Americans in the United States during the termination era of the 1950s and the 1960s and the rise of the self-determination era of the 1970s. During this transitional period from termination to restoration and, finally, recognition, Native Americans have continually fought for the *Right to Know*, *Right of Reply*, and *Right to Govern* in the management of Indigenous collections at archives, libraries, and museums.[5] My definition builds on the important research of Indigenous Australian scholar Kirsten Thorpe (Worimi, Port Stephens) in her dissertation, "Unclasping the White Hand: Reclaiming and Refiguring the Archives to Support Indigenous Wellbeing and Sovereignty." She explains that Indigenous archival sovereignty "is centered in relationships. It is a living Indigenous archive connected to people and place. It is constantly being used and reshaped through cultural flows and connections. It is deeply connected to country and embedded in stories of place. It is a space of cultural resurgence and centers Indigenous well-being holistically to support individual and community social, emotional, and cultural needs."[6] Scholar Rose Miron examines Indigenous archival activism at a local level through tracing the groundbreaking work of the Mohican people to document and preserve their histories, lifeways, and ways of knowing through archival records beginning in the 1970s to the present day.[7] While local histories and stories of Indigenous peoples are finally being documented and shared, much of this work first began with the development of global

and national protocols, policies, and guidelines that were needed to care for Native American records at nontribal repositories.

As noted by Cheyenne scholar Desi Rodriguez, "Indigenous peoples have long and rich histories of data collection and preservation, and these histories provide a solid foundation for the pursuance of Indigenous data sovereignty in contemporary settings." Simultaneous to the work in Indigenous archival studies, since 2015 Indigenous data sovereignty has developed as both a formal concept and growing research field, particularly in the social sciences and health fields, with roots in the historic passage of UNDRIP in 2007. Still, the foundational activism for this field actually began many years prior through the early efforts to protect Indigenous information in archives, libraries, and museums. Since an international law did not yet exist to protect Indigenous information and cultural heritage in archives, libraries, and museums, much of this activist work occurred through specific protocols, guidelines, and principles developed by professional groups and organizations. Building on the foundational efforts to protect Indigenous human remains and associated objects in museums through the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA 1990), activists protected Indigenous archives at nontribal repositories via the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* (2006) and museum objects through the *Guidelines for Collaboration* (2019) and, most recently, the Principles in Indigenous Archival Repatriation (2025)—just to name a few within the United States. Internationally, various organizations and countries have also developed their own Indigenous protocols, guidelines, and principles, including but not limited to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.[8] In addition, various Native nations have proactively protected their history, knowledges, and cultures by developing research procedures and protocols that must be followed when conducting research on their homelands. In addition, numerous tribes have developed their own institutional review boards, protocols, and research projects to ensure protection of Indigenous knowledge and, when possible, the return of collections to Indigenous communities.[9] Much of this provided the foundational work that preceded the formal development of Indigenous data sovereignty and paved the way for more in-depth research to occur.

UNDRIP and the Growth of Indigenous Data Sovereignty

Simultaneous to the official development of protocols and guidelines within archives, libraries, and museums, Indigenous international activists since the late 1970s worked tirelessly to develop the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Indigenous activists across the globe collectively worked together to protect and defend the rights of Indigenous peoples in the international community. Finally, after years of being mired in the bureaucracy and debates of the UN system, the United Nations General Assembly passed UNDRIP in 2007 as a nonbinding human rights instrument. The declaration affirms Indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination as political entities and honors the principle of Indigenous control over Indigenous data, as well as protection of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property (ICIP) and Indigenous research ethics (Articles 14 and 31).[10]

The passage of UNDRIP saw a significant interest and development of research concerning the control, management, and dissemination of Indigenous knowledge and data. Most recently, self-determination and data activism led to the development of the global advocacy movement for Indigenous data sovereignty. Within this context, Indigenous data is defined as data, information, and knowledge in various formats and mediums that are derived from or affect Indigenous peoples, nations, and communities at both the collective and individual levels and, most specifically, falls into these general categories: peoples, languages, resources, environment, and nations.[11] From a Western perspective, some might think of data sovereignty mainly in the context of the digital age or connected to the nation-state. However, I contend that the definition of Indigenous data sovereignty should be expanded to include the protection of *all* information, both tangible (documents, objects, photographs) and intangible (song, dance, stories) forms of traditional knowledge and cultural heritage within and from Indigenous nations. Rather than representing just raw numbers and digital information, Indigenous data sovereignty should be defined as the proper oversight, authority, and management of all information originating from and produced by sovereign Indigenous nations. For the purposes of this article, this includes the information contained in archive, library, and museum collections.

Embedded within UNDRIP's call for the protection of collective rights and self-determinations is a call to action to protect data sovereignty—Indigenous peoples' rights "to maintain, control, protect, and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as their right to maintain, control, protect, and develop their intellectual property over these issues."[12] UNDRIP reaffirms these rights of Indigenous data governance (the ownership, collection, control, analysis, and use of the data), then enacts those rights via specific "mechanisms grounded in Indigenous rights and interests that promote Indigenous values and equity, while providing a framework for addressing deeper historical issues."[13] Indigenous data sovereignty is then operationalized via Indigenous data governance, which utilizes Indigenous decision-making throughout data lifecycles and ecosystems to assert Indigenous rights and interests.[14] Data governance is not just for existing data but also for access and control of the data for current and future governance. Indigenous data governance provides a mechanism for honoring, protecting, and controlling Indigenous data, both internally and externally.

Since the passage of UNDRIP, numerous national and international organizations, projects, and networks have formed that directly support and protect Indigenous data sovereignty and implement Indigenous data governance.[15] In September 2019, the Global Indigenous Data Alliance released the *CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance*, which were produced by the Research Data Alliance International Indigenous Data Sovereignty Interest Group. These principles provide a data-governance mechanism that is people- and purpose-oriented and address data concerns (e.g., collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, and ethics). Highlighting the role of data in Indigenous self-determination, the principles direct and guide external data stakeholders in the secondary use of data, enhancing and protecting Indigenous peoples' rights by providing much-needed direction regarding the importance of developing

relationships with Indigenous peoples in stewarding information.[16] Overall, the main goal of the CARE principles is to ensure that the use of Indigenous data "should result in tangible benefits for Indigenous collectives through inclusive development and innovation, improved governance and citizen engagement, and result in equitable outcomes."[17] The growth of the Indigenous data sovereignty field over the past ten years has brought attention to the challenges that Indigenous peoples face in protecting their information and data throughout the world. However, this growing field is grounded mainly toward the social sciences and health sector, and the long legacy of Indigenous peoples' work in archives, libraries, and museums has remained on the periphery. Global activists' work in these repositories, particularly the development of protocols and guidelines, were critical to the development of the grounding principles of the Indigenous data sovereignty field, particularly in the areas of the CARE principles.

Building Foundational Alliances: Archive and Library Protocols in the United States, Australia, and Canada

Native American activist and scholar Vine Deloria Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux) first utilized the phrase "the Right to Know" in a 1978 report of the same name, prepared for the White House Preconference on Indian Library and Information Services on or Near Reservations held October 19–22, 1978. In his report, Deloria argued that the *Right to Know* was embedded in the United States federal government's treaty responsibility and accountability for tribal communities "need to know; to know the past, to know the traditional alternatives advocated by their ancestors, to know the specific experiences of their communities, and to know about the world that surrounds them. . . ." Through this report, he called for specific action in seven major areas that the federal government should work toward to guide them in their treaty education obligations related to Indigenous libraries and information services. This White House report remained a key policy document and an essential "to-do list" for tribal cultural heritage protectors and activists who worked tirelessly over decades to implement this call to action. However, much of this work happened at a local and organization ad hoc level, not as a formal national or federal policy. Three decades later, the field began to see much-needed policy development through international collaborations by sharing frustrations and witnessing what was occurring in each other's countries concerning the treatment of Indigenous archives and information.[18]

