Minutes of the 2020 General Assembly
of the Swiss Anthropological Association

Thursday, November 12, 2020, 18.00 – 20.00
by video conference

Chair: Ellen Hertz, President of the SAA

Present: Laurent Amiotte-Suchet, Carole Amman, Leïla Baracchini, Bettina Beer, Stefan Binder, Filipe Calvão, Willem Church, Julia Eckert, Mareile Flitsch, Jérémie Forney, Christiane Girardin, Mark Goodale, Claude Grin, Tobias Haller, Judith Hangartner, Ellen Hertz, Andrea Jacot Descombes, Agnieszka Joniak-Lüthi, Lena Kaufmann, Janina Kehr, Nina Khamsy, Olivia Killias, Sabine Kradolfer, Moira Laffranchini, Peter Larsen, Esther Leemann, David Loher, Tobias Marschall, Laurence Ossipow, Johannes Quack, Fenneke Reysoo, Raphael Schapira, Angela Stienen, Jérémie Voirol, Aline von Atzigen, Wiebke Wiesigel, Miriam Wohlgemuth.
Excused: Baptiste Aubert, Sandra Bärnreuther, Attilio Bernasconi, Julie Perrin, Fiona Siegenthaler, Irène Zingg.
Guest (non-member): Anne-Christine Trémon

1. Approval of the Agenda, selection of scrutineers
The agenda is approved unanimously.
The votes will be counted automatically by the videoconferencing platform.

2. Minutes of 2019 General Assembly
The Minutes of the 2019 General Assembly are approved unanimously.

3. President's Address
Ellen Hertz welcomes the participants to this first online edition of the General Assembly and gives a brief overview of the Agenda and of the current situation of the SAA Association:
The good news is the accounts of the association are balanced for now. We still have to worry about bringing in new members and about costs, but for now things are looking good and we can cover our costs with membership fees and what the SAGW gives us. There are a lot of active young people in particular doing things for the Association and that is wonderful, there is a new Interface Commission, there is new head of the Museums Commission, things seem to be moving. But the discipline faces huge challenges in terms of relevance and funding, and then there is of course all of the questions linked to COVID and access to the field.
Current projects of the SAA are: trying to tackle the Data Management / Data Protection challenge, creating a working group on risks in the field, and support for young researchers.

4. 2019 Accounts and Auditors' Report

Christiane Girardin, SAA secretary, presents the accounts and balance for the year 2019 (cf. annex 1): after 2018 that closed with a massive deficit, in 2019 we managed to have, at the end of the year, a small benefit of CHF 5'127.90 by substantially reducing the expenses for administration (secretariat) and for *Tsantsa*, as well as by raising the fees for well-to-do members. This will allow the SAA to gradually rebuild some reserves fo unexpected costs.

The accounts for 2019 have been duly audited by Virginia Suter and Claude Grin who presents the auditors' report stating that the audit they carried out jointly went well and that the profit and loss statement and balance sheet are in accordance with the accounts.

The GA approves by 27 votes and one abstention the 2019 accounts and discharges the Board.

5. Budget for 2020 (final), budget for 2021 (provisional)

Budget 2020 (cf. annex 2): Christiane Girardin presents the final version (last year we presented the provisional version as we did not have the final figures from SAGW/ASSH yet).

Provisional budget 2021 (cf. annex 3): The budget for 2021 also comprises all the activities the commissions had planned for 2020 but postponed to 2021 because of the pandemic. What the commissions will be able to do will depend on the situation, but if planned subsidized meetings or workshops must be cancelled this will not affect the financial outcome, as the budgeted costs equal the budgeted subsidies (+ participation fees if any).

Overview of the figures of SAGW/ASSH subsidies for 2019-2021 (cf. annex 4).

Compared to 2019-2020, in 2021 there are the new activities of the Interface Commission; apart from that, the figures are more or less the same as for previous years. The budget for 2021 is still provisional, because SAGW cannot communicate the final figures for 2021 before mid-February 2021.

6. Reports from the Commissions and Working Groups

a) Audio-Visual Commission (CAV)

As the presidents of CAV are not able to attend, Christiane Girardin reads the report (in French) by Baptiste Aubert (co-president CAV). Ellen Hertz gives a brief resume:
We have an enormous collection of ethnographic films that we have collected over the years, many of them in DVD format, and they are going to become unusable, so the CAV is going to look into possibilities for making a data bank which we can stream from. The Commission is also planning a Summer School for September 2022 for ethnographic film basic training.

b) Editorial Commission – *Tsantsa*

David Loher informs the Assembly that the Commission has been working on two tasks: (1) reorganizing the editorial process in order to guarantee a better overview by using an online submission system, and (2) reorganizing the production, layout and print process by

2

Secrétariat SSE - SEG
c/o Institut d'ethnologie
Saint-Nicolas 4, CH - 2000 Neuchâtel
E-mail Secretariat.Sse@unine.ch
Internet http://www.sagw.ch/seg

Mitglied der Schweizerischen Akademie
der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
www.sagw.ch

Membre de l'Académie suisse
des sciences humaines et sociales
www.assh.ch

concentrating the whole job at Seismo in order to reduce costs. The journal is now listed in the DOAJ (directory of open access journals), the articles are indexed in Crossref and Google Scholar, and articles now all have a DOI (Digital Object Identifier) number. The production of *Tsantsa* is now less expensive, this came with a change of layout and format, smaller and less sophisticated.

The Commission is also considering renaming *Tsantsa* because this title conveys an outdated image of the discipline. This discussion has been going on since 2005 and the Commission would like to decide one way or another. A few proposals were already mentioned, such as adding a subtitle "Journal of the Swiss Anthropological Association", or replacing *Tsantsa* with *JSAA – Journal of the Swiss Anthropological Association* or *JSAS – Journal of Social Anthropology Switzerland*, but further propositions are welcome. The Commission will also revise the wording of the mission statement of the journal.

The discussion will be continued in the Board and results presented at the next General Assembly. Ellen Hertz warmly thanks the heads of the Editorial Commission, David Loher, Laura Affolter and Isabelle Zinn, for the huge amount of work they have been doing for *Tsantsa*.

c) Ethical and Deontological Think Tank (EDTT/GRED)

Wiebke Wiesigel replaced Julie Perrin as the coordinator of the working group. Julie has stepped down but remains a member of the EDTT. Wiebke informs the Assembly that the working group now has eight members, that the article "Searching for ethics", originally written and published in English, was translated into French and German and published in the latest edition of Tsantsa, and that the EDTT continues to present the article in different universities in Switzerland to provoke discussion about topical issues, despite COVID.

For 2021, the EDTT plans a study day initially foreseen for 2019 on "Procedural ethics – what best practices?" that will be held online in March.

In June 2021, the EDTT will also organize, together with Gender Studies, a CUSO module on "Engaging with research ethics through feminist lenses"; guest speakers are Nadja Eggert (UniL) and Holly Porter (University of Cambridge).

d) Interface Commission

The Interface Commission was revived in 2020. Peter Larsen, president, informs the Assembly that membership is growing with people from both inside and outside of academia. Some 15 members meet regularly through zoom and other internet means to discuss collective activities. A major step forward involved the development of a web platform to introduce the Commission and develop activities such as blog posts, workshops and informal exchanges (www.seg-interface.org).

The Commission is preparing a pilot summer school for MA students on the topic of engagement. This is being co-hosted with the Centre for Studies of Society and Culture in

3

Mitglied der Schweizerischen Akademie
der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
www.sagw.ch

Secrétariat SSE - SEG
c/o Institut d'ethnologie
Saint-Nicolas 4, CH - 2000 Neuchâtel
E-mail Secretariat.Sse@unine.ch
Internet http://www.sagw.ch/seg

Membre de l'Académie suisse
des sciences humaines et sociales
www.assh.ch

Ascona and will take place in the summer of 2021. It is also planning a meeting on "Swiss anthropology beyond academia?" to be held in Geneva.

