

MANAGEMENT. STATE OF THE ART

Laia Foix Navarro

Institut d'Estudis Fotogràfics de Catalunya (IEFC)

It is obvious to say that the basic objectives of any heritage organisation are conservation and dissemination; conflicting objectives because the use and manipulation of photographs has been the main cause of their degradation, while without access to this heritage, there is no point in making the investment necessary for its conservation. Everything we have learned, everything we have shared, everything that has been said throughout these thirty years of the I&R Conferences, ranges from conservation to dissemination, traversing the long middle-way that allows us to achieve these objectives.

It has not been easy for those of us who have sought a methodology that would allow us to carry out our work rigorously and professionally. When the biennial I&R Conferences began in order to provide management models and testimonies (experiences), as well as to give specific guidelines for those who deal with photographs, technological changes were happening that would transform, not only the photographic field, but almost all disciplinary, methodological, infrastructural and even creative fields (Romer, 2008). The digitization of information, content, processes, channels and means of transmission has transformed both the raw material and the products we offer, what we do, how we do it and with what tools and means. It is easy to conclude that the methodology we employ in managing photographic heritage is not, and should not be, the same as thirty years ago.

It is undeniable that this statement, “the methodology we employ in managing photographic heritage is not, and should not be, the same as thirty years ago”, is an important assertion because it makes us question much of the basic bibliography and standard manuals we have, makes us question the traditionally tried and tested methods. Do we still need them? Should we chuck them aside? Obviously not, there is much wisdom and experience from those who have preceded us in these texts, but they are not recipe books to be followed automatically, because the scenarios are no longer the same. Understanding how our reality has changed will allow us to unpick what is useful to us from what is not applicable for each of the heritage organisations and collections we manage. Therefore, having forums, such as those provided by the thirty years of I&R Conferences, has allowed us to adjust and adapt regulations, guidelines and directives. We have been able to closely follow the experience of those who have innovated, see new paths and new horizons and learn together to do a little better every day. In this text, I propose that we, together, reflect on three key aspects of the methodology in the management of photographic heritage: what we manage (what we call photographic heritage), who manages it (organizations and professionals) and how we manage it (why? and for whom?).

What We Manage: Reflections on Photographic Heritage

Photographs are the raw material par excellence with which we work. They have been so since the beginning in archives, although they often fulfilled a merely illustrative function within documents or formed part of donations outside the main function of the organization that held them. Often, their illustrative function separated them from their authorship and sometimes even from the

documentation with which they formed a whole. If we remember how we worked before computers arrived, we will remember the need for logbooks, entry catalogues, the difficulty of dealing with the various headings of a single document, and the pragmatic tendency to group documents thematically so that they could be found by what was thought to be their major interest or main heading. Thus, many photographs were saved according to their subject or main motif in different boxes or drawers. It was necessary, years later, to reconstruct holdings and collections in order to recover archival structures and authorship. The identification of authorship, the recovery of the photographer's name, has allowed us to write the history of photography in our field based on research on the ground, in the archives themselves. A search that goes beyond the photographs itself to investigate the photographers (Martí, 2016; Rodriguez, 2012).

The recognition of authorship is also essential to be able to carefully manage the rights – moral and economic – recognized by the Intellectual Property Law. We won't go further into this subject ourselves since the subject is amply and excellently addressed by Ariadna Matas in this same volume, but it is good news that over the years we have become aware of all the agents involved in the management and use of photographic heritage: photographers, managers, producers, heirs and family members, companies and users, as well as the people who feature in the photographs – sometimes without knowing it, sometimes without wanting to. It is also a responsibility, especially for us as mediating entities, to identify all these agents and ensure that the use and dissemination of photographs does not violate the rights of any of them.

Getting to know the photographers is also to getting to know how they carried out their craft: the mobility and itinerancy of the nineteenth century, the establishment of the photographic gallery studios, the birth of the commercial firms over and above the

photographer as the unique maker of the photographic work, as well as the teams of workers and the different trades necessary to make the final photographic artefact. Beyond commercial portraiture, which was undoubtedly one of the first economic mainstays of the photographic industry, together with landscape photography and public works photography, we have advanced our knowledge of other disciplines: scientific photography, industrial and advertising photography, stills photography in cinema, etc. The experiences provided through the locality and individuality allow us to weave a transversal, and often universal, reality of what has been, and is, the history of photography.

