

Thirteenth Meeting of the International Advisory Committee (IAC) of the Memory of the World Programme

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris (Bonvin Building, Room XVI)

24 to 27 October 2017

**GENERAL GUIDELINES
FINAL DRAFT OCTOBER 2017**

UNESCO MEMORY OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME

GENERAL GUIDELINES

FINAL DRAFT OCTOBER 2017

MoW Guidelines Review Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 FOUNDATIONS
- 3 DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY
- 4 STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAMME
- 5 MEMORY OF THE WORLD ACTIVITIES
- 6 THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTER
- 7 FURTHER INFORMATION
- 8 CONCLUSION

APPENDIXES

- 1 International Code of Ethics
- 2 *The Recommendation*
- 3 The proformas
- 4 Inclusions and exclusions
- 5 Expanded definition of documentary heritage
- 6 Nominating digital documents for inscription
- 7 Model terms of reference for a national MoW committee
- 8 Statutes and rules
- 9 MoW logo rules
- 10 Questioned nominations

PREFACE

By DG or ADG

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Historical background ¹

1.1.1 The concept of Memory of the World evolved in the early 1990s, following the creation of the UNESCO Sector for Communication, Information and Informatics in 1990, under which had been assigned the implementation of the General Information Programme (PGI) within that sector. The General Conference of UNESCO in 1991 invited the Director-General, Federico Mayor Zaragoza, “with regard to archives, to promote the safeguard of, and access to the archival heritage, through: advisory services on the establishment of regional audio-visual technical laboratories, and audio-visual archives development plans in four member states; the reconstitution of the archival heritage through microfilming.”² The internet was still in the future, but growing global concerns about the preservation of fragile and endangered documents was a contemporary reality.

1.1.2 After consultation with experts and concerned NGOs³, Mayor approved a budget and a working plan for a programme now known as “Memory of the World”, with a focus firmly fixed on preservation. An Experts’ Meeting was held in Paris on 22 June 1992. By the end many elements which give the programme its present shape had been established: the basic tasks of preservation and restoration, the will to establish an International Advisory Committee (IAC), principal partners such as ICA and IFLA as well as partners in the private sector had been identified, and some basic ideas for Guidelines. The idea of the registers, and use of the internet, was still to come, as was the future focus on access. Education and research, as general tasks for the programme, would arrive much later.

1.1.3 The first IAC meeting, held in Pultusk, Poland, on 12-14 September 1993, produced an action plan which affirmed UNESCO’s role as coordinator and catalyst to sensitise governments, international organisations and foundations, and foster partnerships. Technical and marketing subcommittees were established. The preparation of General Guidelines for the programme was initiated through a contract with IFLA, together with the compilation, by IFLA and ICA, of lists of irreparably damaged library collections and archive holdings. Through its national

¹ The origins of Memory of the World are documented in detail in the publication *A First Sketch of the History of the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme: its Beginnings in 1992* by Lothar Jordan (Pfaffendorf, 2013)

² (UNESCO) *Records of the General Conference*, Twenty-sixth session, Paris, 15 October to 7 November 1991, Vol. 1: Resolutions. UNSCO: Paris, 1992, p 94

³ Non-government organisations: the professional associations within the archival and library fields, such as IFLA, ICA, FIAF, IASA

commissions, UNESCO prepared a list of endangered library and archive holdings and a world list of national cinematic heritage.

1.1.4 Meanwhile, a range of eleven pilot projects employing contemporary technology to reproduce original documents on other media was commenced. These included a CD ROM of the 13th Century Radzivil Chronicle, and Memoria de Iboamerica, a joint newspaper microfilming project embracing seven Latin American countries. These projects enhanced access to this documentary heritage and contributed to its preservation.

1.1.5 By the time of the second IAC meeting, in Paris, France, 3-5 May 1995, the concept of MoW had been fully developed. The meeting adopted its first set of General Guidelines and approved their publication. The International MoW register was established (the first inscriptions would follow in 1997) and the tripartite structure of national, regional and international committees was anticipated. The following year, in Oslo, Norway, 3-5 June, 65 countries were represented at the first International MoW Conference, which declared that the framework of the programme had now been established and called on all countries to establish their national MoW committees. The regional committees for Asia Pacific (MOWCAP, 1997) and Latin America-Caribbean (MOWLAC, 2000) followed, with the first national committees appearing in China and Australia in 2000.

1.2 Background to the present edition

1.2.1 The first edition of *General Guidelines to Safeguard Documentary Heritage* was prepared by Jan Lyall, with the assistance of Roslyn Russell, Stephen Foster and Duncan Marshall. Published in 1995, this pioneering document served as a foundation for the subsequent growth of MoW and the values it represents.

1.2.2 The second edition of 2002 was prepared by Ray Edmondson, with the collaboration of Jon Bing, Richard Engelhardt, Lygia Maria Guimaraes, Ingunn Kvisterøy and Dato' Habibah Zon. While it drew heavily on its predecessor, it differed in content, structure and emphasis, reflecting the growth of the programme in its formative years, including debates on the selection criteria and nomination process for the International MoW Register. Among other things it initiated the creation of a Register Subcommittee.

1.2.3 The exponential growth of the program over the next 13 years meant that future revisions of the *General Guidelines* could not be undertaken lightly, because of the flow on effects throughout the extensive MoW structure. However, by the time of the 2015 IAC meeting (Abu Dhabi, 4-6 October) it was clear that the *Guidelines* and the complementary *Register Companion* – introduced in 2011 – needed to be revisited. The 2002 edition was, in many places, badly out of date, and it did not adequately provide for digital documents, which had by now become far more prominent. Further, the profile of MoW had risen, and the long awaited advent of the *Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form* (adopted at the General Conference of UNESCO on

17 November 2015) meant that the *Guidelines* would need to conform to its provisions.

1.2.4 The IAC assigned Ray Edmondson to chair a Guidelines Working Group, in which he was joined by Joie Springer, Alissandra Cummins, Roslyn Russell and Jan Bos, each bringing their long experience of the programme to the task. David Fricker, Vice Chairperson of the IAC, completed the group and provided a link to the IAC Bureau.

1.3 The review process

1.3.1 The Working Group convened electronically in December 2015, and after preliminary discussions, terms of reference were posted on the MoW website in March 2016, with an issues paper being added in April. Between July and October 2016, public submissions were invited and were posted on the website. Meanwhile, in September, the Working Group met in Canberra, Australia to develop a structure and outline for the new edition, taking the 2002 edition as a point of departure. Successive drafts of the text were then evolved over the following months through electronic discussion, which included consideration of the 45 submissions received on-line.

1.3.2 A partial draft of the new edition was discussed at an Experts' meeting convened in Berlin (1 to 4 March 2017). Further work on the text followed, with a final draft sent to IAC members in September 2017, for discussion and adoption by the IAC at its October 2017 meeting.

2 FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 **Memory of the World (MoW)** is UNESCO's programme for the protection of the documentary heritage, a metaphor for its central role for the development, maintenance and further progress of human civilisation. While much of the transmitted legacy of the past is fragile and fugitive, the protection of present and future documents for the generations to come is not a lesser challenge. Both depend on deliberate and ongoing action.

2.1.2 In order to help prevent the irrevocable loss of collective memory, UNESCO set up the MoW programme in 1992⁴ with the objectives of safeguarding the documentary heritage, facilitating access to it and disseminating it, and raising public awareness of its significance and the need to preserve it. The programme is underpinned and guided by various UNESCO standard-setting instruments, most recently the *Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form* (2015; see Appendix 2), hereafter referred to as the *Recommendation*.

2.1.3 The philosophy of MoW is derived from the founding principles of the United Nations and of UNESCO. The preamble to UNESCO's Constitution⁵ declares:

Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed... the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern... believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge...

2.1.4 Drawing on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other instruments⁶, the United Nations Human Rights Council⁷ has drawn attention to the critical importance of preserving archives and historic memory, citing as a principle that *every people has the inalienable right to know the truth about past events* and adding that:

⁴ Draft statutes of the programme's International Advisory Committee were adopted by UNESCO's Executive Board on 29 February 1996 (149 EX/13)

⁵ As adopted on 16 November 1945 and amended at subsequent General Conferences.

⁶ Such as the Declaration on the Responsibilities of the Present Generations Towards Future Generations 1997

⁷ United Nations General Assembly: Report of the Human Rights Council, 12th session, 1 October 2009; <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/A-65-53.pdf>, pages 25 -28

The right to know implies that archives must be preserved [and that measures should be taken] to prevent any removal, destruction, concealment or falsification of archives... access to archives should be facilitated in the interests of historical research, subject to reasonable restrictions aimed at safeguarding privacy....formal requirements governing access may not be used for purposes of censorship.

2.1.5 Over time, however, considerable parts of the documentary heritage have disappeared and are still disappearing due to natural or human disaster, have been displaced or damaged through historical circumstance or deterioration, or are becoming inaccessible through rapid technological change. Moreover, the lack of legislation or policy often impedes memory institutions in countering irreversible loss and impoverishment of the heritage.

2.1.6 The selection of the exponentially growing amount of present and future analogue and digital documents, and their preservation, is a challenge equal to the protection of the legacy of the past. Long term preservation requires methodological cooperation in an international scale⁸.

2.1.7 In its widest scope, the documentary heritage records the unfolding of human thought, creativity and events, the evolution of languages, cultures, peoples and their understanding of the world and the cosmos/universe. It enables intercultural education and personal enrichment, scientific and technological progress and is a crucial resource for human development. It underpins fundamental freedoms of opinion, expression and information as human rights. This legacy provides resources for the future.⁹

2.2 Objectives

2.2.1 The MoW programme has three main objectives that are closely interlinked:

- (a) **To facilitate preservation, by the most appropriate techniques, of the world's past, present and future documentary heritage.** This may be done by direct practical assistance, by the dissemination of advice and information and the encouragement of training, policy development and implementation by linking sponsors with timely and appropriate projects, or in other ways fostering the development of widely available resources in all its forms.
- (b) **To assist universal access to documentary heritage.** This will include encouraging institutions holding documentary heritage to make it accessible as widely and equitably as possible, in analogue and/or digital form, as

⁸ For the 20th anniversary of MoW UNESCO organised the conference "The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitisation and Preservation" Vancouver, September 2012, The Vancouver Declaration, the recommendation of this event, is followed up by the PERSIST project.

⁹ For a fuller statement see the preamble to the *Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form (2015)*

appropriate. This includes publications and products, and the placing of digitized copies and catalogues on websites. Where access has implications for custodians, these are respected. Legislative and other limitations on the accessibility of archives are recognised. Cultural sensitivities, including indigenous communities' custodianship of their materials, and their guardianship of access, will be honoured. Private property rights should be guaranteed in law.

- (c) **To increase awareness worldwide of the existence and significance of documentary heritage** and thereby foster dialogue and mutual understanding between peoples and cultures. Means include, but are not limited to, developing the MoW registers (see Chapter X), the media, promotional and informational publications, exhibitions, prizes, awards, education programmes and use of the MoW logo. Preservation and access, in and of themselves, not only complement each other, but also raise awareness, as demand for access stimulates preservation work.

2.2.2 In its pursuit of these objectives, the programme recognises that "history is an unending dialogue between the present and the past"¹⁰ or, in other words, the interaction between primary sources and their ongoing interpretation. MoW's concern is with the preservation and accessibility of primary sources, not with their interpretation or the resolution of historical disputes. That is appropriately the province of historians, researchers and other interested parties. UNESCO does not enter into disputes concerning the interpretation of historical events, nor does it take sides. It does not necessarily endorse the ideas or opinions expressed in any items of documentary heritage accepted for register assessment and/or inscription. Further, it does not necessarily endorse the content of the nominations themselves: UNESCO's acceptance of a nomination does not in any way imply automatic agreement with its content.

2.3 Vision and mission

2.3.1 Accordingly, the **vision** of the *Memory of the World* Programme is that **the world's documentary heritage belongs to all, should be fully preserved and protected for all and, with due recognition of cultural mores and practicalities, should be permanently accessible to all without hindrance.**

2.3.2 The **mission** of the *Memory of the World* Programme is to **increase awareness and protection of the world's documentary heritage, and achieve its universal and permanent accessibility.**

¹⁰ E H Carr, *What is history?* 1961, Cambridge University Press

2.4 Character of the Programme

2.4.1 MoW is an expert-led international non-governmental programme. It brings together diverse knowledge and disciplines across the memory professions, their institutions and associations (such as those of archivists, librarians, conservators, museum curators, historians and information technology specialists) and reaches beyond them into less formalized and traditional areas of knowledge. While receiving support from UNESCO, its partners and memory institutions in many countries, the programme also relies heavily on the unpaid work, freely given, of volunteer professionals who serve on its various committees and carry out its projects around the world.

2.4.2 Its scope, and its place within the UNESCO jurisdiction, is described in the *Recommendation*. It complements other UNESCO programmes or instruments, especially the World Heritage Convention and the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, and its context is the range of UNESCO and other UN instruments that impinge on the documentary heritage.

2.5 Ethical foundation

2.5.1 The management of documentary heritage in memory institutions is based on professional ethics and best practice. This is discussed in the *Recommendation*, and particularly relates to methods of preservation and the provision of access. International professional associations within the memory professions have codes of ethics that relate not only to the management of collections, but also deal with standards of competence, integrity, transparency and personal conduct appropriate to practitioners.

2.5.2 MoW has its own Code of Ethics to guide members of its various committees and subcommittees in their work. (See Appendix 1 and Section 4.11)

2.6 Definitions

2.6.1 There are three key definitions, as set out in the *Recommendation*:

2.6.2 A **document** is an object comprising analogue or digital informational *content* and the *carrier* on which it resides. It is preservable and usually moveable. The content may comprise signs or codes (such as text), images (still or moving) and sounds, which can be copied or migrated. The carrier may have important aesthetic, cultural or technical qualities. The relationship between content and carrier may range from incidental to integral.

2.6.3 **Documentary heritage** comprises those single documents – or groups of documents – of significant and enduring value to a community, a culture, a country or to humanity generally, and whose deterioration or loss would be a harmful impoverishment. Significance of this heritage may become clear only with the passage of time. The world's documentary heritage is of global importance and

responsibility to all, and should be fully preserved and protected for all, with due respect to and recognition of cultural mores and practicalities. It should be permanently accessible and re-usable by all without hindrance. It provides the means for understanding social, political, collective as well as personal history. It can help to underpin good governance and sustainable development. For each State, its documentary heritage reflects its memory and identity, and thus contributes to determine its place in the global community.

2.6.4 **Memory institutions** may include but are not limited to archives, libraries, museums and other educational, cultural and research organizations.

2.6.5 These definitions are discussed and elaborated in Chapter 5.

3 DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The five main strategies for the programme are set out in the *Recommendation*. (See appendix 2). In this chapter we consider how to implement them.

3.1.2 The *Recommendation* sets out a range of recommended actions by Member States of UNESCO that are needed to adequately identify, preserve, and provide access to their documentary heritage, and to raise public awareness of its existence and importance. Putting them into practice, over time, will involve the shared actions of governments, memory institutions, professional associations, the education and heritage sectors, partnerships and sponsors, software and hardware developers, civil society organisations, benefactors and individuals. MoW committees and other areas of the Programme (see later chapters) will also have a part to play as the tasks unfold.

3.2 Identifying documentary heritage

3.2.1 Today, every country produces vast numbers of documents! The selection from that vast number which might be properly described as documentary heritage, using UNESCO's definition, is a matter of judgment. In the first instance, that judgment is likely to be largely exercised by the country's memory institutions through the choice of documents they select and acquire, document and interpret, store and preserve. It will be exercised retrospectively (for older documents), currently (for what is being produced now) and prospectively (especially for digital and other documents yet to be created).