During the 1990s and 2000s, Indigenous archivists developed and implemented numerous policies and protocols for the protection of Indigenous collections within non-Indigenous repositories. Foundational to the successful development and implementation of these various documents are the trans-Indigenous alliances built and sustained during this period when Indigenous perspectives were not usually prioritized or heard. As noted by Indigenous scholar Kirsten Thorpe, during that time "archivists who understood Indigenous peoples' needs were rare." Indeed, although many in the archive profession approached the work eager to learn with good intentions, "there was a significant gap in understanding what meaningful change would require." Entering the field at nearly the same time in the early 2000s, both Kirsten and I share the sentiment

of "feeling fundamentally misunderstood." According to Kirsten, "attempting to communicate Indigenous peoples' needs felt like speaking a different language entirely—our worldviews and ways of knowing seemed incomprehensible to the existing system." Trans-Indigenous connections and alliances with Indigenous archivists, historians, and educators ensured that we, and many others in the field, felt supported in the effort to make and implement policy changes, especially in the development of protocols. In reflecting on these international collaborations, Kirsten noted, "Visiting people's country and learning about other Indigenous peoples' histories and experiences creates a vital sense of connection and nourishment. In these exchanges, there is a deep sense of mutual respect, learning, and reciprocity. The interactions generate an energy that accelerates the work, enabling progress at a different scale and pace." Indeed, these trans-Indigenous alliances and connections were central to the development and implementation of policy changes in the United States, Australia, and Canada by providing a place of relationality and care for each other and shared experiences as Indigenous peoples.[19] One of the most influential shared experiences occurred in the development and implementation of protocols to fill the gap in official legal policies and frameworks.

On a cold spring week in early April 2006, a group of fifteen Native American, First Nation, and Aboriginal information professionals and scholars and four non-Native archivists gathered at the Cline Library at Northern Arizona University (NAU), the traditional homelands of the Hopi people, to meet for three days to draft the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* (PNAAM). This document would provide guidance for the care and responsibility of Indigenous collections housed at non-Native repositories throughout the United States. With funding by various organizations (including the Werner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research and the American Library Association), Karen Underhill, director of NAU's Special Collections and Archives Library, coordinated this effort as well as raised the necessary funding for the gathering. In her funding application to the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation in 2005, Underhill reflected on the importance of Indigenous information and data held in archives:

> Most people do not understand the power of archival records to change lives, individually and collectively. A scientific data set may hold the clues to a new cure for cancer, or a seemingly innocuous exchange of letters between bureaucrats may reveal the establishment of governmental policy. Native American communities have firsthand experience with the ways that information resources held in distant institutions can impact the quality of life, the practice of religion, and the future of people . . . sometimes with disastrous consequences, sometimes to their benefit. On a good day, the information allows a medicine man to recapture a lost song or interested members of the public gain new understanding. On a bad day, a photograph image of a Hopi Snake Dance appears in the popular press or an entrepreneur misappropriates a sacred ceremony for commercial gain.[20]

Underhill's reflections point to both the power of Indigenous archives, as well as the nuance required to understand the care required for proper stewardship of tribal archives in non-Indigenous repositories.

The significance of Indigenous archives and the data contained in these collections remained central to the group's discussions over the series of multiday conversations that formed the later document. Over the course of three long days, the group discussed and debated various topics affecting Native American collections at non-Native repositories including sovereignty, preservation, access and use, cultural sensitivity, sacred materials, and intellectual and cultural property rights. Officially published in 2006, today—nearly twenty years later—the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* are the foundational policy, as well as the most utilized and consulted document, for providing guidance on the care, preservation, and access to Native American archival materials in non-Native repositories across the United States. Presently, local, regional, national, and international conferences and organizations have acknowledged, discussed, and referenced the PNAAM as the care standard for Indigenous archives. Indigenous archivists and information professionals who participated in their development and fought for their implementation persevered through strong trans-Indigenous collaborations.[21]

While the purpose of the gathering in 2006 was intended to draft principles for Native American archive collections within the United States, a central tenet of the conference included learning from and collaborating with other Indigenous information professionals from Australia and Canada who had also developed protocols. These trans-Indigenous and cross-border conversations were crucial to the successful drafting of the PNAAM by the United States policy group. Prior to the gathering in 2006, the group consulted international declarations that also aimed to recognize and honor Indigenous cultural heritage rights, such as the Mata'atua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library and Information Resources Network Protocols for Libraries, Archives and Information Services (ATSILIRN). Underhill also traveled to Australia in January 2006 to meet with various information professionals who had already developed similar guidelines to engage in meaningful relationship-building and to learn directly from other Indigenous peoples who had developed and implemented similar protocols. After her visit to Australia, Underhill then invited Australian information professionals to participate in the PNAAM gathering at NAU in April 2006.[22]

Based on their foundational conversations in Australia, Alana Garwood-Houng, an Indigenous librarian in Australia, agreed to attend the Arizona gathering to provide her perspective and experiences of drafting and implementing the ATSILIRN protocols, published in 1995 by the Australian Library and Information Association.[23] Alana served as a coauthor of the document. Developed to address and heal the historical treatment and representation of Indigenous peoples in Australian archives, the ATSILIRN protocols aimed "to guide libraries, archives, and information services in appropriate ways to interact with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in communities which the organizations serve, and to handle materials with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content." Due to the forced removal of Aboriginal children from biological parents and evidence of stolen land and wages—a shared similar history with Native American children and parents—the Australian record includes painful and personal details of this difficult history. As Alana explained, "the protocols

were developed in response to a need by many libraries to know [how] to deal with their Indigenous collections and how to provide services to their Indigenous clients," but what is more important, to acknowledge the important role these repositories could and should play in the reconciliation process. In conversations with additional leaders in Australia (including Alex Byrne at University of Technology, Sydney), they confirmed that each Indigenous community encompasses a "wide range of Indigenous perspectives and traditions in Australia." In accord with this understanding, the document clearly notes that the protocols are "a guide to good practice which will need to be interpreted and applied in the context of each organization's mission, collection, and client community." As noted by Alana, "Protocols can only ever be guidelines and must be broad enough to be interpreted across a range of organizations and circumstances." In line with this, the protocols address the following twelve major areas concerning Indigenous materials in libraries, archives, and information services throughout Australia: governance and management, content and perspectives, intellectual property, accessibility and use, description and classification, secret and sacred materials, offensive materials, staffing, development of professional practices, awareness of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and issues, copying and repatriation of records, and the digital environment.[24]

At the time of the first drafting of the ATSILIRN protocols in the mid-1990s, technology was rapidly changing as the internet began to make information about Indigenous peoples more easily accessible within repositories. As indicated by Alana, "The library and information context is a diverse and changing one, constantly accommodating technological and information expansion as well changing user needs, including changing and diverse Indigenous needs." Indigenous peoples sought to balance and protect their information in repositories by being able to access their information while also protecting it from those who should not have access, especially collections with sensitive or sacred information about Indigenous peoples and communities. Also affecting the impetus for these guidelines was the prior development of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, established in 1991 with the vision for a "united Australia which respects this land of ours; values the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage; and provides justice and equity for all." In addition, the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody made a number of recommendations in its annual report, including access to historical archives and records for Aboriginal people to connect family genealogies and gaps in their histories. In support of this work, the *Bringing Them Home* report was published in 1997, tracing and detailing the extent of Aboriginal mistreatment, suffering, and harm under past government policies.[25] The report also called for increased access to Indigenous archives and other collections across Australia to the larger reconciliation process. As argued by Alana, these actions supported the ATSILIRN protocols as crucial "to assist professionals and sections of the profession [to] embrace the principles of the protocols with goodwill and commitment."[26]

While the ATSILIRN protocols were indeed transformative for the Aboriginal right to information, ensuring their voices were noted in the guidelines for these collections, the process for endorsement and implementation certainly was not without

major challenges—all of which Alana shared with the United States protocols groups as they began drafting their document in April 2006, providing key lessons learned. The Australian Society of Archivists endorsed the 1995 version, but an update in 2005 proved more challenging. In 2004, the library at the University of Technology, Sydney, and the Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning conducted a project "to determine whether the protocols are a useful strategy for highlighting Indigenous information issues and promoting responses to them, to identify any emerging issues which may need to be included, and to collect professional comment on how they could be improved." They concluded that the document "formed a most important contribution to the professional literature and advancement of the interest of Indigenous peoples in Australia." There were a significant number of issues, however, from Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives that needed to be addressed, including governance and policy, education and training, Indigenous employment, training and staffing issues, dissemination of the guidelines, and the role of the ATSILIRN.[27] Despite these challenges, the ATSILIRN protocols provided "a model for similar initiatives around the globe," according to Karen Underhill.

