Memory of the World Programme
Bureau Meeting

UNESCO Headquarters (Bonvin Building, Room B-8.38)

19-20 March 2007
9:30 – 17:30

Attendees: Ms Alissandra Cummins (Acting Chair); Ms Mandy Gilder, Mr Rainer Hubert, Ms Roslyn Russell (Rapporteur), Mr Abdelaziz Abid (Programme Head), Ms Joie Springer (MoW Register).

By Invitation: Mr Dennis Maake, Mr George Boston, Mr Jonas Palm (20 March)

Absent with apologies: Ms Deanna Marcum (Chair)

In the unavoidable absence of the President, Ms Deanna Marcum, Ms Alissandra Cummins took the Chair. Chairperson Ms Cummins welcomed delegates and conveyed apologies of Ms Marcum for her inability to attend. The Agenda was adopted.

1. Welcome address by the representative of the Director-General – Mr Mogens Schmidt welcomed delegates on behalf of Mr Matsuura. Mr Schmidt said that the Memory of the World Register could play the same role as the World Heritage List. Audiovisual and electronic documents are particularly at risk. UNESCO will keep allocating core funding but more is needed from member states themselves. There is a real gap in understanding between awareness of monuments and sites and that of documentary heritage – we must impress this on delegations from member states.

   Ms Cummins thanked Mr Schmidt, and said that the Bureau noted the main preoccupations he expressed on behalf of the Director-General, and took particular note of the very important comments on protection of documentary heritage in post-conflict situations.

2. The Programme progress review was presented by Mr Abid, who thanked Ms Cummins for standing in as Chair for Ms Marcum. His focus in the progress review was on the African continent, and how to bring Africa to a better representation within the programme. He described three projects:

   i. West African Postcards: there had been discussion of whether postcards came under the Memory of the World Programme, but the successful argument was that these postcards 1890s-1930s have historical value, as there is not much documentary heritage from this period – there are 3000 postcards from 16 countries. The project was successful and continued after UNESCO's assistance ended. This is a very good result, as sustainable projects are the goal.

   ii. Slave Trade Archives: involving five African countries – Benin, Cape Verde, Gambia, Senegal and Ghana, and six from Latin America and the Caribbean.

iii. Timbuktu Manuscripts project: has real regional significance. The example of Ahmed Baba Centre and 60-80 private collections were cited. The project started improving conditions of manuscripts, which were really awful, as they had a major problem of sand penetration. The South African government has taken it to new dimensions, with plans for a new building to house manuscripts. By June this year the website will be on line with digitized manuscripts. The project was funded by NEPAD SA. The result is a centre of excellence in Timbuktu for the region.

Eight National Committees have been established in Africa: Cameroon, Congo, Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia and Zambia. There are only two official regional committees – CRALC and MOWCAP plus the Central Asia MoW Network (2003) and the Baltic Sea Region Network (2003). There is no MoW Register for Africa but currently seven African countries have 10 inscriptions on MoW Register, out of the 120 collections from 59 countries. There are not enough yet from Africa, and it is hoped that the IAC meeting in Africa will stimulate more nominations.

Ms Cummins requested a follow up from Lijiang report recommendations. Mr Abid reported that some measures had already been implemented; some need to be referred to Director-General, and others needed further consultation. Ms Cummins remarked that there needed to be a briefing tutorial for new members before the IAC meeting and a reading list. These are not included in the programme for the Pretoria meeting as yet.

There must be a meeting of the Bureau in advance of the IAC meeting. Mr Abid assured the Bureau that there would be time for the Bureau meeting and briefing. The South Africa meeting will occupy a whole week – three working days for IAC, two days for the African delegates' workshop which will precede it. The desired outcome should include the establishment of an African Regional Committee.

Ms Russell updated the Bureau on the International Council of Archives' position regarding the recognition of all National Archives by the Memory of the World Programme. Ms Springer foreshadowed a new selection criterion from the RSC on social/spiritual significance.

Mr Abid reported that the Director-General prefers a greater geographical turnover of the IAC and thus prefers four-year terms for members; chairs of sub-committees are *ex officio* members of IAC. Mr Abid recommended that we wait for another IAC meeting, as the Programme needs a thorough revision of the statutes that deal with the question of expansion of numbers.