3.2.2 The process of selection needs to be policy based. While policies and standards will differ from country to country and institution to institution, they can be based on international best practice. Issues to consider are a neutral balance across knowledge fields and between majority and minority cultures and languages, so that no subject areas are neglected, and the conscious inclusion of different types of artistic expression, whether literary, musical, graphical, audiovisual or otherwise. Adequately covering different historical eras may require diligent searching: eras may be defined chronologically, or, for example, by reference to times of cultural, political, intellectual, industrial or scientific change. The further back in time one goes, the lower the overall survival rate of documents. Policy creation benefits from public consultation and coordination with civil society. Not only is it likely to improve the result: it also increases popular involvement, commitment and public support.

3.2.3 Because of their inherently temporary nature, decisions concerning the selection and preservation of born-digital documents may need to be made at *or before* the time of creation. The reality is that many such documents may not wait around long enough to be selected through more mature consideration.¹¹

¹¹ [Reference here to PERSIST]

3.2.4 Some documentary heritage will always be held *outside* memory institutions, in private hands and research institutions, for example. Such custodians should be encouraged to care for their material in the public interest.

3.2.5 A good selection and monitoring process will identify documents whose survival is at risk. Depending on the nature of the threat, international collaboration may offer an effective avenue to achieve the necessary conservation or restoration work. The MoW programme offers a number of past examples of such projects.

3.3 Preservation

3.3.1 **Nothing has ever *been* preserved. It is only *being* preserved.** The preservation of documents is always an ongoing process. As collections grow, it becomes a cumulative process. Prevention is better than cure, but where necessary remedial steps have to be taken.

3.3.2 In the context of MoW, **preservation** is defined as the sum total of steps necessary to ensure the permanent accessibility – forever – of a document. In the **analogue** realm, it may include a number of steps, such as conservation and restoration of the carrier, copying or migration of the content, maintenance of the document within an appropriate storage environment, and research and information gathering to support these activities. When content migration becomes essential, analogue carriers should be retained where they have continuing value as authentic originals, artefacts or information bearing objects.

3.3.3 In the **digital** realm, preservation may constitute a combination of policies, strategies and actions to ensure access to reformatted and born digital content regardless of the challenges of media failure and technological change. The goal of digital preservation is the accurate rendering of authenticated content over time.¹²

3.3.4 At an elementary level, document preservation requires common-sense steps such as secure storage, an inventory system to keep the collection in order and allow retrieval, and – for digital documents – the backing up of files in multiple locations. But over time, and as collections grow, preservation becomes a more complex matter of specialist skills and infrastructure, best-practice ethics and standards, emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction, and research and development.

3.3.5 In this respect, no country and no institution is an island: international cooperation is essential. Technological change has become so rapid, and specialist skills, facilities and knowledge have become so varied that few, if any, countries now have them all. Particular institutions develop specialisations that allow them to service the needs of others. International arrangements between institutions and service providers, and international training courses for practitioners, are increasingly the norm.

¹² Adapted from the American Library Association medium definition of digital preservation (2007). There are multiple definitions of digital preservation, and they merit comparison.

3.3.6 The literature of preservation is large and constantly evolving and includes MoW publications (see appendix X). Professional associations facilitate the sharing of information and training.¹³ Academic training courses are international in character.

3.3.7 Although access to some documents may be legitimately constrained by copyright and other legal considerations, this should never be a barrier to preservation. All memory institutions should have the right to take whatever preservation action they consider professionally necessary to continue the life of an item of documentary heritage.

3.3.8 One reason that member states are encouraged to support their memory institutions is that long term preservation depends on stable public institutions. Stability is not only a prerequisite for public trust: without it, the infrastructure, skills, policies, corporate collection memory and sustaining relationships cannot be built. The most sophisticated infrastructure and impressive budgets cannot, of themselves, provide these essential elements. Nor can commercial service providers who may appear to be permanent fixtures but who, as experience has shown, can disappear or go bankrupt at great cost to their clients.

3.3.9 In a technologically driven world, it is easy to ignore the continuing efficacy of traditional knowledge. Many cultures have long standing methods of preserving documentary heritage which have stood them in good stead and reflect their own ethos and customs. Some solutions, if well designed, can be surprisingly inexpensive and low-tech.¹⁴

3.4 Access

3.4.1 Permanent access is the goal of preservation; without this, preservation has no purpose except as an end in itself. The provision of access is visible evidence and justification of public expenditure on preservation. MoW encourages universal, democratised access to the whole documentary heritage. While perfection may never be achieved it is an aspirational goal. Consistent with the UN *Universal Declaration of Human Right* (1948) and the UN *Convention on Civil and Political Rights* (1966) everyone has the right of access to their documentary heritage. This includes the right to know it exists, and where to find it.

3.4.2 The provision of access has many aspects, and these are listed in the *Recommendation* (Appendix X). They include the provision of up to date catalogues and finding aids, the internet, and outreach activities like exhibitions.

3.4.3 While an on-site visit is essential to gain access to a physical carrier as well as its content, this is often impractical and the avenues for alternative access through communication technologies are multiplying.

3.4.4 Where restrictions to access are necessary to protect privacy, human safety, security, confidentiality and copyright considerations, they should be clearly defined and stated and of specified duration.

3.4.5 The guidance and advice of the staff of memory institutions, such as curators, archivists and other cultural custodians who are familiar with their collections, can be a crucial

¹³ [Ref to ICA, IFLA, ICOM, CCAAA etc]

¹⁴ [Ref to Haensa temple]

factor in accessing documentary heritage which no catalogue can replace. Their knowledge can be communicated to a remote user but depends primarily on personal interaction.

3.5 Policy measures

3.5.1 As declared in paragraph 4.1 of the *Recommendation*, governments should consider documentary heritage as an invaluable asset. While few may disagree with that statement, it is easier to give it lip service than put it into practice. By its nature, it is often felt that preservation can always be put off until tomorrow, in the face of more insistent and apparently urgent priorities. And that is what sometimes happens. Governments need to create a supportive environment for the protection of their documentary heritage. It is much more than just the provision of budgets to institutions: it is a question of enabling and responding to the energies and resources of the many people in the community to whom the national memory matters.

3.5.2 Hence, there are certain measures that governments can take. These include:

- The promulgation of UNESCO normative instruments to ministries and institutions, and their translation into the domestic language where appropriate
- Applying international standards and curatorial best practice, and supporting their memory institutions in this task
- Identifying documentary heritage at potential or imminent risk and drawing it to the attention of competent bodies

3.5.3 It is only governments that can provide legislative frameworks for memory institutions and ensure their necessary independence in preserving and providing access to documentary heritage. This empowers them and sustains public trust in their activities. Other actions can include:

- Updating relevant domestic legislation so that memory institutions are not inhibited or limited in their ability to take preservation action by the existence of access restrictions
- Periodically reviewing copyright and legal deposit regimes
- Encouraging the development and use of open source software

3.5.4 The role of memory institutions complements that of governments who, in practice, must take into account advice, information and the expertise of those involved in the field. What is achieved may therefore be a result of the quality of advice provided to government by stakeholders. This is obviously so in the identification of documentary heritage at risk, the discernment of budgetary needs, the practical application of international standards and curatorial best practice, and capacity development.

3.6 National and International Cooperation

3.6.1 A memory institution is more than its infrastructure. It is a collection associated with skilled and motivated staff who are building and servicing it. It is an entity surrounded by a community of users and supporters. Memory institutions form a global network, and the skills

and competencies which they nourish and on which they rely are represented by a range of international professional associations, many of them formally recognised by UNESCO. It is in these forums that international standards and best practice are developed, that training courses and research projects evolve, that exchanges of personnel and equipment are established, and that partnerships are forged. Governments are invited to encourage this involvement and its two-way benefits.

3.6.2 It is a truism that no institution is an island. The development of international standards is an ongoing, cooperative task. It takes time and effort and may involve travel and other costs to attend international meetings. At the same time, electronic contact and networking with peers in other countries is relatively easy. Participation in relevant national, regional and international professional associations enables institutions and individuals to share in the global task.

3.6.3 The memory professions embrace several academic disciplines, including librarianship, archival science, materials conservation, information technology, audiovisual archiving, marketing and museum curatorship, in addition to the broad sweep of historical, heritage and cultural studies. Development of academic curricula is constant. The use of relevant UNESCO normative instruments as reference points is part of this picture.

3.6.4 The documentary heritage field is one of lifelong learning for practitioners as knowledge and technology continue to evolve. Formal university courses, both online and campus based, are offered all over the world – for a fee. The field has a large literature. Traditionally it is mostly published in English, French or Spanish, which can be a limiting factor for other language communities. At the same time, summer schools and workshops run by the professional associations to build core competencies offer more flexible possibilities, and sometimes UNESCO National Commissions, together with national and regional Memory of the World committees can play a facilitating role.

3.6.5 At an institutional or personal level, informal international visitation builds practitioner networks and partnerships. These lead to the exchange of skills, knowledge and ideas. Some institutions practice staff exchanges. The internet, email and social media help foster these exchanges and encourage personal research. There is no need to be alone.

3.6.6 The need to become conversant with digital technology is universal, but the management of the analogue heritage remains, as does the need to discern where digital records should replace their analogue counterparts – and, just as importantly, where they should not. The digital environment requires strategic choices in embracing international compatibility of systems and standards, access to proprietary codes, and the need to standardise on open source software.

4 STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAMME

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The programme is carried forward by a tripartite structure of committees and support mechanisms in which each domain (international, regional, national) operates separately, but is part of a single network that conforms to these General Guidelines.

4.2 International Advisory Committee (IAC)

4.2.1 The IAC is the peak MoW body, responsible for advising the UNESCO Director General on the conduct of the programme as a whole. It comprises 14 international experts, selected taking geographical distribution into account. They are appointed by the Director-General, who convenes its meetings. They serve in a personal capacity, and are chosen for their knowledge and authority within the documentary heritage field. The Director General convenes the IAC in ordinary session every two years, in accordance with Statutes established by UNESCO. The IAC defines and maintains its own Rules of Procedure. (See Appendix 8 for the Statutes and Rules). It is also responsible for revising and updating these General Guidelines when necessary.

4.2.2 The IAC maintains an overview of the activities of the entire programme, including providing the Director General with recommendations relating to inscriptions on the International MoW Register. It is supported by a **Secretariat** (based at UNESCO headquarters in Paris) which carries out administrative functions, including maintenance of the main MoW website and liaison with the different MoW entities. The Director General or his/her representative participates in the work of the IAC or its subcommittees but without the right to vote.

4.2.3 As needed, the IAC establishes subcommittees and other subsidiary bodies which it deems useful to further its work. It assigns their terms of reference and, in consultation with UNESCO, appoints their chairs who, assisted by the Secretariat and in discussion with appropriate professional bodies, selects the members and informs the IAC chair. These bodies report to each meeting of the IAC and, when necessary, the Bureau. The subcommittees in operation at the time of publication are described below.

4.3 The IAC Bureau

4.3.1 The Bureau comprises the chair, three vice-chairs and a rapporteur as elected by the IAC at every ordinary session of the IAC. Bureau members are chosen from each of the UN geographic regions to ensure a greater representation and diversity of views. The Bureau maintains an overview of the programme between IAC meetings, makes tactical decisions in

liaison with the Secretariat, liaises with regional and national MoW committees as needed, and undertakes other tasks as delegated by the IAC.

4.4 Preservation subcommittee (PSC)

4.4.1 The PSC reviews developments in preservation and provides advice on analogue and digital preservation matters in response to referrals or requests from the IAC, its subsidiary bodies and the Secretariat, and from regional or national MoW committees. It serves as an enquiry centre responding to questions about storage and preservation of documents and their accessibility. It recommends and undertakes preservation-related studies, produces publications and organises training events. Members are chosen for their expertise within the spectrum of conservation, technical, information technology and curatorial fields.

4.5 Register Subcommittee (RSC)

4.5.1 The RSC undertakes the initial in-depth research and assessment of nominations for the International MoW Register, liaising as necessary with professional associations or other sources in gathering information. It provides recommendations, with reasons, to the IAC for the inscription, referral or rejection of new nominations, and undertakes related tasks assigned by the IAC. Members conduct training upon request and provide general advice and guidance in the preparation of nominations. Members are chosen across cultural and geographic regions and from specialisms within different areas of documentary heritage. The International Council on Archives (ICA), the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and the Coordinating Council of Audiovisual Archives Associations (CCAAA) each nominate one member of the RSC.

4.6 Education and Research Subcommittee (SCEaR)

4.6.1 The SCEaR develops strategies and ideas for raising awareness, education and research in MoW across the education sector. It encourages publications and events, and promotes the development of resources for research related to documentary heritage, including the establishment of knowledge centres. It initiates and stimulates educational initiatives, such as partnerships and projects involving schools, universities, memory institutions and their linkages with MoW. It promotes the visibility of MoW and its logo, encourages debate, raises awareness of preservation and access issues and makes MoW objectives more widely known. It contributes to the organisation of exhibitions on inscribed heritage. Its members are chosen for their specialist and academic expertise.

4.7 National MoW Committees

4.7.1 National MoW committees are independent entities operating at a national level. To be entitled to use the MoW name and logo, they must be accredited by their UNESCO National Commission which advises the Secretariat of their creation. The formation of a national MoW committee in every country where it is practicable is a goal of the programme.

4.7.2 National MoW committees will vary in their roles and range of activities and these Guidelines suggest some of the possibilities available. Operating a national MoW register is one of those possibilities, and some countries have quite substantial registers (see chapter X and appendix X)

4.7.3 There is no rigid organisational model. Whether highly formalised and structured, or more informal in approach, the essence of a committee is that it is a gathering of experts from across the documentary heritage field in its country. Members may serve as individuals, or as representatives of memory institutions or cultural authorities, or a combination of both. In some countries, for local reasons, the UNESCO National Commission may explicitly choose to exercise the functions of a national MoW committee.

4.7.4 Whatever the model, a national committee will normally be expected to meet the following parameters:

- An operational link with, and demonstrated support of, its National Commission for UNESCO, as well as its regional MoW committee (if there is one)
- Membership which reflects the country's geographic and cultural character, the important cultural groups, and the relevant knowledge and expertise
- Written terms of reference and rules, including the basis of membership and succession
- Ability to discharge their role. This may include funding and support, links to major memory institutions and government bodies
- A commitment to awareness raising through regular reporting to the National Commission (copied to Paris secretariat and, if appropriate, regional committee)

4.7.5 As a guide only, a template for terms of reference is set out in Appendix 7.

4.8 Regional MoW Committees

4.8.1 Regional MoW committees are cooperative structures that bring together national MoW committees which share a geographic area, or other common interests such as a shared culture. They provide a means of addressing issues which fall outside the practical scope of the IAC on the one hand, or individual national MoW committees on the other. To be entitled to use the MoW name and logo, they must be accredited by the IAC, its Bureau or the Secretariat. The initiative to establish a regional committee may come from any of these three entities, or from a group of national MoW committees who would be the initial members.

4.8.2 At the time of publication, there are two well established regional committees (MOWLAC and MOWCAP) and a third in initial development (ARCMOW).¹⁵ All three are based on official UNESCO geographic regions. Their statutes, rules and registers can be viewed on their websites.

4.8.3 Regional committees are able to:

¹⁵ MOWLAC is the regional committee for Latin America and the Caribbean; MOWCAP is for Asia Pacific; ARCMOW is for Africa.

