TITLE

Memory of the World – Finding a contemporary expression for a great concept in New Zealand and the Pacific

ABSTRACT
The paper explores the impact of the electronic revolution on the Memory of the World objectives. It addresses a range of user perspectives and behaviours, including those of education groups, diaspora, indigenous peoples and travellers, all seeking credible sources of information. It considers a range of options for accessing information in nations that are developing, in transition or developing and explores the rapid increase of new user driven alternatives. The paper draws mostly on the New Zealand experience.

MIHI
My greeting in the Māori language.

2008 is the United Nations International Year of Languages. New Zealand has three official languages; English, Māori and New Zealand Sign Language. I greet you in all three.
I also pay my respects to the indigenous people, Ngunnawal, the people of the land on which Canberra is constructed, and from whom it was named.

To our hosts UNESCO and the Australian Memory of the World (MOW) Committee we are indebted to your efforts and energies to breathe new life into the MOW, and in bringing us together at this time for the Third International Conference of the UNESCO MOW programme. To the National Library of Australia thank you for your your welcome and your support of this conference.

Greetings to all my fellow delegates.

Title: Memory of the World – Finding a contemporary expression for a great concept in New Zealand and the Pacific

In this paper I will comment on the MOW programme, especially the objectives, and consider some top down and some bottom up models as complementary activities or alternatives to MOW.
The paper examines the key environmental changes impacting on MOW that have occurred between 1992 and 2008, and are likely to be sustainable into the foreseeable future.
The definition of self beyond nationality is discussed as a potentially more inclusive and comprehensive construct with respect to customer behaviour and motivation.
The MOW logo and the documentary heritage imperatives around interoperative standards, preservation and Intellectual Property Rights are scoped and one model that gives direction to integrating all these factors is introduced.
To conclude a fresh look at strategically achieving the MOW goals in today's world is provided.
Finally the position of the National Library of New Zealand Te Puna Mātauranga o Aotearoa is clearly set out as both a challenge to and in support of the MOW programme.

Comments on the MOW programme, the objectives, and consideration of both top down and some bottom up models as complementary activities or alternatives to MOW.

We can all recall the objectives of the UNESCO MOW programme as set out in 1992 were aimed to ensure the preservation and dissemination of valuable archive holdings and library collections worldwide.

The mission of the Memory of the World Programme set out three main objectives. They were:

1. To facilitate preservation, by the most appropriate techniques, of the world's documentary heritage.

2. To assist universal access to documentary heritage, and

3. To increase awareness worldwide of the existence and significance of documentary heritage.

To generalise, and observe, the programme has been most successful with developed nations such as my own, less successful for nations in transition and a poorer performer for developing nations. It is true the programme started with aspirational goals supported by many countries. It gathered explicit, although sometimes conditional, support from various Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) such as the International Council of Archives (ICA) and then later the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA). From New Zealand two nominations, The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and the 1893 Women's Suffrage Petition, both registered in 1997, have been accepted on the register. Another from New Zealand in the future could be the July 4, 1987 Nuclear Free legislation of the David Lange lead Labour Government. But before that could happen, were it decided, we as a country, would need to form a MOW committee of our own, put their recommendation before government and if that was to be supported, then put our bid before international MOW committees, and subject the bid to their criteria, for acceptance onto the MOW register. Why would we do this now? How would we do this in 2008? How does this advance the objectives of the MOW programme? Does this serve the interests of New Zealand in 2008? And besides it, and several commentaries, are already easily accessible through the World Wide Web and it is already preserved in the National Archives of New Zealand.

Putting our nation through a top heavy, albeit thorough process to place our national print treasures in the exalted company of selected treasures of other nations, may

have had prestigious value over 15 years ago. Today it could be seen as elitist, pretentious, bureaucratic, discriminatory or inadequate. However could be seen as more, in the context of the broader MOW programme objectives. It represents a commitment to the preservation of these treasures, to making them accessible to web users and an acknowledgement of their very existence and importance to the world as documentary heritage materials.

