

Memory of the World Programme Review of Statutes and Rules
Discussion Questions on Issues and Directions
Prepared to inform the review of Statutes and Rules

1. How can UNESCO, libraries and archives best work together to achieve their shared objectives?

These shared objectives can be attained first by strengthening the existing partnerships of UNESCO with IFLA and ICOM. The libraries and archives can form synergies or NGO's, which will then work with the Programme, and the National MoW Committees can participate and promote these activities.

2. Is the Memory of the World Programme currently achieving its objectives for UNESCO and for our documentary heritage?

In its present state MoW can never fully achieve all its objectives as its resources can cover solely the needs of the register. To fulfil them some suggest the application of the 2015 Recommendation to all of the Member States and the improved promotion of the inscribed items. In addition, some participants advise for the MoW to be promoted in the same level as the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage, as it has greatly contributed in raising awareness on the protection of documentary heritage with the Registers and PERSIST Project.

3. Should the MoW programme take a more proactive approach in encouraging and soliciting nominations? How?

Despite the staff restrictions, the MoW programme is very active in this aspect. Currently the Register is a tool serving the Programme's objectives but also must achieve balance in geographic representation and variety of documentary heritage. In this light, most parties strongly suggest increasing the member states' participation and encouraging the underrepresented countries, with MoW training workshops and announcing to them the upcoming call for nominations. Furthermore, some propose that when announcing nomination cycle the IAC could call for specific types of nominations, from the underrepresented categories of the register inscriptions. Additionally some parties advise the Marketing Subcommittee to draft awareness raising strategies highlighting the equal importance of the regional, national and international lists. In addition, some question the limit of nominations to the represented countries and propose its removal. Moreover highly recommended is for MoW to study past examples from the World Heritage in resolving conflicts between the Member States.

4. How best to ensure that the Memory of the World International Advisory Committee [MoW IAC] and its Register Sub-committee are appropriately representative of international expertise in the relevant disciplines and bring regional perspectives?

Memory of the World should continue to be an expert-led programme and it is being experts invited by the Director-General. Many participants point out the need to improve transparency in its procedures and have gender and geographic balance in the structure of the Committees. Thus, they recommend establishing database of representatives featuring various disciplines, gender, regions and countries for the Director-General to choose. Moreover, some propose to create a fund for the Register Sub-Committee to be able to hire individual experts' reviews. Finally strongly endorsed is the publication of the members' comments on the nominations.

5. The MoW Programme is intended to rely on experts and involves a level of trust in the judgment of professional colleagues. Should a formal role exist for member states in

decisions on inscription? For transparency, should the expert opinions received and the advice of the Register Sub-Committee to the MoW IAC be made public in advance of consideration by the MoW IAC?

A large amount of the contributions indicates that MoW should keep its expert-led character and its experts should have credit for their work. They also agree that transparency will be increased with the publication of the comments of the IAC and the RSC after the inscription of the registered items, and also the immediate publication of rewritten nominations to the website. Considering that the publication of the RSC advice might increase conflicts, suggested is to allow comments by Member States, Expert Bodies or organisations, on the nominations through the website. Most participants discourage the formal involvement of the Member States in the nomination process; in the case of them assuming a formal role Member States can give a comment to the IAC before their decision. Also some propose that the Director-General should continue to choose the IAC members, after a call for suitable candidates to member states and professional bodies, and the IAC comments should be published to the Director-General and to the MoW Committees excluding all the intermediary steps.

6. Occasionally the MoW Programme receives contested or controversial nominations:

a) should a separate process be established for such nominations?

b) where the assessments provided by experts suggested by the interested parties are sharply divided regarding issues of authenticity or significance, should the matter be referred to independent, appropriately qualified and respected international scholars to undertake an onsite examination of the nominated documents to advise the RSC and MoW IAC in their assessment?

- A) Most parties agree that a standard procedure should not be established as first this action would discourage countries from submitting more nominations. In addition, some cases are too specific, requiring case-by-case assessment thus rendering impossible the establishment of one general process. Instead some suggest an insertion of clearer definitions in the Guidelines requiring the nominations to be written in an objective manner holding responsible for the language the nominators, or Member States. Also, some believe that controversial nominations should not complete the registration process until issues are resolved between Member States. Even though, a formal role should not be given to the member states, some suggest that perhaps nominators can now only be National Commissions or Memory of the World Committees. Another opinion is that the guidelines should also include a clear provision suggesting that the evaluation will not proceed in the case of a written objection by the member states. In some extreme cases, UNESCO can be asked to set up a dialogue or even be handled by the General Assembly.
- B) The participants have confidence in IAC, but in these cases, they recommend to offer funds to approach one or more independent parties to obtain expert reviews and create a second peer review cycle. Agreed by most is the on-site assessment of the proposed heritage as is a direct way to evaluate.

7. Should the MoW develop means to inscribe open or continuously growing archival fonds or institutions? Should the MoW have a special category and programme as MoW PARTNER for a few major global libraries and archives which collectively hold a significant portion of the world's multimedia documentary heritage?