At the same time, other traditionally ignored authorships have begun to occupy the space that belongs to them within the archives and within history. Vernacular photography is an example, fulfilling the functions of registering and recording assigned to this medium. In fact, with vernacular photography, this has always the case for heritage organizations, forming part of the documentation and personal and family archives of locally recognized personalities who have traditionally deserved to take their place in history (Osorio Porras, 2012). Today, as we welcome other class viewpoints, by vernacular photography we also recognise the domestic photography of social classes known as popular or working class (Perramon, 2014). At the same time, other presentations and discourses have been valued over and above the individual photograph in considering the album not only as a container but also as a specific narrative. Beyond the vernacular photography received or collected in the archives, there is all the work carried out with what has been called found photography – in markets, antique shops or even in skips – as well as the artistic works that have given new meanings to photographs (Antich, 2016; Ros, 2018). We have also seen how heritage organizations approach the search and custody of ephemeral photography disseminated through social networks

which is at a risk of being lost because it is not produced on lasting media or not preserved in its digital form by its creators (Bente, 2018).

The inclusion or not of these familial and anecdotal photographs in the archives brings into question what we keep and what we exclude from heritage organizations. To whom does the heritage we manage answer and who does it serve? Who establishes the criteria for collecting in organizations and on what grounds and with what objectives? Which groups have not yet found shelter in the heritage archives of the administrations – which, let us not forget, are structures created by the governing bodies – in order to assist and vindicate them? (Antich, 2016; Osorio Porras, 2012, 2018). Who has written the story of the vanquished, the history of the illiterate, the history of those who do not speak our language, the history of those who could not take the photographs or could not even appear in them? What do organizations make of the memory in order to allow other readings, not to perpetuate biased readings?

With this aim of reaching silenced sectors, we find the inclusion of other authorships, often identified as collective. Family photography can be reviewed, for example, from a gender perspective (Garcia, 2004, 2008), or from that of a social, economic or political class. Similarly, photographs of oppressed or vulnerable minorities – whether due to their sexual, religious, political or economic orientation – are currently reasons for study and conservation and, at the I&R Conferences, in the papers and experiences presented, we have seen how they are gaining a presence. There have often been other readings and perspectives on the photographs already in the collections, which have been used to explain colonizations, wars, religious and ideological impositions, as well as the history of the vanquished and the oppressed (Alonso, 2014; Alsvik, 2018; Boadas, 2016; Calle, 2018; Martinez, 2014; Mathe, 2014, etc.).

All these questions have opened up lines of interpretation that have moved away from merely personal authorship to talk more about genealogies, placing photography, not as an isolated artefact, but one always within a context. We are gradually approaching visual studies, a discipline that is still too little known and little applied in our field, despite having extensive bibliography and tradition in Europe (Pieroni, 2012).

We have also been moving on from photography as an object in itself towards a more holistic view of photographic heritage. Thirty years ago it was common to refuse the admission of registration books or lists, essential for placing the photograph in its context and for having topical and chronological dating, together with other associated data. We have lost precious information that we are only recovering very slowly with great research efforts. Fortunately, the memory of this now dismays us and surely those starting out in this world of photographic heritage cannot understand how it is that negatives, cameras or correspondence were refused admission to the photographic collections of individuals or entities. We perceive ourselves more from the collective and less from an individual standpoint, and this benefits us in all areas, as we see when we talk about the people who work in the organisation and how we carry that work out. Starting from the photographs in the holdings and collections, we have paid attention to the related documentation, we have been unravelling the thread regarding containers, cameras, personal documentation of the photographer, equipment and accessories, technical documentation, advertising, rates, etc. Today, we already have major collections that by themselves explain the craft of the photographer, the path of the photographic industry from manufacturing to distribution and marketing, the dynamics that make amateur photography possible, and the stagings where photography is shown, either publicly or in private environments (Corcy, 2004; Foix, 2018; Harvey, 2004). Collections that, with the diversity of their

objects, contextualize photographic artefacts and also the images captured at any point. Technology conditions what we say, how we say it and who we say it to. The materiality of the photograph (in terms of the taking of the photograph, its processing, visualization and dissemination) conditions its content, its message, as with the other modes of communication. The materiality of photography encompasses much more than the copy, the negative or the camera itself, tied in with a physical and material dimension of culture that brings us closer to new perspectives such as the archaeology of the media or the evidence of the different agents involved in the photographic event (Pieroni, 2012).

The I&R Conferences have also been successful in the inclusion of the moving image as a phenomena inseparable from the still photographic image. It has been so since the beginning, thirty years ago, and today it is a reflection of the use of photography in the personal sphere, visible on social networks, in the documentary field and in the press as well as in the commercial sphere, where image banks distribute still photography and the moving image without distinction.