To be fair the MOW programme cannot be more than aspirational and is not relevant to all peoples. The MOW model has come to be seen as the register more than any thing else and as such it has fallen short on realising its objectives.

Another UNESCO intergovernmental programme, the Information for All Programme (IFAP), works in three specific priority areas to focus actions and discussions and to allocate project funding for;

- Information literacy,
- Ethical, legal and societal implications of Information Communication Technologies and
- Preservation of Information

When placed alongside each other it is apparent how these objectives cover generally similar areas of interest to the MOW programme.

They are different it is true, but are both equally essential or could one, for instance Memory of the World be covered by the broader Information for All programme?

In New Zealand the IFAP committee is willing and able to promote the MOW programme. It could do more. It could absorb the functions of the MOW committee completely. That would be more efficient, more effective and more economical. That would be more sustainable than trying to run both groups and having to meet both sets of overheads. Could that work at the international level too?

Fig 1 **MOW and IFAP objectives**

MOW objectives	IFAP objectives
To facilitate preservation, by the most appropriate techniques, of the world's documentary heritage.	Preservation of Information
To assist universal access to documentary heritage	Information literacy
To increase awareness worldwide of the existence and significance of documentary heritage	Ethical, legal and societal implications of Information Communication Technologies

IFAP plays a key role in promoting awareness of the importance of preserving information. It builds the argument that;

Universal access to information is an essential element of a Knowledge Society. Throughout history, libraries and archives have been the guardians of the documentary heritage of humankind. Although in past centuries the materials used for writing underwent very few changes, the last two centuries have seen the recurrent emergence of new media, ranging from photography to digital formats.

Access to and dissemination of information relies, however, on the stability of documents and the retrievability of their content. Paradoxically, technical developments often result in greater instability and shorter lifespans of documents. For example, the clay tablets of Mesopotamia can last further millennia, but audiovisual documents will only survive for decades, and the life of digital objects, on average, will not exceed ten years. In addition, natural disasters and wars frequently destroy entire archival and library collections. The preservation of the world's legacy of knowledge is a prerequisite for universal access and will greatly impact the extent to which Knowledge Societies develop.

IFAP has a key part to play in promoting awareness of the importance of preserving information. It can assist by supporting the development of preservation standards and management tools, and by strengthening the role of libraries and archives and the librarians and archivists who work in these institutions. A special focus is on standards for the preservation of digitally born materials; a Charter on the Preservation of Digital Heritage was adopted by the 32nd session of the General Conference in 2003.

However, IFAP is also an international programme with challenges of its own. These challenges are well recognised and have informed the work on the IFAP review. The more inclusive, more comprehensive and broader scope of the IFAP programme has much to recommend it. But, if IFAP were to take responsibility for achieving the MOW objectives today they would need to seriously look at the options open to them besides the characteristically top heavy gate keeping approach of the current MOW apparatus.

This brings me to examining some alternatives that take account of some key practices and learning's of the past 15 years. Consider for a moment the stocks held by, and the processes used by e-auctioneers, e-book sellers or e-music retailers. Compare those to the limited stocks held by smaller, more select main street traders, bookstores or music stores. These e-operators carry vast stocks and may deliver worldwide. If there is a market for their items the e-operators can, and do find a way to serve that market and to connect to their clients. The parallel here is in deciding where MOW is to be placed in the documentary heritage market place. MOW could either be very selective and based on one site only, or it could be built around a distributed model with agreed quality control standards. There are good precedents for this such as Picture Australia and Matapihi. MOW can and would, in my view, be bigger, bolder and better by allowing for registration to be driven from the perspective of user groups. Information literate citizens of the world would then be the judges of what was of real value. This is not an either/or approach but rather a both/and approach that both allows for multiple points of entry onto the register and one that affords respect to all nations, and also to any other communities of interest that peoples choose to belong to as expressions of their personal identity. Such an approach could celebrate the biggest of nations and the smallest of groups. To be under the values of the UNESCO umbrella a register would still be necessary. A MOW enabler tool with a targeted programme based on the Grameen Bank model could ensure that all nations have access to the support necessary to register at least one documentary item of heritage value to them, on the MOW register within one year, two within two, three within three and so on through to 2010, or beyond. The process could then grow to include the registration of items from groups other than nations. Such a criterion, or results, driven investment would need to be funded or underwritten by nations of an empathetic disposition. It could be expanded beyond nations once all countries have items on the register and may be opened to attract other financial backers willing to be aligned to the UNESCO MOW programme.