Furthermore, a sub-group of the Commission is working with *Tsantsa* towards having a digital special issue on the topic of engagement. This will be written up and developed in 2021.

e) Medical Anthropology Switzerland (MAS)

Janina Kehr, president of the MAS Commission, informs the Assembly that due to the pandemic, MAS could hold only one event, the MAS Symposium "Caring communities in Switzerland", an interdisciplinary conversation about end of life and palliative care, which took place in February 2020 and was convened and organized by Corina Salis Gross and Barbara Steffen-Bürgi.

The MAS has also been working on several internal issues: a new MAS flyer is in the making so as to promote outreach and new memberships; all internal membership documents and guidelines have been translated in French and English; working relations with French-speaking Switzerland have been extended. As a result of this outreach, four new members from Romandie joined as active MAS members.

The MAS seminar that was planned for 2020 has been postponed to 2021.

For 2021, the MAS is preparing a panel for the SAA conference as well as two events, the MAS Colloquium "The Novel Stakes of Social Medicine" (with UniL) and the MAS Symposium "Health. Care. Gender. Revisiting sex and gender in health and healthcare" (with Swiss TPH and University of Basel).

Janina Kehr will have to step down from the presidency at the end of 2020 and will be replaced by Eva Soom Ammann (now co-president) and Sandra Staudacher is the new co-president.

f) Museums Commission

Ellen Hertz informs that Mareile Flitsch was elected President of the Museums Commission following the departure of Guenther Giovannoni and that the Commission is preparing a conference.

g) Working Group Anthropology and Education

Judith Hangartner informs that the meeting "Dispositive der Selbstständigkeit in der Lerngesellschaft", originally planned for 2019, was postponed and then could not be held because of the pandemic. It will take place on zoom in January 2021.

h) Working Group Risk in the Field

Wiebke Wiesigel explains what lead to building this new Working Group: on the one hand, the obvious concern about the risks researchers incur during fieldwork (violence, health issues, to name a few), and on the other hand, the increased tendencies of universities to regulate travel in general and formalize of risk management procedures.

The working group will look into the following questions: What types of risks are at stake? How are the defined? What consequences, positive or negative, does this formalization have on fieldwork?

The first thing the Working Group will do is a short survey on the policies and practices used in the different anthropology departments in Switzerland. The intention is to draft a position paper that could be used to negotiate with e.g. SNSF or universities, to have a better comprehension of risk and also to make a list of different resources or contact people that could be available for people in difficult situations before, during or after fieldwork. Input is welcome and can be sent to Fenneke Reysoo who heads the Working Group.

The Working Group is also involved in the organization of the CUSO module "Exploring Risks and Vulnerabilities: Gender and Power Relations in Field Research" (co-organized by CUSO Anthropology and CUSO Gender) that will take place in May 2021.

i) Swiss Graduate Program in Anthropology ("CUSO Anthropology")
Esther Leemann reports that the budget for 2021 was accepted and that her salary could be secured so she can continue to do the work as the coordinator of the Program.
In 2020, due to the pandemic, some meetings could be held on-line but most modules were postponed to 2021, which is now packed with workshops, eleven in total.

7. Information on the 2021 (ex-2020) Annual Meeting (TI)

The 2020 Annual Meeting "Re-viewing 'the field': Contemporary debates and approaches to fieldwork", originally planned for September 2020, has been postponed to April 2021 due to the pandemic.

Andrea Jacot Descombes, who organizes it with his Ticino team, reports on the advancement of preparations: If everything goes as planned, the conference might take place at Monte Verità, but in view of the pandemic situation, we may have to opt for a virtual meeting. The organizers will decide on this early next year.

There are 13 panel proposals, Andrea Jacot Descombes will inform the panel conveners right away that the panels are accepted, inform of the format in January and circulate the program as soon as it is available.

8. Discussion on the project "Data Management Plan and Open Research Data"

Ellen Hertz presents the paper she and Sabine Strasser prepared for discussion (cf. annex 5), and informs the Assembly that there is now a very useful collection of links to laws and regulations, Swiss policy papers, SNSF and FORS documents on the website of the SAA at https://www.sagw.ch/en/seg/die-gesellschaft/schweizerische-ethnologische-gesellschaft/open-science-and-data-management
She opens the floor for discussion. The main contributions are:

Filipe Calvão on page 4, point 5 ("Should the same ethical and legal standards apply to all interlocutors and all situations? What might be possible exceptions and what are the grounds on

Mitglied der Schweizerischen Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften www.sagw.ch

Secrétariat SSE - SEG
c/o Institut d'ethnologie
Saint-Nicolas 4, CH - 2000 Neuchâtel
E-mail Secretariat.Sse@unine.ch
Internet http://www.sagw.ch/seg

Membre de l'Académie suisse des sciences humaines et sociales www.assh.ch

which other standards for privacy might come into play?"). He suggests leaving this point out in this paper, as it is controversial.

On data security, Julia Eckert informs on a case in Germany where law enforcement confiscated anthropological data, which triggered a discussion within the German anthropological association (DGSKA) and on the site Verfassungsblog.de about the right to refuse to give evidence – akin to journalists –, which anthropologists do not have.
Her idea is to take the discussion to Swiss anthropologists and other social sciences and address the funding organizations such as SAGW and SNF to support such a motion for legislative efforts for a right to refuse to give evidence for the social sciences, particularly the qualitative social sciences.

Judith Hangartner informs the Assembly that *swissuniversities* launched a call for papers on open research data.

Fenneke Reysoo asks if the authors have thought about the databases generated when using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) such as NVivo, Atlas.ti or MaxQDA.

Peter Larsen supports the idea of a paper not only for the SNSF but also addressed to the researchers on issues like data storage, data security, the preparation of data for open archiving.

Raphael Shapira suggests including digital ethnography and data stored on platforms like Facebook into considerations.

Ellen Hertz asks the members to send in comments and reactions (ellen.hertz@unine.ch), as the matter will continue to be discussed and the final paper hopefully presented for vote at the next General Assembly.

9. Admission of new members, resignations
Presentation of the number of members (496, before admission of new members) following resignations (19), deceased (2), exclusions for non-payment of membership fees (10) and address unknown (2), as well as the new admissions for 2020 (22) (cf. annex 6).
All the members who applied for membership after the 2019 GA and paid their fee for 2020 are admitted unanimously; this brings the number of members to 518 as of November 12, 2020.

10. Elections
Elected unanimously to the Board:
- Ellen Hertz, Neuchâtel, president (reelected for 2021-2023)
- Mareile Flitsch, Zurich (reelected for 2021-2023)
- Anne Lavanchy, HETS Geneva (successor to Barbara Waldis who resigns)

The Board 2021 thus counts seventeen members, as follows:

Ellen Hertz	president	Neuchâtel	2018-2020, 2021-2023
Julia Eckert	vice-president	Berne	2020-2022
Christiane Girardin	secretary	Neuchâtel	since September 2018
Bettina Beer		Lucerne	2019-2021
Filipe Calvão		Geneva	2020-2022
Mareile Flitsch		Zurich	2018-2020, 2021-2023
Jérémie Forney		Neuchâtel	2016-2018, 2019-2021
Mark Goodale		Lausanne	2016-2018, 2019-2021
Lea Helfenstein	students rep.	Lucerne	2020-2022
Andrea Jacot Descombes		Locarno	2020-2022
Nina Khamsy	*Mittelbau* rep.	Geneva	2020-2022
Olivia Killias	*Mittelbau* rep.	Zurich	2020-2022
Anne Lavanchy		Geneva (HETS)	2021-2023
Sonia Mendes	students rep.	Fribourg	2020-2022
Silke Oldenburg		Basel	2020-2022
Véronique Pache		Fribourg	2020-2022
Angela Stienen		Berne (PH)	2020-2022

11. Miscellaneous and Communications

Wiebke Wiesigel informs the General Assembly of the existence of a petition addressed to the Federal Assembly that demands more permanent jobs for the *Mittelbau* at Swiss universities. If you have any comments or reactions, feel free to contact her (wiebke.wiesigel@unine.ch) and of course if you agree you are welcome to sign the petition at https://www.petition-academia.ch/de/start/.