All these changes to what we consider to be photography have been brought together in the new historiography of photography that has been developed. A history of photography born within the history of art, which endowed photography with its own identity based on its artistic values. This identity, connected to and granted by museums as custodians of art, endorsed by academia, caters only to a part of the photographic creations. Many historical photographs have come to us invested with this artistic status because this was the basis on which they were accepted by the museum bodies. Other entities to endorse the value of photography were the archives, and in this case they justified the inclusion of photographs in their collections for their documentary value, in as much as they were organizations of memory at the service of the organs government and power, who

write the history of the facts. Paradoxically, the same photograph is at once devoid of its documentary value within the museum, and its artistic value within the archive. The holistic vision of all that is photographic heritage has allowed the history of photography in the fields of science (medicine, astronomy, physics...), industry, crafts, etc. to be retrieved. It has also allowed us to contextualize the photographic artefact more thoroughly (Pieroni, 2012; Riego, 1990; Roca, 2012).

Who Manages It: the Organizations and the Professionals

Although the I&R Conference was born within the Municipal Archive of Girona, it is clear that the photographic heritage is scattered across very diverse entities. Heritage organizations (libraries, museums and archives) are significant in terms of professional practices, guidelines, directives, regulations and methodologies, which enrich the management of heritage photography. Thus, we receive from the museum tradition the valuation of photography as an artefact; from the archive tradition, the concept of genealogy and the treatment of holdings and collections at different levels; and from the field of libraries and documentation centres, the pre-eminent interest in the content of the reproduced image. In photography, these three points of view come together equally, and this was understood when the aim was to work through consensus, achieving conceptual and methodological advances, such as in the Sepia project or Europeana Photography, to name two of those that have made the greatest mark (Klijn, 2004; Ortega, 2002). The contributions made by private collectors, art galleries and other entities straddling the space between cultural promotion and economic benefit, as well as image agencies (Burgi,

2018; Roux, 2002) also play an important and enriching role. Likewise, the diversity of managing organizations have, at the same time, also facilitated and enhanced the holistic vision of what we consider photography and photographic heritage to be. Attending the I&R Conference — or consulting the events published on the Internet — has also allowed us to travel the world hand-in-hand with these preeminent entities. European countries have repeatedly had a presence (the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, Malta, Portugal, the Scandinavian countries, etc.), and we have also been able to find out about first-hand experiences from the United States of America or Canada, as well as countries in Central and South America. The different ownership of these entities (state, local, public, private, consortia, etc.) opens up a range of possibilities in terms of management models that provide examples and experience of adapting to new scenarios, as well as improvement in the processes and the results obtained (Bonhomme, 2000; Falces, 2000; Sosa, 2018, Vito, 1998).

Over the years we have witnessed successive models that have prioritized economic profitability, technological immersion, visibility and dissemination, the reinterpretation of content, etc. Undoubtedly, economic profitability has been, and is, a shared concern. In 2004 David Iglésias exposed a state of affairs in Spain (Iglésias, 2004) that offered very lean margins in terms of the economic benefits deriving from the exploitation rights of photographic collections. Margins that have not improved over the years (Boadas, 2018). It is not just a problem in our field: initiatives such as Parisienne de Photographie, which seemed exemplary, have had to lower their expectations after the severe financial crisis of 2008 (Doury, 2012) and once again resort to public funding a few years later in order to conserve heritage funds ¹. Publishing and press business models have been very changeable in an increasingly aggressive market,

where profits from usage rights are increasingly small and harder to obtain in the face of the growing supply of rights-free images. The image bank, Getty Images, is an example of this. Founded in 1995, it has been swallowing more and more archives: both from small family-managed agencies as well as large image banks and agencies. The balance of thirty years ago no longer exists, the rules of the game for participating in this market are not decided in the world of cultural and heritage organizations, but rather in the world of large investment.

Traditionally, the entity that managed a collection gave a specific character to the process, which conditioned certain results and services, targeting a defined profile of users. Currently, in the new scenario, the majority of users work on the net and this tends to bring about a consensus on the services offered and the results achieved. The platforms on which they are offered have become both an advantage and an impediment in equal part. The cost of being able to compete with the big search engines (Google or Getty Images, to name two of the most popular) both because they are accessible, friendly and effective, as well as for the available results, presents an obstacle for commercial initiatives that wish to position themselves on the Internet. For other entities, cooperation or collaboration are often the only way to have a visible and effective shop-window on the network, as well as to ensure that the images and metadata they make accessible endure and are preserved.