- Pursue advocacy and publicity over a large geographical area
- Run cooperative events such as training workshops on chosen topics
- Bring delegates of national MoW committees together for periodic meetings
- “Backstop” for countries in the region that do not have a national MoW committee
- Assist in forming and mentoring new national MoW committees
- Operate a regional MoW register
- Maintain up to date contact details for members and associates across the region
- Produce regional publications

Regional MoW committees submit a formal report biennially to the IAC.

4.9 Other meetings and connections

4.9.1 Although not on a regular schedule, the MoW programme from time to time convenes or hosts conferences, meetings and seminars on particular topics, or other gatherings to progress its objectives. It also relates naturally to the various non-government organisations (NGOs) and professional associations active within the documentary heritage field.¹⁶ These bodies are sources of expert strategic, curatorial, policy and technical advice. It is logical to seek their guidance where it can be helpful in furthering the programme’s objectives. Many people who are involved in MoW committees are also active in their respective professional forums so the connections are logical and are encouraged.

4.9.2 Professional forums also act as platforms to promote MoW, which can often feature in their own conference agendas. Their members are thereby encouraged to consider, for example, whether their own institutions hold documentary heritage which could be nominated for a MoW register. A successful nomination enhances the status of the nominating body and may also benefit the institution in other ways, such as helping attract preservation funding for threatened documents.

4.10 The MoW logo

4.10.1 The Memory of the World logo permits committees as well as institutions holding items listed on a register to demonstrate their link with UNESCO. This can be useful in publicizing the work of the committee in promoting or protecting documentary heritage, or in highlighting an inscription on a register. However, its use is subject to the provisions which are set out in the *Guidelines for Logo Use* (Appendix 9) Granting use of the logo is the prerogative of the Director-General, UNESCO’s governing bodies and National Commissions.

4.10.2 UNESCO determines the conditions under which the logo can be used and may request the cessation case of unauthorized, or a violation of, use. While commercial use is

¹⁶ The programme specifically recognises CCAAA, ICA, ICOM and IFLA

normally not authorized, in an exceptional and individual case, UNESCO may grant use upon application to the Director-General or to the National Commission.

4.10.3 The logo is a symbolic graphic in which the concentric circles can be interpreted to represent various document formats, as well as the diffusion and preservation of memory, The breaks in the circles thereby represent lost and missing memory.

4.11 Code of Ethics

4.11.1 There are ethical considerations associated with membership of a MoW committee or subcommittee and the statement at Appendix 1 is drawn to the attention of all who become formally involved in the programme. It is mandatory for members of the IAC and all of its subcommittees to subscribe, in writing, to the Code.

5 MEMORY OF THE WORLD ACTIVITIES

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 Memory of the World has many aspects. Fulfilling the programme's objectives leads to a range of activities that are constantly evolving. A reading of the *Recommendation* will suggest the future trajectory of the programme, and the opportunities and challenges ahead. The activities covered below are descriptive of where the programme stands at the time of writing.

5.2 Workshops and seminars

5.2.1 Memory of the World workshops and seminars are held in the national, regional and international domains and would normally be organised by Memory of the World committees, the Secretariat, or professional associations. They may be stand-alone events, or linked to other events, such as meetings of national or regional MoW committee or the regular conferences of professional associations.

5.2.2 They take various forms and are of varying duration. For example:

- *Special events*: anniversaries, launches of projects or publications, public awareness raising
- *Policy and strategy*: implementation of the *Recommendation* and of other UNESCO normative instruments
- *Capacity building*: training preservation, collection management, access and other professional topics
- *Nomination preparation*: mentoring first-time nominators in preparing and submitting register nominations

5.3 Publications

5.3.1 MoW-branded or MoW-related publications may be directly commissioned or produced by UNESCO, or co-produced with commercial publishers. They are also produced by individual MoW committees. In addition, UNESCO facilitates the publication of relevant texts and manuals by professional associations. Publications may be hard-copy or electronic, or both. Hard copy publications may be distributed through commercial channels or UNESCO offices; electronic publications are often accessible on websites. The main MoW website carries an indicative but not exhaustive list of publications. Categories include the following:

- *Professional manuals*: Guidelines and standards on preservation, digitisation, library management, professional philosophy
- *Registers*: Illustrated books about inscriptions on various MoW registers – national, regional and international – and related ebooks and websites. MoW registers are typically accessible on the websites maintained by the responsible MoW committees.

- *Academic and research*: in-depth theses, articles, newsletters and books on the principles of MoW, its socio-cultural importance and its place in the educational and research spectrum and disciplines
- *Guidelines*: The *General Guidelines* and related publication are produced in several languages
- *General*: Books, booklets and web publications on topics ranging from legal deposit legislation to lost memory.

5.3.2 Since MoW was founded, many publications based on individual items or collections of documentary heritage inscribed on various MoW registers have been produced by UNESCO and by the relevant custodial institutions. These take many forms, including books, CDs, CD-ROM, DVD and e-publications.

5.4 UNESCO Days

5.4.1 The United Nations General Assembly designates a number of "International Days" to mark important aspects of human life and history. Specialized Agencies, including UNESCO, can also proclaim World Days. In this case, the proclamation of international days depends on their governing bodies and internal regulations only.

5.4.2 UNESCO thus celebrates UN International Days related to its fields of competence, in addition to the other World Days, proclaimed by the Organization's governing bodies or other institutions. <http://en.unesco.org/celebrations/international-days>

Many of these Days related to documentary heritage and therefore to MoW. For example:

- 13 February: World Radio Day
- 21 March: World Poetry Day
- 23 April: World Book and Copyright Day
- 3 May: World Press Freedom Day
- 8 September: International Literacy Day
- 28 September: International Day for the Universal Access to Information
- 5 October: World Teachers' Day
- 27 October: World Day for Audiovisual Heritage
- Third Thursday in November: World Philosophy Day
- 10 December: Human Rights Day

5.5 Prizes and awards

5.5.1 In various settings, MoW may provide awards and other forms of recognition, including Certificates of Inscription for documentary heritage added to any of its registers, and certificates of attendance at seminars and training events.

5.5.2 The UNESCO/Jikji Memory of the World prize, which commemorates the inscription on the International MoW Register of the Buljip jikji simche yojeol, the oldest existing

book printed with moveable metal type, is funded by the Republic of Korea through the Municipal Council of Cheongju City. The cash prize is awarded every two years by the Director General of UNESCO to an individual, institution or other entity that has made a significant contribution to the preservation and accessibility of the documentary heritage.

5.6 Normative Instruments

5.6.1 From time to time UNESCO promulgates “normative” or standard setting instruments. There are four types: conventions, recommendations, declarations and charters. A full explanation of this is available on the UNESCO website.¹⁷

5.6.2 The *Recommendation* is an example of such an instrument. It sets out international best practice relating to preserving and accessing the documentary heritage, and calls on member states to undertake a range of actions in this regard. The Appendix of the *Recommendation* lists a number of other normative instruments relevant to the objectives of MoW.

5.6.3 UNESCO instruments are particularly useful to memory institutions when developing their own policies and rules, because they can be cited as authoritative international benchmarks on which institutional policy and practice can be based.

5.7 Declarations, standards and advisories

5.7.1 There are other declarations and statements which do not fit the above UNESCO definition but which are also important and useful reference points. Several of these are also listed in the Appendix to the *Recommendation*. The following merit special mention:

- The Universal Copyright Convention (1952)
- The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (amended 1979)
- *The IFLA statement on Libraries and Intellectual Freedom* (1999)
- *The Universal Declaration on Archives* (2010): this was adopted by ICA and was later endorsed by UNESCO. It is a succinct statement of archival principles.
- The “Vancouver Declaration” (2012): *The Memory of the World in the digital age: digitisation and preservation*. This statement was the outcome of an international conference of specialists and is a reference point for principles and practice.

5.8 Research and Education

5.8.1 MoW encourages the disciplines of research and scholarship using documentary heritage as source material in historical research, incorporating the use of MoW registers as a starting point for research. Including MoW in school and university curricula, and linking them

¹⁷ http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=23772&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

to memory institutions, will encourage an awareness of preservation issues and will help the experiences of the past speak to the present.

5.8.2 The IAC Education and Research Subcommittee oversees this strategy and develops networks of educational and memory institutions, together with knowledge centres as an aid to awareness raising, research and publication. In this way, the MoW registers and publications are seen as a starting point for a journey of research and discovery.

5.9 Exhibitions and events

5.9.1 Exhibitions can take many forms, ranging from a series of posters to a large scale curated and multi-media experience at a memory institution. On-line exhibitions, presented on a website, are a variation of the concept.

5.9.2 Typically, exhibitions are built around documents which have been inscribed on MoW registers. Significant documents can be put on display, and they satisfy a natural public curiosity to see “the real thing”. Exhibitions are usually organised by a MoW committee in conjunction with an organisational host which provides the space and facilities for display.

5.9.3 Sometimes public events, such as lectures or films screenings, are organised in conjunction with an exhibition – or, in a further variation, with the public presentation by UNESCO of a Certificate of Register Inscription to a custodial institution. The options available for raising awareness and attracting public attention to the documentary heritage and the objectives of MoW are really limited only by imagination.

5.10 Leveraging inscription and the logo

5.10.1 All successful nominators receive an official Certificate of Inscription. In the absence of any other alternative, this is simply delivered by mail. But this is to miss an opportunity to promote both the document and its moment of inscription. A formal certificate presentation is potentially a high profile media event that benefits both the recipient institution and UNESCO.

5.10.2 As mentioned above, custodians of inscribed heritage are encouraged to publicise their status and to draw public attention to the items that have been inscribed. Many institutions have placed selected items on public display; they have digitised them so that they are readily accessible; they have promoted their recognition through websites and social media; they have sold reproductions as retail products.

5.10.3 In addition, custodians of inscribed heritage or organisers of MoW related activities are entitled to use, and are encouraged to apply for, a personalised or localised version of the UNESCO/MoW logo. There are, of course, rules about how the MoW brand and logo can be used. These are detailed in Appendix 9.

5.11 The International, Regional and National Registers

5.11.1 MoW committees maintain public registers of significant documentary heritage in the international, regional and national domains. The selection criteria for all registers are essentially the same, although wording may vary. The registers are differentiated by their geographic coverage, and whether the coverage of the heritage inscribed is judged to be of **international, regional or national** significance.

5.11.2 All registers operate autonomously and to their own time frames. **They are not a hierarchy.** All inscriptions have equal value in the eyes of UNESCO. The world's documentary heritage is so vast and complex that a single register would be unwieldy and unworkable. The tripartite approach allows regional and national expertise to be applied to assessing nominations in a way that would be impossible if there was just a single global register.

5.11.3 The International Register was the first to be established (in 1997). Regional and national registers have followed progressively, and each is administered by the responsible committee. As new registers are established, their selection criteria and nomination process must first be approved by the relevant UNESCO Regional Office or National Commission.

6 THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTER

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 **This chapter relates only to the operation of the International MoW Register.** Regional and national registers operate in a similar manner, though with individual variations, and readers should refer to the specific websites or the committees of these registers for further information.

6.1.2 To seek inscription on the register, a nomination on the prescribed form (Appendix X) must be duly lodged with the MoW Secretariat. It will undergo subsequent evaluation as described below.

6.1.3 There are some limitations and exclusions on the scope of documents that can be nominated. These are detailed in Appendix 4.

6.2 Benefits of inscription

6.2.1 Being inscribed on a MoW register is not an end in itself. It is a beginning.

6.2.2 Inscription on a register publicly affirms the significance of the documentary heritage and makes it better known. It becomes part of the visible continuum of documents that have had a substantial impact on cultural and social history, allowing for the possibility for history to be re-interpreted over time. Inscription encourages accessibility and attracts publicity. It carries the symbolic weight of UNESCO certification and the right to use the MoW logo, which is in itself an affirmation of UNESCO's recognition of significance, notwithstanding that UNESCO does not necessarily endorse the content of the documentary heritage. The stature of the documentary heritage and the custodial institution benefits by association with the inscriptions already on the registers. It visibly justifies government or other expenditure on the institution and the documentary heritage in its care.

6.2.3 Sometimes inscription can help to attract sponsorship and funding to protect heritage under threat. Sometimes it has the effect of making the documentary heritage more secure. There are cases on record where inscription has even saved an entire archival institution from closing and being dismantled.

6.3 Criteria for inscription

6.3.1 Using a consistent set of criteria facilitates more accurate analysis and helps elucidate the unique characteristics and meanings of each item or collection. All criteria are considered when making an assessment, but not all will be relevant to the item or collection. One or more criteria may apply and be interrelated. It is not necessary to find evidence of all criteria to justify that an item is significant. Indeed, an item may be highly significant under only one primary criterion, with clarification added by considering the comparative criteria.

The criteria are a prompt for describing how and why the item or collection is significant. They will have different shades of meaning depending on the type of item or collection under consideration.

6.3.2 The following criteria are applied to all nominations throughout the assessment process.

6.3.3 **Assessment is comparative and relative.** There is no absolute measure of cultural significance. Assessment is relative. Selection for inscription results from assessing the documentary heritage on its own merits against the selection criteria, against the general tenor of these Guidelines, and in the context of past nominations, whether included or rejected.

6.3.4 **Authenticity and integrity** The threshold test is whether the documentary heritage is what it appears to be. Has its identity and provenance been reliably established? Copies, replicas, forgeries, bogus documents or hoaxes can, with the best of intentions, be mistaken for the genuine article. Is it complete or incomplete? Is part of the documentary heritage being kept elsewhere and not included in this nomination? Is it all of the same age or have missing parts been replaced with newer copies? Is it an original – or if not, is it the earliest known generation? What percentage of the heritage remains in its original state?

6.3.5 This can be a complex matter, depending on the nature of the documents in question. Some documents – such as audiovisual media, digital files, and medieval manuscripts – may exist in variant versions or exemplars of the same or differing antiquity, integrity or state of preservation.

6.3.6 **World significance: *Primary criteria***

6.3.6.1 The IAC must be satisfied that the documentary heritage is of world significance. Comments should be made in relation to one or more of the following criteria. *Not all the criteria will necessarily apply to a particular nomination – only those relevant should be chosen.*

6.3.6.2 Historical significance What does the documentary heritage tell us in relation to the history of the world? Does it deal with:

- Political or economic developments, or social or spiritual movements
- Leading personalities in world history
- Events of world-changing significance
- Specific places of significance
- Unique phenomena
- Traditional customs
- Relations between or among countries or communities
- Changing patterns of life and culture
- A turning point in history, or a critical innovation
- An example of excellence in the arts, literature, science, technology, sport or other parts of life and culture

6.3.6.3 Form and style Significance may lie in the physical nature of the documentary heritage. Some documents may seem unremarkable in this respect - for example, hand written manuscript or typescript paper records – but can, for example, have stylistic qualities or personal associations that deserve attention. Other forms of documentary heritage may display innovative qualities, high levels of artistry or other notable features. For example:

- Is the documentary heritage a particularly fine exemplar of its type?
- Does it have outstanding qualities of beauty and craftsmanship?
- Is it a new or unusual type of carrier?
- Is it an example of a type of document that is now obsolete or superseded?

6.3.6.4 Social, community or spiritual significance In what way is the documentary heritage attached to a specific community in the present, and how is it demonstrated? For example, a community may be strongly attached to the heritage of a beloved leader, or to the documentary evidence related to a specific incident, event or site with particular associations. Or it may revere the documentary heritage associated with a spiritual leader or a saint. Information should be provided on how this attachment is expressed.