With these concerns fresh on her mind, Alana visited the protocols group in the United States in April 2006. She brought with her important lessons for the group, relating the challenges Indigenous Australian information professionals faced as they drafted the guidelines and continued to try to implement the major tenets of the ATSILIRN protocols. While there were plenty of major concerns from the non-Indigenous perspective, she focused first on the specific concerns she had as an Aboriginal person in the information field. With more than ten years of experience with the protocols, she shared her most important lessons and possible action items for our group, including creating a permanent website for the document; devising methods for developing information professions through mandatory policy recommendations by organizations; centering and connecting these guidelines to human rights; acquiring funding to implement them at federal, regional, and local levels; and placing more Indigenous people on state and national cultural advisory boards.

What is most important, she stressed reaching out to and working with organizations that want to hear about these guidelines.[28] In addition, Kim Lawson (Heiltsuk Nation) provided a First Nations perspective in Canada and helped us to understand the challenges and issues faced in Indigenous archives and libraries, in particular with her work at the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs.[29]

These conversations and the relationships built with Alana and Kim were transformational as we developed the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* for collections in the United States. Unlike the Australian call for action under the Council for Australian Reconciliation, by 2006 the United States had taken no such action nor had issued any official act of apology to Native American people for their past historical actions of forced assimilation, ethnic genocide, and removal of children from Indigenous homes to national boarding schools. However, unlike Australian Indigenous communities, as Underhill pointed out in 2006, "the sovereignty government status and associated human and cultural rights of Native American communities are recognized by federal and state law in the United States and through federal or provincial

acknowledgement in Canada." Sovereignty and all associated rights, including engaging in government-to-government relationships with federal entities, maintaining their territories, creating their own laws, and electing leaders, all served as the foundational principles in the protocols document.[30] The centering of sovereignty is clearly reflected in the introduction to the document: "Native American communities are sovereign governments. This unique status and associated rights recognized by federal and state law impact the hundreds of organizations in the United States which hold archival collections documenting Native American lifeways. . . . While we share a common commitment to the preservation and dissemination of knowledge, archivists and librarians should understand and respect Native American rights and laws, which are recognized in the United States Constitution." The trans-Indigenous conversations and lessons learned are also reflected in the ten sections of the protocols: building relationships of mutual respect, striving for balance in content and perspectives, accessibility and use, handling of culturally sensitive materials, providing context, intellectual property issues, copying and repatriation of records, research protocols, reciprocal education and training, and awareness of Native American communities and issues.[31]

The next five years were devoted to the dissemination and endorsement of the protocols by various repositories and organizations. In 2007, after a very contentious review process, the Society of American Archivists voted not to endorse the protocols. Rather, between 2008 and 2011 the Native American Protocols Working Group held yearly forums at the annual conference to ensure ample discussion and education occurred within the profession. As one of the lead coordinators of the working group, I experienced firsthand welcome support of the document as well as adamant disagreement with the guidelines, as it challenged Western approaches to archival practices, instead centering Native American sovereignty and Indigenous ways of knowing. Most conversations were productive, with many eager to learn and understand; other conversations, however, included challenging and harmful discussions for Indigenous archivists.[32]

The work between Australia and United States archivists and researchers during the period of the drafting of the protocols and the implementation phase has been invaluable. When asked to reflect on this period and the partnerships built, Kirsten Thorpe noted the following:

> The connections between Indigenous peoples in Australia and the United States on the development of protocols for archives and libraries have been an exemplar of international solidarity. These collaborations have enabled communities to share approaches for transforming archival practice to recognize and implement Indigenous cultural protocols. The work is, at its core, collaborative, nurturing, and strengthening.[33]

This solidarity set a strong foundation that has continued to shape and influence collaborations across these countries.

Education, implementation, and endorsement of protocols were a large part of activists' work, but authors and activists knew that this was not the only way that they would see meaningful, lasting change. While it took significant time for the larger

national and regional organizations to endorse the protocols, the major transformation work occurred at the regional and local level based on the work of individuals and groups of activists who were willing to take a stand in their organizations and challenged the status quo in the management of Indigenous collections. Central to combatting the weight of these collective experiences included continual connection and collaboration with other Indigenous archivists from Australia and Canada.[34]

The Archive Summit: Cross-Border Collaborations between Australia and Canada

Cross-border collaborations between the United States and Canada continued throughout the next five years and coalesced in the Archives Summit on September 9, 2015, as a preconference gathering at the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums annual meeting in Washington, DC.[35] Based on the original intent of the protocols as a living document, this gathering brought together some of the original drafters, as well as key experts, practitioners, and allies in the archive and library fields from the United States and Canada, with each side providing presentations, research, and case studies on the major issues each country's Indigenous peoples faced regarding the proper care and management of collections at non-Indigenous repositories.[36] Together, the group also reviewed and reflected on lessons learned since the drafting and implementation of the protocols nearly ten years earlier in 2006. In-depth discussions occurred within three preselected breakout groups on thematic areas of the ten sections of the protocols to determine some possible next steps for future guidance, conversations, and toolkits.[37] These conversations were guided with care, especially in light of the major challenges archivists faced in the implementation of the protocols in often-unsupportive institutions. Creating a safe environment ensured that attendees were comfortable in sharing their perspectives and experiences to know where improvement was needed as the group made a plan for future expansion of research and policy work.

Representing Canadian archivists and librarians, Camille Callison (Tahltan Nation; Indigenous services librarian, University of Manitoba) provided an overview of work under way in the Association of Canadian Archivists, the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, and the ongoing work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).[38] With experience in various different institutional repositories and years of service at both a national and international level, she provided a useful overview of past and current archival policy within Canada. Unlike the United States, the Canadian government established a formal TRC and traveled across Canada to gather stories, records, and other materials to document the history of residential schools across the nation. In June 2015, Canada's TRC issued "94 Calls to Action" addressed to the Canadian government and its citizens, including Call to Action No. 70, which called upon the Association of Canadian Archivists "to undertake, in collaboration with Aboriginal peoples, a national review of archival policies and best practices." Goals included determining compliance with UNDRIP and the United Nations Joinet-Orentlicher Principles, "as related to Aboriginal peoples' inalienable

right to know the truth about what happened and why, with regard to human rights violations committed against them in residential schools." After the review, the group would also include a report with recommendations "for full implementation of these international mechanisms as a reconciliation framework for Canadian archives."[39] Callison also led one of the three breakout groups focused on intellectual property, research protocols, and the repatriation of records. After lengthy discussions with the group, they came to the following conclusion for issues to address: the general lack of awareness of Indigenous intellectual property rights issues and Indigenous communities calls for needed guidance on how to develop and implement intellectual property and research protocols. Based on these assessments, the group thus suggested the creation of a working group or workshops on this topic at various conferences, most notably at the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums conference and others where Indigenous peoples attend.

Based on his experience in the United States and Canada, Jonathan Pringle, archivist at Northern Arizona University, facilitated the group that focused on accessibility and use, culturally sensitive materials, and providing context. Representing institutions in both North American countries, attendees provided honest feedback, comparing how each handles these very complex issues, revealing the unique situations encountered in each country. For example, in the United States, many publicly funded institutions of higher learning are often unable to impose blanket-access restrictions across the board, but rather impose use-level restrictions or access restrictions at a collection or item level. Collectively, the group agreed on the following recommendations: creation of tribal community advisory or ad hoc groups to assist in access and use restrictions; tracking legacy restrictions and metadata about collections within the institution; and the continued development of lists of collections in repositories to ensure tribal communities are aware of materials. In addition, the issue of repatriation continued to be a major topic of discussion, as the word evokes the process within the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and yet the archives are not covered under that law. Experts on both sides reminded attendees that, while applying *repatriation* to archival materials can often be controversial, it is important to push the boundaries of the terminology, especially as archival items remain absent from official repatriation. The more archivists who include and discuss the topic of repatriation in the context of museum and archive holdings, the more that such institutions may lead the way and take action in the spirit of the law.[40] These discussions provided an opportunity to discuss what was working well in repositories, pinpointing areas for clarification as well as the development of new policies and innovative tools in the continued implementation of the protocols in the future.