The digital divide that was a concern at the turn of the century, given that many social sectors did not have access to IT, has smoothed over this inequality at a time when smart-phones, which the majority of the world population owns, should eliminate this problem. Nowadays, we understand that digital inequality also includes the quality of infrastructures, the knowledge necessary to manage them and the increasing costs of software, among other aspects that affect, not only access, but also the quality and

completeness of the information and the options for action that this access offers to the different population groups. If you look at it from the point of view of the information producers, in this case the entities that manage photographic heritage, the digital gap affects the technology they can access to manage their collections. A management that includes implementing the digitization of analogue originals, cataloguing and indexing with more or less user-friendly software, access to standardized software that allows the exchange and interoperability between systems, software that allows publication on the Internet, etc. Many heritage entities that ended the 20th century having automated their photographic archives are still absent from the Internet, and others, despite having a presence there, are invisible. In a dynamic of continuous and growing technological change, the fact that we didn't miss the train doesn't mean we won't be thrown off along the journey.

On the other hand, many entities work around this barrier by not carrying digital preservation processes that meet the minimum requirements to guarantee the preservation of images (and their metadata), which is one of the basic objectives of any heritage organisation. These deficits affect the structure of files, the metadata that guarantees the preservation (preferably using standards such as PREMIS) of these files, the appropriate repositories and the processes of reviewing and updating in a field as dynamic and constantly evolving as that of digital preservation.

These difficulties that affect still photography multiply when we talk about audiovisual heritage. We have talked about the success of including the moving image within the framework of the I&R Conferences since the beginning. There have been numerous contributions from the audiovisual sector. Televisió de Catalunya (Catalonia Television, TVC) has been present repeatedly because, despite being a body whose main objective is producing and broadcasting programming, as a public service they were aware of

the need and obligation to have an archive that preserved the content (Conesa, 2012). Alícia Conesa, as head of documentation at TVC, participated in various editions (1992, 1994, 1996, 2004, 2012) providing knowledge and experience in a difficult sector, given the vulnerability and extreme diversity of media used in television, and the need for an active, changing and increasingly sophisticated and expensive preservation policy. If it has been difficult for state television, the situation on local television is, in many cases, shocking. We have a unique audiovisual heritage, generated in the region itself by local protagonists, primary sources that tell us about our closest history, but yet we cannot guarantee its durability (Saavedra, 2010).

The digitization, not only of the content, but also of the processes of recording, writing, editing, postproduction and broadcasting, became a must in the dynamic sectors of television and the press between the 1990s and 2000s (Conesa, 2004; Vito, 1998). This automation was necessary in order to guarantee the survival of the communication media with the minimum of quality and competitiveness that the sector demands. But the effort that this computerization involved in order to reduce the costs of graphic arts and distribution, and enhance the supply of services, was not enough. The press is still in a crisis situation that is not only economic, although many titles have only managed to survive by public investment or subsidy. This precariousness has led to continued cuts that, although they have been more visible when they have affected editorial staff, have been harsher for internal management services such as archives. It is a situation exacerbated by the competition posed by large websites, such as Reuters, with rates and services that are not comparable to those of an internal photography team, although neither are the results the same. Photographers have been disappearing from newspapers, and the professionals who managed the photographic archives, where they

have been managed in-house, have seen their functions change with the gradual neglect of their own archives in order to deal with the increasing access to ready-cooked reports offered by multinationals at minimum prices. In any case, their management models and the transformation processes they have been involved with over the years have been interesting and in some cases have been instructive for heritage organizations (libraries, archives, museums) that did not take the concept of profitability – economic or otherwise – into account in their objectives. In addition, the communication media crisis has affected the photographic archives that occasionally provided them with content.

In recent years we have seen economic crises happening one after another, creating situations that also force us to rethink our work and management methodologies in order to take into account new economic, political, social, technological and climatic realities. In an increasingly globalised environment, cooperation and collaboration allow us to grow, but they also make us aware – or should do – of the most disadvantaged areas and groups, inside and outside our borders. Ethics should spearhead the management models of our organization, answering the question of why, over and above the question of what we do or how we do it (Boadas, 2016; Edmonson, 2004).

Because the organizations are, after all, people at the service of people. When we talk about an organization, we often refer to the professionals who carry out the technical and documentary processes that make access to photographs possible. Specialization and, at the same time, the diversity of professional profiles is a constant in this field. Archivists, museologists, librarians, documentarians, historians, archaeologists, anthropologists, exhibition curators, restorers-conservators, photographers, computer engineers, etc. The management of photographic heritage needs all these professionals and it also needs, in particular, good managers

(Boadas, 2018). The I&R Conferences have been the witness and plaintiff for the specialization of those who manage photographic heritage.

Conference after conference, we have had workshops for finding out about the diversity of existing photographic artefacts led by the leading experts in photography identification and conservation from all over the world: it is obvious that we need to know what we manage. It has been the answer to an evident need and, at the same time, a luxury for all attendees. In this same volume, Àngela Gallego explains this to us and argues it from the point of view of her expertise, but as a layperson in restoration and conservation, I can confirm what a privilege it has been to be able to learn about this specialization from the hand of the great masters, so necessary for us managing photographic heritage.