Most participants believe that the addition of new items should be possible under certain conditions, as it is difficult to keep digital-born heritage concise. Many also expressed the opinion that in principal the nominated heritage should be finite and precisely defined. Most agree that MoW should not establish partnerships in order to retain equality between global institutions, if

necessary perhaps establish partnerships with national institutions, even though global partners would greatly assist the safeguarding of documentary heritage. Many individuals suggested creating a “best practices” initiative, besides Jikji Prize, as a distinction to individuals or institutions who have assisted the Programme. Some additional suggestions were to consult the World Heritage on the ways they present and give access to their inscriptions. Offer the contents of the MoW International Register in more languages. In addition, to redesign the website with linked data and with the Semantic Web.

8. What descriptive form should an inscription take and how to ensure the documents are visible to search engines?

The contributors acknowledge that the current financial resources do not allow many changes and the current website fulfils the needs of the Programme. They also find that it is important to keep the content updated and available in other languages. Some countries suggest, if possible, to enhance the website with more links to the nominator Institution and National Commissions or Memory for the World Committees. Many recommend also adding thematic relation of heritage and some articles that complete the nomination form. Furthermore, if funds are available, they advise to redesign the website to appeal to youth and include a search engine to assist the experts to find registry related data. Moreover, they advise, support the MoW Committees to create their website displaying their registered items or even recreate the website under a new theme.

9. What commitment should be made to the digitization and publication of inscribed documents through online media, web sites and apps, that will enable and encourage access in an engaging and informative way?

Many agree that UNESCO should recommend digitization and access to inscribed items, if they are already digital items their presentation should be linked to UNESCO website. They also indicate to ease the use of the website and enrich with more images. Some participants believe that the nominators should commit to inform the public on their inscriptions. Some further suggestions were the use of applications such Big Data in developing an archival application software, which will promote visual documentary heritage and showcase best practises.

10. Should the MoW explore the publication of a new English edition of the book and the feasibility of editions, full or regional, in other languages?

Considering the cost of a new publication, the contributors agree that the Programme should continue the publication of a new edition of the book in more languages and in digital form, so that its future updating and sharing will be easier. Some important suggestions are to include in the publication hyperlinks, regional and national inscriptions and to use a thematic approach instead of a chronological order. Moreover, some added that a bigger part should be dedicated in presenting the Programme and its activities. Additionally, many opinions agree that the book must be more available for the public to purchase, perhaps offer it in Airport shops. It has been suggested that in order to gather funds for the creation of a new edition the support of the Member States is required along with crowd funding or open call for entries in regional, national and international level.

11. Should digital copies of all inscribed documents (copyright permitting) be added to the World Digital Library or other suitable and sustainable digital repository as a requirement of inscription?

Most discourage the addition of the inscribed documents to the World Digital Library and the requirement for digitalization. They also express that this measure will limit the inscriptions from small institutions, who lack the funding to digitise, and will create confusion between the Programme and the Institution. Instead, some propose a cross-collaboration with the owners/custodian of the heritage to represent their heritage. Furthermore, some believe that the

electronic submission of the nominations will increase the digital data, and that the already digital items should be linked to the UNESCO website. Moreover it is acknowledged by many that if this take place MoW Programme will increase its visibility and the access to the items of the international, regional and national, if library materials.

12. How should the funding implications of this be addressed?

Since most gave a negative response to question 11 they explained that no funding should be addressed, some further explain that MoW should prioritise other activities instead and emphasize on the importance of protecting privately owned heritage and analogue items. On the other hand, the positive responses mention that since the high cost for digitization should be covered by WDL, the Member States or future partnerships and donors found by the Marketing Sub Committee.

13. Should institutions holding inscribed documentary heritage be required to report periodically on the state of the documents and their preservation and access plans? How frequently?

The participants agreed and proposed to hire an external expert every three to four years to draft a report, which can then be available on the website. They suggest sending questioners to the owners/custodians that will be compiled into the report. Some mention to create a supervised by the IAC periodic review with the provision to remove items that no longer fulfil the criteria. A second idea introduced for the National Commissions/Committees to visit the items periodically, as some already do so. Moreover, some recommend for UNESCO to create a framework policy and contact the owners under the “common heritage of humanity.”

14. Should the criteria exclude privately owned documentary heritage or require a binding commitment to donate/bequeath inscribed documents to an established institution?

The majority disagrees and propose to include in the guidelines a provision for allowing access to the inscribed heritage, as behavioural requirement. Additionally, the nominator can give a written agreement providing public access to the heritage. Some further explain that privately owned heritage can be as important as national and its donation must be avoided in fear of property nationalization.

15. Can you provide specific examples of the impact of inscribing documents on public awareness, preservation, use and funding?

Generally, most agree, that the use of the inscription depends on the institution, although some observe a drawback in the publicity generated by the register as it draws attention from the other activities of the programme. Inscribing document can attract funding for digitization as is the case for the Czech Republic National Library. Moreover, the Luis Buñuel’s movie Los Olvidados was rescued due to its registration, and led to other communities to be more aware and active in the protection of their heritage. Another example is the Leprosy Archives of Bergen which generated interest and created seminars in the related fields. In addition, in Poland attracted was media attention to the inscribed items such as the 1980 Gdansk Demands, the 1573 Warsaw Confederation, the Codex Supraslensis, the BOS, and the inauguration of the country Register in 2014. In St Kitts, no impact was observed. It is mentioned, that awareness was raised for the heritages and funding for their preservation gathered in the cases of Beatus Rhenanus (Humanist Library of Sélestat, Alsace) in 201, Rousseau manuscripts (Libraries of Geneva and Neuchâtel) in 2011 in Switzerland and France, and the archives of Mr E. Swedenborg by Sweden.