3. Reports by Programme Sub-Committees (Technology, Marketing, Register).

Technology Sub-Committee

Mr Boston spoke to a written report from Mexico City meeting of SCoT on 7-9 September 2006. Since the Mexico City meeting the major advance has been Kevin Bradley's project for an open-source solution for all archives. The main goal is to get various open source groups on board. The next step is to talk to UNESCO about funding the next stage, an experimental kit of hardware. Feedback would be very useful – what is wanted is a cheap, effective, machine-read, easily migratable system. Tapes last about five years and about as long as any computer system lasts. Hardware may have to be replaced – the software price needs to be brought down and made affordable for smaller archives. He also reported on a meeting with International Association of Sound and Audiovisual Archives (IASA) technical committee, dealing with technical aspects of modern storage systems, and training for preserving tapes. IASA is taking the lead and extending remit beyond the audiovisual.

Formal adoption of new statutes for Sub-Committees – Dietrich Schuller to step down, Jonas Palm suggested as new Chair and SCoT seeks endorsement of this – they want individuals chosen for their expertise.

Mr Abid suggests that the Bureau recommend that the IAC formally recommend that Mr Palm be appointed as Chair. This was agreed by the Bureau.

Mr Palm trained as a paper and photographic conservator in Copenhagen. He worked for 12 years in Sweden at Uppsala University Library; then 8 years at the Royal Library in Denmark and since 2002 in Sweden, where he is Director and Head of Division of Preservation at the National Archives.

Ms Cummins asked about the open-source software project – when does SCoT want feedback reports from members?

Mr Boston said that the report is nearly completed and then endorsement of the proposal will be sought from the IAC. A working model will be displayed. Kevin Bradley has done a magnificent job in the six-month timeframe.

Ms Gilder asked how a national or regional committee could feed questions and feedback to SCoT. Mr Boston said they could contact people on the Sub-Committee. One of the problems with the UNESCO [MoW] statutes is that they hinder retaining expertise. This doesn't apply to Sub-Committees which don't have time limits, so SCoT has been able to retain expertise on the Sub-Committee. Eight people is the core number to abide by Programme Guidelines. The Sub-Committee can bring other people in as necessary.

Marketing Committee

Mr Abid spoke to printed report. The meeting in Oslo in March 2006 mainly concentrated on an operational marketing plan. The previous plan was vague. Two papers resulted from this meeting: a report and guidelines for licenses. There is a need for more funding and resources. The dilemma is that it is easy to argue for MoW's importance: the name is good and should be capitalized upon. Many companies should be willing to be sponsors. However, to unlock potential a seed budget will be needed. One or more persons should develop a presentation to put to companies. Mr Abid said that this is not possible – there is only half a million dollars for two years available for the whole Programme. TSC – one staff position + $100,000, realistically $200,000 (for two years). UNESCO has signed MOUs with Microsoft, Intel etc. This occupies one staff position and takes up an enormous amount of Information Society Division time.

Mr Abid highlighted proposals:

a) Television programmes – idea from Discovery channel on intangible heritage. We should try to do the same thing for MoW – eg Bleek collection and click language. Someone is needed to do the work.
b) Books, CD-ROMS and websites – about 20 MoW websites. Idea is to have more – banner advertising for sale, or a subscription scheme (which is very difficult to administer). Ms Gilder suggested that 'major' should be 'national' libraries.
c) Circle of Friends could be set up at national levels. Mr Hubert said that the marketing plan is based on prerequisites we don't have, and needs to be broken down to a realistic level. Mr Abid said that people who work in marketing have a lot of imagination. Ms Cummins suggested that the Participation Programme was the way to proceed with UNESCO – regional committees should suggest a structured approach to training and marketing. This gives us $100,000 ($35,000 per country per two year period). In South Africa we can make it clear that this should be prioritized. Ms Cummins said that there needs to be serious research on foundations that could be approached. For IAC – suggestion that MoW make strategic approaches to member states to raise the issue of giving it priority in Participation Programme. Ms Springer reported that the Participation Programme has had its funding drastically reduced – for regional support three or more commissions have to agree to a request, and gain approval of the country in whose territory the

activity would take place. MoW would fall under the Communication and Information Sector – NGOs and National Commissions can submit requests.