Since the end of the last century, and increasingly nowadays, these photographic artefacts have been digital which, despite sharing many characteristics with other digital objects within the information society, have peculiarities that we need to discover. At the I&R conferences we have also had specialists in this area, from home and abroad, always with the will, if not to get us ahead of ourselves, at least to tell us what direction we are heading in. It is developed later by David Iglésias, who is a reference in this field for his knowledge and for his pedagogical work which has facilitated our understanding and introduction – surely too timidly, too slow – in this environment. Technology, in a digital scenario, soaks up all technical processes: from the reception of holdings and collections, the digitization of chemically-produced photographs, the admission of digital files, the cataloguing and indexing, preservation, dissemination and the management of cycles and interactions. This transversality affects not only the photographs themselves, but also how and where we manage and process them. Communication is no longer between the organization and users, it is an interaction

between systems, and understanding – communication languages and the situations and devices on which the game is played – are those of the digital sphere.

How We Manage It: Why? For Whom?

Traditionally who has managed the photographic heritage has dictated how it is managed. We need to think more about for whom we manage it: a management geared towards the user, as proposed by the OAIS (Open Archival Information System) model. From the moment of entry or creation of the photographic archive within the entity, we must bear in mind why and for whom we will invest resources in preserving and giving access.

Perhaps it is also time to face the fact that many of the heritage collections we have in our organizations did not enter the archives through reasoned and planned acquisition processes, may not meet the entity's collection criteria – if they existed – or respond to the interests of other types. Now it is necessary, sooner rather than later, to review these collections and check that they conform to our collection policy before we invest resources in technical and documentary processes that are not relevant. The evaluation and trimming of the collections we manage is a subject overdue in many organizations. We should grow our collections in quality, even when this involves decreasing them in quantity (Pérez, 1996; Álvarez, 2012). We have said before that it is obvious that we need to know what we manage, referring to the nature of the photographic artefacts we keep, but it is equally necessary to know the quantitative volume of these artefacts. We continue to lack the inventories and records that make careful planning possible, an endemic need that, despite some progress, is still to be resolved (Boadas, 2018; Vicente, 1990).

Photographic heritage management is not an exact science, but it must be carried out with a scientific methodology and rigour. Not only do we work with digital items (digitally generated or digitized) but we do so in a digital environment. Our users, when we talk about heritage, are usually from outside our organizations, and today this means they are on the web. The Internet has long ceased to be a cluster of motorways going from place to place, and has become a meeting point and, therefore, mutual understanding is obligatory. Interoperability, metadata, the semantic web, etc. cannot be alien concepts for us because they are the path to our users; probably the only path with a future. In this same volume, David Iglésias deals with the most technical and technological aspects that allow us to act and interact in the digital environment, while in this chapter, we will discuss the more methodological aspects in terms of intellectual processes that we export to the digital environment. We will see how the intellectual processes typical of cataloguing or indexing have also been affected by the new digital situation and therefore must be reviewed and updated.

If we focus management towards our users, and not just towards ourselves, we will see ourselves side-by-side with the other organizations our users access in search of heritage photographs. And through this sectoral view, we will see the different problems we find ourselves in (Klijn, 2004; Ortega, 2002b; Truyen, 2016): entities from different fields (museums, archives, libraries, etc.), with different volumes of collections and with different amounts of economic and human resources, a diversity of photographic artefacts, a diversity of software used, a diversity of topics addressed and a diversity of interests and objectives.

The coming together of entities from the various fields that manage heritage photography has meant the use of the different standards belonging to each. Thus, traditionally, archives have worked with ISAD and ISAAR (CPF) standards for the description of documents

and for records of authorship relating to institutions, people and families, respectively. Libraries had AACR standards. In museums, with a lower degree of standardization, CDWA, VRA Core Categories and Spectrum stand out, to cite some of the most used. In the 1990s, these data content standards generated their corresponding data structure standards in XML schemas in order to allow the publication, exchange and use of information on the Internet. In the archival field, the EAD standard was adopted; in the field of library science, the MARC format in its XML version; and in the museum field, the LIDO format has ended up prevailing. Also in the 1990s, the Dublin Core schema was developed to try to harmonize the different existing metadata models and facilitate the interoperability of systems. The basic standards, however, were created based on the reality prior to the new digital situation and successive versions have been including adaptations to the resources, formats and objects belonging to the digital field. This has generated conceptual models that, despite wanting to reach the various documentary, heritage and so-called memory environments, have seen different versions created according to the field: in the museum, the CIDOC-CRM model (promoted by ICOM in 1994); in library science, the FRBR model (promoted by ifla in 1997), and in archive field, the RIC-CM model (promoted by the ICA, in 2016); all of them with the aim of improving accessibility to the information and knowledge of cultural heritage in a context where it is assumed that dissemination should not be carried out on an individual basis but through collaboration and cooperation. Europeana was born with this objective and has become a catalyst to mobilize resources and provide a technological infrastructure that enables the publication of content through interlinked structured data (Linked Open Data), which makes what we know as the semantic web possible. This is structured through repositories configured using the OAI-PMH model to facilitate the aggregation of content by different entities. For those