16. Are there initiatives MoW might try to encourage the use of the documents inscribed on the Register in education at all levels and research?

Many find that the SCEAR's aim is an excellent way to achieve this, and add that University programmes should incorporate documentary heritage in their curriculum. In addition, they suggest that the National Commission/Committees can implement these educational projects. Moreover, the idea of showcasing best practises is also introduced here.

17. Can UNESCO broaden its understanding of “World Heritage” and “cultural heritage” to include documentary heritage? Should the MoW Programme develop a similar center, fund, magazine and education programme?

The participants agree that Documentary Heritage is part of the cultural heritage, and suggest improving its promotion. They also explain that the World Heritage's funding is allocated by the Member States and is responding according to the tasks set at the World Heritage Convention. Whereas the MoW Programme is expert led and cannot have the same financial model. Additionally some say to revisit the role and structure of the Programme creating more activities outside the Register.

18. How can we encourage and assist the development and growth of Memory of the World committees and registers regionally, as appropriate, and nationally?

One view suggests for the development of the MoW Committees to draft regionally specific strategies. Moreover, it is encouraged for the more active and experienced Committees to offer advice to the new. Another set of actions for the Secretariat are to provide clear but flexible tasks for the MoW Committees. 1) To make available toolkits, tutorials, and other materials designed for the national libraries and archives. 2) To promote the inscriptions from the underrepresented countries. 3) In addition, to make accessible the webpage in more languages. Additionally, MoW can offer a booklet on the website with advice on operation, activities, funding, how to nominate and maintain national register.

19. What should be in the implementation plan for the new (2015) UNESCO Recommendation on the Preservation and Access to our documentary heritage?

It is suggested that the implementation of the Recommendation should cover the creation of new publications and training workshops on documentary heritage preservation and education on the inscriptions. Some participants recommend the creation of regional project proposals by the SCEAR and SCOT in collaboration with other institutions. Which the MoW committees will then enforce and therefore measure the impact of the Recommendation. Moreover, others proposed for the PERSIST groups to set the criteria for the digital documentary heritage inscription and to develop policies for the Member States. In addition, it is recommended for the Programme to develop a marketing strategy aiming to improve the engagement with the public.

20. How best to implement and build on the work of the PERSIST initiative?

Many expressed that the funding is inadequate for running properly the PERSIST initiative. In addition, they suggested for the Member states to take responsibility in creating a fund dedicated for the Persist. Moreover some emphasized that once it is realised it should include public and private institutions and display the best practises.

21. To what extent should the MoW actively market and develop its brand to increase public awareness and promote capacity and standards for the preservation of and access to global documentary heritage?

The participants observe that by raising awareness the MoW Programme will attract more funding and attention but will risk the commercialization of the Programme and the already inscribed heritage. They suggest that a stronger connection with the UNESCO banner will strengthen the branding of MoW. Another thought is for the Marketing Sub Committee to organise informative

meetings for the public, and use the Social Media as a promotional tool. Additionally some propose the exploration of more radical methods such as annual nomination fees provided by nominators for the inscribed items.

22. Can UNESCO explore new structures to enable creative partnerships with NGOs and the private sector while maintaining appropriate accountability for standards and reputation?

Many suggest that the Programme can benefit from its existing partnerships. In addition, they encourage the exploration of new concepts with public and private institutions. Moreover, they recommend in the case of partnership with for profit organisations to establish clear guidelines and guarantees, in order to maintain transparency and avoid conflict. Such an example is a possible collaboration with Search Engines. Furthermore, an idea is proposed for the creation of partnerships by the Member States, thus promoting the Programmes objectives

23. The MoW IAC has discussed on many occasions the need for strategic partnerships with closely related initiatives both within UNESCO and beyond. How do we best advance these? Priorities?

Strongly suggested for the MoW Programme is to initiate more UNESCO cross-sector collaborations. In addition, it is emphasized the importance of first establishing criteria for any future partnerships that will ensure the transparent promotion of the Programme. Some set as priority to target the existent digital programs and prearrange who will hold the digital items. "Such partnerships might include the Swedish Academy (in its role administering the Nobel Prizes), the International Council of Museums, societies and festivals dedicated to cinema films, Google and PEN International", or with other libraries such as Europeana.

24. Should the MoW IAC undertake a study of the implications and feasibility of developing the current normative instrument for documentary heritage as a Convention?

Discussions on a MoW Convention within the CI sector could prove useful but are discouraged by most for several reasons like the lack of funding, the implementation of the 2015 recommendation and the programme review, which are only now taking place.