6.3.7 **World significance: *Comparative criteria***

6.3.7.1 The IAC needs further information on the character of the documentary heritage itself.

6.3.7.2 Rarity or uniqueness Can the document or the collection be described as unique (the only one of its kind ever created) or rare (one of a few survivors from a larger number)? This quality may need elaboration: a collection or manuscript or other item may be unique but not necessarily rare. There may be other collections or items which are similar but not identical.

6.3.7.3 Condition What is the condition of the documentary heritage? Depending on the nature of the document or the collection the description will need to be sufficiently detailed to allow an appreciation of current risk and/or conservation needs.

6.3.8.1 ***Statement of Significance***

This statement is a summary of the points made under the primary and comparative criteria, and the test of authenticity and integrity. It should go on to explain:

- Why this documentary heritage is important to the memory of world and why its loss would impoverish the heritage of humanity

- What its impact – positive or negative – is or has been on life and culture beyond the boundaries of a nation state or region

6.4 The nomination parameters

6.4.1 The documentary heritage may be publicly or privately owned.

6.4.2 The instructions set out in the nomination proforma (Appendix X) are part of these Guidelines.

6.4.3 For practical reasons, nominations are limited to two per country in each two year cycle. When there are more than two, the relevant national MoW committee or UNESCO National Commission will be asked to make a choice and explain their reasons for the choice.

6.4.4 Two or more nominators in different countries may submit joint nominations where collections or groupings are divided among custodians: there is no limit on the number of such nominations nor on the number of partners involved. Where the nominator is not also the custodian, the custodian would need to consent to the nomination. If the custodian withholds consent, the nominator would need to explain the reason.

6.4.5 There are some specific exclusions or limitations on the types of documentary heritage which may be nominated. For further information see Appendix 4.

6.4.6 A nominated collection or archival fonds must be finite, with clear beginning and end dates, and must be closed. Vaguely described or open ended nominations will not be accepted. Typical examples are a closed archival fond identified by box and location numbers, a data base of fixed size and content, an inventoried collection. If catalogue or registration details are too unwieldy, provide a description of the contents with sample catalogue entries, accession or registration numbers: or add such details as an appendix. For the dynamic character of some types of digital documentary heritage see Appendix 6.

6.4.7 Where documentary heritage exists in multiple copies and similar but variant versions – for example, books and feature films – the nomination will be deemed to apply to the **work** itself, rather than just the specific copy or copies cited, although at least one specific copy must be identified in the nomination. Under certain circumstances, further copies of exemplars of documents can be proposed for addition to an existing Register inscription. See section 6.7..

6.4.8 **Brevity:** Nominations should be comprehensive but no longer than necessary: they are judged by quality, not quantity. There is no mandatory length, but a maximum of about 15 A4 pages is usually sufficient.

6.4.9 **Pictures, lists, graphics or digital files** can be added as appendices when needed, and these can be very helpful to the assessors. Unless declared otherwise, acceptance of a nomination by the Secretariat is deemed to grant UNESCO the right to publish and use images and graphics included in the nomination in the conduct of the MoW programme, including in UNESCO publicity material. It is also deemed to grant UNESCO permission to publish the nomination form on the MoW website.

6.4.10 **Objectivity:** Every nomination stands on its own merits. Nominations should be based on fact, and written in impartial and objective language. The use of grandiose or unprovable claims, or derogatory, propagandistic or polemical language, is counter-productive

and makes assessment more difficult. Nor is it helpful to add interpretations, such as drawing parallels with other historical events. Such nominations may be rejected or returned to the nominator for revision.

6.4.11 **Accessibility:** Nominators are encouraged to make their documentary heritage publicly accessible, whether on-site or on the internet, wherever practicable. While this is **not** a precondition for inscription, accessibility is an objective of the programme and is obviously helpful in the assessment process.

6.4.12 **Legal:** The posting of nominations on the MoW website or the inscription of documentary heritage on a register has no prima face legal or financial consequences. It does not formally affect ownership, custody or use of the material. It does not, of itself, impose any constraint or obligation on owners, custodians or governments. By the same token, it does not impose any obligation on UNESCO to resource conservation, management or accessibility of the material. Nor does it imply UNESCO's endorsement of the content of the nomination. It does, however, represent a commitment of the custodians of inscribed heritage to its preservation and accessibility.

6.5 The nomination process

6.5.1 **Submission:** At least 4 months before a fixed deadline, the Secretariat issues a call for nominations on the MoW website, indicating the deadline and the formal criteria the nomination must meet. Nominations following the prescribed format (see Appendix 3) may be submitted by any person or organisation to the MoW Secretariat, electronically and in hard copy. A closing date for each biennial intake is publicly announced.

6.5.2 The MoW Secretariat records each nomination and examines its legal, technical and other pertinent aspects in verifying its contents. It informs the nominator about the results of this preliminary examination. If the nomination lacks essential information, this will be promptly requested. Further action will not be taken until all this information is complete. If the nomination is accepted for assessment, the Secretariat notifies the nominator, copying the concerned Permanent Delegations, National Commissions for UNESCO and National MoW Committees. It uploads the nomination form on the MoW website.

6.5.3 The Secretariat will then pass the nomination to the RSC for assessment. The nomination is immediately open for comments (objections, support or other information pertaining to the selection criteria) which can be sent to the Secretariat by a specified deadline using the prescribed form (see Appendix 3). The RSC reviews and takes into account any received comments, and initiates a course of action appropriate to the circumstances indicated and the context of the documentary heritage being nominated.

6.5.4 As the RSC's assessment proceeds, the Secretariat may seek additional information from the nominator, who may modify or update the nomination in compliance with the above parameters, depending on the questions raised.

6.5.5 The RSC comes to a preliminary assessment and recommendation of the nomination. The Secretariat notifies the nominator, copying the Permanent Delegations, the National Commission for UNESCO and the National MoW Committees of the countries concerned. The nominator is offered the opportunity to respond to this preliminary

recommendation. Based on these responses, the RSC can reconsider its assessment before submitting its recommendations to the IAC.

6.5.6 The RSC submits its recommendations, with supporting explanations, to the IAC sufficiently in advance of its ordinary biennial meeting. The IAC, in turn, considers these recommendations in reaching its own views in respect of each nomination. In its professional assessment it proposes these to the Director-General of UNESCO, who makes the final decision. Nominators are advised of the outcome. Successful nominations are announced to the media.

6.5.7 Nominations that have been called into question during the period open for comments will be given more time for dialogue among the concerned parties. Dialogue may be mediated (see details at Appendix 10). Ultimately the Director-General will take a final decision on the nomination, taking into account the professional advice provided by the IAC and any other relevant information.

6.6 The RSC/IAC assessment process

6.6.1 The RSC undertakes the researching and initial assessment of nominations. It is charged with the thorough investigation of each nomination, which will include consultation with referees proposed by the nominator as well as referees independently chosen by the RSC. It seeks comment and evaluation from whatever appropriate sources and experts it considers necessary, and will compare every nomination with similar documentary heritage, including heritage already inscribed on the Register.

6.6.2 The process is as transparent as possible, while having due regard for privacy concerns which may require confidentiality, and to the Code of Ethics of the programme. To this end, the following practices are observed:

- The RSC (as well as the IAC) operates at arm's length from the nominator so that its objectivity is not influenced. All communication with the nominator is through the Secretariat.
- Nominations, when complete and verified, are posted on the MoW website so that they are publicly visible. If the nomination document is updated during the course of assessment, it is always the latest version that will appear on the website. Nominations are thereby available for scrutiny and comment (see below).
- While research on nominations is carried out by individual RSC members, the RSC's findings and recommendations are the result of collegial discussion by the whole group. The work of individual members is not identified.
- When the RSC determines its preliminary recommendation to the IAC, the Secretariat formally communicates it in writing to the nominator, who will be given opportunity to respond. If the RSC is not fully convinced, the nominator may be asked to provide an adapted nomination form with additional information or stronger argument. The RSC can then reconsider its view before submitting its recommendations to the IAC.
- With respect to any nomination, the RSC or IAC will normally propose one of the following courses of action, with supporting reasons:

INSCRIPTION: the selection criteria have been satisfied and the required technical information is complete

PROVISIONAL INSCRIPTION: the selection criteria have been met but some technical details are incomplete. A date for submission of the missing information will be specified, and if duly provided inscription automatically follows

REFER AND RESUBMIT: the nominated heritage may potentially meet the criteria for inscription but the information provided is inadequate to fully establish this. The nominator is invited to submit a fuller nomination for consideration in the next cycle.

REJECTION: the nomination does not demonstrate that the criteria for inscription on the International Register can be met.

6.6.3 **Rejection** of a nomination is not necessarily a negative comment either on the significance of the nominated documentary heritage, or the nomination document itself. For example, the RSC or IAC may feel that the heritage would more appropriately be nominated for a national or regional register. It may determine that it would be best as part of a joint nomination rather than on its own. Or it may conclude that the nominator has not made a convincing case on this occasion. Rejection does not preclude re-submission (up to a maximum 3 times if the content of the nomination is unchanged.)

6.6.4 **Comment and objections** During the assessment process a specified window will be declared during which public comments, which includes objections, support or other information relevant to aspects of any current nomination, may be lodged by any person or organisation. For example, the sender may wish to provide information to supplement the nominator's case, or may object to the nomination on the grounds of its content or whether the selection criteria have been met. Comments which go beyond these areas, however, will not be considered by the RSC.

6.6.5 Such comments should be made on the specified proforma (see Appendix 3) which identifies the sender and sets out the substance of the comment. The Secretariat will respond and will, if necessary, engage in dialogue with the sender. Each case will be handled on its merits. In its advice to the IAC, the RSC will acknowledge all such comments received, and where relevant report their substance.

6.7 Additions to existing inscriptions

6.7.1 Where documentary heritage exists in multiple copies and variant versions – for example, printed books or feature films released in differing versions or multiple languages – the nomination will relate to the **work** itself rather than just the specific copy(ies) cited. If further copies or 'exemplars' of comparable integrity and antiquity are subsequently identified, they may be proposed for addition to an existing inscription.

6.7.2 The same mechanism will also apply to inscribed collections that prove to be incomplete: for example, where the collection is spread over multiple institutions and further parts of the collection are later identified.

6.7.3 The process may be initiated by the custodian, or by the IAC or Bureau, or the Secretariat. The attendant case work is assigned to the RSC and may involve

- Reviewing the existing nomination and establishing standards of authenticity, uniqueness, integrity and rarity appropriate to the particular case
- Identifying the proposed exemplars, their custodians and relevant management plans
- Preparing the case for adding the exemplars to the existing inscription
- Reviewing whether the currently inscribed document(s) continue to meet the selection criteria

The Secretariat then contacts the relevant custodians to seek their agreement to add the exemplars to the inscription.

6.7.4 Proposals utilise a simplified nomination proforma (see appendix 3). Beyond this, the closing date and other processes required for the biennial intake of nominations apply, with the outcome announced at the same time as the list of new inscriptions. A certificate of inscription is awarded to the custodial institutions concerned.¹⁸

6.8 Monitoring and reporting of inscriptions

6.8.1 Consistent with the provisions of the *Recommendation*, the status and well-being of inscribed documents needs to be systematically monitored:

- To provide an assessment of the impact of inscription on the preservation of documentary heritage within a country or organisation
- To provide an assessment of the condition of the inscribed documents and of measures being taken to maintain it
- To establish a framework to seek advice on preservation should their condition have deteriorated or be otherwise at risk
- To promote collaboration and sharing of experiences across the MoW network and maintain the credibility of the programme

6.8.2 Accordingly, all institutions and individuals having custody of inscribed documentary heritage should file a report on its condition with the Secretariat every six years, in accordance with a calendar maintained by the Secretariat. The proforma for the report is at (Appendix X). Reports will be referred, as appropriate, to the RSC or PSC, which will in turn recommend any follow up action. Failure to lodge a timely report will automatically initiate such action, and could potentially result in the IAC proposing the removal of the inscription from the International Register to UNESCO's Director General.

6.8.3 The IAC will mandate the standards and methodology for the monitoring procedure, which may include, when necessary, institutional visits by experts designated by the Secretariat. Notwithstanding the six-year cycle, should the Secretariat receive advice from any source, including a third party, that inscribed heritage has seriously deteriorated or that its

¹⁸ This process was first used in 2015 for the inscription of additional early copies of the feature film METROPOLIS (1927) and the removal of the previously inscribed copy, which no longer met the selection criteria.

integrity has been compromised, the RSC and/or PSC will be tasked with investigation. If the advice is substantiated, the Secretariat will transmit the resulting report to the nominator or custodial institution, as appropriate, for comment. The RSC and/or PSC will evaluate the comments and make a recommendation to the IAC for removal, corrective action or retention. If the IAC supports a recommendation for removal, all parties will be informed.

6.9 Removal from the Register

6.9.1 In addition to the cyclical review process described above, removal of documentary heritage from the Register may also be justified if new information warrants a reassessment of its inscription and demonstrates its ineligibility against the criteria under which it was inscribed.

6.9.2 The review process may be initiated by any person or organisation (including the IAC) through an expression of concern, in writing, to the Secretariat, which will refer the matter to the RSC for investigation and report.¹⁹ If the RSC finds that the concern is substantiated, the Secretariat will contact the original nominator (or, if uncontactable, other appropriate body) for comment. The RSC will evaluate the assembled data and make a recommendation to the IAC for removal, retention or other corrective action. The Secretariat will inform all parties concerned of the outcome and ensure any necessary adjustment to the Register.

¹⁹ The investigation may include independent assessment by a qualified person or organisation, or seeking the views of relevant NGOs, regional and national MoW committees

7 FURTHER INFORMATION

7.1 The Registers

7.1.1 The registers are a visible means of achieving the objectives of MoW. They help to make an abstract ideal – the preservation of documentary heritage – accessible and concrete. By progressively identifying, recognizing and highlighting significant and irreplaceable documentary heritage, the larger objectives of preservation, access and awareness are promoted and advanced. The inscription of an item on any MoW register is an **affirmation** by UNESCO of its permanent value and significance. It also raises the stature of the institution that holds the item(s). Over time, the registers will contribute to enlarging perceptions and understanding of world history by making little known documentary heritage more visible and accessible.

7.1.2 As the registers grow they help in identifying missing documentary heritage, in linking dispersed collections, in supporting repatriation of material, and in supporting the implementation of the *Recommendation*.

7.1.3 **Three register types:** The world's documentary heritage is so vast and complex that a *single* register would be unwieldy and unworkable. Geographically-based registers also allow *appropriate regional and national expertise* and local resources to be applied to assessing nominations in a way that would never be possible if there was only a single register.

7.1.4 The **international** register was the first to be established – in 1997 – and is therefore the oldest and largest. **Regional** registers are managed by regional MoW committees.²⁰ They inscribe documentary heritage which has been influential within that region and therefore have regional significance. **National** registers are managed by national MoW committees (or in their absence by UNESCO National Commissions) and inscribe documentary heritage which has been influential within that country and is judged to have national significance. The registers are not a hierarchy. All are equally important.

7.1.5 Inscription on all registers is based on essentially the same criteria and process, as set out in these General Guidelines, but each is adapted to the geographic and cultural setting in which it operates. Once its criteria and process have been approved by the IAC, Bureau or Secretariat, each register functions autonomously, within its own timeframes, nomination and assessment process as determined by the responsible MoW committee.

7.1.6 The registers can be accessed on line, variously through the main MoW website or the websites of regional and national committees. Each inscription typically includes summary information and images; if the documentary heritage is accessible in digital form there might be a hotlink to it.