From this gathering, the group identified major lessons learned and next steps for both United States and Canadian archivists. First, while Canadian archivists received guidance and next steps alongside the work happening with the official TRC, the archivists in the United States encountered major challenges when developing and implementing policy without a federal mandate. Rather, policy and development work must instead originate from various professional groups, whether official or ad hoc. Of course, this Archives Summit group already knew a bit of this, but this gathering

solidified that fact clearly and showed how far ahead Canadian policy was with the TRC mandates. Second, that the action items identified would need to be carried out by various organizations and groups to reach a multitude of the profession, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous. Based on the presentations, discussions, and feedback from the gathering, the group determined the action steps would include connecting specific articles from UNDRIP to the protocols with accompanying educational tools, publishing case studies on the ten sections of the document, creating an implementation guide, ensuring continued open dialogue at conferences and workshops, and collaborating with the museum summit group within the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums.[41]

The protocols continue to be discussed and debated, but in order for implementation to occur, repositories must have implementation guides, training, and case studies. The Archives Summit group continued to work independently on research projects, and members collaborated with the Society of American Archivists' Native American Archives Roundtable (NAAR) to implement action steps on these items over the next five years. Simultaneously in 2018, nearly twelve years after they were first drafted, SAA endorsed the protocols as an external principle. Included in the endorsement was a much-needed apology from the SAA Council for the length of time it had taken for the organization to approve and endorse the guidelines.[42] While the apology was a major step forward for the profession, more crucial would be whether the organization supported and implemented the identified action items. Later, with the support of SAA Foundation funding, the NAAR developed four case studies and hosted a five-part webinar series between 2019 and 2021.[43] The important work of the cross-border Archive Summit reiterated and solidified the call to action needed within the profession for Indigenous archival sovereignty grounded within the framework of UNDRIP to contribute to the ongoing fight for the protection of Indigenous cultural heritage at local, national, and international levels.

Activating Policy and Education: The Right of Reply and the Tandanya-Adelaide Declaration

The trans-Indigenous collaboration and alliances significantly expanded over the next five years as policy development and research continued between the United States and Australia, particularly related to the foundation principles of archival sovereignty, the *Right to Know* and the *Right of Reply*, and the various guidelines, protocols, and statements that implement these principles. In October 2019—more than four decades after Deloria's "Right to Know" report in 1978—the Indigenous Archives Collective (IAC) hosted the Right of Reply: Indigenous Rights in Data and Collections Symposium, focusing on Indigenous self-determination and national truth-telling efforts. The IAC defines the *Right of Reply* as "recognizing the issues and inherent biases associated with record-making and collecting paradigms that silence and subjugate Indigenous peoples' voices and knowledges." Further, it "is contingent on the Right to Know and is a component of a larger participatory model in which record 'subjects,' individuals, and communities are repositioned to become record 'agents' and

participants in the act of record creation." Within this context, this self-determination right provides Indigenous peoples the opportunity to challenge both the record and information associated with the item. This process ensures that more accurate information is reflected and sits alongside the record, "rather than replacing." This legal and moral right to fully respond to records, a right that has not always been extended to Indigenous peoples, is crucial to ensuring Indigenous archival sovereignty through ownership, access, and privacy.[44] The question of who within the Indigenous community would be assigned to respond to such inaccurate records varies from community to community. In some cases, with Native Nations or First Nations in North America, tribal councils may delegate this work to tribal historic preservation officers or tribal archivists. In Indigenous communities in Australia, heads of communities decide or are themselves delegated, and sometimes it can rest on individual activists doing related policy work. Each community is different and each exercises its inherent sovereignty to decide who replies.

Prior to the event, the IAC distributed an issue paper to provide background information and to encourage discussion of the *Right of Reply*.[45] The document included larger questions about the impact on Indigenous peoples from the promotion and increased accessibility to digitized collections, the effects of contextualizing collections, and the increasing effect of automation and artificial intelligence. The symposium culminated in a final session where attendees further discussed both the definition and the significance of the *Right of Reply*. These findings then formed the foundation for the later development of a formal statement authored by the IAC in 2021. Within this statement, the IAC affirmed the principles and rights frameworks that grounded and supported the *Right of Reply*, which included the following: UNDRIP; the *CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance* and associated movements working to support Indigenous data sovereignty; the *Statement of Principles relating to Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives*; the "True Tracks" principles developed by Terri Janke to protect and support Indigenous cultural and intellectual property; the ATSILIRN protocols; and the Tandanya Declaration.[46]

In addition to the Right of Reply symposium in Sydney, the event was bookended by the International Council on Archives (ICA) conference held in Adelaide, Australia. This conference culminated with the ICA publicly launching the *Tandanya-Adelaide Declaration* (referred to hereafter as the Tandanya Declaration) "as a public statement on the importance of Indigenous priorities in the international archives sector." The ICA officially launched the Tandanya Declaration as part of the combined Indigenous Archives Summit held between ICA and the National Archives of Australia (NAA) under the theme "Challenging and Decolonizing the Archive—See Us—Hear Us—Walk with Us," held on the lands of the Kaurna people of the Adelaide plains of South Australia at the Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute. This marked the ICA's first official declaration on Indigenous matters in response to UNDRIP, especially those articles that address Indigenous peoples' cultural heritage and information rights. Developed and articulated by the then newly formed ICA Expert Group on Indigenous Matters, the Tandanya Declaration includes "five major areas of immediate action for archives to acknowledge Indigenous concerns in archives," under

the following themes: knowledge authorities; property and ownership; recognition and identity; research and access; and self-determination. The statement "is unique, as it is the first to be crafted by a group of Indigenous archivists from around the world and that it is intended to be applicable to all Indigenous peoples globally." According to some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander archivists, the ICA statement was "a welcome addition to the existing protocols and position statements that acknowledge the importance of archives for Indigenous peoples and the competing and complex issues that arise in relation to the management of archives that have supported efforts of imperialism and colonialism."[47] However, they balance this welcome acknowledgement with also bringing attention to how the Tandanya Declaration would actually be implemented and put into practice, in Australia and globally.

Nearly a year later, the Australian Society of Archivists conference was held in September 2020, exploring questions of mobilizing action related to the statement panelists presented, "Supporting and Activating the Tandanya-Adelaide Declaration on Indigenous Archives." The group, including Rose Barrowcliffe, Lauren Booker, Sue McKemmish, and Kirsten Thorpe, brought specific attention to examining key themes and issues relating to ongoing dialogue and the required Indigenous leadership required for acting on and expanding the key themes of the statement. They acknowledge that the declaration is built on many years of protocols and guidelines that already exist in Australia, including the ATSILIRN protocols and the ASA policy statement (previously mentioned in this article), which "provides a framework and vision to act." Further, through "an Australian context, it provides us with a new moment for transformation, a possibility to reframe archival approaches to privilege Indigenous peoples' worldviews, priorities, and aspirations." Through this discussion and a later coauthored published article, they balanced this excitement with concern. According to Thorpe, she reflected on her "immense trepidation about the burdens this work will place on Indigenous people now and into the future." Focusing on key questions related to the required leadership and resources as well as the centering of Indigenous communities, she further argued it was a key moment to bring "profound and transformational change," but modifications to the approach for engagement in the process and methods for further discussion must be addressed. She worried that, without an investment in a paradigm shift that is "truly Indigenous-led and community driven," the declaration would focus on collecting institutions rather than prioritize Indigenous peoples and communities' needs.[48]

According to Lauren Booker, "as with many declarations, in and of itself, it is inert, a vehicle that we need to operate for it to go." As the declaration is so broad in scope, it is crucial to bring more context for each countries' Indigenous peoples as they begin to activate the statement. Further, a major theme seen in many global statements, particularly regarding the Tandanya Declaration, is the challenge of enacting the global policy at a local level, especially without significant support and resources of the larger group—here, ICA. To meet these challenges and questions, Australian archivists recommend several ways forward with guidance for activating the declaration in Australia and beyond. A large part of this action is bringing this *global* policy to a *local* policy level. To do so, they recommend the following: creating Indigenous-led action

through a cross-sectional approach, particularly relating to "voice, treaty, and truth-telling"; employing First Nations archivists and recordkeeping professionals; applying models such as the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission; supporting national and regional organizations who are leading the way in activating the declaration at a local level; and consulting and applying frameworks to guide the sector. Referencing the words of Ambelin Kwaymullina, First Nations writer, they argue that this activation work will require non-Indigenous members of the archival and recordkeeping community to focus on "walking humbly" and finding "the places where different worlds meet," the places of "connection, enrichment, and transformation," a commitment to justice, and the creation of "decolonized futures."[49]