25. Given the broad mandate intended for the MoW, is possible to:

a. Rename the IAC as the Memory of the World Programme Committee,

Most declined the renaming of the IAC even though it would formalize its role

b. Enable more frequent meetings of the full committee

c. Formally constitute the sub-committees with defined membership and projects, with support for regular meetings

It is strongly indicated that more meetings would prove very useful if there is adequate funding, otherwise virtual meetings can be held instead. Most agree that there is no need to formalise the role as MoW should remain an expert led programme

d. Involve the MoW IAC more actively in related UNESCO initiatives

This is most accepted and could lead in the creation of more initiatives and their allocation to MWPC, cross-sector collaboration.

A Review of the Memory of the World (MoW) Guidelines and Companion Documents: Call for Submissions and Discussion of Issues

INTRODUCTION

In general, it is believed that the Memory of the world Programme functions well and should continue be an expert led programme, despite its limited financial and human resources.

Additionally, all agree that MoW should strengthen its current structure without further complicating the rules. Another area that needs improvement is the communication with the public through the MoW website. Towards this the following actions are most suggested: often update the content of the page, make the page available in all UN languages and upload frequently publications relevant to documentary heritage preservation. Moreover, the participants highlight the use of the Register as promotional tool for the other MoW activities. In addition, they strongly feel that to avoid exploitation of MoW for political means it is necessary to revise the guidelines, in ethics and protocol, and emphasize the NGOs' roles that support the Programme. Furthermore, it is recommended that any changes made on the documents must be specific and should not render past decisions invalid.

VISION, MISSION AND OBJECTIVES.

Q: How far do the objectives, vision and mission of MoW support UNESCO's objective of "building peace in the minds of men and women"? How far do they support other UNESCO reference points, such as the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity?

All agree that MoW interrelates to UNESCO's objectives as is directly referring to information literacy, and its activities safeguard history with the promotion and protection of documentary heritage. In addition, it is mentioned that the programme hosts dialogue through information exchange that develops critical thinking, understanding and respect to the culture and ideas of other people. Moreover, Heritage inscriptions from the bright and dark side of human history interlard this dialogue. Furthermore, to strengthen the Programme, many draw focus into the preservation and access objectives of the Programme and promotion of specific heritage types. Such types are from underrepresented countries, under threat and documents related to human rights violations.

Q: How can MoW better coordinate with other UNESCO programmes, recommendations and conventions, such as the Convention for Safeguarding Intangible Heritage (2003), and the World Heritage Convention (1972)?

All find useful MoW's involvement in the other Programmes and conventions of UNESCO and propose different ways of achieving these collaborations. Firstly, one idea is to create a committee that assist discussions between the three heritage programmes and drafts mutual strategies. Secondly, it is introduced to create synergies and cooperative activities linking the UNESCO heritage programmes. Thirdly, some suggest creating a mutual summit or convention were the three programmes can share best practises examples and create lists of endangered documentary heritage. Moreover, it is recommended for Mow to strengthen its relationship with other memory institutions and create a committee that explores future partnerships with similar institutions. Finally, some introduce that the programme can also serve as a memory map through a platform that contains all documentary heritage.

DEFINITIONS

Q: Do definitions need to be revisited?

Many find that some definitions need to be enhanced further and propose that the recommendation of 2015 should be advised prior to any change in the definitions, as it is the most recently agreed document. Some of these revisions are as follows. First, the terminology of MoW should be reviewed to ensure consistency with archival terminology and be regularly updated to incorporate new technologies. Second, the notion of documentary heritage must be further analysed to include: the heritage feature of a document; the significance of a document for its information and not solely its artistic value; the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage for the better understanding on the nominations. Third, for digital documents the terms carrier and content should include the ways they ensure its visibility. Moreover, 'access' and the

achievement of raising awareness objective should include all the aspects of access. Furthermore, the term 'safeguarding' is featured in the cover of the Guidelines but not as part of the text, given that its notion changes in different policy documents a definition could be established. In addition, the term 'memory institution' could also be further developed and make a clear distinction between MoW and other projects as the World Digital Library, for the public. Also clearer definitions ought to be provided for the exception on the two nominations per country quota. Finally, some propose to incorporate examples from the registers in the definitions and explain the MoW definitions in training sessions to assist the nominators, who are not professionals in the field, in filling out the form.

Q: There are complexities in deciding inclusions and exclusions under these definitions: what about artistic, literary and musical works? What about audiovisual works and physical objects? How to adequately define and embrace digital documents, in all their manifestations?

It is mentioned that the definition of documentary heritage lies within the format of its medium or its content. Many participants find that at the moment the revision of definitions is not crucial to the survival of the Programme as the Guidelines and Recommendation specify documentary heritage as heritage valuable for its information. Moreover, some emphasize the importance of the thorough study of digital documents in all their possible forms before subjecting their definition to change. Additionally, some believe that MoW should maintain the flexibility of the current procedures as it allows more types of works to be included.

STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT

Q: Can the structure of committees be improved?

The majority finds that the structure and management of the programme functions well and that the current structure of the committees should be maintained. Adding, that there is always room for improvement. Some suggest that more culturally sensitive decisions on access and preservation will be achieved with the recruitment of experts with different geographical, linguistic, cultural background and from other scientific fields than libraries and archives. Others deem necessary to improve and update the web presence and information on the Committees. Moreover, it is said that the objectives for access and preservation will be promoted with creation of more collaborative committees. In addition, some participants find that the National Commission must collaborate closer with the Programme.