Licensing of logo: separate logo. Any licensing of MoW logo must be aligned to UNESCO logo, and must be compatible with UNESCO rules and conditions.

Suggested criteria: recognition by media – need for pro-active approach. Raising money - $500,000 needed per year. Committees and Circles of Friends: the latter is something that is active in a different way. These would hold events, exhibitions, and talks. Other suggestions:

- National Commissions should participate in marketing

- 100 National Committees as a goal.

- Regional Committees to provide marketing strategy.

Mr Abid said the criteria are measurable and precise. Ms Cummins asked whether we agree to adopt these criteria, in the light of lack of funding. To what extent is UNESCO assisting with promotion of the Programme?

Mr Abid said that they help us with major events, for example, the IAC meeting, or when a member state organizes an event to mark successful nominations, for example, the commemoration of the Battle of the Somme in London in October 2006. We need to do marketing ourselves – UNESCO will not draft a marketing plan, but could provide advice. A private consultant would have trouble understanding the Programme.

Ms Cummins recommended that the Bureau adopt the success criteria with the caveat that Item 2 should be resized in line with the resources we do have. South African Committee will share with us a publicity strategy. These proposals were agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 12.50 for members to read suggested new guidelines, to resume at 4pm.

Register Sub-Committee

Ms Springer reported for Register Sub-Committee and indicated the number of nominations accepted (32) and rejected (22) by the RSC at its meeting in Paris in December 2006. Two days were spent on discussion of the nominations, and the last day was given over to broad discussion of a range of issues (see RSC report and below). The full report of the Register Sub-Committee was made available to Bureau members.

The most important decision concerned the position of the International Council of Archives on the status of archives within the Register. Mr van Albada is now prepared to accept that the Programme itself recognize the place of national archives in preserving the world's memory; and has no problem with the nomination of individual items, series or fonds for inscription on the Register.

The RSC also recommended that the nomination forms could be improved with a revised step by step guide to make the process easier for nominators.

Procedures for updating inscriptions: a standardized way of incorporating additional material that has come to light must be developed. This is an agenda item for the RSC meeting to be held on 21 March 2007, as is the establishment of a Lost and Missing Heritage Register.

A new draft criterion to encompass community or spiritual signifance was a recommendation of the RSC meeting in December 2006. Ms Russell and Mr Edmondson collaborated on a position paper

which set out the rationale for this criterion and gave some possible models. These were reworked by the Bureau, which then approved the following for adoption by the IAC:

Social/spiritual/community significance: this concept is another way to express the significance of a document or set of documents in terms of their spiritual or sacred values, and the emotional attachment a specific community can demonstrate in relation to them for the way they contribute to its identity and social cohesion.

This criterion must reflect *living* significance – the documentary heritage must have an emotional hold on people who are alive today. Once those who have revered the item for its social/spiritual/community significance no longer do so, or are no longer alive, it loses this specific significance and eventually acquires historical significance.

More adjustments to additional criteria will be made by the RSC Chair and the Secretariat. These include criteria for special collections, and the papers of political leaders. Ms Gilder suggested that the latter could form part of National Liberation Heritage Archives – add papers associated with papers accumulated under a common theme (eg Liberation papers).

Ms Cummins made the point that the International Council of Museums (ICOM) ought to be represented on the RSC; and that provision for this had been made in the section relating to NGOs and advisory bodies in the original MoW Statutes – this text should be reinstated in the Statutes and ICOM be invited to join RSC along with IFLA, ICA, and CCAAA. This proposal was agreed.

Ms Cummins also suggested that the RSC's recommendations on nominations, to be forwarded to IAC members before the Pretoria meeting, also contain an invitation for IAC members to lodge their comments on acceptance or rejection of nominations. Objections should be registered by IAC members before the Pretoria meeting, and these should be circulated before the meeting. This was agreed.

The problematic nominations should be discussed first at Pretoria. This procedure was agreed.