End of the meeting: 8:06 pm

SEG-SSE-SSA – comptes d'exploitation 2019 – Jahresrechnung 2019

Dépenses – Ausgaben			CHF
3.1	**Publications**		
	3.1.1	Tsantsa 24/2019 (PR 2019: 21'000.-)	33'542.18
	3.2.1	Anthropological Theory 2018 (PR 2018: 20'000.-)	20'000.00
3.2	**Manifestations de la société / Tagungen**		
	3.2.1	**Symposiums, congrès, colloques**	
		Colloque annuel 2019 (PR 2019: 20'000.-)	18'007.91
		Colloque annuel 2018 (PR 2018: 20'000.-)	6'666.65
		MAS : Colloque ex-2018 (PR 2018: 2'400.-)	2'045.33
		MAS : Symposium 2019 (PR 2019: 11'500.-)	9'514.35
		MAS : Colloque 2019 (PR 2019: 2'300.-)	2'300.00
		CAV : Panel 2019 (PR 2019: 1200.-)	1'641.97
	3.2.2	**Commissions : défraiements**	
		MAS : frais	148.25
		GRED : frais	68.00
3.5	**Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles (FS 2019: 9'000.-)**		
	3.5.1	Archivage des collections 2019	1'074.75
	3.5.2	Achat de films 2019	7'655.78
3.9	**Informations disciplinaires: Bulletin, Newsletter, étude DMP**		
	3.9.1	Versements pour publications (bulletin 2018) (VP 2018: 3'000.-)	2'568.00
	3.9.2	Salaire Webmaster (PR 2019 Newsletter: 2'500.-)	3'077.20
	3.9.3	Charges sociales	981.27
	3.9.4	Frais domain registr. / hosting seg-sse.ch	94.90
	3.9.6	Etude DMP et Open Research Data	2'700.00
3.10	**Relations publiques, sensibilisation publique**		
	3.10.1	Salaires portail disciplinaire cult-soc.ch 2019 (PR 2019: 20'000.-)	20'000.00
3.13	**Cotisations**		
	3.13.1	A la société faîtière (ASSH)	200.00
3.15	**Administration**		
	3.15.1	Salaires (secrétariat)	18'855.60
	3.15.2	Charges sociales	682.21
	3.15.3	Frais de secrétariat (matériel, frais de port, copies)	658.52
	3.15.3.1	Frais : banque et ccp	224.28
	3.15.3.2	Webling (base de données membres)	765.80
	3.15.4	Frais : séances	29.00
			153'501.95
		Excédent de recettes	5'127.90
			158'629.85

Recettes – Einnahmen			CHF
4.1	**Subsides ASSH**		
	4.1.1	**Publications**	
		Tsantsa 2019	21'000.00
		Anthropological Theory 2018	20'000.00
	4.1.2	**Symposiums, congrès, colloques**	
		Colloque annuel 2019 (PR 2019: 20'000.-)	13'333.00
		Colloque annuel 2018 (PR 2018: 20'000.-)	6'666.65
		MAS : Colloque ex-2018 (PR 2018: 2'400.-)	2'206.25
		MAS : Symposium 2019 (PR 2019: 11'500.-)	9'514.35
		MAS : Colloque 2019 (PR 2019: 2'300.-)	2'300.00
		CAV : Panel 2019 (PR 2019: 1200.-)	1'200.00
	4.1.3	**Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles**	8'730.53
	4.1.4	**Informations disciplinaires: Bulletin INFO SEG-SSE, Newsletter, portail disciplinaire**	
		Bulletin SEG-SSE Info 2018	2'568.00
		Newsletter 2019	2'500.00
		Portail cult-soc	20'000.00
4.2	**Cotisations des membres**		
	4.2.1	Membres individuels à CHF 100.-	26'088.28
	4.2.2	Membres sans activité lucrative à CHF 55.-	3'646.51
	4.2.3	Étudiant-e-s et doctorant-e-s à CHF 35.-	6'329.46
	4.2.4	Membres collectifs à CHF 250.-	5'250.00
4.3	**Autres contributions**		
	4.3.1	Contribution pour l'étude DMP et Open Research Data	2'700.00
4.5	**Produit de la vente de publications**		-314.08
4.7	**Produit des manifestations (participations aux colloques)**		
		Colloque annuel 2019	4'468.84
		Panel CAV 2019	441.97
4.9	**Recettes diverses**		0.09
			158'629.85
			158'629.85

BILAN AU 31.12.20 19

I Actif

1	Caisse	0.00
2	Chèques postaux	5832.49
3	Banque	
	3.1 Carnets d'épargne	19879.71
	3.2 Livrets de dépôt	
4	Titres	
5	Débiteurs	
6	Installations, mobilier	
7	Avoir d'impôt anticipé (année ☐)	
8	Actifs transitoires	24551.28
9	Excédents de dépenses (comptes d'expl.) report de l'année précédente	-19028.57

Le total de l'actif doit correspondre exactement au total du passif

31234.91

II Passif

1	Créanciers	
	1.1 dettes auprès de l'imprimeur/éditeur	
	1.2 autres créanciers	
2	Dettes à la banque	
3	Passifs transitoires	24697.32
4	Réserves	
	4.1 pour travaux en cours (travaux de terrain, exploitations, publications, etc.)	409.69
	4.2 pour futurs travaux et manifestations	1000
	4.3 pour acquisitions	
5	Capital propre	
	5.1 fortune attribuée	
	5.2 fortune disponible	
6	Excédents de recettes (comptes d'expl.)	5127.90

31234.91

Lieu et date:

Neuchâtel le 6 mars 2020

Le/la trésorier/ère:

Le/la président/e:

SEG-SSE-SAA – Budget 2020

Dépenses – Ausgaben		CHF
3.1 Publications		
3.1.1 Tsantsa 26/2020 (SAGW: 21'000.-)		43'500
3.2.1 Anthropological Theory 2020 (SAGW: 20'000.-)		20'000
Manifestations de la société		
3.2 3.2.1 Symposiums, congrès, colloques		
3.2.1.1 colloque annuel 2020 (SAGW: 15'000.-)		20'000
3.2.1.2 Tagung MK: Provenienz klären (SAGW: 10'000.-)		10'000
3.2.1.3 CAV panel 2020 (SAGW: 1'200.-)		1'200
3.2.1.4 MAS symposium 2020 (SAGW: 6'500.-)		6'500
3.2.1.5 MAS Seminar 2020 (SAGW: 2'300.-)		2'300
3.2.1.6 Tagung Bildung (ex-2019) (SAGW: 5'600.-)		5'600
3.2.1.7 GRED Journée d'études (ex-2019) (SAGW: 3'000.-)		3'000
3.2.2 Commissions : défraiements, frais divers		
3.2.2.1 MAS : frais et site web		500
3.2.2.2 CAV : frais		400
3.2.2.3 Comité : frais		300
3.2.2.4 commission des musées : frais		100
Délégations		
3.3 3.3.1 Délégations : frais		300
Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles (SAGW: 9'000.-)		
3.5 3.5.1 archivage		1'000
3.5.2 achat de films		8'000
Coordination: Bulletin, Newsletter		
3.9 3.9.1 Versements pour publications (bulletin 2019) (SAGW: 3'200.-)		3'200
3.9.2 Salaire Webmaster (SAGW: 2500.- pour Newsletter)		3'000
3.9.3 Charges sociales		1'000
Relations publiques, sensibilisation publique		
3.10 3.10.1 Salaires portail disciplinaire (charges sociales inclues) (SAGW: 20'000.-)		20'000
3.10.2 Autres relations publiques: GRED (SAGW: 1600.-)		1'600
Cotisations		
3.13 3.13.1 à la société faîtière (ASSH)		200
3.13.2 aux organisations nationales		
3.13.3 aux organisations internationales		
Administration		
3.15 3.15.1 Salaires (secrétariat)		19'200
3.15.2 Charges sociales		600
3.15.3 Frais de secrétariat (matériel, frais de port, copies, webling)		2'000
3.15.3.1 Frais : banque et ccp		250
		173'750
	excédent de recettes	500
		174'250

Recettes – Einnahmen		CHF
4.1 Subsides ASSH		
4.1.1 Publikationen		
4.1.1.1 Tsantsa 26/2020		21'000
4.1.1.2 Anthropological Theory 2020		20'000
4.1.2 Symposiums, congrès, colloques		
4.1.2.1 colloque annuel 2020		15'000
4.1.2.2 Tagung MK: Provenienz klären…		10'000
4.1.2.3 CAV panel 2020		1'200
4.1.2.4 MAS symposium 2020		6'500
4.1.2.5 MAS séminaire 2020		2'300
4.1.2.6 Tagung Bildung (ex-2019)		5'600
4.1.2.7 GRED Journée d'études (ex-2019)		3'000
4.1.3 Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles		9'000
4.1.4 Informations disciplinaires: Bulletin INFO SEG-SSE, Newsletter, portail disciplinaire		
4.1.4.1 Bulletin 2019 (PR 2019)		3'200
4.1.4.2 Newsletter 2020 (PR 2020)		2'500
4.1.4.3 GRED (PR 2020)		1'600
4.1.4.4 Portail cult-soc (PR 2020)		20'000
4.2 Cotisations des membres		
4.2.1 200 membres individuels à CHF 100.-		20'000
80 membres individuels à CHF 200.-		16'000
4.2.2 45 membres tarif réduit à CHF 55.-		2'475
4.2.3 125 membres étudiants/doctorants à CHF 35.-		4'375
4.2.4 20 membres collectifs à CHF 250.-		5'000
4.3 Autres contributions		
4.3.1 contribution de tiers		
4.3.2 autres contributions		
4.3.3 prêt de films		
4.5 Produit de la vente de publications		500
4.7 Produit des manifestations (participations aux colloques)		
4.7.1 Colloque annuel 2020		5'000
		174'250
		174'250

SEG-SSE-SAA – Budget provisoire 2021

Dépenses – Ausgaben

		CHF
3.1	**Publications**	
3.1.1	Tsantsa 26/2021 (SAGW: 21'000.-)	37'500
	Tsantsa projet de refonte (6'000.-, dont 50% en 2020 et 50% en 2021)	3'000
3.2.1	Anthropological Theory 2021 (SAGW: 20'000.-)	20'000
3.2	**Manifestations de la société**	
3.2.1	**Symposiums, congrès, colloques**	
3.2.1.1	Colloque annuel 2021 (SAGW: 18'600.-)	23'600
3.2.1.2	CAV: Panel 2021 (SAGW 3'000.-)	3'000
3.2.1.3	MAS: Symposium 2021 (SAGW: 5'700.-)	5'700
3.2.1.4	MAS: Colloque 2021 (SAGW: 5'600.-)	5'600
3.2.1.5	Interface: Colloque 2021 (SAGW: 8'000.-)	8'000
3.2.1.6	Interface: Summer School 2021 (SAGW: 13'000.-)	13'000
3.2.1.7	Colloque annuel ex-2020 (SAGW: 15'000.-)	20'000
3.2.1.8	Tagung Museumskommission ex-2020 (SAGW: 10'000.-)	10'000
3.2.1.10	MAS: Symposium ex-2020 (SAGW: 6'500.-)	6'500
3.2.1.11	MAS: Seminar ex-2020 (SAGW: 2'300.-)	2'300
3.2.1.12	Tagung Bildung (ex-2019) (SAGW: 5'600.-)	5'600
3.2.1.13	GRED: Journée d'études (ex-2019) (SAGW: 3'000.-)	3'000
3.2.2	**Commissions : défraiements, frais divers**	
3.2.2.1	MAS : frais	100
3.2.2.2	CAV : frais	100
3.2.2.3	Commission des musées : frais	100
3.2.2.3	Interface : frais	100
3.2.2.5	Comité : frais	100
3.5	**Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles (SAGW: 9'000.-)**	
3.5.1	archivage	1'000
3.5.2	achat de films	8'000
3.9	**Coordination: Bulletin, Newsletter**	
3.9.1	Versements pour publications (bulletin 2020) (SAGW: 3'200.-)	3'200
3.9.2	Salaire Webmaster (SAGW: 2500.- pour Newsletter)	3'000
3.9.3	Charges sociales	1'000
3.10	**Relations publiques, sensibilisation publique**	
3.10.1	Honoraires portail disciplinaire (charges sociales inclues) (SAGW: 25'000.-	25'000
3.10.2	Autres relations publiques: GRED (SAGW: 1600.-)	1'600
3.13	**Cotisations**	
3.13.1	à la société faîtière (SAGW-ASSH)	400
3.13.2	aux organisations nationales	
3.13.3	aux organisations internationales	
3.15	**Administration**	
3.15.1	Salaires (secrétariat)	19'000
3.15.2	Charges sociales	700
3.15.3	Frais de secrétariat (matériel, frais de port, copies, webling)	2'000
3.15.3.1	Frais : banque et ccp	250
		232'450
		232'450

Recettes – Einnahmen (ASSH: chiffres 2021 provisoires)

		CHF
4.1	**Subsides ASSH**	
4.1.1	**Publikationen**	
4.1.1.1	Tsantsa 26/2021	21'000
4.1.1.2	Anthropological Theory 2021	20'000
4.1.2	**Symposiums, congrès, colloques**	
4.1.2.1	Colloque annuel 2021	18'600
4.1.2.2	CAV: Panel 2021	3'000
4.1.2.3	MAS: Symposium 2021	5'700
4.1.2.4	MAS: Colloque 2021	5'600
4.1.2.5	Interface: Colloque 2021	8'000
4.1.2.6	Interface: Summer School 2021	13'000
4.1.2.7	Colloque annuel ex-2020	15'000
4.1.2.8	Museumskommission: Tagung ex-2020	10'000
4.1.2.10	MAS: Symposium ex-2020	6'500
4.1.2.11	MAS: séminaire ex-2020	2'300
4.1.2.12	Tagung Bildung (ex-2019)	5'600
4.1.2.13	GRED: Journée d'études (ex-2019)	3'000
4.1.3	**Activités à long terme : archives audiovisuelles**	9'000
4.1.4	**Informations disciplinaires: Bulletin INFO SEG-SSE, Newsletter, portail disciplinaire**	
4.1.4.1	Bulletin 2020 (PR 2020)	3'200
4.1.4.2	Newsletter 2021 (PR 2021)	2'500
4.1.4.3	GRED (PR 2020)	1'600
4.1.4.4	Portail cult-soc (PR 2021)	25'000
4.2	**Cotisations des membres**	
4.2.1	46 membres individuels à CHF 200.-	9'200
4.2.2	220 membres individuels à CHF 100.-	22'000
4.2.3	45 membres tarif réduit à CHF 55.-	2'475
4.2.4	135 membres étudiants/doctorants à CHF 35.-	4'725
4.2.5	20 membres collectifs à CHF 250.-	5'000
4.3	**Autres contributions**	
4.3.1	contribution de tiers	
4.3.2	autres contributions	
4.3.3	prêt de films	
4.5	**Produit de la vente de publications**	100
4.7	**Produit des manifestations (participations aux colloques)**	
4.7.1	Colloque annuel 2021	5'000
4.7.2	Colloque annuel ex-2020	5'000
		232'100
	excédent de dépenses	350
		232'450

Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association

5 - Budget: SAGW-ASSH Subsidies

Project	2019	2020	2021*
Tsantsa	21'000.-	21'000.-	21'000.-
Anthropological Theory	20'000.-	20'000.-	20'000.-
SAA Annual Meeting	20'000.-	15'000.-	18'000.-
CAV: Panel	1'200.-	3'000.-	3'000.-
Museumskomm.: Tagung	---	10'000.-	---
MAS: Symposium	11'500.-	6'400.-	5'700.-
MAS: Kolloquium/Seminar	2'300.-	3'300.-	5'600.-
Interface: Colloquium	---	---	8'000.-
Interface: Summer School	---	---	13'000.-
WG Education: Tagung	5'600.-	---	---
GRED: Journée d'étude	3'000.-	---	---
Bulletin INFO SEG-SSE	3'200.-	3'200.-	3'200.-
Newsletter SEG-SSE	2'500.-	2'500.-	2'500.-
GRED: disciplinary information	1'400.-	1'600.-	1'600.-
SAGW portal cult-soc.ch	20'000.-	20'000.-	25'000.-
Audiovisual Archives	9'000.-	9'000.-	9'000.-

* The figures for 2021 are provisional.

Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association

Open Science, Data Management and Ethics in Anthropological Research Position Paper of the Swiss Anthropological Association (SAA)

Introduction

Context

Over the past decade, anthropologists, like other scientists, have been confronted with demands from funding agencies, lawmakers and the public to conduct their research based on principles of open science. The movement for open science[1] aims at increasing access to research data and output, and increasing transparency, collaboration and sharing in the research process. These principles reflect different objectives: to enhance replicability and validity of results; to avoid wasteful duplication of projects and infrastructure; to promote democratic access to and influence over the research; and to encourage the dissemination of knowledge to scholars, disciplines and

---

[1] The tendency to capitalize this term, often referred to simply as "Open Science", strikes us as odd and we use the terms "movement for open science" or "open science paradigm" instead.

countries which cannot afford access to commercially based scientific publications and data-sharing platforms.

The rapidity with which this new paradigm has been adopted is a phenomenon worth anthropological investigation in its own right. Clearly, the push for open science is closely associated with social transformations induced by digitalization and the omnipresence of the Internet. While it is generally portrayed as a form of resistance to the privatization of research data, it is more properly understood as multidimensional, promoted by a wide variety of actors for a variety of reasons (for a preliminary discussion see [Wikipedia](#)). European and Swiss regulatory and funding agencies have been particularly quick to subscribe to the principles of open science which, over the past five years, have been integrated into the institutional reality that Swiss anthropologists must understand and work within.

The open science paradigm in Switzerland is broadly based on the 2003 [Berlin Declaration](#) on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, jointly signed by the SNSF, swissuniversities and the Swiss Academies on January of 2006. This declaration contains the main arguments for openness to scientific knowledge and provides a legal basis for open access and open data instruments. To translate these broad principles into national policy, in late 2018 the Swiss Federal Council adopted "[Strategy Digital Switzerland](#)". This strategy addresses the challenges caused by the digital turn, and proposes a "coherent legal basis regarding the legal rights relating to data, access to data and data handling". The document also places national initiatives to harmonize data accessibility with the ongoing revision of the Federal Data Protection Act.

As Switzerland's national funding institution, the SNSF has the obligation to set forth a framework and prerequisites for funding in conformity with the Berlin Declaration. These principles were defined by Article 47 of its [Funding Regulation](#) in 2015. Concretely, Art. 47 requires research institutions and researchers to provide both greater public access to research results (through its "[Open Access to Publications](#)" policy) and greater access to the data on which these results are based (through its "[Open Research Data](#)" policy). The later further requires researchers to submit a data management plan (DMP) in which they spell out how they will make data available to the public, in compliance with the [FAIR principles](#) (findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable) for open data. In addition, the SNSF helps finance [FORSbase](#), a platform for data storage, sharing and archiving for the social sciences that is in conformity with the FAIR principles, and that can assist researchers in the construction and fulfilment of their DMPs.

In 2019, the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences (SAHSS), responsible for a substantial part of SAA funding, also adopted an "[Open Science Policy](#)". This policy applies in particular to the research infrastructures that are supported by the SAHSS, such as DaSCH (Data and Service Center for the Humanities), a data repository hosted at the University of Basel that researchers in the humanities can use to store and archive their publications and data in conformity with the FAIR principles. The SAHSS's open science policy also has a direct effect on the SAA in that it requires our professional journal, *Tsantsa,* to transition to full open access in the coming years[2].

Finally, in October of 2019, the State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation mandated swissuniversities, the Swiss consortium of institutions of higher learning, to prepare a national strategy, or "[Open Science Action Plan](#)", for the period 2021-2024. This action plan, which will focus on coordinating investments in data management infrastructure across universities and cantons, is currently under development, and is scheduled for validation, after consultation with relevant stakeholders, in November of 2021.

Procedure leading to this position paper

In the spring of 2018, the SAA Board launched a debate on the issues of open science and data management, catalyzed by the SNSF's new data management requirements. At its September 2018

---

[2] The SAA Editorial Commission is currently addressing these questions and we will not further develop them here.

meeting, the Board mandated two independent researchers to produce an initial analysis, which was discussed at an extended Board meeting in June of 2019[3]. Through this discussion, Sabine Strasser (then vice-president) and Ellen Hertz (president) identified a series of open questions, which they decided to submit to the central governing institutions for Swiss open science policy: swissuniversities, the SNSF, and the SAHSS. The results of this consultation were transmitted to SAA members at the SAA General Assembly held in Geneva in November of 2019, in a document entitled "[Data Management Framework for Anthropological Research. Discussion Paper of the Swiss Anthropological Association](link)".

The present paper reflects these discussions as well as further inquiries carried out by Hertz and Strasser. It aims to clarify the SAA's position on these important issues.

Key questions for anthropological research

The SAA sees the push towards open science as a welcome occasion to clarify disciplinary practices on a wide variety of issues, ranging from collaborative research to informed consent, from data sharing and protection to restitution of our research results to the people with whom we work. None of these issues is entirely new to the discipline, and indeed, anthropologists have long contributed to fundamental reflections on the politics of research and access to research results. However, new regulatory and legal requirements, as well as changing expectations within the discipline and amongst our stakeholders, require us to take more clear-cut positions so as to provide guidance to our members and to make our needs and perspectives available to policymakers and the public.

There are two principles thrusts to new regulatory activity in the area of data management: the policy push for increasingly open data on the one hand, and legal requirements for increased attention to data protection and privacy rights of research subjects on the other. All experts we have read and talked with acknowledge that these two goals can enter into tension if not properly understood. The most general formula for resolving these tensions is summed up in the phrase that was quoted to us by swissuniversities: "as open as possible, as closed as necessary". The following discussion is organized around these two norms, beginning with what is legally mandated (data protection) and then moving on to what is strongly recommended (increasingly open data).