International Advisory Committee (IAC)¹ (5.2)

Q: How should the Director General choose members for the IAC? Should a call for CVs be periodically put out to member states, MoW committees and experts, professional bodies, etc?

The plurality agrees that the existing process works well and can be maintained. Many suggest the creation of documentary heritage experts who should be included in a constantly updated open database of candidates for the Director-General to choose. In this database Member states, MoW committees and the partner NGOs can add possible candidates. The RSC and the other advisory groups should give opinions and a shortlist from which the Director-General can make a selection of the final candidates and perhaps having the Executive Board's approval. Moreover, some believe the creation of a few more criteria that ensure gender and geographical representation and diversity of expertise in all areas of cultural heritage. Additionally, some propose their obligations may include the general promotion of the programme, preparation of a

publication on the programme and could have final decisions on the International Register inscriptions. A further suggestion is for the Secretariat and the Bureau to give to the IAC and the Sub-Committees detailed responsibilities and feedback at the end of their appointment.

Q: Should prospective members make a written commitment to promote MoW in some way, and later give account of it?

The greater part of the participants' considers that a membership would surely give more commitment from the experts and possibly visibility of the Programme. And find an opportunity to increase transparency in the operations and decisions of IAC.

Q: Should there be equitable balance in terms of gender, geographical spread, diversity of expertise?

All agree this will increase the objectivity of decisions. Additionally, some put forward that the majority of the members (10) must be selected on a basis of geographical representation and the minority (4) should be chosen from the Bureau, in order for them to participate in two nomination cycles. A similar structure must be adopted by the RSC as well. Moreover, some say the visibility of the IAC and the subcommittees' will be increased with their members published on the website.

Q: What should be the duration of appointment?

Nearly all agree that the duration of appointment should be increased to four or five years, so that the members will gain more experience on the Programme. Some even suggest that perhaps some members can be elected for longer periods than others, for example some for 4 years and some for 2 years. Moreover, to increase transparency, the dates of their appointment and renewal should be published on the website.

Q: How can the IAC retain its own corporate memory?

One idea is that a database can be created by the Secretariat. Another proposition is that the structure of the IAC should cover this need with the creation of a formal process that appoints new members who replace only 1/3 of the committee, instead of changing all the members, thus ensuring experience and new ideas.

Q: How far should IAC meetings be open to observers or invited participants? How should register nominations be evaluated – what is appropriate for open discussion, and what should be discussed and decided by the IAC in camera?

Whether the meeting should be open is debated in the comments, but most agree that there should be open meetings but not while they discuss nominations and the register. Open meetings could be possible either through web broadcast or through the creation of two separate meetings; one for the discussion on Memory of the World Programme and one for the register. Some add that any queries on nominations should be settled before the deciding meetings. The participants that believe that the sessions of IAC should be closed, and suggest for the Secretariat to briefly communicate to the Member States with the creation of some reports containing: minutes on the appointment of members and developments on the Jikji Prize or International Register.

IAC Subcommittees (5.3)

Q: Should this arrangement (the way Subcommittees work) be changed or augmented? Does it meet the needs of the future? Is the work of these groups sufficiently well known?

Most comment that the current arrangement has proven useful but there is always space for improvement. One proposed improvement is to better promote the work of the committees by publishing on the MoW website their activities. Moreover, nearly all agree that the Register Sub Committee should be able to visit the nominated items on site. Some add that more meetings would be very useful, if there are sufficient funds, otherwise web meetings can be held instead.

Finally, many believe that transparency must be increased on the Subcommittees by having open or available online meetings, but allowing the Subcommittees to hold private sessions too.

Q: Would it be advantageous to establish a formal pool of experts and professional bodies, proposed by member states, professional bodies and other stakeholders, to complement these committees?

Nearly all find it would be beneficial as long as these experts have a clear advisory position and not obtain a political role during discussions.

The Secretariat (5.4)

Q: What services and activities should be expected of the Secretariat?

The participants in their majority state that there are not more services and activities to be expected from the Secretariat at its current state. Additionally they wish for more sustainable human and financial resources to be found. Some also propose the following ideas to be adopted by the Secretariat. Firstly, they find important to clearly define the role and responsibilities of the staff of the Secretariat in the documents. Secondly, the relationship between the MoW Committees and National Commissions must be strengthened. Thirdly, the Secretariat must work closely to the National Committees and divide the work and responsibilities equally. And create More MoW Committees, giving them training in accordance to their individual cultural and geographical needs. Finally, one of the improvements on the website is the inclusion of focal points between the Members states and the Programme and the staff should be protected from external lobbying.

Monitoring of inscribed heritage (5.11)

Q: How often should monitoring be done, and by whom?

A report mechanism must be created and take place either annually or every five to 10 years, which can then be accessible to the public. It could be in a form of standardised questionnaires similar to the ones used in World and Intangible Heritage or through public supervision with the creation of a webpage destined for the monitoring of the inscribed items. Moreover, these reports could be drafted with the assistance of the secretariat, by various parties such as the nominators/the Subcommittees (SCoT, RSC)/a Monitoring Sub Committee/the IAC/an external consultant. Finally, funding should be available send on site missions to assess the state of the heritage.