A Way Forward: From Global to Local through Education, Research, and Care Practices

Building on the global-to-local recommendations of Australian archivists, I conclude with final reflections and suggested methods for a way forward in the ongoing work of Indigenous archival sovereignty activism in the current decade. Many of the international Indigenous information scholars examined throughout this article agree that the key to enacting global policy is through making substantial change at a local level via three key areas: centering Indigenous ways of knowing in education, utilizing Indigenous research methods, and supporting the care and well-being of Indigenous peoples represented in and working with cultural heritage collections. Further, this must be accomplished by realizing that each Indigenous community is unique. Therefore, protocols, guidelines, and declarations must also be applied at regional and local levels. While there will be similarities across Indigenous communities, the differences are the ways we honor specific needs and make a lasting impact in field and sector. As noted by Kirsten Thorpe, based on the nature of "international, national, or state-based approaches, archival declarations and statements homogenize First Nations priorities rather than [recognize] communities as diverse groups with diverse and locally situated needs."[50] Indeed, local Indigenous issues and needs must guide work in developing and applying global and national policies to effect, change, and overturn the innaccurate ways that Indigenous peoples have historically been represented in Indigenous archives.

Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination must be embedded in the activation of declarations and frameworks. While some countries have national Indigenous research ethics policies, such as in Australia, and formal Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, like Canada, the United States still lacks either, as well as any formal national policy regarding Indigenous archives.[51] This is why global and national policies are so important to fill that void, yet to have power they must be implemented at the local level. Such national policies should be implemented through the intersection of Indigenous archive sovereignty, Indigenous data sovereignty, and Indigenous data governance principles. The archive protocols and international statements developed over the past twenty years, together with the *CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance*, provide important pathways for activating international declarations by

protecting Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination within cultural heritage collections across institutions.[52] Recent research has specifically focused on how the CARE principles may be applied at both a high level at institutions and universities as well as at a local level for direct benefit to Indigenous communities, reflecting the specific needs of the tribal communities.[53] Collectively, these frameworks reflect and assert Indigenous values and approaches to data and collections management in archives, libraries, and museums.

The activation of global and national policies must be guided by centering Indigenous ways of knowing and applying Indigenous research methods within archival education, work, and practice—a major tenet on which many Indigenous informational professionals and data scientists agree.[54] In a recent special issue of *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, titled "Indigenous Studies in Archives and Beyond: Relationships, Reciprocity, and Responsibilities," I argued that the decolonization of Indigenous archives and research over the last twenty years has become, and should remain, the baseline standard for managing collections and engaging in research with Indigenous communities. Evidence of this is found in the ways that many non-Indigenous institutions, repositories, and academics have made substantial changes in their collection and curation policies and research agendas, centering Indigenous ways of knowing and community-engaged participatory approaches through relationship-building. Examples of this work include implementing specific protocols; updating colonial collecting policies; centering partnerships with tribal communities; providing traditional knowledge context of cultural heritage materials based on conversations with tribal elders and community knowledge-holders; arranging and describing collections based on Indigenous ways of knowing; creating welcoming spaces for and with Indigenous peoples; and the digital or physical return of items.[55] Another way of advancing Indigenous archival sovereignty and governance is through building and implementing technologies and data infrastructures grounded in Indigenous protocols, knowledge, and rights systems. These systems and protocols are foundational to upholding and sustaining Indigenous epistemologies and research methods. According to the Global Indigenous Data Alliance, these locally designed frameworks, principles, and protocols "remain vital resources to ensure that existing and emerging technologies—and the policies that govern their use—uphold Indigenous peoples' rights, embed Indigenous values, and support self-determined futures."[56]

Significant transformation requires integrating Indigenous ways of knowing and research methods for modeling more effective and ethical care approaches to archival collections and cultural heritage. Key to making these changes includes transforming educational curriculum and pedagogical approaches in higher education that will provide emerging professionals, practitioners, and scholars with the foundational approaches to understanding Indigenous history, knowledge, culture, and research methods—necessary for stewarding Indigenous collections grounded in Indigenous protocols, ways of knowing, and respectful relationships. Foundational to this work is not just teaching about Indigenous peoples but how and from whom the teaching is conducted. Developing education courses, programs, and environments in which Indigenous methods and ways of knowing are taught and implemented ensures that

students are able to engage in learning that is meaningful, generative, and intentional. Further, a cohort model that is grounded in relationality provides opportunities to learn and implement the building of meaningful relationships as part of education, whether at the secondary-education or professional level, while also modeling ethical Indigenous research methods. Key examples of Indigenous information cohort programs within the United States include the Knowledge River Scholars Program at the University of Arizona, the Indigenous Archival Training program through the Society of American Archivists Native American Archives Section, and the Tribal Digital Stewardship Cohort Program at Washington State University.[57]

Centering Indigenous research methods in education and practice is key to changing the system from within, although the idea of decolonizing and indigenizing both the academy and work sectors is certainly not new, as Linda Tuhauwai Smith called for this change beginning in 1999 with her groundbreaking work *Decolonizing Methodologies*.[58] Similar to global and national declarations, Indigenous research methods must continue to be enacted at regional, university, and local levels, as represented through the works of Shawn Wilson, *Research Is Ceremony*, and Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies*.[59] Recognizing how policy statements can often be "performative tools" rather than catalysts for change, Kirsten Thorpe argues that "archival practice can only change with a commitment to research," particularly Indigenous participatory research projects across library and archival spaces to bridge the gap between research and practice. Indigenous research methods must be taught and practiced in institutions of higher learning, in workshops, and through grant development for information professionals. Indigenous research practices include methodologies rooted in Indigenous relationality and ways of knowing, including storywork, yarning, and *talanoa* (inclusive dialogue), which support building trust and respectful relationships, and projects led and codesigned with Indigenous peoples' input, priorities, and desires.[60]

While significant work must continue to take place within non-Indigenous institutions, Indigenous peoples and communities are activating change on their own terms at a local level in various ways. These include leading curation and research projects within Indigenous archives, libraries, and museums; establishing research ethics protocols in their own communities; and developing Indigenous-led cultural and research centers within Indigenous communities, universities, and institutions. Indigenous scholars leading research projects that foreground Indigenous relationality and ways of knowing from the beginning will significantly reduce the need to fix or fight back against a broken colonial system. For example, literary scholar Johanna Bird (Peguis First Nations) explores Indigenous research methodologies in archives by highlighting the development of the Deyohahá:ge: Indigenous Knowledge Center , which represents "Two Roads," or parallel paths of thinking, in preserving and nurturing Indigenous knowledge and wisdom and fostering community-based knowledge-sharing and research.[61] These types of initiatives are certainly not new, as Indigenous communities have always been fighting to protect our histories, lifeways, and traditions for decades; however, these types of projects have significantly increased over the last ten years, standing as key examples of implementation and activation at a local level.

The trans-Indigenous alliances examined in this article represent the importance of collaborating on a global scale to assert Indigenous resurgence and political sovereignty at a local level through developing protocols, guidelines, and declarations. For global and national policies and protocols to be effective, they must be implemented at a local level, in non-Indigenous repositories and in Indigenous communities. Central to this work is enacting care in the archives through relationality and CARE principles rooted in Indigenous values. The foundational reforms and protocols presented in this article are grounded in *Right to Know, Right of Reply,* and *Right to Govern* principles, ensuring that Native archives utilize Indigenous ways of knowing—truth-telling and justice, recognition and healing, spiritual and emotional connections, the restoration of dignity, and cultural care and protocols, especially the care and protection of Indigenous peoples from harm.[62] This restorative work in Indigenous archival sovereignty seeks to return the access, control, and oversight of collections back to Indigenous peoples. The collaborations presented here represent how crucial trans-Indigenous alliances are to this shared journey of advancing Indigenous archival sovereignty, globally and locally. These collaborations are more important than ever as we seek to bring care and well-being back into the archive to protect Indigenous collections.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the many Indigenous activists and allies who have fought for Indigenous archival sovereignty, those with whom she has had the honor of collaborating and working with over the past twenty years, particularly those within the First Archivist Circle, Indigenous Archives Collective, Society of American Archivists' Native American Archives Section (formerly the Native American Archives Roundtable), and the International Council of Archives' Expert Group on Indigenous Matters. The author also acknowledges and thanks the activists and interviewees who shared their stories and experiences, which are central to documenting this important history. This article was supported by the University of Oregon Wayne Morse Resident Scholar Program.