"As closed as necessary": implications of the "do no harm" principle in anthropology

The cornerstone of anthropological research ethics is and has always been long-term concern for the people with whom we work (on this subject, see the two statements produced by the [SAA Ethical Deontological Think Tank](link) (EDTT)). At a minimum, anthropologists are held to the deontological injunction to "do no harm": they must do all they can to ensure that their research, or even their mere presence, does not do harm or create undue risks for the people they are studying. These risks can involve collecting information about, clarifying the functioning of or otherwise drawing government attention to political, economic or migratory activities that are contested, surveyed or outlawed. In these cases, the data that anthropologists collect is, of course, highly sensitive in nature and can lead to various forms of harm if it falls into the wrong hands. Anthropological data can also involve risks that are less collective in nature but could create harms to the reputation or socioeconomic well-being of individual research subjects.

With the digitalization revolution, the risks that anthropological data falls into the wrong hands or is inadvertently revealed to unwanted publics has become increasingly real. It has also become increasingly regulated, notably through the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation

---

[3]

([GDPR](#)) and, in Switzerland, through the revised Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection ([FADP](#)). Both legal frameworks require that researchers pay far greater attention to issues of data security and protection of privacy. In this section, we will examine this issue by discussing five interrelated questions, all of which require increased attention from the anthropological community:

1. How can researchers best secure their data against third-party misuse?
2. How can researcher best anonymize their data?
3. What are the requirement for and implications of obtaining the full and informed consent of research subjects?
4. How can researchers be protected from legal pressure to reveal names or relevant data about their research subjects?
5. Should the same ethical and legal standards apply to all interlocutors and all situations? What might be possible exceptions and what are the grounds on which other standards for privacy might come into play?

(1) Data security and legal liability: how better to secure our data

Anthropologists have traditionally celebrated the virtues of the pen and paper, and recorded the greater part of their interactions and observations in field notebooks. Today, while the notebook remains a useful tool for recording data *in situ*, our notes are generally re-transcribed in digital form and stored on our computers, memory sticks or the cloud. We also increasingly record interviews in digitalized formats and take digitalized pictures and videos. Furthermore, much of this data is exchanged over the Internet, often in non-crypted format or via non-secured platforms. These practices raise real problems of data protection for the people we work with, and create risks of legal liability for researchers themselves.

The new data protection frameworks put in place by the European Union and the Swiss Confederation apply first and foremost to businesses, and seek to regulate the commercialization of data. They also apply to data collected by governments and local authorities, as with personal health data collected during the pandemic. Because publicly funded research produces and stores data for public purposes, it is not the principle target of these regulations. However, the SNSF's new DMP requirement reflects the fact that, strictly speaking, researchers are legally responsible for safeguarding their data to the best of their abilities. While universities own the data produced by their researchers, they do not own the intellectual property rights to exploit it, nor are they responsible for the methodological and ethical choices researchers make.

Our exchanges with Swiss authorities on open science policy have clarified the instruments for and limits of data protection for anthropological researchers. University servers are considered the safest place to store data, while personal computers, memory sticks and other portable formats are considered risky. It is thus strongly recommended that anthropologists use university facilities only, or if this is not possible that they encrypt data that is stored in other locations. Universities may be partially responsible for any security breaches if they have not fully informed their researchers of necessary procedures or if they have not properly secured their servers, but most universities have now put in place the necessary procedures and infrastructure.

This represents a major shift in disciplinary practice for many anthropologists, and one that requires immediate attention. In principle, university computer service departments can help researchers put the appropriate measures in place, but SAA members – notably independent researchers and researchers in the field – should signal to us any difficulties they are having securing their data.

(2) The problem of "anonymization"

In current anthropological practice, one of the principle tools used to protect research subjects is anonymization, for example by assigning of code names or numbers to interviewees or situations and

keeping the code separate from the data itself. However, as anthropologists have long pointed out, full anonymization is undesirable, as anthropological data is highly context-bound, its meaning depending on the particular characteristics of the person speaking or the situation of interaction. Because total anonymization would dilute or distort the meaning of empirical data, most anthropologists will not and should not pin their hopes on this means to ensure the protection of the people we work with.

The contextual, situated nature of anthropological data is well recognized by specialists active in the area of social science data management in Switzerland. These experts readily admit that total anonymization is neither possible nor desirable, and encourage anthropologist rather to think in broad terms about what good-faith efforts they can make to disguise identities (pseudonyms, altering non-relevant details, creating composites, etc.). The FORS center of expertise for social science research, in particular, has produced a highly instructive study entitled "Data anonymisation: legal, ethical, and strategic considerations", in which it recommends that anonymization be considered along with other measures such as informed consent, research design and access control, to create a general strategy for data protection. Similar suggestions and guidance can be found at Swiss university libraries' websites on data management.

(3) The status of "informed consent" in Switzerland

As mentioned above, the obtention of "informed consent" is another path open to researchers to ensure that personal data is protected. If the people we work with understand and agree to participate in anthropological research, it is argued, they can also control the kinds of data they wish to convey to researchers, thereby protecting themselves. From a legal point of view, researchers may indeed be discharged of certain responsibilities if they have obtained informed consent. As with anonymization, however, these formalist approaches to "doing no harm" do not do justice to the complex questions underlying anthropological ethics.

Currently, Swiss law does not require researchers to obtain explicit, written informed consent, as oral and implicit forms of informed consent satisfy legal requirements as long as they are obtained in good faith. However, current revisions of the Swiss Data Protection Act are moving towards a requirement of *explicit* consent, though not necessarily in written form. The EU GRDP governing EU-financed research tends to be less lenient; it is currently leaning towards requiring that researchers show their research subjects explicit informed consent forms at the beginning of the research process. However, these forms need not be signed until the end of the research process. This complex legal situation is well summed up in a recent paper published by FORS entitled "The informed consent as legal and ethical basis of research data production".

These nuances are of crucial importance to anthropological researchers, who have long argued that consent must be understood not as a formalized moment in time, but as part of a long-term relationship of mutual trust established between researchers and the people with whom they work (see EDTT 2018 "Searching for Ethics"). Anthropology is generally a "hypothesis-generating" and not a "hypothesis-testing" science, based on inductive reasoning and a continual back-and-forth between data collection and problem formulation. Anthropologists may thus find it difficult to present research subjects with a complete description of their research design at the beginning of the research process. Indeed, in some cases formalized written consent obtained at the beginning of this process may in fact violate ethical and deontological norms, as genuine guarantees of consent can only be obtained over time, and with a full understanding of how research questions have evolved, how results will be disseminated and in which contexts. One expert recommended to us that anthropologists insist on and develop the notion of "dynamic consent" through case studies that illustrate the ways in which consent can and does evolve over the course of the research project. The EDTT is to be commended for having already begun this work through studies detailing cases of concrete ethical problem solving by Swiss researchers. In the future, it would be useful to synthesize

and systematize these case studies, so as to help Swiss regulatory agencies understand the nature of the ethical issues at stake.

(4) Relations with law-enforcement authorities

Indirectly related to questions of data protection is the further and largely unaddressed question for the discipline is whether and how anthropologists can resist requests to hand over their data to law-enforcement officials. Anthropologists have a long tradition of studying illegal or "informal" behavior, collecting information that could be of interest to the police in their efforts to control drug trade, prostitution or human trafficking, for example. Anthropologists are also deeply involved in studying issues of migration and asylum, leading them to access information about informal strategies for avoiding immigration enforcement procedures, or about the economy of middlemen and the geography of migration routes.