REGISTERS (4.1 to 4.9)

R: Nominations may be submitted directly by any person or organization, including governments, NGOs and private individuals.

Many contributors observe that the priority given to the nominations coming from National Commission or MoW Committees might discourage individuals to nominate. In the same time questions Mow's openness, and makes very difficult for information and documents to be inscribed from countries that their governments interests differ from the peoples.

Q: Should the IAC take a proactive role in encouraging and soliciting nominations?

And it is discouraged to select and specific nomination to the Registers.

Nearly all state that the IAC or the Subcommittees should not initiate any nominations directly to keep transparency and avoid creating stakeholders and conflict. Moreover, an exception is made in the case of heritage under threat, allowing the IAC to intervene for items of outstanding universal value. In addition, the IAC can indirectly encourage institutions to nominate with strategies of promotion drafted by the MSC. Finally, another idea is for the RSC to indicate to the

IAC points in the nomination that need strengthening and invite other parties to join the nomination.

Criteria for inscription(4.2) (*Companion Section 3*)

Q: Without changing their fundamental meaning or consistency with past usage, do the criteria still communicate effectively? Individual criteria produce repetitions ... Is there a simpler or better way of structuring this information? For example: significant in a material sense, or significant for their content, significant as testimonies of historical events, and so on? Should the statement of world significance be the summation of the results of analysis under these criteria, rather than a standalone statement that precedes them?

Most find that the understanding of the criteria ought to be increased to facilitate the needs of the nominators. One suggestion to this end is the use of examples under the criteria for inscription. Moreover, another proposal is to change “world significance” to “Statements of Significance” which incorporates the summary of the rest of the criteria, replaces the summary and minimizes the repetition in the form. In addition, the translations of “world significance” in the French documents are the imprecise “universal interest” or “global significance”, it is preferred to retain the term “more global significance” instead of “universal interest”. Likewise, “World significance” can apply only for the International register items and not to the national and regional. Otherwise this terms should be clearly defined in the Guidelines and include examples. Furthermore, it is recommended to consider as one the social/spiritual/community criterion.

Q: How do the criteria adequately cater for born digital documents, which by nature can be subject to constant change and updating – and which can be significant partly for that reason?

A plurality of participants considers that the criteria should remain with minor alteration to integrate the digital documents needs. To this end it is proposed for MoW to run a small individual selection to assess their needs before making any changes. Considering that for digital documents the requirements of “finite and clearly defined” and “outstanding universal value” may not always apply. Finally, all agree that before any revisions on the definitions in the Guidelines the 2015 Recommendation must be consulted

Q: How should the criteria relate to the goal of the sharing of knowledge for greater understanding and dialogue, in order to promote peace and respect for freedom, democracy, human rights and dignity?

The contributors agree that MoW’s nature is directly related to this goal and the register promotes space for dialogue and understanding. Some further explain that the criteria’s role is to assess an items’ value; which they do to certain extent.

Q: Nominated documentary heritage must be finite and precisely defined: open ended or continuously growing collections are ineligible, because additions may not match the criteria, and MoW and UNESCO would lose control of its standards. Is this still an appropriate stance?

Most find this stance agreeable although suggest creating a standard process that enables such collections to be inscribed, with caution, must be established. Moreover, it is reminded that digital heritage relates more to this case making essential the inclusion of a provision in the guidelines that defines the process of inscription and the possibility of extensions. This provision should also be enhanced with examples.

Q: Nominations of an entire collection of an institution are normally ineligible, for practical reason is this appropriate?

It vividly stated that the acceptance of collections should be allowed and this procedure clearly defined in the guidelines. Some believe that this should not be effective for additions to already inscribed heritage; any accruals ought to go through the application process. Moreover, most do not find appropriate the rejection of nominations on the basis that they are difficult to manage; they should be accepted as long as they fulfil the criteria and objectives of the programme. Additionally it is said that in some cases such as police archives do not always constitute a viable candidate.

Q: Is there a need for greater clarity on some issues, such as the assignment of the category of “provisional inscription” for nominations that have met the criteria but lack certain administrative information?

It is generally agreed for provisional inscription to be possible, as long as it is clearly defined in the guidelines and contains clear stages of this process. Moreover, some propose that the deadline of submission of any missing information must be known well in advance, in order for the nominators to submit all the necessary information prior to the RSC assessment.

Design and preparation of the nomination form

Q: Is the nomination form easy to use? What additional information should be included? For example, to verify the authenticity of nominated documents, to describe the level of threat, to describe the preservation and maintenance plans and support future monitoring of their condition?

Most participants state that the nomination form covers the necessary fields for proper evaluation, and believe that more improvements can be applied. Some find useful for it to contain clearer instructions for its completion, examples and recommendations of other proposals as best practises. In addition it is requested for clearer definitions to be given on what should section 3.2 include for privately owned heritage. Also regarding section 5.2 suggested is clarifying the deference between world significance and the previous criteria. Likewise, section 9 should provide a description of the contents of detailed management plan, and become an obligatory section along with the document authenticity. Additionally, the nomination form could greatly benefit from the addition of images and of a statement that requiring objectivity in language. Also some consider advantageous the hiring of a professional questionnaire designer to make sure the questions are clearly defined.