7.1.7 **Who can nominate?** In practice, most nominations come from institutions, such as libraries, archives or museums, that propose items that are in their own custody. They are

²⁰ At the time of publication, there are two regional registers, maintained by MOWLAC and MOWCAP.

best placed to provide the kind of information needed by the Secretariat and the RSC for assessment purposes. But nominations also come from a range of private and public organizations, from international associations and from private individuals.

7.1.8 When nominating to a regional or the international register, it is a good idea to involve your national MoW committee (if there is one) in the process. It is not compulsory – but if your national MoW committee or National Commission for UNESCO supports your nomination, its endorsement will be taken into account in the assessment process. Deadlines are set for each cycle of nominations and are strictly observed.

7.1.9 **Competition and quotas** It's sometimes erroneously assumed that nominations "compete" for inscription. Nomination is not competitive. Every nomination is judged against the criteria. Either it satisfies them or it does not.

7.1.10 At the time of publication, there is no overall limit to the number of nominations that will be accepted from each country or organization for National or Regional registers. For the International Register only, there is a limit of two nominations per country in each two-year cycle, except for joint nominations where there are no limitations on numbers (see 6.4.3 and 6.4.4). UNESCO fosters international cooperation.

7.1.11 **Asking for help** Preparing a nomination requires work, and can be a daunting task, especially the first time! Nominators can seek help from any MoW National or Regional committee, or the Secretariat can refer enquiries to a mentor who can explain the range of information needed and how to compile and arrange it (this is called technical help). There are ethical limitations which are set out in the Code of Ethics (see appendix 1).

7.2 Lost and missing heritage

7.2.1 In every country, significant parts of the documentary heritage have been lost or are missing.²¹ Developing a public record of this now inaccessible heritage is a crucial means of placing the MoW programme in context, and is a precursor to the possibility of virtual reconstruction of lost and dispersed memory. It adds both urgency and perspective to the challenges of identifying and protecting the surviving heritage.

7.2.2 *Lost* documentary heritage is material that is known to no longer survive: that is, its decay or destruction is reliably documented or can be reliably assumed. *Missing* documentary heritage is material whose current whereabouts is unknown, but whose loss cannot be confirmed or reliably assured.

7.2.3 There is no set methodology for creating a MoW record of lost and missing heritage. While initially it was thought that MoW registers could develop a "lost and missing" section,²² this proved over time to be impractical as the parameters for register nomination do

²¹ For a sobering window into this subject, refer to the MoW publication *Lost memory – libraries and archives destroyed in the 20th century* (UNESCO, 1996), and other works on the subject, such as Raven, J; *Lost libraries: the destruction of great book collections since antiquity* (2004, Palgrave Macmillan) and Deocampo, Nick: *Lost films of Asia* (2006, Anvil). Wikipedia offers a *List of destroyed libraries*.

²² See the previous edition of *General Guidelines to Safeguard Documentary Heritage* (UNESCO, 2002), section 4.9

not really apply. There is no owner or custodian involved, and the material itself is not available for inspection, so it cannot be precisely listed and can only be described in general terms. Nor are issues of preservation, management and access relevant.

7.2.4 Nevertheless, MoW committees are encouraged to develop their own methods of establishing and documenting lost and missing heritage. This may, for example, be in the form of descriptive lists on MoW websites which grow over time, or in the form of stand alone publications. It is a task which offers much scope for research, and may sometimes lead to the happy result of finding documentary heritage that was believed to have been lost.

7.3 Heritage under threat

7.3.1 The survival of documentary heritage can sometimes be threatened by physical or political circumstances, armed conflict, intended private use or other situations in which the open and public approach set out in these *Guidelines* may be impractical. For example, there could be instances where the very act of listing documentary heritage in a MoW register might draw unwelcome attention to it and actually imperil its security.

7.3.2 The IAC, Bureau or Secretariat seeks to be informed of such instances. They will respect the confidentiality of advice received, and where appropriate seek to further assess particular cases or situations. Where it is apparent that important documentary heritage is imperilled, the IAC or Bureau will form a judgement on whether the heritage meets the criteria for a Register, on the level of risk and on the most appropriate action. The chair may then confidentially inform the Director General, who in turn will decide whether to exercise the discretions available to him or her to afford protection to the heritage.

7.3.3 In these cases, or in more public instances where significant heritage is under urgent threat, priority may be given to seeking resources – from UNESCO or elsewhere – to inventory, conserve or copy the endangered material.

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 From an idea which evolved in the early 1990s, MoW has matured into a widely recognised global programme, with an extensive committee structure involving thousands of participants on a largely volunteer basis. It has raised the profile of humanity's documentary heritage and it has facilitated the preservation and accessibility of the vast documentary heritage. In doing so, however, it has revealed how large a task remains if, throughout the world, the heritage is to be adequately protected and managed, and documents at risk are to be safeguarded.

8.2 MoW has much further to grow, and many more people – especially younger people – to reach. It is hoped that this new edition of the *General Guidelines* will facilitate the next stage of the journey. Perhaps never before in history has the world community so critically needed access to its memory, to overcome amnesia and xenophobia, and to build a sustainable and peaceful tomorrow.

Appendix 1

MEMORY OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ETHICS²³

1 Introduction

1.1 The following principles and requirements apply to members of the IAC, its subcommittees, working groups, the Secretariat and all those acting on their behalf. Regional and national MoW committees are expected to adopt their own Codes of Ethics which uphold the central values expressed in the International Code but are adjusted to accommodate regional or national cultural norms.

2 General principles

2.1 Members are experts who serve in a personal capacity, not as representatives of states, authorities or other entities, and in exercising their roles they represent themselves accordingly. They do not seek or accept instructions from governments, institutions or other external parties.

2.2 Members ensure that they have no real or apparent conflict of interest in the exercise of their responsibilities. If they become aware of any such conflict they are required to declare it.

2.3 Potential conflicts of interest may include:

- Being cited as an expert referee in a register nomination, or having an active relationship with a nominating organization
- Having governmental, commercial or private responsibilities which may conflict with the free exercise of one's expert opinion within the context of the program
- Expressing opinions which could be construed as prejudicing the outcome of a nomination, creating false expectations or which are otherwise contrary to the *General Guidelines*.
- Casting a vote on a nomination from one's own country

²³ This Code is based on the Ethics Protocol adopted by the IAC in 2011 for the guidance of IAC and RSC members. In the light of experience its scope has been expanded to include all IAC subcommittees.

2.4 Members accept an obligation to devote adequate time to the responsibilities of their roles, including becoming fully conversant with the *General Guidelines*, the *Recommendation* and other relevant reference points.

3 Management of register nominations

3.1 At every stage the nomination assessment process aims to be completely objective by testing nominations against prescribed criteria and nothing else. Being a committee-based process, and subject to the final decision of the Director-General, no prediction can ever be made of the success or otherwise of a particular nomination.

3.2 **Mentoring and advisory role** Because the nomination process can be complex and even daunting, it is appropriate for IAC and RSC members, and others qualified to do so, to provide encouragement and technical advice to intending nominators in developing their proposals for the International Register. This will usually happen in the following ways:

- Identifying heritage for which it *may* be possible to construct a case for inscription. This is particularly the case for countries which have little or no representation in the register, or where the logic and process for nomination needs to be better understood
- In the context of structured workshops or training events aimed at developing the skills for preparing nominations
- When a RSC member has been specifically assigned by the RSC or the Secretariat to work alongside a potential nominator in helping them prepare a nomination

Such involvements should be declared to the next IAC or RSC meeting.

“Technical advice” means helping nominators to interpret the nomination form and to provide the fullest range of relevant information for the informed assessment of their nomination. It does not include constructing the nominator’s case on their behalf.

3.3 **Relations with nominators** During the assessment phase, nominations are assigned among RSC members for research and preparation of an initial report to the RSC. Correspondence and contact with nominators during this time is normally the responsibility of the Secretariat. RSC members do not engage in direct contact with nominators unless authorised by the Chair of the RSC or the Secretariat to do.

IAC and RSC members may **not**:

- Prepare a nomination form, or prepare the argument or “case” for inscription, on behalf of a nominator. This must be entirely the work of the nominator.
- Offer an opinion to the nominator concerning the likely success or otherwise of the nomination, or its eligibility or suitability for the register, or otherwise express support of, or antipathy to, a nomination
- Express a partisan stance in relation to a nomination and its passage through the MOW process
- Express or imply personal support for a nomination through the acceptance of gifts or inducements of any kind
- In any other way compromise the objectivity of the assessment process

3.4 **Committee protocol** Where an IAC or RSC member has a real or apparent conflict of interest in relation to any nomination, that conflict is to be declared and its resolution documented in the relevant minutes. This includes occasions on which the member has provided mentoring or advisory advice, as mentioned above. In such cases, the member may provide information or otherwise contribute to IAC or RSC discussion when invited by the Chair to do so, but will abstain from any voting in relation to the nomination.

4 Lobbying, gifts and inducements

4.1 Both register inscription and broader association with the MoW program is prestigious and desirable. Governments and institutions may engage in lobbying activities in pursuit of their objectives, for example in an effort to maximise the possibility of a successful outcome for particular nominations, or conversely to minimise this possibility for nominations of which they disapprove.

4.2 For example, from time to time, members may be contacted by those with an interest in a nomination, seeking advance information about its likelihood of success. Such approaches should be discouraged by invoking the confidentiality provisions that bind IAC and RSC members in regard to the nomination process: once a nomination is accepted for assessment, all such questions should be directed through the Secretariat. Such incidents should be documented and reported to the RSC Chair and the Secretariat.

4.3 Lobbying can take many forms, including gifts and offers of travel, hospitality or calls for private meetings with IAC or subcommittee members. The practice has different implications and nuances in different cultures; what is deemed improper in one culture may be no more than good manners in another. Careful judgment is required in order to avoid conflict of interest on the one hand, and giving needless offence on the other. At the same time, countries or institutions in a position to fund lobbying activities must not thereby gain an assessment advantage over nominators who are not in such a position.

4.4 Mindful of the principles set out in this Code, members should weigh such approaches carefully and, if in doubt, consult with the Secretariat or the chair of RSC or IAC. The relevant issues to be weighed are:

- What are the assumptions or expectations of the party making the approach?
- Is the party fully aware of, and does it accept, the ethical constraints which bind members of the IAC and its subcommittees?
- Would a positive response by a member usefully add to the information available for assessing a nomination or project (for example, an opportunity to inspect nominated heritage at first hand)?
- Would a positive response by a member advance the programme in some other way (for example, an opportunity to meet with a national MoW committee)?
- Would a negative response cause genuine offence to the detriment of the MoW programme?

4.5 To ensure transparency, all such approaches, and the actions taken in relation to them, are to be documented by the member concerned and reported to the Secretariat. The reports will be considered at the next IAC or subcommittee meeting and will be annexed to the report of that meeting.

Appendix 2

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE PRESERVATION OF, AND ACCESS TO, DOCUMENTARY HERITAGE INCLUDING IN DIGITAL FORM

PREAMBLE

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, meeting in Paris from 3 to 18 November 2015, at its 38th session,

Considering that documents produced and preserved over time, in all their analogue and digital forms through time and space, constitute the primary means of knowledge creation and expression, having an impact on all areas of humanity's civilization and its further progress,

Also considering that documentary heritage records the unfolding of human thought and events, the evolution of languages, cultures, peoples and their understanding of the world,

Underlining the importance of documentary heritage to promote the sharing of knowledge for greater understanding and dialogue, in order to promote peace and respect for freedom, democracy, human rights and dignity,

Noting that the evolution of documentary heritage enables intercultural education and personal enrichment, scientific and technological progress and is a crucial resource for development,

Considering at the same time that the preservation of, and long-term accessibility to documentary heritage underpins fundamental freedoms of opinion, expression and information as human rights,

Also considering that universal access to documentary heritage must respect both the legitimate interests of rights-holders and the public interest in its preservation and accessibility,

Recognizing that aspects of the history and culture which exist in the form of documentary heritage may not be conveniently accessible,

Recognizing also that over time considerable parts of documentary heritage have disappeared due to natural or human disasters or are becoming inaccessible through rapid technological change, and **underlining** that lack of legislation impedes memory institutions to counter irreversible loss and impoverishment of that heritage,

Recalling that, in response to this challenge, UNESCO established the Memory of the World Programme in 1992 to increase awareness and protection of the world's documentary heritage, and to provide for its universal and permanent accessibility,

Taking into account the rapid evolution of technology, and the challenge of establishing models and processes for preserving digital heritage objects including complex ones, such as multi-media works, interactive hypermedia, online dialogues and dynamic data objects from complex systems, mobile content and future emerging formats,

Also taking into account the international standard-setting instruments and other relevant treaties and statements, as listed in the Appendix,

Bearing in mind the need for States, communities and individuals to take appropriate measures for the protection, preservation, accessibility and enhancement of the value of documentary heritage,

Having decided at its 37th session that this question should be the subject of a Recommendation to Member States,

Adopts, on this seventeenth day of November 2015, the present **Recommendation**:

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Recommendation, a **document** is an object comprising analogue or digital informational content and the carrier on which it resides. It is preservable and usually moveable. The content may comprise signs or codes (such as text), images (still or moving) and sounds, which can be copied or migrated. The carrier may have important aesthetic, cultural or technical qualities. The relationship between content and carrier may range from incidental to integral.

Documentary heritage comprises those single documents – or groups of documents – of significant and enduring value to a community, a culture, a country or to humanity generally, and whose deterioration or loss would be a harmful impoverishment. Significance of this heritage may become clear only with the passage of time. The world's documentary heritage is of global importance and responsibility to all, and should be fully preserved and protected for all, with due respect to and recognition of cultural mores and practicalities. It should be permanently accessible and re-usable by all without hindrance. It provides the means for understanding social, political, collective as well as personal history. It can help to underpin good governance and sustainable development. For each State, its documentary heritage reflects its memory and identity, and thus contributes to determine its place in the global community.

Memory institutions may include but are not limited to archives, libraries, museums and other educational, cultural and research organizations.

1. IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTARY HERITAGE

1.1 Member States are encouraged to support their memory institutions in establishing selection, collection and preservation policies by research and consultation, guided by internationally established and defined standards regarding documentary heritage in their territories. The documents, fonds and collections should be managed in a way that ensures their preservation and accessibility over time, and assigns means of discovery, including cataloguing and metadata.

1.2 Policies, mechanisms and criteria for selecting, acquiring and de-selecting documentary heritage should be developed by memory institutions in coordination with civil society, taking into account not only key documents but also their contextual material, including social media. Selection criteria must be non-discriminatory and clearly defined. Selection must also be neutrally balanced with respect to knowledge fields, artistic expressions and historic eras. Because of their inherently temporary nature, decisions concerning the preservation of digital documents may need to be made at or before the time of creation.

1.3 Member States are encouraged to identify specific documentary heritage the survival of which is at potential or imminent risk, and draw it to the attention of competent bodies able to take appropriate preservation measures. They should support and strengthen their relevant memory institutions and, where practical and appropriate, encourage research communities and private owners to care for their own documentary heritage in the public interest. Similarly, public and private institutions should ensure professional care for the documents which they themselves create.

1.4 Member States should encourage the identification and nomination of significant documentary heritage to national, regional or international Memory of the World Registers as a means of raising awareness.

1.5 Member States are invited to develop training and capacity-building schemes as appropriate to ensure the identification, preservation and access to documentary heritage.