Unlike journalists, anthropologists do not benefit from a clear-cut legal framework under which this data is protected against law enforcement. The German Association for Social and Cultural Anthropology (DGSKA), in cooperation with other disciplines, is currently initiating a discussion on potential legislative proposals for the right to refuse to give evidence for the social sciences. The SAA is represented there by Julia Eckert. This is clearly an area where the SAA must become active in the future, by contacting journalists and other qualitative researchers (sociologists, human geographers, migration scholars) along with the SAGW in order to formulate a concerted stance so as to protect our research data and our access to people and groups qualified as illegal.

(5) Limits to the duty to protect research subjects?

Over the past few decades, heading Laura Nader's call to study "up", anthropologists have increasingly focused their empirical methods and analytical tools on sites of wealth, power and decision-making. As C. Wright Mills points out, however, studying the "power elite" involves methodological challenges and ethical choices, for the rich and powerful do not easily accept being the object of study, and have the means to intimidate or silence anthropologists who propose analyses that compromise the good image they generally have of themselves. Arguably, the protection of individuals' legitimate interests in privacy and control over personal data should, in these circumstances, be weighed against the public interest in further understanding the workings of power and wealth in a highly unequal world.

Thus far, these complicated ethical issues have not been tackled head-on, neither by the anthropological community, nor by regulators. While studies based on deception can be (legally and ethically) justified in some cases (as with studies of neo-Nazi or terrorist groups), there is little systematic reflection about whether it is legal (or feasible) to go undercover to study more "official" institutions for the exercise of power, such as political parties, corporate boardrooms or boards of directors for major media, nor on what forms of anonymization anthropologists can or should offer the people who govern these institutions. With the formalization of data protection measures spearheaded by the EU, the risk that these questions become further marginalized is real.

Researchers at Sussex University have recently applied for EC funding for comparative work on ethnographic research practice that raises precisely these issues, with a project submission entitled "The Integrity of Ethnographic Research Practice". Ellen Hertz is a member of this research team, and will continue to follow these issues for the SAA. In the medium term, the Swiss anthropological community should ensure that there exist directives on the appropriate conceptual and regulatory frameworks for research involving "studying up".

"As open as possible": implications of the FAIR principles for anthropological data

Anthropologists have every interest in opening up and systematizing access to our research data, not simply for scientific purposes (restudy, validity, historical documentation) but also because anthropological analyses nourish social debate and provide insights that are critical to democratic society's ability to govern itself. Furthermore, the more the public comes to understand how anthropologists come to the conclusions they do, the more legitimate anthropological contributions to these public debates will be.

As mentioned above, our exchanges with experts involved in data management policy at the national level, and particularly at the FORS Center for excellence in the social sciences and specialists in charge of data management at the Universities of Bern and Basel, have convinced us that the specificities of qualitative, inductive research methodologies such as those generally practiced in anthropology are well understood. The fine work performed by the EDTT can serve as a reference on these issues. In [two detailed papers](), they explore the characteristics of much anthropological research that differentiate our approach from more positivist or deductive epistemological frameworks: the dynamic and interactive formulation of research questions; a processual (versus procedural) relation to informed consent and ethics more generally; the co-production of embodied knowledge through long-term *in situ* collaboration, often with vulnerable subjects and often in non-Western contexts, etc.

Rather than review these questions here, we direct our readers to the EDTT papers, and concentrate on the more technical questions raised by data management requirements and the application of the FAIR principles. Below, we discuss three issues that require increased attention from the anthropological community and that can form the basis for requests that the SAA addresses to the institutions governing open science policy in Switzerland. These are:

1. What counts as anthropological data and which kinds of data should be made available to the public under which conditions?
2. What are the FAIR principles and how do they apply to anthropological data?
3. Who is responsible for data maintenance over time?
4. What resources (training, data management assistance) can be made available to researchers to ease the transition to a productive data security and open data paradigm for anthropology?

(1) What counts as anthropological data and what should be made open?

In the initial discussions over data management and DMPs organized by the SAA, we spent a considerable amount of time discussing what counts as "data" within this framework. In particular, many felt that, for different reasons, fieldnotes and personal journals should not be classified as "data" for DMP purposes. Fieldnotes often contain a mixture of personal reflections by the anthropologist and more objectified descriptions of places, people or interactions. Separating the anthropologist's subjective experience of the field from the objective data that s/he produces is virtually impossible, and indeed, not recommended. Rather, the consensus within the discipline is that anthropologists work with "situated knowledge", knowledge that is created not from nowhere but from the point of view (individual, social, cognitive, cultural, etc.) of a researcher in interaction with the world. Situating knowledge production through reflexivity is one of anthropology's primary ways of striving towards objectivity in the research process, as it allows readers better to understand of how the researcher arrived at the conclusions s/he did.

It also emerged from our preliminary discussions that other types of data – recorded or transcribed interviews, drawings, photos, focus groups, documents and material objects – might well be made available to colleagues and to the public, but perhaps only under certain conditions. Clearly, researchers have much to gain by sharing interview material on similar topics but obtained in different contexts or under different circumstances, just as they might well profit from the map-drawing, inventorying and videotaping of their colleagues. The main questions concerned how to

guarantee protection for the people we work with and how to associate these forms of data with sufficient information about their contexts of production so as to make them meaningful for other researchers.

These initial discussions within the SAA were certainly worth having and helped bring out a surprising degree of consensus within the discipline about our epistemological and professional self-understandings. In hindsight, however, the questions they raised do not seem difficult to resolve from an administrative and legal point of view. On the question of fieldnotes, for example, the situation seems clear. Fieldnotes are data, in the sense that they contain and produce information that helps us reach our research results, but this does not mean that they must imperatively be placed in open access. What is required of researchers (on SNSF DMPs, for example) is a brief but well-reasoned assessment of which kinds of data they wish to make available for open access, and which kinds of data they wish to keep closed, or open only under certain conditions (see below).

The experts we consulted assured us that anthropologists can be frank and straight-forward about the reasons motivating the decisions not to make some data available to other researchers or to the general public. These reasons can include protecting one's own privacy, security or personal integrity; protecting the integrity of research subjects mentioned in the notes (and which, because of contextual indices, risk being identifiable); or the fact that certain kinds of anthropological data are simply not useful for other researchers other than for biographical or historical purposes. This is particularly true of fieldnote, which are generally incomprehensible (and sometimes literally illegible) for anyone other than the person who wrote them.

Concretely, the FORS data repository provides the possibility of tailoring open access to individual researcher's needs. Data can be made accessible under certain conditions, after a certain amount of time, or only in metadata format. Interested researchers or members of the public can be directed to contact the researchers themselves for full access, once again under conditions that researchers are free to set. Thus, the purely technical questions of how and where to store data for open access seem relatively simple: anthropologists should address their requests to experts at FORS (or DaSHS, with whom we have had less contact). These professionals can provide advice free of charge before, during and after the research process. Specialists in DM at universities (we exchanged with Basel and Bern) are also supportive in finding solutions and willing to offer workshops for organizations such as the SAA in order to identify and sort out problems in relation to representation and protection of data in particular disciplines.

(2) Application of the FAIR principles to anthropological data

The "FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship" were spelled out in an influential review paper in 2016 and were rapidly integrated into the SNSF's data management framework. The acronym "FAIR" represents the principles concepts mobilized by this framework: data must be *f*indable (essentially through the use of digitalized metadata), *a*ccessible (through long-term secured and publicly financed data-sharing platforms), *i*nteroperable (through standardized metadata that allows for (semi-)automated exchange and interpretation) and *r*eusable (through metadata clarifying research protocols).