Another alternative, again with UNESCO support, is the USA lead multilingual and aspirational World Digital Library concept. Although quite new it is narrower in scope than the IFAP model but this too has the potential to carry, or link, to the MOW programme. Its founding identity through the Library of Congress in Washington DC, USA will be seen as an asset by some and a risk by others, but done well to UNESCO standards, and with IFLAs active support, this issue is far from insurmountable.

The World Digital Library is to be developed in cooperation with UNESCO and other libraries and cultural institutions from around the world with the aim of promoting international and inter-cultural understanding, expanding non-English and non-Western content on the Internet, and contributing to scholarship. The project will focus on digitizing unique and rare material and making it available freely on the Internet. This material is to include manuscripts, maps, books, musical scores, sound recordings, films, prints and photographs, and architectural drawings from libraries and other cultural institutions around the world. A key aspect of the project is to build digital library capabilities in the developing world, so that all countries and parts of the world can participate and be represented in the World Digital Library.

"For UNESCO, libraries – be they paper-based or digital – have always played a crucial role to fulfil its mandate to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image and to maintain, increase and spread knowledge", said Abdul Waheed Khan announcing UNESCO's support to the initiative.

The concept of a World Digital Library is aspirational and it must truly belong to, and be seen to belong to, the whole world .

The key point here is that entries on the register retain their own stand-alone integrity, have an easily discoverable place on the register and cannot in any way be perceived to be ranked, rated or interpreted. If funding to ensure preservation and access is the goal then there is much to recommend a perceived neutral portal to bring the MOW registered items together. Alternatively the European Digital Library may be seen as a possible co-ordinator for MOW too absorbing as it has the new nations on Europe or what about a Pacific Portal. The sum of these and any other portals could be the basis of an expanded MOW programme.

No matter what model thrives it will require sustainable funding from at least one or more of the worlds most developed nations, or from the business communities.

Evaluation of the model will need to be regular and must include measures relevant to objectives about preservation, access, integrity and usage.

The issues of ensuring access to the web and of supporting equitable and affordable access to information are as much to the fore as ever. Promoting the development of a multicultural information literate society is still about building capability and capacity. The need for programmes to ensure the preservation of content remains as challenging as ever. Adverse climatic conditions, war, neglect and poverty all contribute to the challenges in preserving documentary heritage while the decreasing cost of technologies, and some very smart sustainable solutions, can contribute to the solution. To make content accessible electronically is often possible when originals no longer exist. Preservation of such e-copies is hugely important and one of the reasons my country has embarked in collaboration with ExLibris on the innovative and timely New Zealand National Digital Heritage Archive (NDHA).

Our NDHA programme is an innovative project to preserve precious national cultural heritage assets for future generations to explore and enjoy," commented Penny Carnaby, our Chief Executive/National Librarian at the National Library of New Zealand on June 6 2007. The ground-breaking NDHA will realize a solution to the global need for digital preservation technologies, acknowledged by New Zealand's own Digital Content Strategy, by working with Ex Libris Group to the benefit of the international library community. This will be commercially available as an end-to-end trusted digital preservation system and would contribute to all three off the MOW objectives.

Key environmental changes (1992 and 2008), sustainability and identiy.