A special acknowledgment of two incredible Indigenous archival activists who have already "walked on"—Ally Krebs and Ann Massman.

Notes

1. Gina Starblanket, "Resurgence as Relationality," *Everyday Acts of Resurgence*, ed. Jeff Corntassel et al. (Olympia: Daykeeper Press, 2018), 28–32.

2. Chadwick Allen, *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), xiv-xv. My approach builds on the work and discussions posed by Allen and many other Indigenous scholars who utilize the term *trans-Indigenous* to signify indigeneity "across" or "beyond," as well as "together (yet) distinct," rather than "ands" and "comparative." As he notes, "The point is not to displace the necessary, invigorating study of specific traditions and contexts but rather to complement these by augmenting and expanding broader, globally Indigenous fields of study"(xiv). See also, Chadwick Allen, "A Trans*national* Native American Studies? Why Not

Studies that Are Trans-*Indigenous?*," *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4 (no. 1) 2012. For a critique of Allen's work, see Rob Wilson, "Coming to Worlding Terms with 'Trans': Methodologies in Chadwick Allen's Trans-Indigenous." *Verge: Studies of Global Asias* 4, no. 2 (2018): 87–95.

3. Jo-Ann Archibald, *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body and Spirit* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008), ix. See also Jo-Ann Archibald et al., eds. *Decolonizing Research: Indigenous Storywork as Methodology* (London: Zed Books, 2019).

4. Shawn Wilson, *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008); Matt Wildcat and Daniel Voth, "Indigenous Relationality: Definitions and Methods," *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 19, no. 2 (2023): 475–83; Sandra Littletree, Miranda Belarde-Lewis, and Maris Duarte, "Centering Relationality: A Conceptual Model to Advance Indigenous Knowledge Organization Practices," *Knowledge Organization* 47, no. 5 (2020): 410–26. On relationality, international relations, and Indigenous feminist theory, see Rauna Kuokkanen, "It's about All Relations: Indigenous Feminist Theory of Relational Freedom," *Review of International Studies* (2025).

5. For an overview of this history, see Jennifer R. O'Neal, "'The Right to Know': Decolonizing Native American Archives," *Journal of Western Archives* 6, no. 1 (2015): 1–17.

6. Kirsten Thorpe, "Unclasping the White Hand: Reclaiming and Refiguring the Archives to Support Indigenous Well-Being, and Sovereignty" (Master's thesis, Monash University, 2022), 207; see also Kirsten Thorpe, "Returning Love to Ancestors Captured in the Archives: Indigenous Well-Being, Sovereignty, and Archival Sovereignty," *Archival Science* 24 (2024): 125–42.

7. Rose Miron, *Indigenous Archival Activism: Mohican Interventions in Public History and Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2023).

8. I mainly focus on these four settler-state countries, often referred to as the CANZUS states (Canada, New Zealand, United States, and Australia), as these are the countries that have worked most closely together on Indigenous information sovereignty issues. These nation-states also voted against the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples at first, but later reversed their votes in approval of the declaration.

9. For a general overview of the history of the fight to ensure access, control, and return of collections to Indigenous communities in the United States, see Jennifer R. O'Neal, "Indigenizing Research and Archives: Relationality and the Collections Back Movement," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 113: no. 1 (Spring 2024): 11–27. A few examples of tribal institutional research boards and research protocols include the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, "Protocol for Research, Publication, and Recordings: Motion, Visual, Sound, Multimedia and other Mechanical Devices," https://www.hopi-nsn.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/HCPO-Research-Protocol.REVISED.2021.pdf; Navajo Nation Human Research Review Board, https://nnhrrb.navajo-nsn.gov/aboutNNHRRB.html, accessed May 13, 2023; Karuk Tribe, "Protocol on Karuk Tribe's Intellectual Property Rights: Research, Publication and Recordings," https://sipnuuk.karuk.us/system/files/atoms/file/ATALM17_KTResearchProtocol.pdf; and "Practicing Pikyav: Policy for Collaborative Projects and Research Initiatives with the Karuk Tribe," https://sipnuuk.karuk.us/system/files/atoms/file/ATALM17_PracticingPikyav.pdf.

10. *United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, United Nations, March 2008, https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf. For a reference guide to the UNDRIP declaration, see Indian Law Resource Center, "The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: A Quick Reference" (Helena: Indian Law Resource Center, ca. 2011); UNDRIP, Articles 14 and 31; Rebecca Tsosie, "Tribal Data Governance and Informational Privacy: Constructing 'Indigenous Data Sovereignty,'" *Montana Law Review* 80, no. 2 (2019); Megan Davis, "Data and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples," in *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*, ed. Tahu Kukutai and John Taylor (Canberra: Australian National University

Press, 2016), 25–38. For more on the long history of UNDRIP, see S. James Anaya, *International Peoples in International Law* (Second Edition) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Sheryl Lightfoot, *Global Indigenous Politics: A Subtle Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

11. Davis, "Data and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples."

12. Tahu Kukutai and John Taylor, "Data Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples: Current Practice and Future Needs," in *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*, ed. Tahu Kuktai and John Taylor (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2016), 1–24, xxii.

13. Stephanie Russo Carroll et al., "Operationalizing the CARE and FAIR Principles for Indigenous Data Futures," *Scientific Data* 8, 108 (2021), 1.

14. Maggie Walter and Stephanie Russo Carroll, "Indigenous Data Sovereignty, Governance, and the Link to Indigenous Policy," in *Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Policy*, ed. Maggie Walter et al. (New York: Routledge Press, 2021).

15. The main Indigenous data sovereignty networks developed include (with formation year) Te Mana Rarauunga Maori Data Sovereignty Network (2015), United States Indigenous Data Sovereignty Network (2016), Maiam nayri Wingara Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Data Sovereignty Collective (2017), International Indigenous Data Sovereignty Interest Group at the Research Data Alliance (2017), and Global Indigenous Data Alliance (2019). These Indigenous-led advocacy, education, and research networks seek to address global concerns "to protect Indigenous data from misuse, ensuring Indigenous peoples are the primary beneficiaries of the data and leveraging Indigenous data toward Indigenous aspirations" (Walter and Carroll, "Indigenous Data Sovereignty, Governance," 11).

16. Walter and Carroll, "Indigenous Data Sovereignty, Governance."

17. Carroll et al., "Operationalizing the CARE and FAIR Principles," 2. Many organizations and projects are already working to implement the principles into their systems and standards. This includes the Local Contexts project (https://localcontexts.org/), which is partnering with the Smithsonian Institution to develop collections CARE notices for Indigenous collection, providing guidance on how an item should be stewarded. This will extend the current cultural institution notices developed by Local Contexts, and the new notices will reflect inherent relationships of care, responsibility, and governance in collection stewardship within the institution. They will function as direct mechanisms to assist in management and decision-making consistent with CARE Principles.

18. Vine Deloria Jr., *The Right to Know: A Paper* (prepared for the White House Preconference on Indian Library and Information Services on or Near Reservations), Office of Library and Information Services, US Department of the Interior, Washington, DC, 1978; Allison Boucher Krebs, "Native America's Twenty-First Century Right to Know," *Archival Science* 12 (2012): 173–90; Jennifer R. O'Neal, "'The Right to Know': Decolonizing Native American Archives," *Journal of Western Archives* 6, no. 1 (2015): 1–17; Jennifer R. O'Neal, "Respect, Recognition, and Reciprocity: The Protocols for Native American Archival Materials," in *Identity Palimpsests: Archiving Ethnicity in the US and Canada*, ed. Dominique Daniel and Amalia Levi (Sacramento: Litwin Press, 2014), 125–42.