2. PRESERVATION OF DOCUMENTARY HERITAGE

2.1 Preservation of documentary heritage means encompassing techniques, treatments, procedures and technologies of any nature, preventive and remedial, aiming at the preservation of the documents and of the information contained therein.

2.2 Preservation is an ongoing process requiring the management of both analogue and digital objects and can be enhanced by scholarship, technology and science. Analogue carriers should be retained where they have continuing value as authentic originals, artefacts or information bearing objects. In the case of digital documents, action and intervention are

desirable from before the point of creation and acquisition, in order to optimize further management, minimize costs and to properly manage the risks involved. Cooperation should be further encouraged among governments, memory institutions and the private sector.

2.3 In pursuing measures of preservation, integrity, authenticity and reliability should be the guiding principles. Concrete measures and actions should follow the international legislation and the recommendations, guidelines, best practices and standards developed or supported by memory institutions. The Memory of the World Programme, should provide a platform to promote standards and share best practices.

2.4 Member States are encouraged to develop awareness-raising and capacity-building measures and policies as a key component of preservation, including promoting research as well as training for documentary heritage professionals and providing facilities for such. These should embrace curatorial best practices, current and emerging technologies, forensic skills and core competencies in relevant scholarship, science, technology and engineering, thereby raising awareness of the urgency of timely preservation action in a constantly changing environment.

2.5 The existence of possibly legitimate access restrictions on any part of the documentary heritage should not inhibit or limit the ability of memory institutions to take preservation action. Member States are invited to take this consideration into account while implementing this recommendation and through updating their relevant domestic legislation.

2.6 Member States that hold in their memory institutions collections originating in or of relevance to other States are encouraged to share digital programmes and copies of such heritage with the Parties concerned.

2.7 Member States should encourage consistency of best practice and preservation standards across memory institutions, including risk management, such as the degradation and theft of documents, and investment in appropriate technical infrastructure. This may include nationwide coordination and sharing of tasks among memory institutions, based on their existing roles, strengths and responsibilities.

2.8 Member States are encouraged to support memory institutions' participation in the development of international standards for preservation. Member States are further invited to encourage memory institutions to link with the appropriate professional associations to both enhance and share their technical knowledge, and contribute to the ongoing development of international standards.

2.9 Member States are invited to support the development of academic curricula for digital preservation, as well as networking activities at national, regional and international levels for more effective implementation of the Memory of the World Programme, and the promotion of exchanges of experiences among UNESCO Member States based on best practice models.

3. ACCESS TO DOCUMENTARY HERITAGE

3.1 Member States are encouraged to provide appropriate legislative frameworks for memory institutions and ensure their necessary independence in preserving and providing access to documentary heritage, so as to sustain public trust in the scope of material selected, and the way in which it is preserved. The provision of access is visible evidence and justification of public expenditure on preservation.

3.2 Member States are urged to promote and facilitate maximum inclusive access to, and use of, documentary heritage by empowering memory institutions to provide accurate and up-to-date catalogues and finding aids, equitable person-to-person access services to the original documents, if necessary for research, Internet and web-based publications and portals, electronic and digitized content, using international best practice standards. Member States are further encouraged to support memory institutions in the development of international standards for access and use, using recognized standards that support interoperability. Whenever possible, content should be structured, machine-readable and linkable.

3.3 The avenues for providing access to documentary heritage are multiplying through the growth of information and communication technologies and the development of global networks among memory institutions and their partners. Member States should encourage and support the development of outreach programmes, including exhibitions, travelling presentations, radio and television programmes, publications, consumer products, online streaming, social media, lectures, educational programmes, special events and the digitization of content for downloading.

3.4 Programmes for access to documentary heritage may be facilitated by partnerships, including public-private ones. Member States are invited to encourage such arrangements if they are responsible and equitable.

3.5 Where restrictions to accessing documentary heritage are necessary to protect privacy, human safety, security, confidentiality or for other legitimate reasons, they should be clearly defined and stated and be of limited duration. They should be underpinned by appropriate national legislation or regulation by including an appeals mechanism against such decisions.

3.6 When updating or enacting new legislation which impacts on access to documentary heritage, Member States should consider the need to maximize such access while respecting the legitimate interests of the rights-holders. Member States are encouraged to extend this public access to countries with which they have shared a historical documentary heritage.

3.7 Member States are invited to enhance the visibility and accessibility of their documentary heritage through the outreach activities and publications of the Memory of the World Programme as appropriate, with investment in digitization of content for access purposes now being one of its key components. Member States should support and promote

public domain access, and wherever possible, encourage the use of public licensing and open access solutions.

4. POLICY MEASURES

4.1 Member States are urged to consider their documentary heritage as an invaluable asset and to apply this perspective in national legislation, development policies and agendas. They are further encouraged to recognize the long-term need for new investment in the preservation of different types of originals in analogue format, in digital infrastructure and skills, and to adequately endow memory institutions.

4.2 At the same time, in the context of their national heritage policies, Member States are encouraged to take a global view of the needs of memory institutions, beyond the practicalities of infrastructure, and encourage logical partnerships and cost sharing with other entities in setting up shared facilities, processes and services.

4.3 Private and local institutions and individuals holding valuable collections need public encouragement and support as well as adequate visibility in national directories.

4.4 Member States should improve access to documentary heritage by encouraging the development of new forms and tools of education and research on documentary heritage and their presence in the public domain.

4.5 Through legislation and policy, Member States are encouraged to create in a participatory approach a stable, enabling environment that will give incentives to sponsors, foundations and other external parties to support memory institutions and, with them, to invest in the preservation, accessibility and use of documentary heritage in the public interest.

4.6 Member States are encouraged to periodically review copyright codes and legal deposit regimes to ensure they are fully effective, with limitations and exceptions, for preserving and accessing documentary heritage in all its forms. Effectiveness would also profit from the strengthening and harmonization of legislation and alignment of policies among Member States.

4.7 Where preserving and accessing documentary heritage requires the use of software or other proprietary technology not covered by copyright exceptions, Member States are invited to facilitate access to proprietary codes, keys and unlocked versions of technology on a non-profit basis.

4.8 In order to facilitate optimal exchange of data, Member States should encourage the development and use of internationally recognized open source software and standardized interfaces for managing digital documentary heritage, and seek the cooperation of software and hardware developers in extracting data and content from proprietary technologies. Likewise, their memory institutions should aim for international standardization and interchangeability of cataloguing methods and standards.

4.9 Member States are invited to support and develop policies and initiatives affecting documentary heritage, including monitoring the status of documentary heritage inscribed on the Memory of the World Registers.

4.10 Member States are encouraged to contribute building synergies between the Memory of the World Programme and other heritage programmes in order to assure further coherence of actions.

5. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

5.1 In view of the need to intensify national and international cooperation and exchanges, in particular through the pooling of human and material resources to assist research and the protection and preservation of documentary heritage, Member States should support the exchange of research data, publications, and information; the training and exchange of specialist personnel and equipment. They should promote the organization of meetings, study courses and working groups on particular subjects, such as cataloguing, risk management, identification of endangered documentary heritage and modern research.

5.2 Member States should encourage cooperation with international and regional professional associations, institutions and organizations concerned with documentary heritage preservation and access, with a view to implementing bilateral or multilateral research projects and publishing guidelines, policies and best practice models.

5.3 Member States are invited to facilitate the exchange between countries of copies of documentary heritage that relate to their own culture, shared history or heritage, and of other identified documentary heritage, in particular due to their shared and entangled historical nature or in the framework of the reconstitution of dispersed original documents, as appropriate, which has been the object of preservation work in another country. The exchange of copies will have no implications on the ownership of originals.

5.4 To the best of their ability, Member States should take all appropriate measures to safeguard their documentary heritage against all human and natural dangers to which it is exposed, including the risks deriving from armed conflicts. Likewise, they should refrain from acts likely to damage documentary heritage or diminish its value or impede its dissemination or use, whether it is to be found on the territory of one Member State or on the territory of other States.

5.5 Member States are encouraged to engage in international cooperation to safeguard endangered documentary heritage through digitization or other means following a request made by another Member State.

5.6 Member States are invited to strengthen their cooperation with the Memory of the World Programme through their memory institutions by establishing national Memory of the World committees and registers, when deemed appropriate.

The General Conference recommends that Member States should apply the above provisions concerning the preservation of and access to documentary heritage by taking whatever legislative or policy measures or other steps that may be required, in conformity with the constitutional practice of each State, to give effect, within their respective territories to the principles, measures and norms set forth in this Recommendation.

The General Conference recommends that Member States bring this Recommendation to the attention of the appropriate authorities and bodies.

The General Conference recommends that Member States should report to it, by the dates and in a manner to be determined by it, on the action they have taken to give effect to this Recommendation.

APPENDIX

International instruments covering the protection of elements of documentary heritage:

I. UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954);

Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970);

Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972);

Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003);

Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005);

Recommendation for the Safeguarding and Preservation of Moving Images (1980);

Recommendation concerning the Promotion and Use of Multilingualism and Universal Access to Cyberspace (2003);

Charter on the Preservation of Digital Heritage (2003).

II. Declarations and other documents

The Universal Declaration on Archives (2010) accepted by the International Council on Archives (ICA), and endorsed by the 36th session of the General Conference of UNESCO (2011);

Warsaw Declaration: 'Culture –Memory– Identities' (2011);

The Moscow Declaration on Digital Information Preservation (2011) adopted by the International Conference on "Preservation of Digital Information in the Information Society: Problems and Prospects" organized by the UNESCO Information for All Programme (IFAP);

UNESCO/UBC Vancouver Declaration "The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation" (2012);

The IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) Statement on Libraries and Intellectual Freedom (1999).

1993 Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples

2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

III. International treaties

Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (last amended in 1979);

Universal Copyright Convention (1952);

International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations (1961)

Appendix 3

THE PROFORMAS

- Nomination to the International MoW Register
- Nomination of additional exemplar to an existing inscription
- Comment on a current nomination to the International MoW Register

UNESCO MEMORY OF THE WORLD REGISTER NOMINATION FORM

1.0 Title of item or collection being proposed

Keep the title short – maximum ten words is desirable.

2.0 Summary (max 200 words)

*Give a **brief description** of the documentary heritage being nominated, and the argument for its **significance for the memory of the world**.*

*Write this section **last**, once you have completed all the other sections. Include all the essential points you have made in the nomination, especially the key arguments you have made in the statement of significance **as to why the nominated documentary heritage is critical to the memory of the world**.*

3.0 Nominator contact details

3.1 Name of nominator (person or organisation)

3.2 Relationship to the nominated material

3.3 Address

3.4 Telephone

Email

4.0 Declaration of Authority

I certify that I have the authority to nominate the item, or items, described in this document to the Memory of the World Register.

Signature

Full name and position

Date

5.0 Legal information

5.1 Name of owner (person or organisation)

5.2 Address

5.3 Telephone

Email

5.4 Name and contact details of custodian IF DIFFERENT from the owner

5.5 Legal status

Provide details of legal and administrative responsibility for the preservation of the documentary heritage.

Any relevant supporting documents should be scanned and submitted with the application.

5.6 Copyright status

If the copyright status of the documentary heritage is known, it should be stated. However, the copyright status of a document or collection has no bearing on its significance, and is not taken into account when determining whether it meets the criteria for inscription.

Images supplied with the nomination must be accompanied by the signed 'Agreement Granting Non-Exclusive Rights' form available on the UNESCO Memory of the World website.

5.7 Accessibility (note any restrictions, including cultural restrictions)

Describe how the item(s) or collection may be accessed.

If legal or cultural constraints limit access, describe the nature of these constraints.

Digitisation for access purposes is encouraged. Comment on whether this has already been done, or is planned.

6.0 Identity and description of the documentary heritage

6.1 Name and identification details of the items/collection being nominated

Give the exact title of the nomination and the institution(s) nominating it. These will appear on the inscription certificate if the nomination is successful.

6.2 Catalogue or registration details

Give the catalogue or registration details for the item or collection.

Provide a physical description of the item(s) if it is relevant to their significance.

A nominated collection or archival fonds must be finite, with clear beginning and end dates.

If the catalogue or registration details are too unwieldy, provide a description of the contents with sample catalogue entries, accession or registration numbers.

Or you can add the catalogue/registration details as an appendix, or refer to an online inventory.

6.3 Visual documentation (if available and appropriate)

Visual documentation includes photographic images or audiovisual material where relevant.

Attach photos as jpg files to be submitted with the application, or supply a CD, DVD or USB key for audiovisual material.

6.4 History/provenance

*Set out the history of the item or collection - its 'life story' or provenance - from the time when it was created to its place in your institution. This is critical to the item or collection's **authenticity**. You may not know all the details, but give as comprehensive an account of the item or collection's provenance as you can.*

6.5 Bibliography

A bibliography provides evidence that the documentary heritage has been used by scholars, and knowledge of its impact and influence is in the public domain. It is a good idea to cite the works of scholars from outside your own country, as well as local scholars, to demonstrate this influence.

6.6 Names, qualifications and contact details of up to three independent people or organisations with expert knowledge about values and provenance of the nominated material.

Name	Qualifications	Contact details (email)
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

Note that the names and contact details of these referees will not be disclosed on the Memory of the World Register, nor disclosed without their permission to any third party. Other authoritative referees should also be contacted to obtain a broad spectrum of opinion for assessment purposes.

7.0 Assessment against the selection criteria

7.1 Primary criteria - significance value to the world. Comment on one or more of the following significance criteria.

Not all the criteria will apply to your documentary heritage. Choose only those criteria that are relevant to your nomination.

7.1.1 Historic significance

What does the documentary heritage tell us about the history of the world? Does it deal with

- *Political, economic, social or spiritual movements*

- *leading personalities in world history*
- *events of world-changing significance*
- *specific places of significance*
- *traditional customs*
- *relations with other countries or communities*
- *changing patterns of life and culture*
- *a turning point in history, or a critical innovation*
- *an example of excellence in the arts, literature, science, technology, sport, or other parts of life and culture?*

7.1.2 Form and style

This criterion refers to the physical nature of the documentary heritage. Much documentary heritage is unremarkable in this respect, for example, manuscript or typescript paper records. However, some forms of documentary heritage display innovative qualities or high levels of artistry, and it is to these that this criterion applies.

- *Is the documentary heritage a particularly fine exemplar of its type?*
- *Does it have outstanding qualities of beauty and craftsmanship?*
- *Is it a new or unusual type of carrier?*
- *Or is it an example of a type of document that has now disappeared?*

7.1.3 Social, community or spiritual significance

*This criterion refers to the attachment to the documentary heritage of a specific community **in the present**. You must show how this attachment is demonstrated, for example, a community may be strongly attached to the heritage of a beloved leader, or to the documentary evidence of a specific incident or site. Or it may revere the documentary heritage associated with a spiritual leader or a saint. Provide information on how this attachment is expressed.*

7.2 Comparative criteria. Comment on one or more of the following comparative criteria:

7.2.1 Rarity

Is the item or collection rare? Is it one of a kind (the only one ever created), or the last survivor of a form of documentary heritage that was once widespread? Do similar items or collections exist?

7.2.2 Integrity, completeness, condition

Is the documentary heritage complete, or are sections or pages missing? Has part of the documentary heritage become lost, or are supplementary parts being preserved elsewhere? If so, give details.

What condition is it in?

