QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Country: The Netherlands

Organization(s) or entity (s) responsible for the preparation of the report: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sciences

Officially designated contact person/institution: Ms. D. van Norren

Name(s) of designated official(s) certifying the report: Ms A. Groeneveld

Brief description of the consultation process established for the preparation of the report:

The Netherlands Memory of the World Committee and other experts have provided answers the questions within their competence. The Ministry of Education, Culture and Sciences has certified these answers, but was unable to provide answers to the other questions in the proposed timeframe.

REPORTING ON THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS 0F THE RECOMMENATION:

General support:

1. Has the Recommendation been promulgated to appropriate ministries and institutions? (Section 1)

Major heritage institutions such as the National Library of the Netherlands, National Archives and the Institute of Sound and Vision are well aware of the Instrument, as they have actively contributed to the Dutch input during the writing process of the Recommendation before its adoption in 2015.

The Memory of the World Committee has informed relevant experts of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science at a presentation on the MoW programme of April 4 2016. For the Library field, the new Recommendation was presented during a meeting on 'International Matters' organised by the Netherlands Library Forum *Fobid* on March 11 2016.

2. Has the Recommendation been translated into the national language(s) (if applicable)?

No.

3. Has your country created a supportive, participatory, enabling and stable environment for all parties? (1. 1, 1.2, 3. 1, 4. 5, 5. 1, 5. 2)

Yes. The government finances and supports a range of national, regional and local memory institutions. On the national level one can name *inter alia* the National Library of the Netherlands, National Archives and the Institute of Sound and Vision, the Dutch knowledge centre for digital heritage and culture (DEN), EYE film museum, museum Meermanno and the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE).

The Netherlands has a dense network of public libraries and more than 2500 school libraries. There are 11 provincial archives (*Regionaal Historische Centra*) and many archives on the local level.

Cooperation in the management of digital data collections was fostered since 2008 in the *National Coalition Digital preservation* (NCDD). The Ministry of Education, Culture and sciences took the

initiative for the creation of a National Strategy for Digital Heritage in 2015, with which the NCDD is merged since 2018.

The Dutch government has made an additional € 325 million available for the heritage in the coming years (2018-2021). The Cabinet is doing this in order to ensure that future generations continue to enjoy and to experience our cultural heritage. The Cabinet is also investing in culture (in general) and in historical-democratic awareness: this amount will rise from € 25 million in 2018 to € 80 million in the years thereafter.

4. How, if at all, has your country applied international standards and curatorial best practice (2. 4, 2. 7, 2. 8, 2. 9, 4. 2, 5. 1, 5. 2, 5. 5)?

DANS, the Netherlands institute for permanent access to digital research resources, has been closely involved in the development of the CoreTrustSeal certification (https://www.coretrustseal.org). This community based non-profit international organization promotes sustainable and trustworthy data infrastructures by offering to any interested data repository a core level certification based on the catalogue and procedures of the CoreTrustSeal Data Repository Requirements (https://www.coretrustseal.org/why-certification/requirements/). These requirements are intended to reflect the characteristics of trustworthy digital repositories.

DANS is also involved in international collaborative initiatives on software sustainability in science and culture.

5. What consultation mechanisms does the government maintain with stakeholders in the documentary heritage sector (national and private memory institutions, professional associations, relevant NGOs)? (1. 2)

Documentary heritage as a concept is gaining ground with policy makers. The MoW Register and its potential to appeal to the public play a part in that. In the latest 'Erfgoedbalans' documentary heritage had its place, via the subsidies that the Ministry gives for digitisation projects.

6. What actions has your country taken in order to support memory institutions in establishing policies and standards by research and consultation, guided by internationally established norms? (1. 1, 1. 2, 2. 2, 2.3, 3. 2)

The Dutch Digital Heritage Network (*Netwerk Digitaal Erfgoed* NDE) supports the use of (international) standards as a necessity for cooperation. The same is true for Clariah, a distributed infrastructure for the humanities and social sciences: https://www.clariah.nl/

The National Plan Open Science, adopted in 2017, will provide a strong impetus for the preservation of scientific publications and data in conformity with international standards.
https://www.openscience.nl/en

The government supports the participation of Dutch heritage institutions in international organisations like IFLA, LIBER, CERL en ICA where standards are constantly developed and discussed.