who are not familiar with it, this may seem like an incomprehensible acronym, but it is concerned with enhancing and facilitating citizens' access to cultural resources in an environment of democratic societies that are managing this heritage mostly in the field of public entities at the service of these citizens.

In terms of photographic heritage, the different standards, what there are of them, have tried to adapt themselves in order to delineate it in all its complexity. Notable are the efforts made by the Sepia project (Ortega, 2002). The necessary adaptations made by the different entities to be able to catalogue photographs using standards designed for other documentary formats strain the proposed models and make it difficult for them to exchange data, contributing to the disparity of options. It should be said that if cataloguing is carried out with the consistent and rigorous application of a standard, metadata mapping will be, if not automated and easy, at least viable. Unfortunately many entities do not follow any standards and develop their own patterns, often supported by software that also doesn't follow XML data structure standards, also hindering the understanding between systems.

On the other hand, we find photographic collections of different dimensions – in terms of the volume of items, as well as the volume of resources of each organisation. This fact often conditions the degree of depth or specificity with which we consider documentary processes. Let's not forget the multiplicity proper to the photographic process, which often means that multiple manifestations of the same photograph coexist, which can be realized on very diverse and difficult to identify artefacts, while requiring different storage conditions suitable for conservation (Domènech, 1996; Riego, 1992). In addition, there is the diversity of programmes with different systems for encoding information which usually affect the exchange and interoperability on the internet and participation in collective

catalogues. Undoubtedly, the application of models such as OAIS and metalanguages such as XML facilitate this task.

When we consider standardization with the aim of making a single search directed at different documentary collections possible, to all these more or less measurable aspects and objectives, we must add the problem of indexing. Many of the photographic collection are in organizations defined by their specificity and thematic specialization. It is easy to understand their need for specific vocabularies and lexicons, which are an added difficulty in making the advantages of the semantic web possible. The use of the standard SKOS model facilitates the interoperability of systems but, on its own, it does not solve the complexity of conceptual maps and the depth and exhaustiveness with which we can represent the meanings of photographs. In addition, photographs are especially polysemic, subjective in terms of their reading and interpretation, and are usually denuded of the data that would identify and contextualize what they show. Few vocabularies, lists of subjects or thesauruses designed for images can be found. Astonishingly, we have the Getty Institute's AAT thesaurus, which covers the thematic area of many heritage organizations and has become a de facto standard for its quality and exhaustiveness. The team behind it, who update and review it continuously, and the partnerships that expand its multilingual capacity, make it a tool that adds value to the indexing process.

Regarded as legitimate documentary sources, and not merely illustrative, the analysis of images has been enriched with contributions from photographic theory, visual anthropology, historical methodology, philosophy and social studies, without forgetting museography and archival methodology (Pieroni, 2012; Riego, 1990; Roca, 2012). These new disciplinary contributions have also been enriched by new points of view and ideological positions, such as feminism and decolonialism, as well as views critical of

Eurocentrism, capitalism and Westernism regarding issues of gender, race or class. This debate not only affects how we read, interpret and index images, it also conditions the language and vocabularies we use in information systems. We talked about this in the first part of this text when we reflected on what we keep in our archives and for whom. But it also questions how we store it, how we disseminate it, how we mediate between the content and our users in order to facilitate access to it by all the people we serve, whatever their status or ideology. It is obvious that what we are saying involves the review and re-indexation of our collections, as well as the revision and modification of the indexing vocabularies we use.

These methodological issues particularly affect the results obtained by users, since their searches are carried out on the information system that supports our catalogue. In a scenario where searches are carried out over the Internet, the elimination of the intermediary is the norm; the help of a professional – archivist, librarian, etc. – is non-existent or not immediately available, which is almost the same thing. Although we have digitized images, description and textual access points are the key to the visibility or invisibility of our collection. To these information systems, we must add the management and conservation of metadata that will guarantee the functionality and preservation of the catalogue itself and, by extension, the photographic collection (Osorio Alarcón, 2018). It is no exaggeration to say that the catalogue is the axis around which the conservation and use of our photographic archive pivots. The cost of good-quality records is high, as they largely depend on human effort, on who creates them, and it is a specialized and slow task. It is difficult, however, to overestimate this cost, because despite having sophisticated and expensive computer systems, and having accurate and high-quality digitizations, the results obtained by a user in their searches will depend on the quality of the cataloguing and indexing done. As Edwin Klijn says: “Although data exchange

standards can establish a bridge between catalogues organized according to different principles and, therefore, can contribute to interoperability, ultimately it is the consistency of cataloguing that determines the success or failure of the operation. A standard of exchange can do nothing to improve the quality of the catalogues” (Klijn, 2004).