7.3 Statement of significance

*Summarise the points you have made in 7.1 and 7.2, and make the case for **authenticity** based on the **provenance** of the documentary heritage.*

*What has been the **impact** of this documentary heritage material on world history and culture?*

*Why is this documentary heritage important to the memory of the world? What has been its impact on life and culture **beyond the boundaries of a nation state or region**? State why the documentary heritage is important to the memory of the world, and why its loss would impoverish the heritage of humanity.*

8.0 Consultation with stakeholders

8.1 Provide details of consultation with relevant stakeholders about this nomination

Relevant stakeholders include:

- *Owners/custodians of the documentary heritage*
- *Communities with involvement in the documentary heritage*
- *Scholars who research the documentary heritage*

9.0 Risk assessment

9.1 Detail the nature and scope of threats to the nominated material

Is the documentary heritage at risk from:

- *Climatic conditions*

- *Poor storage*
- *Economic issues*
- *Potential political interference*

If your documentary heritage is at risk, say so - UNESCO needs to know its true situation.

10.0 Preservation and access management plan

10.1 Describe, or attach as a scanned document, any existing plans. If no plans exist, provide details about proposed conservation, storage and access strategies.

11.0 Any other information that may support the nomination

11.1 Note below or attach scanned documents as appropriate.

This may include statements from supporters, plans for promoting the documentary heritage if it is inscribed, or scanned news items relating to the documentary heritage.

How do you see this documentary heritage being used for education and research?

12.0 CHECKLIST

Summary completed (section 2);

Nomination and contact details completed (section 3);

Declaration of Authority signed and dated (section 4);

If this is a joint nomination, section 4 is appropriately modified, and all Declarations of Authority obtained;

Legal information (section 5);

Details of custodian if different from owner (section 5);

Details of legal status completed (section 5);

Details of accessibility completed (section 5);

Copyright permission for images completed (section 5);

Catalogue and registration information (section 6);

History/provenance completed (section 6);

Bibliography completed (section 6);

Independent referees identified (section 6);

Significance – primary criteria (section 7);

Significance – comparative criteria (section 7);

Statement of significance (section 7);

Details of consultation with stakeholders completed where relevant (section 8);

Assessment of risk completed (section 9);

Summary of Preservation and Access Management Plan completed or strategy proposed (section 10);

Any other information provided – if applicable (section 11);

Additional scanned documents, including suitable reproduction quality photographs identified to illustrate the documentary heritage (300dpi, jpg format, full-colour preferred);

INTERNATIONAL MEMORY OF THE WORLD REGISTER

PROPOSAL TO ADD AN EXEMPLAR TO AN EXISTING INSCRIPTION

SUMMARY

(About 200 words)

CASE DETAILS

(A record of how, when and why the process was initiated, how it was carried out and by whom, with relevant dates and tabulation of steps taken. The steps would include research and consultation with stakeholders. It may be included here in the proforma, or be attached as a separate report from the case investigator).

EXISTING INSCRIPTION (example)

(Here set out the details and date of the current inscription and its rationale. These can be drawn from the original nomination document)

THE CASE FOR ADDITION

(Here set out the case for adding the additional exemplar. The work itself has already been recognized, so the need here is to describe why this exemplar deserves to be added to the inscription, how it differs from or complements the currently inscribed document, what additional quality or completeness it adds to the present inscription).

IDENTITY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE ADDITIONAL EXEMPLAR

Name and identification details

Catalogue or registration details

Visual documentation if appropriate

History/provenance

DETAILS OF THE CUSTODIAN

Owner

Legal status

AUTHENTICITY

(Is it established?)

UNIQUENESS

(What is unique about its content or the nature of the carrier)

RARITY

(If it is a rare survivor of what was originally a larger number of copies explain this).

INTEGRITY AND CONDITION

(Complete or incomplete? State of preservation? Comparison of content and condition with the inscribed exemplar)

CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

ASSESSMENT OF RISK

PRESERVATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

OTHER INFORMATION

INTERNATIONAL MEMORY OF THE WORLD REGISTER

COMMENT ON A CURRENT NOMINATION

IDENTIFICATION OF THE NOMINATION

NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS OF THE COMMENTATOR

SUMMARY OF THE COMMENT

DETAIL OF THE COMMENT AGAINST THE SELECTION CRITERIA

Important note: Comments that will aid in the assessment process are welcome from any person or organization. Comments must be received before the closing date stated on the MoW website, and must relate directly to the selection criteria set out in Section 6.3 of the *General Guidelines*. Comments unrelated to these cannot be considered. For further information, refer to paragraphs 6.6.4 and 6.6.5 of the *Guidelines*.

Appendix 4

INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS

The programme embraces documentary heritage over the whole of recorded history, from papyrus scrolls and clay tablets to digital files. In principle, nothing is too old or too new to merit consideration. No distinction is made between ‘public’ and ‘private’ documentary heritage.

Audiovisual documents

Audiovisual media exist in a wide variety of analogue and digital formats. Identifying an “original” or earliest surviving generation is sometimes a matter of judgment. As a general principle, MoW seeks the “original” and therefore most authoritative version rather than whatever copy the nominator happens to have on hand.

(Case study: METROPOLIS)

Interviews, oral histories and performances

Performances of traditional ceremonies, dances, music, story telling and similar cultural expressions are usually conceived of as intangible heritage, but if they are captured as sound or audiovisual recordings they become fixed in time and the recordings are therefore recognised as documents.

Likewise, interviews, testimonies and oral histories are recognized as documents with the same legitimacy as their text-based equivalents.

Artistic, literary and musical works

This is, by its nature, an area of unclear boundaries in which MoW has established its precedents with care.

MoW does not seek to inscribe artistic, literary or musical works as such, based purely on their artistic, literary or musical merit. However, it does inscribe documents that show the genesis of an important single work, group of works or of a whole oeuvre, or depict a prominent state of a work, and/or the biographical and societal context of an important artist or work (such as first draft, fair copy, letters that show the beginning, process, or end of an outstanding work, the personal library of an artist, composer or writer, for example, with personal annotations, films or tapes with interviews). The importance can be generated by aesthetic qualities and/or impact on culture and history.

To suggest a hypothetical example, one may nominate a group of letters that reveal the relationship between two Renaissance painters. These are documents. But their actual paintings would be ineligible for nomination *unless* they had significant documentary value and satisfied the criteria for inscription on a MoW register.

➤ *Examples of inscriptions: Metropolis, Gutenberg Bible, Astrid Lindgren Archives, Wizard of*

Oz, Bayeux Tapestry, Gothic architectural drawings, Beethoven's 9th symphony MSS, the Bayasanghori Shahnameh, Carlos Gardel tango recordings, Russian posters, Song of the Nibelungspoem:



Exclusions from the international register

As a practical necessity, and to avoid offence, experience has shown that certain types of document should not normally be considered for inscription on the International MoW Register. *The two examples below are indicative only.*

Papers of contemporary political leaders and political parties

Normally, these would be relevant to national or regional MoW registers, according to the due decisions of their MoW committees. However, the need to be – and to be seen to be – even-handed and objective can conflict with the current political circumstances in which every MoW committee operates. MoW registers should avoid being subject to any accusations of political partisanship.

Where a national or regional committee decides to assess such material, the extent of influence needs to be weighed carefully. Is the individual or organization widely influential, for good or ill, in shaping recent history – for example, in starting or ending wars, in shaping social or political systems, or in establishing great insights or principles?

There will clearly be instances when the influence of a past political figure extends beyond national or regional boundaries. The relevant documentary heritage may then need to be assessed against the criteria for the International MoW Register.

National constitutions and similar documents

These may be appropriate candidates for national MoW registers, but would not normally qualify for the international or regional registers because their influence is usually restricted to the country concerned. Exceptions would be documents that have clearly had wide geographic influence, for example in serving as models for other national constitutions, or in pioneering what have since become universally accepted principles.

“Whole of institution” nominations

While the nomination of a collection, a fonds or a group of collections and fonds is welcome, the nomination of the *entire contents* of a memory institution is unlikely to be successful, unless it demonstrates a significance, unity and coherence beyond the *coincidence* of material which happens to reside in the same institution. Further, such nominations do not usually meet the test of being closed and finite – the holdings of the institution are constantly changing.

For some institutions, such as official national, city and university archives or national libraries, acquisition of material is determined by legislation; jurisdiction and policy and archival fonds can be interrelated. By definition, MoW registers are highly selective and seek to recognize

specific heritage of outstanding significance.

Appendix 5

EXPANDED DEFINITION OF DOCUMENTARY HERITAGE

A **document** is an object comprising analogue or digital informational *content* and the *carrier* on which it resides. It is preservable and usually moveable. The content may comprise signs or codes (such as text), images (still or moving) and sounds, which can be copied or migrated. The carrier may have important aesthetic, cultural or technical qualities. The relationship between content and carrier may range from incidental to integral.

Documents are the result of a deliberate intellectual act and come in numerous forms:

Text items such as manuscripts (of any age), books, newspapers, posters, correspondence, business records, computer files etc. The textual content may be recorded in ink, pencil, paint, digits or other medium, The carrier may be paper, plastic, papyrus, parchment, palm leaves, bark, stone, fabric, hard disk, data tape or other material.

Non-text items such as drawings, maps, music scores, plans, prints, diagrams or graphics. The recording medium and the carrier may be similarly diverse.

Audiovisual items such as sound discs, magnetic tapes, films, photographs – whether in analogue or digital form, however recorded and in any format. The physical carrier may be paper, various forms of plastic or celluloid, shellac, metal or other material.

Virtual documents, such as websites, which may be an assemblage of data from a variety of sources on a single or multiple computers, or from one or more data carriers on a single computer.

Documentary heritage comprises those single documents – or groups of documents – of significant and enduring value to a community, a country or to humanity generally, and whose deterioration or loss would be a harmful impoverishment.

Documentary heritage is a collective term used by MoW to refer to a *single* document of any kind, or a number of documents that form a logical and coherent *group* (such as a *collection*, a *holding* or an archival *fonds*). The size of the group does not matter; what holds the group together does. A *collection* is a self-contained group of individual documents that have been brought together by a particular circumstance, reason or purpose (for example, subject matter, character, provenance, or historical relationships). An archival *fonds* is the whole group of documents made or received by a person or organization in the course of their normal activities and kept for future reference, and in which the administrative context and relationships between records is preserved. A *holding* is a set or larger grouping of defined collections and/or fonds. It is possible that collections, fonds or holdings may have become split between two or more institutions in the same or different countries, over time, for various reasons.

MoW defines a *document* as having two components or aspects: the information *content* and

the *carrier* on which it resides. *Both may be of great variety and, in the context of inscribed documents, of different degrees of importance.*

Generally, in traditional (analogue) text documents, content and carriers form a unit which is usually considered as the *original*. Such documents may owe much of their importance to the specific nature of the carrier (for example, an illuminated manuscript or a photograph recorded on a particular kind of paper) or its circumstantial associations (for example, a music score written by a famous composer or a collection compiled or owned by a renowned person).

In the case of machine-readable or reproducible documents – that is, all audiovisual documents except analogue photographs, and all digital documents – the carrier, although necessary to physically contain the information, is sometimes of lesser or even no importance in the context of Memory of the World. This is because digital and audiovisual information is generally preserved by migration from one storage platform and carriers to the next. However, this is not always true. There are cases where the particular carrier on which the content is stored could be the reason for a document's inscription (for example, a phonoautogram, or the oldest data on punch cards). Motion picture film may have characteristics (such as an obsolete colour process) which give the carrier a particular importance.

Appendix 6

NOMINATING DIGITAL DOCUMENTS FOR INSCRIPTION²⁴

Compared to analogue documents, digital documents have a very short history and they are still evolving very rapidly. In the context of these Guidelines, this Appendix does not pretend to present a full overview nor to draw conclusions on this development. Its only purpose is to serve as a tool to manage them within the framework of the Memory of the World Registers. They have been formulated in such a way that they can be used by potential nominators.

Criteria for inscription

The principles and criteria for the inscription of digital documents are essentially the same as for physical documents. Both the content and the carrier (including the software) could provide reasons for inscription.

Metadata

A book or any other physical document can be accessed and read without cataloguing details, but digital objects cannot be accessed without metadata. For that reason, metadata are an integral part of digital objects. Bibliographical, technical, administrative and structural metadata, together with representation information, preservation description information and packaging information should always be part of the nominated material.²⁵

Representation

Responsive digital documents have a different look and feel when accessed on different devices. Layout, type fonts and type sizes are adapted, although the textual content of the document itself remains unchanged. If the significance of the digital document mainly relates to its content, the representation may be less important. But if the appearance of the digital document is the main reason for its nomination, differences which are caused by the use of different devices may affect its significance. Any nomination form dealing with digital materials should address this issue, for example by specifying the software environment in which the document was created and was intended to be accessed.

Management plans

²⁴ A wider exploration of issues relating to digital documents in the MoW context can be found in the doctoral thesis by Anca Claudia Prodan, *The Digital "Memory of the World": an exploration of documentary practices in the age of digital technology* (2014, Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany)

²⁵ A useful description of essential metadata can be found in the *Reference model for an open archival information system (OAIS)*: <https://public.ccsds.org/pubs/650x0m2.pdf>.

The sustainability of digital objects is even more critical than the enduring conservation of physical materials. This relates also to the necessary hardware and software to keep them accessible. Management plans of the holding institutions should always be added as an appendix to nomination forms for digital materials. These management plans should be specific about the preservation of digital documents and cite the institution's digital preservation policy and preservation plan that will ensure their ongoing accessibility.

Monitoring

Monitoring the continuing presence, accessibility and condition is as important for digital objects as for physical documents, if not more. An advantage of digital materials is the possibility of carrying out the monitoring from anywhere, without physically visiting the holding institution. But because of the dynamic character of many digital materials, monitoring should be done on a more frequent basis, preferably once every year. Monitoring includes checking if all qualities and features that justified inscription on the Register are still available and working.

Storage and access adaptations, developments in hardware and software, emulations and other technical and metadata changes may affect the sustainability of the digital materials both in a positive and a negative way. This should be taken into consideration in the monitoring process. If sustainability of the document is in doubt the inscription may need to be removed from the Register.

Categories of digital materials

For the sake of simplicity and usability digital materials can be divided in three categories:

- I. Digitized materials
- II. Fixed born digital objects
- III. Dynamic born digital objects

Software has been proposed as a fourth category because it complies with the description of documents in the 2015 *Recommendation* (possibly comprising 'signs or codes'). But in the tradition of the Registers, nominated items have always been *documentary manifestations*. Software as such is not a manifestation. The application of innovative or otherwise significant software can be the reason for the nomination and inscription of a digital document (just like the Gutenberg Bible was inscribed, not because of its text, but as the manifestation of a new technique). So for the moment software itself is not eligible to be regarded as a document, but the discussion may be resumed at a later stage.

I. Interpreting the criteria for *digitized objects*

Digitized objects are digitized versions of physical original documents: books, newspapers, archives, maps, pictures, films, sound and video recordings, etc., etc.

Why nominate digitized objects?

By definition digitized objects are not originals, so they are not the most authentic copies/manifestations of the given documents. The nomination form should always explain why the digitized versions are nominated and not the originals. Some reasons could be:

- The inaccessibility, disappearance or destruction, real or potential, of the original documents. The original may still exist but is in such a condition that it is illegible or at risk of disappearance;
- The corpus of digitized copies is a virtual reunification of a former collection that is now scattered over many locations;
- The digitization has added value due to addition of e.g. high quality OCR, full text indexation, contextualization, tags for named entities (persons, places, dates, events), other search facilities etc.;²⁶
- The applied method or technique of digitization is innovative and the nominated objects are manifestations giving proof of this innovation.

What exactly (which version) is being nominated?

Sometimes institutions preserve digitized content in different formats, e.g. scans in TIFF and JPG. Usually, but not necessarily, the format with the highest quality is considered the preservation copy. The nominated version should normally be the preservation copy.