19. Kirsten Thorpe, email communication, January 27, 2025.

20. Karen Underhill, "Proposal: Native American Protocols for American Libraries, Archives, and Information Services," submission to the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation (2005), 1. For a full overview of the gathering and aim of the document, see Karen Underhill, "Protocols for Native American Archival Materials," *RBM* 7, no. 2 (2006): 134–45.

21. For a full overview of the history of the protocols, including steps toward endorsement and adoption by various organizations, see O'Neal, "Respect, Recognition, and Reciprocity" and Jennifer R. O'Neal, "The Right to Know: Decolonizing Native American Archives," *Journal of Western Archives* 6, no. 1 (2015): Article 2.

22. *The Mata'atua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples*; Alex Byrne et al., *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library and Information Resources Network*

Protocols for Libraries, Archives and Information Services (Deakin: Australian Library and Information Association for the Aboriginal and Torres Stait Islander Library and Information Resource Network, 1995), https://atsilirn.aiatsis.gov.au/protocols.php. See also UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003), https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention, and the United Nations, *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People* (1994), https://original.religlaw.org/content/religlaw/documents/draftundecrindigp1994.htm, all accessed November 15, 2024. Karen Underhill interviewed Alana Garwood-Houng, senior family history officer, Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra, Australia, January 24, 2006.

23. Alana Garwood-Houng is a Yorta Yorta woman with Wergaia and Wamba Wamba heritage. She has worked as a librarian at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies since 1989. She is one of the founding members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library and Information Resource Network. She currently serves as the curator of art and object at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) in Canberra, Australia.

24. Alana Garwood-Houng, "Protocols: Meeting the Challenges of Indigenous Information Needs," in Martin Nakata and Marcia Langton, ed., *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 36 (2005): 2, 143. Alana's article lists eleven areas, but the website lists an additional one of "digital environment," which was added later. Underhill, "Protocols for Native American Archival Materials," 136; Karen Underhill, interviews with Alex Byrne, pro-vice chancellor of teaching and learning and vice president of alumni and development; Martin Nakata, director of the Indigenous Academic Development Unit, Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning; Vicky Nakata, research assistant, Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning; and Gabrielle Gardiner, library research and policy officer, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia, January 23, 2006.

25. Australian Human Rights Commission. *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families* (April 1997).

26. Ibid, 143-144.

27. Ibid, 145. M. Nakata, A. Byrne, V. Naka, and G. Gardiner. "Mapping the Impact of the 1995 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Protocols for Libraries, Archives and Information Services' (unpublished report, Sydney, UTS: 2005), as cited in Alana Garwood-Houng, "Protocols" (2005); M. Nakata et al. Ch. 16. The reference committee included three Indigenous people: Alana Garwood-Houng, Jackie Huggins, from Reconciliation Australia and a former Board member of the State Library of Queensland, and John Mohi, from the National Library of New Zealand.

28. Author's personal notes, Protocols Gathering (Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University, April 5, 2006).

29. Kim Lawson worked at the Xwi7xwa Library at the University of British Columbia for ten years before serving in her current role as the Research and Community Liaison Librarian with the Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Center (IRSCHDC) at the University of British Columbia. She has worked extensively on Indigenous archives and languages. See, "Locally Contingent and Community-Dependent: Tools and Technologies for Indigenous Language Mobilization," by Jennifer Carpenter, Annie Guerin, Michelle Kaczmarek, Gerry Lawson, Kim Lawson, Lisa P. Nathan and Mark Turin, in *Indigenous Languages and the Promise of Archives*, ed. Adrianna Link, Abigail Shelton, and Patrick Spero (University of Nebraska and The American Philosophical Society, 2021), 125-155.

30. Underhill, "PNAAM," *RBM* (2006), 136.

31. First Archivists Circle, *PNAAM*, Introduction and Core Sections (2006).

32. At the 2012 annual meeting, the Society of American Archivists awarded the Native American Protocols Working Group with an Exemplary Service Award. However, SAA Council voted not to endorse the guidelines.

33. Kirsten Thrope, Email Communication, January 20, 2025.

34. For a full overview of the history of the *Protocols*, including steps toward endorsement and adoption by various organizations, see Jennifer R. O'Neal, "Respect, Recognition, and Reciprocity: The Protocols for Native American Archival Materials," In *Identity Palimpsests: Archiving Ethnicity in the US and Canada*, ed. Dominique Daniel and Amalia Levi, 125-142. Sacramento: Litwin Press, 2014 and Jennifer R. O'Neal, "The Right to Know: Decolonizing Native American Archives," *Journal of Western Archives* 6, no. 1 (2015): Article 2.

35. Funding for the gathering was made possible by the Institute of Museum and Library Services. We thank them and the entire ATLAM leadership for providing space and funding for this gathering.

36. Original drafters in attendance included Jennifer R. O'Neal, Karen Underhill, and Robert Leopold. Presentations were provided by Jennifer R. O'Neal (The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde; University of Oregon—USA), Camille Callison (Tahltan Nation; Indigenous Services Librarian, University of Manitoba), Karen Underhill (Northern Arizona University—USA), Elizabeth Joffrion (Director of Heritage Resources, Western Washington University - USA), Natalia Fernandez (Multicultural Librarian, Oregon State University—USA), Janet Ceja (Assistant Professor, Simmons University - USA). Affiliations listed are from professional positions held during the gathering—not current positions.

37. Attendees selected from three thematic discussion groups: 1) Building Relationships of Mutual Respect; Striving for Balance in Content and Perspective, Reciprocal Education and Training, Awareness of Indigenous communities and issues (Led by Jennifer R. O'Neal) 2) Accessibility and Use; Culturally Sensitive Materials; Providing Context (Led by Jonathan Pringle) 3) Intellectual Property Issues; Research Protocols; Copy and Repatriation of Records (Led by Camille Callison).

38. See Camille Callison, Loriene Roy and Gretchen Alice LeCheminant, eds. Indigenous Notions of Ownership and Libraries, Archives and Museums (Boston: DeGruyter Press, 2016); Camille Callison, Ann Ludbrook, Victoria Owen, Kim Nayyer, "Engaging Respectfully with Indigenous Knowledges: Copyright, Customary Law, and Cultural Memory Institutions in Canada 5 no. 1 (2021), 1-15.

39. "ACA Indigenous Matters Working Group, Assessment and Recommendations Final Report & Resource Guide 2024," https://archivists.ca/ACA-Indigenous-Matters-Working-Group-Assessment-and-Recommendations-Final-Report-&-Resource-Guide-2024 ; "Delivering on Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action," https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1524494530110/1557511412801; "Museum and Archives" Calls to Action 67 to 70, https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1524504831027/1557513782811 (accessed January 15, 2025); Association of Canadian Archivists Indigenous Matters Working Group,"Final Report to the Association of Canadian Archivists from the Indigenous Matters Working Group—Assessment and Recommendations" (July 2024); ACA-IMWG and Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Center, "Caretaking Memory: A Resource Guide for Archival Practitioners Working in Indigenous-Centered Archives" (2024); Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action (2015).

40. Archive Summit Report, written and presented by Jennifer R. O'Neal at the Association for Tribal, Archives, Libraries, and Museums Conference on September 11, 2015; Jonathan Pringle, Archive Summit facilitation notes, Email Communication, September 14, 2015.

41. The Museum Summit Group in ATALM focused their work on the development of "The Guidelines for Collaboration." Later published by the Indian Arts Research Center in 2019. Work

was facilitated by Landis Smith, Cynthia Chavez Lamar, and Brian Vallo. Sante Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research. See, https://guidelinesforcollaboration.info/ (accessed January 15, 2025).

42. See the Society of American Archivists statement, "SAA Council Endorsement of Protocols for Native American Archival Materials," https://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-council-endorsement-of-protocols-for-native-american-archival-materials (accessed January 15, 2025).