Ms Gilder commented on the issue of lost and missing heritage : items are sold out of the country and there is no trace of where they are. She gave the example of a stamp collection, and also the case of the records of South Africa's state security bodies which claim that the Archives Act does not cover them. An estimated four tons were destroyed before 1994. This is a grey area in that there is no way of knowing what was in them. Ms Springer said that material would have been eligible for inscription on the International Register could be listed on the Lost and Missing Heritage Register whose creation is under examination. This Register would be confined to the 20th century. Mr Abid said that Mr Joan van Albada and Mr Hans van der Hoeven had demonstrated that the greatest losses actually did occur in the 20th century. ICA has identified 3000 items to date.

Meeting resumed 20 March, 9.30 am

4.   Assessing nominations for the UNESCO/Jikji/Memory of the World Prize

Reports on Jikji nominations

Bureau members had assessed the Jikji nominations previously and came to the meeting with their shortlists and comments.

Mr Hubert commented on the insufficient details of digitization projects and on the problems he identified in many of the nominations:

 - They had no connection with a preservation programme
 - Institutions presented their normal mandate, not a unique project
 - Candidacies of individuals who were primarily self-promoted

- Where is the extraordinary or exceptional work?

Criteria:
    Whether work was the first example of this
    Best way of doing work
    Whether it had wide influence
    Scope/size of collection.

Bureau members supported Mr Hubert's view.

Ms Gilder agreed that people are applying for a prize for carrying out the normal mandate for archives; and was concerned that individuals, not their institutions, were being singled out. This was self-promotion.

The following shortlist was established by collating the results brought to the meeting by Bureau members:

Phonogrammarchiv, Austria; INA (national audiovisual institute), France; National Library of Malaysia. These will be forwarded to IAC.

Further questions:

No. 1: Phonogrammarchiv, Austria: Ms Gilder noted that the nomination definitely meets the criteria, but the nomination is for their everyday work – they are simply fulfilling their mandate.

No 7: INA, France: Mr Hubert commented that INA overstate their case and should offer comparative data relating the hours of recording that they have done. (see page 2 of nomination) – 855,000 hours – 'only country in the world to have saved this much'. Where is recognition of UNESCO's work in Afghanistan? This was funded by UNESCO but there is no indication of this. Portal – some downloads free but then they charge – therefore questions relating to access should be addressed.

No. 14: National Library of Malaysia – Mr Hubert raised the question of high levels of relative humidity. Mr Abid said that this reflected an accommodation for ambient temperature in Malaysia.

Ms Cummins and Ms Russell submitted the following comments:

  - The form should be revised to preclude nominations by individuals on their own behalf – at present it allows this to occur.
  - There seems to be a complete misunderstanding of the intent of the prize in many nominations – as noted above by other Bureau members, many of those nominating appear to think that the prize is for carrying out the normal work of archives. The selection criteria need to be better articulated to avoid this, and to attract eligible candidates and projects only.

Ms Cummins and Ms Russell also wished to congratulate the Czech Archives for their report on the way they had expended the monies from the 2005 Jikji Prize, and suggested that this be sent as an exemplar to other Jikji Prize winners. They also noted that, of 23 nominations, 8 were incomplete and 15 were complete; and five were for individuals and 18 for organizations.

Comments on shortlist from SCoT representatives

Mr Boston remarked that it was amazing how many people did not read the nomination form. It was not well understood that they did not have to be digitization projects. However, access is still an important criterion.

No 1: Phonogrammarchiv - Very sound and very proactive around the world. It provides assistance and mentoring to archives in different parts of the world. Austrian Government to be commended for the money it expends around the world. No technical criticisms.

No 7: INA – material already digitized to be made available on the web. In its global projects, questions concerned when and how are materials are be stored? What are arrangements for working copies back in home countries? In some situations master copies should be stored outside the country. Alternative would be on-line access. No technical criticisms.

No 14: Malaysia – primarily an extension of traditional materials preservation. Comes down to climatic conditions – on a short timescale for treatment. No technical criticisms.

In response to Ms Gilder query about alternatives to digitization, Mr Boston replied that digitization was not the only answer, but it makes documents more widely accessible. Analogue audiovisual materials have to be digitized to be preserved.

4.   Draft agenda for the IAC meeting in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa, 11-15 June 2007

Ms Gilder and Mr Maake reported on the planned IAC meeting in Pretoria. South Africa is very excited about having this meeting. It is one of a series of international meetings in South Africa in 2007 dealing with heritage.