What is clear now in 2008 is that the environment in which the MOW programme of 1992 was launched has now changed vastly. Internet and web connectivity is now the defining feature of the age. Compact discs are nearly extinct in developed countries and fading fast elsewhere. Several countries have disappeared and new ones have been created. Electronically born, and e-copied, content has grown exponentially and continues to do so. The proprietary software industry has reinvented itself several times already and in doing so has set the scene for the rise of new open source software solutions. The politics of the Cold War have been replaced by the social and economic revolutions of the Dancing Elephant in India

and the Hungry Dragon in China. Borderless businesses are reshaping the world, making what we wear, changing where our bills come from and reformatting what we have outsourced to read. In Korea digital multimedia broadcast (DMB) cell phones point the way to a hand-held connected world and iPods are here, at least for the moment.

Over the past decade we recognise even more the need for greater inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue to promote peace and non-violence, thereby contributing to our wider regional and international security objectives. MOW can and does contribute to this dialogue when my machine can open it.

One of the biggest changes in these 15 years has been the recognition that our planet is more fragile than we thought. The first Digital Earth Summit focused specifically on sustainability. An international team of government, business, academic, and citizen leaders convened that Summit in August 2006, in Auckland, New Zealand. It was a scientific gathering focussed on long-term survival and how technology and the data it provides can best be applied to achieve sustainability in all sectors of society and the environment. That seems to me to be using the MOW for the citizens of today and the future.

At the World Summit on the Information Society held earlier in 2003 (Geneva) and 2005 (Tunis) civil society and national representatives recognised the importance of the revolution in Information Communication Technologies as a means of shaping the future of the world and as a contribution to achieving the development goals outlined in the UN Millennium Declaration. World leaders decided that a global vision and a global dialogue were needed to build the framework of an all-inclusive and equitable Information Society. This summit also affirmed its commitment to the achievement of sustainable development.

If MOW is to continue in any form it too must address the need to achieve sustainability. My country is committed to walking the talk to build a sustainable future for New Zealand through our govt3 programme. So for us to continue to be a part of the MOW programme that too needs to be committed to sustainability.

Consider also the changing perspective of the individual citizens of the world. Today I can be a citizen of my nation and much more besides. The programme will be challenged to reflect our various gender, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, indigenous and

geographical identities none of which may be uniquely organised by nation, as is MOW in its present form. This represents a design challenge for MOW and again requires that pluralism is embraced to ensure that MOW is inclusive, celebratory, distributed and able to accommodate diversity.

The MOW logo. Documentary heritage, interoperative standards, preservation and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). One model that gives direction to integrating these factors is introduced.

The logo of the MOW is the badge of recognition that is attached to registered items. That symbol does have the power of association with the high-minded values of UNESCO. It does have value in its own right as a piece of intellectual property. That symbol also represents for some the rejection of their highly valued documentary heritage. For others it represents the inability of the programme to address trans-national bids, or the impossibility of having the treasures of minority interest groups promoted through an international organisation based on a the primacy of the nation state. Like any IPR asset this logo must be used to promote its brand. That is to promote the objectives of MOW through whatever vehicle is in currency.

We can confirm the need for international standards that allow for information sharing and discovery across collections and languages such as the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative.
At the National Library of New Zealand where we hold published and unpublished treasures we see a pressing need for a preservation stream of work that can integrate the end to end processing of treasures from galleries, libraries, archives and museums (GLAMs). From the clients point of view our conventions and practices are of little interest to them for they seek information on their terms and want to find it easily. Improved access to information is dependent on best practice across the GLAMs sector, 24x7 online performance and high performance search engines. Nothing less than that will do and the same goes for the MOW programme.

The management of IPR is critical in dealing with documentary heritage treasures. Issues of provenance, group ownership, indigenous rights, treaty obligations and access to approved groups are all factors to be considered when managing the MOW programme. Sometimes materials will not be shared in the MOW environment, for that is rightful owners may exercise, and the need for preservation is just as important. Exploitation, misappropriation and abuse of heritage content are all risks

associated with sharing in an open environment. Informed owners must weigh these risks carefully before their treasures are released into the public, or even into a rights managed environment. Sometimes it is too difficult or impossible to identify the rightful owners of treasures so professionals can, at some risk, behave as substitute owners of IPR. Saying sorry and putting things right is a collaborative experience of a complex nature but it is better than being litigious in my view.