The catalogues of thirty years ago have gone on to become information systems that comprehensively manage the entire collection. The digital environment has benefited both internal management and public dissemination, exponentially multiplying knowledge of and access to photographic heritage. Social networks, despite their fleetingness, have facilitated the dissemination and spread of photographs, as well as interaction with users, who also become agents of diffusion with an impact unthinkable a few years ago. It should be borne in mind by organisations that the dissemination we carry out must be consistent with our role as mediators, it should not be an end in itself since, if we become our own clients, it would then be easy to end up working for ourselves – and our institutional interests – and not for our users. If we are in public entities, this issue is particularly important. Montserrat Baldomà speaks exhaustively to us about dissemination in this volume, with an exceptional historical and conceptual review.

Conclusion

For thirty years, we have had the I&R Conference to talk about photographic heritage management. It is undeniable that we have made great progress in these thirty years, but it is also undeniable that we have done so too slowly. We know what needs to be done, and how to do it, but we lack resources, and in the meantime, while waiting, many photographic originals cease to exist. Twenty years

ago the report In the picture was published, an overview of European photographic collections, carried out by the European Commission on Conservation and Access (ECPA). Some of the main conclusions of the study still apply today (Klijn, 2004): the lack of personnel who are qualified and specialized in photographic conservation in many organizations; use of too many descriptive models for photographic materials; existence of many digitization projects – in progress or in the planning process – that have not previously had the documentary processes carried out; and in addition, the level of description of the original photographs is often considered insufficient or ineffective.

In fact, carrying out the various technical and documentary processes for all the photographs existing in our collections represents a totally unthinkable investment, not only economically, but also for the amount of hours of work it would entail. As managers, we must establish viable and manageable projects in our organizations, draft action plans that balance our objectives with our resources, taking into account the magnitude of our photographic heritage. It is not worth us sheltering behind the orthodoxy of regulations and standards of excellence that are not adapted to the urgency our heritage demands. Given the previously mentioned scenario of ongoing economic crises, perhaps we should have the courage to ask how many of us are captaining Titanic, continuing to conduct the orchestra instead of organising the lifeboats. Difficult but necessary decisions must be taken in order to find genuine and viable solutions to the needs of our users. Fernando Osorio expressed this in the last edition of the I&R Conference: “To the extent that this triangular marriage between planning, balancing budgets and updating experience solidly and systematically, the survival rate of photographic collections will increase and the death drive, which leads to a sickness in the archive, will be reduced.” (Osorio Alarcón, 2018). Undoubtedly, all the information and

experience accumulated throughout these thirty years of I&R Conferences should facilitate this coming together of resources, planning and knowledge, which are the key to good management of photographic heritage.

Bibliography

ALONSO FERNÁNDEZ, Juan; PURCET i GREGORI, Aleix. Fascismo, Guerra y Fotografía: la mirada de la nueva España, 2014.

ALSVIK, Anette; CARLSEN, Astrid. Bodil Biørn's photo collection from Armenia, 2018.

ÁLVAREZ MARTÍNEZ, Patricia; GONZÁLEZ RUIZ, David; PARDO NAVARRO, Isabel. L'avaluació de fons fotogràfics digitals. L'estudi de cas del fons del fotògraf Efren Montoya a l'Arxiu Històric de Sabadell, 2012.

ANTICH, Xavier. Fotografia, memòria i creativitat. La imatge fotogràfica i el treball de dol en esdeveniments traumàtics, 2016.

BOADAS, Joan. Trenta anys en la gestió del patrimoni fotogràfic. Una projecció cap al futur, 2018.

BOADAS, Joan; SAAVEDRA, Pau. Illes Marshall, 70 anys després de la primera bomba: el CRDI i la documentació audiovisual del Tribunal de Reclamacions Nuclears, 2016.

BONHOMME, Pierre. Patrimoine Photographique : presentació i objectius, 2000.

BURGI, Sergio. A fotografia brasileira no século XIX e XX. No acervo do Instituto Moreira Salles, 2018.

CALLE, Storm; LACHAERT, Pieter-Jan. Photography and war. German photography of Ghent (Belgium) during the First World War, 2018.