Q: Should the submission of a nomination form automatically confer on UNESCO the right to use extracts, images and sounds from the documentary heritage concerned in MoW publications and publicity?

Most believe that UNESCO should have the right to publish the nominations on the website including the information surrounding them. Therefore suggested is the addition of a statement in the nomination form and the guidelines of the terms of use by UNESCO would ease the process of promotion and publication.

Preparing nominations (4.5)

Q: Should there be clearer requirements in the Guidelines concerning the objectivity of language and argument, the factual accuracy of information, and the objectivity and neutrality of intent – in other words, to make it clear that unfounded claims and polemical opinions would be unacceptable?

All agree with the guidelines having a requirement for objectivity in language and that any polemical opinions will not be tolerated. Also proposed is to have a procedure of handling of nominations that do not fulfil it, such as immediate revision, additional sources etc.

Submission and initial process (4.6)

. MoW should further explain the nominating process and advertise the dates for the application process on the website and with the Committees

A regular global meeting of the MoW Programme could discuss the development of activities and any issues of the MoW. The nomination assessment process should remain as is, but there should be a discussion whether the member states or the MoW committees can give an informal consultation.

Q: Nominations may be submitted as hard copy or electronically. Should it be possible, instead, to submit them entirely electronically?

The participants embrace the possibility of submitting electronically should be enabled, but is suggested to retain the option to submit as hardcopy, after discussion with the Secretariat. Considering that less developed countries may have technical difficulties to participate online, (poor internet speed will be difficult for complex applications).

Q: Should the practice of uploading original nomination forms to the MoW website be retained? What happens if nominations are revised (as some always are)? Should they be uploaded and retained only in their final form? Because of technical limitations, nominations are currently “edited down” to below the 2MB limit for posting on the website. Should the full document be publicly accessible on request?

Most insist in continuing the practice of uploading the nominations. In addition, they recommend uploaded on the website to be the final form of the nominations and ensure that other documents are up to date. Moreover, it is mentioned that the fact the nominations are edited down must be formally communicated through the website or on the form. Another suggestion is to make available the full document, to ensure transparency, with the exception of prior request by the nominator to keep some parts confidential or to provide the full document upon request. Besides, the 2MB should suffice to include whole document with the exception of forms that include illustrations. Many emphasize the importance of raising funding for the updating and increase of space on the website. Apart from the positive aspects, the immediate uploading of nominations for some is deemed as not a very good practise as the documents are not always reviewed or miss parts.

Q: What processes should be available to allow third parties to make comments on nominations for inscription? Should these be required in a specified format that addresses the formal criteria? Should anonymous or confidential comments be admitted? How should comments formally submitted be dealt with, and by whom?

It is debated in the submissions if third parties should make comments on the nominations. If comments are allowed they should be made on a time frame and communicated to the nominators and then to the RSC through the Secretariat; while keeping their identities private. In addition, some suggest a positive attitude towards the criteria to be followed. Despite comments potentially be proven useful, the form should state that any controversial comments, or unfounded allegations will not be taken into account. Some strongly discourage this practice for several reasons. Firstly if there is an issue with a nomination someone could contact directly the Secretariat. Secondly, enabling people to comment on the nominations will negatively affect the expert-led character of the Programme, as it reflects that the experts should be trusted. Thirdly, the workload given to the Secretariat will be very difficult to handle (recording, responding and sharing of the comments).

Assessment by RSC (4.7)

The assessment of the nominations proposals by archival experts should be retained

Q: Does all this provide the right balance between transparency, protection of privacy and confidentiality, and freedom from lobbying? Should the RSC's minutes and final report to the IAC, including its recommendations, be public or confidential to the IAC?

It is mutually agreed that the assessment process is good but more promotion of the function of the RSC is necessary. Moreover, some suggest, making public the IAC recommendation would prevent lobbying and increase transparency. Another suggestion is publishing a final report from IAC, incorporating the recommendations from the RSC. In addition some believe that reports are not needed to be published and the RSC report can be just communicated to the nominator explaining the reasons for acceptance or rejection.

Q: To what degree should the RSC – for the information of the IAC – draft a public explanation, against the criteria, for the inscription or rejection of each nomination? Should the names of consulted experts (other than those mentioned in the nomination document itself) be mentioned in the evaluation form? Should their comments be made public? Some experts insist that their identities not be revealed

The final report of the IAC or the RSC should be published and featured on the website including explanations on their decisions, especially in the case of difficult and controversial nominations. One idea is that consulting experts' comments should be communicated at least to the nominator if they are considered by the RSG. Most believe that the identities of the experts should remain private if this is their wish.

Q: Where there is external lobbying, to what extent should media speculation be responded to? And by whom?

Many find engaging with the media not a good practise. It is advised in some cases the chair of IAC to prepare a response, considering that cases can be very different and might require a different approach.

Role of IAC

Q: The minutes of IAC meetings are later made public. How soon after the meeting should a list of successful and unsuccessful nominations, with supporting justifications, be publicly issued?