As this brief description suggests, the FAIR principles were developed for the natural sciences, and do not apply simply or easily to social science data, particularly that of a qualitative nature. In direct opposition to anthropological insistence on the need for situated interpretation of situated realities, the FAIR principles "emphasise machine-actionability (i.e., the capacity of computational systems to find, access, interoperate, and reuse data with none or minimal human intervention) because humans increasingly rely on computational support to deal with data as a result of the increase in volume, complexity, and creation speed of data" (sited here on the GO FAIR Initiative website). While it is no doubt the case that anthropological data is increasing in volume and complexity, it has not yet, and probably will never be, pooled into large databanks accessible by machines. It thus seems

highly unlikely that a majority of anthropologists will use automated computational systems for analyzing third-party data in the near future.

In our view, the entire FAIR paradigm must be significantly rethought if it is to apply to our discipline. Certain questions it raises (such as harmonization or standardization of metadata) open up interesting avenues for reflection on how anthropological data could be better shared, archived and made available to our publics. However, to proceed with this inquiry, we believe it would be necessary to establish a working group for qualitative social sciences, in conjunction with the specialists at FORSbase and specialized university divisions, whose task it would be to translate the FAIR framework into terms and procedures that could be used by anthropologists. The kinds of substantive questions this working group could answer are: what can usefully count as a "data set" for anthropological data and what kind of PID (persistent identifier) would make sense for our discipline? What does it mean to "describe" a data set, and to make this information "machine-readable"? What kinds of information count as "metadata" and how could this be standardized? How could these standardized metadata be stabilized over time and across scientific communities? What language(s) would metadata be recorded in? Adapting the FAIR framework to anthropological data would also raise significant practical and financial issues (see below).

As these questions demonstrate, we are very far from being able to imagine actual sharing of anthropological data through machine-based activities. To do so would require creating forms of consensus (notably about keywords and terms to be used as metadata) amongst the global community of anthropologists that are currently non-existent. In this regard, the natural sciences represent an entirely different kind of scientific practice. The natural sciences have, over many decades, developed global networks of scientific publications, promoted English as their single working language, and standardized procedures and harmonized vocabulary for the description of protocols and data in digital form. While the SAA is willing to participate in reflections about these fascinating questions, it is unthinkable that the small Swiss anthropological community single-handedly create this form of global dialogue. This would take massive institutional support and extensive international cooperation over years.

(3) Data maintenance over time

Another way in which the question of open access has been formatted by the natural sciences revolves around expectations for the length of time that data should be maintained in repositories. The protocols of the SNSF DMP currently suggest that data should be destroyed at the end of the project, or only kept for a short period after its end. This may make sense for experimental data in the natural sciences, that has no intrinsic interest in and of itself once it has been integrated or compared to larger data sets. However, the notion that anthropological data ought to be destroyed after analysis goes against much of what makes anthropological data useful and potentially sharable in the first place: the historical perspective they give researchers on their research subjects, locations or interlocutors. Perhaps data should be destroyed to protect our research subjects - a question we considered above - but they should not be destroyed because they lose relevance with the passage of time!

Thus, rather than planning to destroy data, we would recommend making them available, as archives, for a significant period of time after the end of the project. Indeed, it may be that given the different embargos that researchers have placed on access to their data, much of what anthropologists wish to make available will only become public years after the project has ended. While the people with whom we with at FORSbase seemed to indicate that this would pose no problem, it will require that researchers make choices about what they wish to make accessible far in advance and under circumstances that will most certainly differ from those prevailing at the time the embargo is lifted. In all of these matters, anthropological researchers will need to be trained for thinking through these questions and assisted so as to ensure that no one is harmed by data made open to the public down the road.

(4) Training, time and resources

The move to make anthropological data more publicly available holds out many promises for anthropologists. These include, but are not limited to, increased collaboration between researchers, increased sharing of hard-won interviews, descriptions and mappings, and increased possibilities for restituting our analyses to the people we work with and to our various publics. However, moving disciplinary practice in this direction is not a small task, nor is it entirely clear that anthropologists would have the skills, time and funding necessary to adopt these new practices in a meaningful way.

What is clear is that none of this can happen without a significant investment of resources on the part of our universities and funding agencies. Anthropologists would need help imagining new forms of research design and training involving digital infrastructures and operational logics. We are aware that the SNSF offer the possibility of budgeting up to CHF 10'000 in funding per project for data management. This is a very helpful beginning, and would allow researchers to conduct preliminary metadata coding of the data they wish to make available. However, the risk is quite real that without a concerted, cross-disciplinary and even international effort to create a standardized vocabulary and common protocols for this coding, these data will simply languish in data repositories, and will be neither findable, accessible or reusable.

We do not wish this to be taken as a rejection of the entire open data enterprise. We do, however, want to avoid that the push for open data become a kind of formalized "jumping through the hoops" that, for lack of interoperability, does not lead to increased access in the real world. These questions, and many more, could be studied in detail in the proposed working group on FAIR qualitative data management proposed above.

Conclusion

The open science paradigm represents a fascinating development, a quasi-revolution for the natural sciences and an intriguing set of challenges to the human and social sciences. The SAA wishes to "join the bandwagon" and continue to reflect on the principles and practices that the move toward open science promotes. We see many interesting opportunities for transforming some of the more individualistic, inward-oriented habits of our discipline. Indeed, a number of anthropologists are already developing innovative models for shared research platforms such as the Platform for Experimental and Collaborative Ethnography (PECE), an open source/access digital platform for anthropological and historical research run by Kim Fortun at the University of California (Irvine). However, we also see potential traps and difficulties for a discipline that is already underfunding and understaffed in comparison to the natural sciences.

From the point of view of the SAA, and somewhat paradoxically, the single clearest benefit of this new paradigm lies not in its encouragements towards openness but in its reminders about closure. With the digital data revolution, anthropologists must thoroughly and urgently rethink their relation to data security, for the protection of our research subjects and also for our own protection. Over the next few years, the SAA will prioritize closure over openness, through training and infrastructure development, while contributing in parallel to on-going discussions on open data.

Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association

Annex 6

9 - Admission of new members, resignations, exclusions

Admissions of new members 2020

20 individual memberships	
Laurent Amiotte-Suchet, Lausanne	Manuel Insberg, Staufen
Stefan Binder, Zürich	Clémence Jullien, Zürich
Stefano Boumya, Bellinzona	Nina Khamsy, Bogis-Bossey
André Chappatte, Genève	Aurélie Netz, Paudex
Willem Church, Luzern	Laura Madeleine Pohl, Wildberg
Geremia Cometti, Strasbourg	Pierrick Porchet, Corcelles-le-Jorat
Laura Coppens, Bern	Facundo Rivarola Ghiglione, Genève
Chiara Feliciani, Cointrin	Anne Lee Steele, Genève
Claudio Foppa, Solothurn	Jelena Tosic, St. Gallen
Nils Graber, Lausanne	Sarah Waeber, Neuchâtel
2 institutional memberships	
Laboratoire d'études des processus sociaux, Neuchâtel	Museum Rietberg, Zürich

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
New members	31	21	45	62	22

Resignations, exclusions etc.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Resignations	19	1	18	18	19
Address unknown	5	0	4	0	2
Deceased	0	1	0	0	2
Exclusions for non-payment	17	1	11	18	10
Total	41	3	23	36	33

Total number of members (new members are included)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Collective membership	18	18	18	19	19
Lifetime membership	10	9	9	10	11
Regular membership	310	285	276	292	278
Reduced membership	63	61	52	45	47
Students, PhD students	129	138	142	162	163
Total	530	511	498	528	518

Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association