- CONESA, Alícia; FORTINO, Montserrat. Euscreen, aparador del patrimoni audiovisual de la televisió a Europa, 2012.
- CONESA, Alícia. RULL, Imma. La Digitalització de l'arxiu audiovisual de TVC, 2004.
- CORCY, Marie Sophie. Les Col·leccions Fotogràfiques del Musée des arts et métiers, 2004.
- DOMÈNECH i FERNÁNDEZ, Sílvia. La Multiplicitat de fotografies dins de l'arxiu, 1996.
- DOURY, Nathalie. La digitalització del patrimoni: a la cerca d'un model econòmic sostenible. El cas de la Parisienne de Photographie, 2012.
- EDMONSON, Ray. Arxius Audiovisuals: filosofia, principis i ètica, 2004.
- FALCES, Manuel. El Centro Andaluz de Fotografia, 2000.
- FOIX, Laia; PARER, Pep. La col·lecció Miquel Galmes: la materialització de la fotografia al llarg de la història, 2018.
- GARCÍA FELGUERA, M. de los Santos. De Olot a Málaga: la fotògrafa Sabina Muchart Collboni, 2004.
- GARCÍA FELGUERA, M. de los Santos. Investigación sobre una fotógrafa que trabajó en España en el siglo XIX, la señora Ludovisi, 2008.
- HARVEY, Michael. National Museum of Photography, Film & Television, 2004.
- IGLÉSIAS, David. Explotació comercial de conjunts fotogràfics. Estat de la qüestió, 2004.
- JENSEN, Bente [et al.]. Archives and museums collecting social media photographs for the future - Some Scandinavian examples, 2018.
- KLIJN, Edwin. La Catalogació de col·leccions fotogràfiques: una visió general, 2004.
- MARTÍ BAIGET, Jep. CLIFFORD. Portal dels fotògrafs del segle XIX a Espanya (1839-1900), 2016.

- MARTÍNEZ TERUEL, Ricard. *Fotografies Capturades. Quan les imatges canvien de bàndol i de peu de foto*, 2014.
- MATHE, Barbara. *Whose pictures are these? Indigenous Community Access and Control of Digital Archives*, 2014.
- ORTEGA, Isabel. *Proyecto SEPIA (Safeguarding European Photographic Images for Access)*, 2002.
- OSORIO ALARCÓN, Fernando. *Gestión de la conservación en colecciones fotográficas provadas: casos de estudio en México y Latino América*, 2018.
- OSORIO PORRAS, Zenaida. *La confianza visual: los archivos decimonónicos como patrimonios nacionales*, 2012.
- *Reflexiones para el estudio de los archivos fotográficos institucionales del siglo XX*, 2018.
- PÉREZ PENA, Josep; SUQUET I FONTANA, M. Àngels. *Consideracions sobre l'avaluació i tria de les fotografies*, 1996.
- PERRAMON ZAPATERO, Francesc. «Capsa de Sabates», una proposta metodològica i teòrica sobre fotografia domèstica i memòria en l'arxiu, 2014.
- PIERONI, Augusto. *Anàlisi i interpretació de l'obra fotogràfica com a fonaments per al seu estudi i documentació*, 2012.
- RIEGO AMEZAGA, Bernardo. *La Fotografía como fuente de la historia contemporánea : las dificultades de una evidencia*, 1990.
- *Una multitud de procesos denominados «fotografía»*, 1992.
- ROCA, Lourdes; RUSSELL GREEN, Andrew. *Huellas de luz. Reflexiones metodológicas sobre investigación con imágenes y patrimonio*, 2012.
- RODRÍGUEZ MOLINA, María José; SANCHIS ALFONSO, José Ramón. *Los fotógrafos de España en los anuarios y guías comerciales (1851-1936)*, 2012.
- ROMER, Grant B. *Què va ser la fotografia*, 2008.
- ROS NICOLAU, Josep. *Pràctiques artístiques i arxius d'imatges. Nous usos de fons i col·leccions fotogràfiques*, 2018.

- ROUX, Dominique. La Galeria del Chateau d'Eau de Toulouse, 2002.
- SAAVEDRA, Pau. L'Observatori Permanent d'Arxius i Televisions Locals (OPATL): un projecte de cooperació, 2010.
- SOSA, Daniel. Misión y objetivos del Centro de Fotografía de Montevideo (CDF), 2018.
- TRUYEN, Fred; IGLÉSIAS, David. PhotoConsortium, International Consortium for Photographic Heritage, 2016.
- VICENTE I GUITART, Carles. Els Arxius d'Imatges a Catalunya: balanç i perspectives, 1990.
- VITO, Roberto di. Adquisició, gestió i arxivament digital: instruments especialitzats per a l'organització del treball de periodistes i arxivers, 1998.