43. An entire resource page is available on the SAA Native American Archives Sections page. Please note originally this group was created and identified as a "roundtable" in 2005 however all roundtables in the organization switched to sections around 2019. See, "Protocols for Native American Archival Materials": Information and Resources Page," https://www2.archivists.org/groups/native-american-archives-section/protocols-for-native-american-archival-materials-information-and-resources-page ; "Access Policies for Native American Archival Materials: Case Studies," https://www2.archivists.org/publications/epubs/Native-American-Archival-Materials-Case-Studies, co-editors, Diana Marsh, Lotus Norton-Wisla, and Katherine Satriano ;"Implementing the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials: Webinar Series," https://www2.archivists.org/groups/native-american-archives-section/implementing-the-protocols-for-native-american-archival-materials-webinar-series-and-res. Jennifer R. O'Neal hosted and coordinated the webinars. All websites accessed January 15, 2025.

44. Originally named the Indigenous Archives Network, the group was founded by Dr. Kirsten Thorpe and Dr. Shannon Faulkhead in 2011 through the National Archives of Australia Ian Maclean Research Award. In 2018, the group was later renamed the Indigenous Archive Collective. Members include both Indigenous and non-Indigenous professional archivists and researchers. The group is "a place where Indigenous practitioners and researchers lead; as a place of support; as a place where cultural safe collaboration, dialogue and reflexive practice, and advocacy for transformation in the Australian and international GLAM sector can occur." The symposium was made possible through the leadership of the Jumbunna Institute for Indigenous Education and Research and sponsorship from University of Technology Sydney, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Monash University, the Australian Society of Archivists, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Data Archive, the State Library of New South Wales and the Australian Library and Information Association.

Indigenous Archive Collective, "The Indigenous Archives Collective position statement on the right of reply to Indigenous knowledge and information held in archives," *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 49 (no. 3) 2021: 244-252; quote 246. For a general overview of the Right of Reply, see Indigenous Archive Collective, eds. *The Indigenous Right of Reply to Archives: Working Towards Indigenous Sovereignty, Healing, and Justice in Archival Practice* (London: Routledge Press, 2026).

45. The issue paper is available on the Indigenous Archive Collective website: https://indigenousarchives.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/final-right-of-reply-issues-paper-october-2019.pdf (accessed January 15, 2025).

46. Indigenous Archive Collective, "The Indigenous Archives Collective position statement on the right of reply to Indigenous knowledge and information held in archives," *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 49 (no. 3) 2021: 244-252; official statement pg. 246-247, statement principles pg. 248; Terri Janke, True Tracks: Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Principles for Putting Self-Determination Into Practice, PhD Dissertation: The Australian National University, February 2019, available at: https://www.terrijanke.com.au/terri-janke-phd-true-tracks; see principles on pg. 330.

47. Rose Barrowcliffe, Lauren Booker, Sue McKemmish, and Kirsten Thorpe, "Activating and Supporting the Tandanya Adelaide Declaration on Indigenous Archives," *Archives and Manuscripts* 49, no. 3 (2021): 167-185. See also, Raymond Frogner, "Creating Tandanya—The Adelaide Declaration," International Council on Archives, 2020.

48. Barrowcliffe, et al, 168-171.

49. Ibid, 182; Ambelin Kwaymullina, *Living on Stolen Land*, Broome: Magabala Books, 2020, pg. 51, 64—as cited in Barrowcliffe, et al. See also, Kirsten Thorpe, "Designing Indigenous-Led Archival Futures: The Application of Indigenous Research Methodologies Within Archival Research and Practice," *Archives & Manuscripts* 52, no. 1 (2024): 29-44.

50. Kirsten Thorpe, "Designing Indigenous-Led Archival Futures," 40.

51. The only government-wide policy recently enacted on a national level in the United States is guidance specifically focused on "environmental sustainability and the responsible stewardship of natural and cultural resources in federal policymaking." See White House Council on Native American Affairs, "Indigenous Knowledge Guidance for Federal Agencies" (2021).

52. Global Indigenous Data Alliance (GIDA), *CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance*, GIDA, 2019, available at https://gida-global.org/care; See also Maiam Nayri Wingara & Australian Indigenous Governance Institute, Key Principles, 2018, available at https://www.maiamnayriwingara.org/mnw-principles, accessed January 15, 2024. Kirsten Thorpe, "Designing Indigenous-Led Archival Futures," 33.

53. Riley Taitingfong; Russo Carroll, Stephanie; Figueroa, Oscar; Tautolo, El-Shadan; Fa'alili-Fidow, Jacinta; et al. (2025) "Care Directs Us Home: Prioritizing Indigenous Peoples Community Standards Communique," https://www.gida-global.org/gidacarebrief.

54. See, Kirsten Thorpe, "Designing Indigenous-Led Archival Futures; Rose Barrowcliffe, Lauren Booker, Sue McKemmish, and Kirsten Thorpe, "Activating and Supporting the Tandanya Adelaide Declaration on Indigenous Archives," *Archives and Manuscripts* 49, no. 3 (2021): 167-185; Vina Begay and Kelley M Klor. "Provenance through Storytelling: Application of Indigenous Relationality toward Arrangement and Description." *Archival Science* 24, no. 4 (2024): 611–35.

55. Jennifer R. O'Neal, "Indigenizing Research and Archives: Relationality and the Collections Back Movement," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 113, no. 1 (2024): 11-27. This was part of a special issue titled "Indigenous Studies in Archives and Beyond: Relationships, Reciprocity and Responsibilities." This work builds on my earlier research examined here: Jennifer R. O'Neal, "From Time Immemorial: Centering Indigenous Traditional Knowledge in the Archival Paradigm," in *Afterlives of Indigenous Archives: Essays in Honor of the Occom Circle*, ed. Ivy Schweitzer and Gordon Henry, (Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2019) 45-58. Begay and Klor, *Provenance Through Storytelling* (2024).

56. Riley Taitingfong, et al. (2025) "Care Directs Us Home: Prioritizing Indigenous Peoples Community Standards Communique," https://www.gida-global.org/gidacarebrief.

57. O'Neal, "Indigenizing Research and Archives," 16-19. Lotus Norton-Wisla, "Cycles of Learning and Growth: Developing the Tribal Digital Stewardship Cohort Program Guided by Indigenous Perspectives," *Journal of Western Archives*: 13: I (2022). For more about the Knowledge River Scholars Program, see https://infosci.arizona.edu/knowledge-river and for the Indigenous Archival Training Program within the Society of American Archivists Native American Archives Section0p, see "Indigenizing Archival Training: Final Report," https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/Mellon+IAT+Final+Report-compressed-compressed.pdf.

58. Linda Tuhiwai Smith. *Decolonizing Methodologies : Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, 1999).

59. Shawn Wilson, *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008); Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies : Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts*. University of Toronto Press, 2009.

60. Kirsten Thorpe, "Designing Indigenous-Led Archival Futures," pg. 33-34; See also, Kirsten Thorpe, "Transformative Praxis-Building Spaces for Indigenous Self-determination in Libraries and Archives," *In the Library With the Lead Pipe*, 2019. Joann Archibald, *Indigenous Storywork*; Jo-ann Archibald, Jenny Bol Jun Lee-Morgan, Jason De Santolo, eds. *Decolonizing Research: Indigenous*

Storywork as Methodology (London: Bloomsbury Books, 2019); Tecun, Arcia. "Talanoa: Tongan Epistemology and Indigenous Research Method." *AlterNative : An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* (Auckland, N.Z) 14, no. 2 (2018): 156–63; Sweeney Windchief and Timothy San Pedro, eds. *Applying Indigenous Research Methods : Storying with Peoples and Communities*. (Routledge, 2019).

61. Johannah Bird. "Indigenous Relational Methodologies and Archives." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 113, no. 1 (2024): 41-59; "Deyohahá:ge: Indigenous Knowledge Centre" website, https://www.snpolytechnic.com/indigenous-knowledge-centre.

62. Jennifer R. O'Neal, "Responsibility with Heart: Protecting Indigenous Data Sovereignty in Traditional Ecological Knowledge." *Indigenous Voices: Critical Reflections on Traditional Ecological Knowledge*, ed. Lara Alanna Jacobs (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2025) 295-310; Kirsten Thorpe, "Returning love to Ancestors captured in the archives: Indigenous Wellbeing, Sovereignty and Archival Sovereignty," *Archival Science* 24 (2024): 125-142.