This practice is generally accepted, additionally it is encouraged to be posted without delay after the endorsement of the Director-General. Preferably within a month after the IAC meeting.

Q: Certificates of inscription are subsequently issued by UNESCO to each institution which has custody of the inscribed heritage. Should this continue to be the case, or should certificates go to the nominator, where this is different to the custodian(s)?

The custodian of the documentary heritage concerned should be the end recipient of the certificate of inscription. However is recommended by some participants, the delivery of the certificate should be done in a manner that attracts media attention – e.g., through a member of the government etc. Another suggestion is that copies for information should be distributed to appropriate National Commissions for UNESCO and the Memory of the World Committees. Moreover, the Permanent Delegations to UNESCO should be notified and have a possibility to obtain a copy according to the needs.

Access to the International Register

Q: The International Register is accessible on the website, in English, French and Spanish.(www.unesco.org/webworld/mow). Should it be accessible in other languages? Is the current arrangement effective and adequate? Are the linkages to the inscribed

documents adequate? Is it sufficiently illustrated? How to ensure the contents of the Register are adequately visible to search engines? Public awareness is linked to ease of access to the Register.

The majority recommends for the International Register to be made available in all UN/UNESCO languages. Some even suggest, if possible, the nomination be available in its national language, as way to increase its visibility. In addition, it is suggested for The Register Nomination Form to include: an executive summary and have a hyperlink to the corresponding with additional material, like the digitised version of the item. Further proposed is the addition of more illustrations and information on the nomination. Moreover, another idea is to replace the text on the list “Documentary heritage submitted by X and recommended for inclusion in the Memory of the World Register in xxxx.” to a more interesting including the nomination’s subject, importance, and time period. Generally is communicated, that the website needs improving, as firstly it is difficult to locate it between other programmes, secondly it is hard to navigate and thirdly assumes that the visitor has the knowledge to UNESCO’s organisational structures. Furthermore highly recommended is to make the design more modern and engage with the visitor. An additional idea is to dedicate page on the nomination submission, containing a timetable, the process and general advice for the nominator. Finally it is proposed to have a clearer presentation of the contact details of the Secretariat and the MoW documents and the Recommendation.

Provision for objections and removal

Q: The review process can be initiated internally (by the IAC) or externally, by any person or organisation, and ultimately involves a final evaluation by the IAC. Should this provision be formally extended to allow for expressions of concern during the RSC/IAC assessment phase, before the IAC recommends for or against inscription, and with sufficient advance notice? Does the present provision ensure a sufficiently objective and expert process, based on factual evidence independent of official stances or political opinion?

It is observed that this practise already takes place with the IAC receiving expressions of concern submitted to the Secretariat, during or even before the RSC and IAC meeting. Some indicate that any such submissions must be clearly defined in the Guidelines. Although many find that this process may allow different stakeholders to get involved in the nomination process.

ETHICS AND PROTOCOL

Q: In 2011, the IAC adopted the protocol and ethics statement at Appendix 2 to guide the work of the IAC and RSC. It will be reviewed and probably incorporated in the revised Guidelines, with the intention that it apply generally across the programme. Is it appropriate? Does it need amending? Are there further areas which it should cover?

Nearly all acknowledge that the ethics and protocol function generally well. Additionally they recommend to add it in the guidelines as it is culturally sensitive and it needs to be promoted.

THE OTHER MoW ACTIVITIES

Mow should focus on the protection of documentary heritage through its other activities with the support of UNESCO and Mow Committees and Sub-Committees. The creation of cooperative projects within UNESCO and the Programme’s visibility directly on the main UNESCO website are important. The MoW page must be redesigned and should include a project-based structure. “Normative instruments and advocacy p1 add: its regional and national committees. Prizes and projects p1 I commented earlier on what I see as lack of info (to IAC but perhaps also to the public) regarding this process. P2 add: regional Perhaps could acknowledge as an example the valuable contribution from ROK in this regard” (H. Jarvis)

Q: How can MoW engage further with professional, academic, commercial and philanthropic bodies?

One suggestion is to launch a call for possible new partnerships, as well as the re-establishment of some of the past partnerships (such as the WDL). Also advised is the creation of a network of institution, as proposed by the SCEaR, who will organise activities and events. Programme can participate in those events and the National Committees/Commission can promote them.

RESOURCES

Q: A far greater level of administrative support is now needed to maintain the programme's independence and objectivity. How can this be provided?

All agree that more resources and funding are extremely important for the persistence of the Programme. Also is suggested that these Funds should come from both UNESCO and the Member States. Additionally it is recommended for the IAC members and the Members of the Sub-Committees could promote MoW in their respective countries. Moreover, countries could be called to contribute staff members in the UNESCO secretariat.

Appendix / Final Remarks

In general, belief, the MoW programme structure functions well but it must be as promoted as of the World and Intangible Heritage Programmes. Moreover, a Convention is not considered a priority for the Programme. Furthermore, is suggested for MoW to request a report from the Memory Institutions on their activities towards promoting their inscribed on the Register items, which will assist the promotion of the MoW Programme. In addition, it is proposed for the RSC needs to have a larger pool of experts to advice on.