7 What major capacity-building measures and policies have taken place within the sector? Is research and training for documentary heritage professionals organized in your country? How often? (2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 5. 1, 5.2)

Legislation and mandates:

8. What legislation does your country have in place to:
   - define the authority, mandate, independence and governance structure of your

national memory institutions? (3. 1, 4. 5)

- guarantee the ability of memory institutions to take unhindered preservation action on documents in their collections? (3.5 to 3. 7)
- promote and facilitate maximum inclusive access by empowering memory institutions? (3. 2)
- support memory institutions providing access to material whose copyright status cannot be clarified? (3.5 to 3. 7)
- ensure statutory deposit of documents in memory institutions? (4. 6)

9. Has government net funding of national memory institutions (in recent years) increased or decreased? By how much? (4. 1)

10. What long term investment in analogue and digital documentary preservation has been made? (4. 1)

For publications and archives large scale funding to digitize and give free online access to the works and therefore preserve the paper version of the title (Metamorfoze/Delpher)

11. What encouragement has been given in the development of open source software and access to proprietary codes by memory institutions? (4.7, 4. 8)

Identification and preservation status of documentary heritage

12. Do ail national memory institutions have published collection development, preservation and access policies? Are there in your country established policies, mechanisms and criteria for selecting, acquiring and de-selecting documentary heritage? What policies have been developed recently? (1. 1)

Most national memory institutions have policies and criteria for selecting, acquiring, preserving and de-selecting documentary heritage. There is currently a lot of attention for policies on these issues in the digital sphere.

13. What documentary heritage has been identified as at potential or imminent risk (if any)? What action has been taken? Was it brought to the attention of competent bodies? (1. 3, 2. 7, 5. 5)

Born digital documentary heritage.

14. What arrangements are in place to protect the documentary heritage from danger? (5. 4) ? Structural funding & grants ?

15. What practical support has been given to private, local and individual collections of documentary heritage? Are they visible in national directories? (1. 3, 4. 3)

Capacity-building

16. What specific steps have been taken to encourage consistency of best practice, coordination and sharing of tasks among memory institutions? (2. 1, 2. 7)

For this work organisations like the Netherlands Coalition for Digital preservation (NCDD) and the Dutch Digital Heritage Network (NDE) have been established.

17. What training schemes have been developed? (1. 5)

18. What is the level of involvement of national memory institutions in international professional associations and networks? (2.8, 2. 9)

The level of involvement is high (LIBER, CERL, IFLA, FOBID, CENL, etc.)

19. Are there partnerships, including public-private ones, established allowing sharing of costs, facilities and services? (2. 2, 3.4, 4. 2)

Yes, like digitisation partnerships with Google, Proquest and Dutch publishers. And with OCLC: https://www.oclc.org/en/home.html.

Memory of the World programme

20. Is there in your country a national Memory of the World committee? If not, what plans exist to establish one? (4. 10, 5. 6)

Yes

21. What recent nominations have been made to Memory of the World registers (international, regional, national)? (1. 4)

There is no regional or national Register; in the last round of the international Register (2017) 5 nominations were added: Westerborkfilm; Amsterdams Notarieel Archief, Wittgenstein Papers, Aletta Jacobs Archive, Panji-tales.

22. Are there any Memory of the World outreach and visibility activities organized in your country enhancing accessibility of documentary heritage? Please give examples. (3. 7)

Yes. The MoW Committee has organised projects to learn heritage institutions to use Wikimedia as a means to give access; to bring all institutions with items on the Register together in order to collectively use the MoW status to increase the visibility of the sector as a whole; and to study and safeguard heritage (the documents of the WHC nomination in Guyana; the Westerbork film).

The MoW exhibition that was held at Unesco during a General Conference some years ago, has been on show in the National Library of the Netherlands.