There may also be different levels of all sorts of metadata. The nomination form should also indicate which set of metadata is being nominated.

Authenticity and integrity

Any nomination of (a collection of) digitized objects should answer two questions:

1. Are all original documents authentic and complete and was the original collection complete? (A digital copy of a forgery is also a forgery.)
2. Are all digitized copies 'authentic' (i.e. not retouched or corrupted) and complete? (No images or metadata missing or incomplete.)

II. Interpreting criteria for *fixed born digital objects*

Fixed born digital objects are, for instance: digitally produced E-books, digital born archives, pictures, sound recordings, databases, interactive presentations, e-mails, tweets, etc. Closed and archived websites are also in this category. Fixed born digital objects have been produced in a digital way, but once they are finite the intention is to keep them unchanged for ever.

(Just like physical documents, a born digital document may have been adapted before it got to its final state. But from that moment on it should be fixed to fit in this category.)

In principle, (collections of) born digital objects which are fixed and finite are similar to (collections of) physical documents, and the same criteria apply. Special attention should be given to the fixed character. Management plans and other security measures, and monitoring options, should guarantee that the objects, files and metadata have not been and will not be subject to any form of manipulation (photoshopping, deselection or addition of items etc.), neither in the past nor in the future. Preservation should include specification of the technology necessary to access and represent these fixed born digital objects.

²⁶ In these cases the collection could be fixed and finite but the presentation is probably dynamic. The nomination form should address this issue.

III. Interpreting criteria for *dynamic born digital objects*

Some obvious examples: active websites, continuously enhanced digital resources such as educational media, social media.

Websites can be dynamic in several (usually combined) ways, e.g.:

- The website changes regularly due to alterations, additions and deletions executed by the webmaster;
- The website (or webpage) is personalized: it varies and changes based on the characteristics of the user (identity, location, type of membership, given or supposed preferences etc.);
- The website is interactive: it responds to questions or orders from the user.

The dynamic, non-fixed and non-finite character is one of the main characteristics and features of websites and can be a significant value. For that reason the general requirement that items should be fixed and finite must be elaborated by the following additional requirements:

- The nomination form should contain an extensive description of the structure, content, options, facilities, metadata, links and other features of the website at the moment of nominating. It should also contain a description of the history of the website.
- The nomination form should contain a description of the process, criteria and responsibilities regarding the dynamics of the material.
- A fixed copy of the dynamic born digital object as it was on the date of submission of the nomination should be archived, be preserved and be accessible (at least for monitoring purposes).
- The owner or webmaster of the dynamic born digital object should provide an overview of all changes made to the content, metadata, technical formats, features and facilities, preservation measures and other major changes, on a regular basis in connection to the monitoring process. This may require that an updated, fixed copy of the dynamic born digital material as archived on the date of review be supplied in order for the inscription to remain on the register.

Appendix 7

MODEL TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A NATIONAL MOW COMMITTEE

The following model, which is presented as a guide only, has been adapted from the terms of reference of the Australian national *Memory of the World* Committee.

Name

The committee, which shall be known as the [country] *Memory of the World* Committee, will operate within the framework and objectives specified in the *Memory of the World* General Guidelines.

Role

The [country] *Memory of the World* Committee will have the responsibility for the overall management and monitoring of the Programme in [country] and will:

- Establish and maintain the [country] national *Memory of the World* Register, and encourage, receive and assess nominations of documentary heritage for inclusion in it.
- coordinate and propose nominations from [country] to the international *Memory of the World Register*
- work in close cooperation with governmental and non-governmental organizations in [country] in developing the national register and contributing to the international register,
- raise awareness of and promote the *Memory of the World* Programme in [country],
- encourage and seek government and private sector sponsorship for specific *Memory of the World* projects and activities in [country],
- work in close collaboration with the [country] National Commission for UNESCO, and the regional *Memory of the World* Committee
- maintain regular contact with the Secretariat.

Membership

The [country] *Memory of the World* Committee shall have members that are representative of all regions and relevant cultural interests within [country]. Only one member may be appointed from any one organization or peak body. Members will be appointed in their personal capacity by the Chairperson of the [country] National Commission for UNESCO or his/her representative. Members will be chosen on the basis of their knowledge of the field and on their ability to contribute to the achievement of the Programme's objectives.

Sample composition of Committee and possible membership:

- Member of the IAC or regional *Memory of the World* Committee (if available)
- professional from the archival community
- A professional from the library community
- A member of the indigenous community (where relevant)
- A professional from the museum community
- Official from the government department responsible for heritage or culture (may attend in a representative rather than personal capacity)
- A professional with Conservation/Preservation expertise
- One or two other persons with relevant specialist skills or experience

Term of Office

Appointment is for a period of four years with an option for a second term. To ensure continuous innovation and continuity, half of the first committee will be appointed for an initial term of two years and the other half for four years. Thereafter all appointments will be for four years.

Rules

Office bearers – A chairperson and deputy chairperson will be appointed by the [country] National Commission for UNESCO.

Financial matters – The Committee will manage its own funds which will be used primarily for raising awareness and promotion of the *Memory of the World* Programme, and accounted for to the National Commission for UNESCO. As required, it may manage projects or tasks delegated by the National Commission, the IAC or the Regional *Memory of the World* Committee.

Legal responsibilities – The Committee will not enter into any contractual arrangements between the owners and custodians of documentary heritage and commercial organizations.

National *Memory of the World* Register – The Register will be compiled by the Committee and will be retained by the [country] National Commission for UNESCO. Electronic access to the register will be provided through a website.

Meetings – At least two meetings will be held each year in a convenient location. Half the members will constitute a quorum.

Minutes – Minutes of each meeting will be taken and will be available to the Secretariat and the National Commission for UNESCO.

Reporting – A formal annual report of the activities of the Committee will be provided to the Secretariat.

Sub-committees – Sub-committees will be formed as and when required.

Appendix 8

MEMORY OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME: STATUTES AND RULES

Appendix 9

MEMORY OF THE WORLD LOGO: RULES

Guidelines on Logo Use

GENERAL

In order to demonstrate their link with UNESCO, Regional or National Committees of the Memory of the World Programme and institutions which hold a documentary heritage item listed on a Memory of the World Register can use the UNESCO Memory of the World logo. However, such use is subject to the following provisions:

- The conditions for the use of the logo will be determined by UNESCO and they cannot be changed without prior written agreement of UNESCO.
- The UNESCO Memory of the World logo must be cautiously used so as not to cause any misinterpretation by the public about the respective status of the committee or the institution; the UNESCO Memory of the World logo must under no circumstances be used for any commercial purposes, neither by the Committee nor by the institution.
- All promotional and publicity materials produced by an institution or by a Regional or National Committee bearing the UNESCO Memory of the World logo should feature a disclaimer such as “xxx Institution/Committee is responsible for the choice and presentation of views contained in this xxx and for opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization”.

Logo use by institutions which host a documentary heritage item inscribed on a Memory of the World Register

The logo that should be used for a registered documentary heritage item will include four parts:

- The logo of UNESCO with its three elements, i.e. the temple symbol, the full name of the organization, and the vertical dotted line;
- The [new] logo of the Memory of the World Programme;
- The name of the registered documentary heritage item;
- The standard line of text “Inscribed on the Memory of the World [International/Region/Country] Register in xxxx (Year)”.



This logo should only be used in connection with the particular registered item in the archive, library or museum and should not be used by the institution generally. For example, if the manuscript of Ibsen’s “A Doll’s House” is displayed in a case, the above UNESCO Memory of the World logo could be featured either on the case or be used next to the manuscript. However, this logo should not be used in the entrance hall, nor should it be used in such a way as to give the impression that the building is a UNESCO office or some other entity of the UNESCO Secretariat. It should not be used on the general publicity materials or merchandise produced by the institution.

Logo Use by Regional or National Committees

As officially established Regional or National Committees of the Memory of the World Programme, these Committees are equally invited and encouraged to use the UNESCO Memory of the World logo in order to demonstrate their association with UNESCO and to promote, facilitate and monitor the implementation of the Programme within their respective regions and countries.

The logo used by a Regional or National Committee should be composed of three parts:

- The logo of UNESCO with its three elements, i.e. the temple symbol, the full name of the Organization, and the vertical dotted line;
- The [new] logo of the Memory of the World Programme;
- The standard line of text “National Committee of + country name” or “Regional Committee of + name of the region”.



Steps for obtaining the UNESCO Memory of the World logo

When a logo is required by an institution for a registered documentary heritage item or by a Regional or National Committee, the institution or the committee is required to complete and send a very simple Logo Request Form (Appendix 1) to the UNESCO Programme Officer in charge of the Memory of the World Programme.

UNESCO will create the logo in accordance with UNESCO's graphical guidelines.

An electronic file that contains the logo in a pdf high resolution illustrator vector format will be sent to the requesting organization, together with a technical note that explains how the logo can be downloaded and reproduced.

Further terms and conditions concerning logo use

Commercial use of the logo is not permitted, except under a specific contractual arrangement expressly authorized by the Director-General of UNESCO. The sale of goods or services bearing the name, acronym, logo or internet domain names of UNESCO for profit is regarded as commercial use, as well as licensing and partnerships with commercial entities. If an occasion arises in which the UNESCO Memory of the World logo may need to be used in the context of commercial use or for fundraising purposes, the concerned institution or the Regional or National Committee is required to contact UNESCO to seek authorization.

Authorizing the use of the name, acronym, and logo of UNESCO is the prerogative of the governing bodies of UNESCO. In other words, institutions that hold a registered documentary heritage item can use the logo in its activities that are directly and only related to the registered item but cannot authorize the use of the logo to others. Equally, Regional and National Committees can themselves use the logo in their activities for the Memory of the World Programme but cannot authorize the use of the logo to others.

The height of the temple symbol alone is used as the way of measurement for the size of the logo. When the logo is reproduced, the height of the temple symbol should never be smaller than 12mm.

No element within the logo or the proportion between the different elements of the logo can be changed or modified without prior written agreement of UNESCO.

Institutions and Regional or National Committees are required to complete an annual questionnaire (Appendix 2) on events and activities that they have organized to promote the registered documentary item or the Memory of the World Programme. The purpose is for UNESCO to evaluate the outreach and impact of the Memory of the World Programme.

Logo Request Form

1). In which language or languages is the logo required?	
2). What is the name of the registered documentary heritage item or the Regional or National Committee in each of the languages that you require?	
3). If you are requiring the logo in more than one language, do you need the logo in each language separately or do you need a logo that is bilingual and trilingual?	
4). Please provide information on where and how the requested logo will be used.	

Please send the completed Logo Request Form by email to:

Memory of the World Secretariat
Communication and Information Sector
UNESCO
7, place de
Fontenoy 75352
Paris 07 SP
France
Telephone: 00 33 1 45.68.44.97

Questionnaire

1. Name of Institution/Committee

2. Year of Events/Activities

3. During the year, how many events/activities were organised that are related to the promotion of the registered documentary item or the Memory of the World Programme?

4. Who were the audience of the events/activities? (Please tick all those relevant)

- Development agencies (e.g. international and intergovernmental organizations, UN system)
- Policy makers (e.g. Government Ministries, parliamentarians, local authorities)
- Civil society (e.g. NGOs)
- Private sectors
- Scientists/researcher/ academia
- Educators/teachers/trainers
- Students/youth
- Mass media
- Specialized media
- General public
- Others (please specify)

5. Was there any media coverage for the events/activities? (Please specify the total number of each feature)

Type	Local	National	International
Print			
Radio			
Television			
Internet			

6. How many people in total were reached approximately through these events/activities?

7. What was the impact achieved for the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme through these events/activities? (Please tick the two most relevant)

- the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme's name and logo were made visible to new audiences
- the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme's particular missions were made known to new audiences

__the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme's accomplishments were promoted to new audiences

Please send the completed questionnaire, together with, if relevant, copies of information materials which bear the UNESCO/MoW linked logo or which include the mention of UNESCO, such as promotional and publicity brochures, press releases, press clippings, radio recordings, video and television footage, to:

Memory of the World Secretariat
Communication and Information Sector
UNESCO
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP
France
Telephone: 00 33 15.68.44.97

Appendix 10

QUESTIONED NOMINATIONS²⁷

The Memory of the World programme has three main objectives:

- a) To facilitate preservation of the world's past, present and future documentary heritage.
- b) To assist universal access to documentary heritage.
- c) To increase awareness worldwide of the existence and significance of documentary heritage.

1 In its pursuit of these objectives, the Memory of the World (MoW) programme recognizes that “history is an unending dialogue between the present and the past” (E.H. Carr) or, in other words, the interaction between primary sources and their on-going interpretation. MoW's concern is with the preservation and accessibility of primary sources, not with their interpretation or the resolution of historical disputes. The recommendation of the experts is that Memory of the World does not enter into disputes concerning the interpretation of historical events, nor does it take sides. It neither endorses the ideas or opinions expressed in any items of documentary heritage accepted for register assessment and/or inscription, nor does it necessarily endorse the content of the nominations themselves. Therefore, the following clarification related to the nomination procedures is proposed.

2 At least 4 months prior to the fixed deadline, the MoW Secretariat issues a call for nominations for the International Register on the MoW website, also indicating the deadline and the formal criteria that each nomination must meet. On submission of a nomination the MoW Secretariat examines the legal, technical and other pertinent aspects of the nomination and informs the nominator about the results of this preliminary examination. If the nomination is accepted for assessment the MoW Secretariat notifies the nominator, copying the concerned Permanent Delegations, National Commissions for UNESCO and the National Committees for Memory of the World, uploads the nomination forms on UNESCO's Memory of the World website and sends the nomination form to the Register Subcommittee (RSC) for assessment. The nomination is immediately open for comments (objections, support or other information pertaining to the selection criteria). Comments can be sent to the Secretariat via the respective form within a fixed time frame according to the timeframe set in the MoW guidelines.

²⁷ Adopted by the UNESCO International Experts' Meeting on *Memory of the World*, Berlin, March 2017

The entire process of the assessment of MoW nominations will be conducted in accordance with both the UNESCO rules of procedures and the MoW Code of Ethics.

3 The MoW Secretariat transmits to the RSC the received comments. The RSC reviews these and initiates a course of action appropriate to the circumstances indicated and the context of the documentary heritage nominated.

4 The RSC takes into account all the comments received in its assessment of the nomination. The RSC comes to a preliminary assessment of the nomination. After the RSC issues its preliminary recommendation, the MoW Secretariat notifies the nominator copying the Permanent Delegations, the National Commissions for UNESCO and the National Committees “Memory of the World” of the countries concerned. The nominator is offered the opportunity to respond to this preliminary recommendation.

5 Based on these responses the RSC can reconsider its assessment before submitting its recommendations to the IAC.

6 The IAC examines the nominations together with the recommendations of the RSC and recommends to the Director-General its professional assessment of the nominations.

7 Nominations that have been called into question will be given more time for dialogue to the concerned parties, even before submission to RSC. Dialogue may be mediated. The outcome of such a dialogue could be:

- a) a joint nomination,
- b) agreement on an inscription including opinions showing differing perspectives on the events or facts reflected in the nominated document,
- c) if no agreement has been reached, continued dialogue among the concerned parties may be encouraged for one more cycle (i.e. a maximum of four years after submission of the nomination) at which time the RSC will submit its recommendation to the IAC and the IAC will be expected to make a final recommendation to the Director-General.

8 The Director-General takes the final decision on the inscription taking into account the professional advice provided by the IAC and any other relevant information.