Ms Gilder and Mr Maake made a PowerPoint presentation on the Pretoria IAC meeting. Ms Cummins suggested an amendment to the objective to hold an African workshop: replace 'need to establish' with 'seek to establish'. Concluding Plan of Action to take this forward and establish a regional committee for Africa.

Suggestions for changes to meeting programme:

Bureau (outgoing) meeting to be scheduled in parallel with African delegates workshop.
   a. Recommendation that we start IAC Meeting a day earlier (to look at problematic nominations.)
   b. Day 3 June 13 – amend 'Meeting of Bureau' to 'Meeting of IAC' – I day closed meeting
   c. Day 4 June 14 – amend Meeting of Bureau to meeting of IAC – I day closed meeting
   d. Day 5 June 15 – Presentation of draft report (morning) – adoption of final report in afternoon. Meeting of incoming Bureau.
   e. Procedure for distribution of dossiers (members to comment on those not agreed in advance of meeting)

Invitations to be made to NGOs (ICOM etc)

Mr Abid said that on 11 June the first session will include a briefing of new members on work of IAC and MoW programme.

Budget

DAC providing R3.5 million

DoE providing R500,000

UNESCO HQ providing $33,000

Programme (and see PowerPoint printout in Appendices)

11/06/2007

Speeches and presentations

12/06/07

Case studies of national and regional committees

Group sessions and meeting of Bureau

13/06/07

Excursions for non-IAC members and IAC meeting

14/06/07

Meeting of IAC

15/06/07

IAC meeting - Presentation and adoption of final report

Speeches and presentations of documents and plans of action

16/06/07

Departure of delegates

Discussion of other IAC meeting-related matters

Ms Gilder asked how UNESCO plans to ensure that expertise represented by IAC members and Sub-Committee members past and present will be available.

Mr Abid said that former IAC and Sub-Committee members are invited and it is hoped they will attend, but UNESCO cannot pay their fares. He hopes that South Africa will meet their accommodation and food costs. There will be a maximum 35 people coming to the meeting plus about 5-6 local – but should not be more than 40 people (otherwise it will become a conference).

Ms Gilder asked how the head of the Programme will interact with the media.

Mr Abid said that we have people who can speak to the media – himself, Ms Cummins, Ms Russell, Bendik Ruugas.

Ms Gilder said that the National broadcaster (SABC) is on Committee and will be present.

Agenda for Pretoria IAC meeting

-        Welcome address by Minister or Director General of Arts and Culture

-        Representative of Director-General – Acting Director-General for Priority Africa

-        Election of Bureau

-        Reports from Sub-Committees; two regional committees.

-     Ms Springer or Mr Abid will talk about the latest progress of programme – special focus on Africa and mentioning the Enslaved Peoples Archive.

-     Go through the selection criteria (updated)

-     Assessment of nominations – Bureau to recommend procedure

-     Committee to make formal recommendation to Director-General

-     Jikji Prize – three recommendations to go forward for judging by the IAC.

Projects – there is no money – delete from main agenda and add to Bureau agenda (pending new injection of funds)

Preserving digital heritage review – Luciana Duranti Uni of British Columbia is running a programme on digital preservation and a train the trainer programme.

Ms Cummins mentioned that 2007 is the Abolition of Slave Trade Bicentenary and thought the presentation on the status of the Slave Trade Archives project was needed. Also needs to be a formal recognition of the establishment of the African Regional Committee.

Ms Cummins confirmed that the IAC meeting would be held from 13-15 June.

5.   Any other business

Ms Cummins recorded the Bureau's satisfaction that the Intangible Heritage Convention came into force on 18 March 2007.

Ms Gilder asked the members of the SCoT for advice on how to deal with Dictabelt (SA). Thousands of recordings of proceeding of court cases of the 1960s archives cannot be retrieved due to the problem of finding equipment to access this material. She asked for assistance of SCoT to gain access to Dictabelt tapes. Mr Boston suggested that large national archives or former practitioners from many years ago could help.

The Bureau welcomes new members of the IAC, and looks forward to meeting them in Pretoria.

Question relating to the participation of observers – Mr Abid clarified that observers could only speak if invited by the Chair. The Bureau confirmed the decision that actual assessment decisions would be made in camera, a policy adopted in Lijiang.

6.   Closure of the meeting at 5.30pm.