Here I want to acknowledge one attempt to integrate and balance these complex factors contained in an evaluation written by Dr Martin Nakata on the Northern Territory Library's Libraries and Knowledge Centres (2006) In this report Dr Nakata notes the Libraries and Knowledge Centres (LKC) concept, as a model for the delivery of relevant and sustainable information services in the Northern Territory, has the potential to be a key infrastructure element for the Northern Territory Government.s plans for building capacities in the regions and better futures for all Territorians. LKC services, when fully developed in line with the whole-of-government approach, will prove to be vital components of regional development strategies, business development, ongoing education and training needs, literacy and basic skills development, and information communication across the Territory. For this to be realised, development of the Libraries and Knowledge Centres model must be linked at the highest level of the inter-agency coordination processes, articulated as a capacity building agenda, developed in multi-purpose venues and connected with high-bandwidth information communication technologies.

The LKC concept is an innovative approach to engaging with changing community needs for knowledge and information that could become a leading example for the ways such services can be delivered to Indigenous Australians.

What is particularly impressive about this work is that it has identified grass roots needs and capacities that can be integrated to the opportunities afforded through government infrastructure to deliver real decision-making, ownership and power to local communities grappling with issues of self respect and identity. This report on the LKC model is where MOW as it exists today can be truly complemented by an extraordinary empowering partner. The writer, his team and the people of Australia's Northern Territory have made an outstanding contribution to our understanding of memory and how it can be shared and managed. I commend it to you all.

To conclude: strategically achieving the MOW goals.

The National Library of New Zealand Te Puna Mātauranga o Aotearoa both challenges and supports the MOW programme.

I shall conclude by returning to the MOW programme as I know it.
MOW has had a fair go at achieving its objectives. The model is conceptually valuable and it should be retained but targets will need to be set to ensure that

1. all nations are represented on the register as they would wish to be.
2. all nations should have entries on the register by 2009
3. at that point freeze the MOW programme
4. and transfer it to IFAP for leadership
5. and make the programme a distributed data base open to communities of all descriptions
6. modelled on best practice
7. and taking account of the Northern Territory LKC model,
8. the New Zealand experience and
9. the IFAP UNESCO .objectives

The New Zealand experience warrants some explanation at this point. It is a consultative model suited to a country with a dispersed population and an emerging ICT infrastructure. The model has the benefit of a whole of government five year Digital Strategy that encourages collaboration between national and local body governments so that we as a country can realise our economic, social, cultural and environmental goals to the benefit of all our peoples. It has an incubatory New Zealand Digital Content Strategy that focuses on the points of view of the end users where we can tell our stories and be visible to the world. There is an Aotearoa New Zealand People's Network being rolled out through public libraries providing free access to broadband for creators and users. An E-Government Strategy, a Geospatial Strategy, an ICT Strategic Framework for Education and a Public Broadcasting Programme complete the current line up. Along with a Creative Commons Aotearoa site and Māori on line AIO are a host of content feeds open to the world. Te Ao Hou, Kete Horowhenua, NZETC, Te Ara the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand and much, much more. These are windows on the Memory of New Zealand and it is growing by the hour.

So finally, in NZ our National Library of New Zealand will continue to watch with interest the debate on MOW and the outcomes of this conference.

We will continue to play our part in the whole of government strategy for the peoples of NZ

We will move a s fast as we can in completing the NDHA for the country. The project is due for completion in mid 2008 and will be operational in 2009.

Preservation and access, hand in hand, in the Library and across the country will be fundamental to our programmes

We will support wherever practicable the requests for collaboration with other countries especially our Pacific and Polynesian neighbours.

I thank you all for you attention

Conclude in Māori.

References

All the materials referred to in this presentation are web accessible as at Feb 2008.

.**Ina whai mātauranga, ka haere kūare mai, engari, ka hoki mārama atu.**

When seeking knowledge, people may set out with dark ignorance, and yet may return with bright enlightenment.