

## **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**

**REPORT FROM THE GENERAL GUIDELINES WORKING GROUP**

# MEMORY OF THE WORLD IAC MEETING

Paris, 24-27 October, 2017

## REPORT FROM THE *GENERAL GUIDELINES* WORKING GROUP

### Introduction

This report accompanies the final drafts of the revised *General Guidelines* (including the *Code of ethics*) and the *Companion* as they stood on 9 September 2017.

### Reasons for the review

The reasons for the Review were as follows:

- The adoption of the *Recommendation on the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form* at the 2015 General Conference required that the *General Guidelines* be modified to conform to it;
- The operating context of the MoW programme has changed markedly since the last revision of the *General Guidelines* in 2002. Not the least of those changes has been the global explosion of digital information;
- MoW has grown exponentially since 2002, with the proliferation of activities, committees and registers, and the accumulation of operational experience. The *Guidelines* needed to be more robust to match the current state and expected future growth of the programme;
- Not surprisingly, after 15 years, some parts of the 2002 *Guidelines* were literally outdated.

### Formation of the Guidelines Working Group

At the 2015 IAC meeting in Abu Dhabi, 4-6 October 2015, it was agreed that the *Guidelines* were in need of revision. Ray Edmondson was assigned the task of assembling and chairing a voluntary Working Group to undertake the revision, with a view to the revised *Guidelines* taking effect for the 2018 round of nomination submissions. Terms of reference were subsequently developed in discussion with the Bureau.

Members of the Group were:

**Jan Bos**, IFLA nominee to the Register Subcommittee (RSC) and current chair of RSC

**Alissandra Cummins**, former chair of IAC, former president of ICOM, former chair of the UNESCO Executive Board

**Ray Edmondson**, former member of IAC, former CAAA nominee to the RSC, former chair of MOWCAP, author of the 2002 *Guidelines* and *MoW Companion*

**David Fricker**, current vice chair of IAC, current president of ICA

**Roslyn Russell**, former chair of IAC, current member of RSC, chair of Australian MoW Committee, co-author of the 1995 *Guidelines*

**Joie Springer**, current member of RSC, former head of MoW Secretariat, Paris



## The Guidelines Working Group's Terms of Reference

The full terms of reference are appended. In summary they were:

- Reviewing the adequacy of the *Guidelines* and *Companion* as a sound operational basis for the growth of MoW. This includes revisiting its vision, mission and objectives and ensuring congruence with the new *Recommendation*.
- Bringing other aspects of MoW to the fore so that the registers are less dominant.
- Reviewing the role and functioning of the IAC and its subcommittees
- Inclusion of a code of ethics
- Reviewing aspects of the MoW registers and the nomination process, including definitions, criteria, proformas, monitoring, objectivity of language, transparency, sensitivity to controversy, and global harmonization.
- Marketing and logo, community engagement, and relations with other UNESCO programmes

## How the Guidelines Working Group proceeded

The Group saw its priority task as a revision of the *General Guidelines*, since everything else flows from these.

The 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, and there was coordination with the Working Group on Statutes and Rules. Meanwhile, in September 2016, the 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 (see below).

A partial draft of the revised *Guidelines* (known as Mark 4) was discussed at the Experts' Meeting convened in Berlin (1 to 4 March 2017). Further work on the text followed, informed by the rapporteur's record of the meeting as well as subsequent input from IAC members. From this, the Group developed the final draft (Mark 6). This was submitted to the Secretariat on early September 2017.

Revisions to the *Companion* were developed after the conclusion of major work on the text of the *Guidelines*. The terms of reference of the existing IAC subcommittees were reviewed in parallel with this.

## Major themes in public submissions

Among the great many ideas and suggestions traversed in the public submissions, the Working Group noted some major themes that emerged and which merit comment here:

*Limiting the number of register nominations:* It was expected that the current limit of two nominations per country per cycle for the International Register would attract some comment. In the event, it was a topic largely ignored, so it is assumed that this limit is generally accepted as a reasonable and practical mechanism for managing the workload.

*Adding gateways for nominations:* Traditionally there have been no “gateways” for nominations to the International Register. In principle, anyone can directly nominate anything without the prior approval of national or regional committees, or any other “filtering” body. Among the 15 respondents who raised the topic, opinion was equally divided on the advisability of “filtering”. In practice, the RSC has always sought the views of a relevant national MoW committee or UNESCO National Commission – or other bodies – when needed for dealing with particular nominations. Under provisions agreed in March at the Berlin Experts’ Meeting - and now incorporated into the *Guidelines* – relevant national MoW committees, National Commissions and Permanent Delegations to UNESCO will be apprised of nominations accepted for assessment, and will have ample opportunity to comment should they wish to. Accordingly, the traditional principle has been left unchanged.

*Separate process for “disputed” nominations:* Of the 26 submissions which commented on this issue, 17 opposed the suggestion that “disputed” nominations should be somehow isolated and dealt with by a separate process (4 were in favour and 5 had no firm opinion). The Working Group accordingly designed a single processing stream for all nominations.

*The expert-led character of MoW:* Retaining the present, distinctive expert-led character of the MoW programme (as opposed to a states or government-led approach) attracted the strongest affirmation of all: 18 were in favour, 2 against. Accordingly the expert-led character of MoW has been reinforced in the *Guidelines*.

*A MoW convention:* Only 3 respondents supported the idea of turning MoW into a convention: 11 rejected the idea.

*Allowing inscription of privately owned documentary heritage:* Traditionally privately owned collections and documents, as opposed to material held in memory institutions, have been accepted for inscription. Ten respondents supported the continuation of this practice and none opposed it, so Guideline provisions on this matter are unchanged.

## Differences with the 2002 edition of the *Guidelines*

The new structure differs from the earlier edition. Appropriate references to the *Recommendation* are now included, and the prominence of the International Register has been reduced, so as to more effectively place it in the wider context of the programme. Definitions adopt the exact wording of the *Recommendation*.

For the most part, the text has been completely revised and rewritten so there is not always a section-by-section comparison with the 2002 edition. The number of appendices has been increased.

The original Register nomination form has long since been superseded by later iterations, and a new version is proposed in the revised *Guidelines*. A nomination form for “additional exemplars” has been added, as well as a proforma for “Comments” .

Some material in the *Companion* which was judged more appropriate for inclusion in the *Guidelines* has been moved across into the appendices or the main text, and editorially revised in the process.

A detailed comparative account of the changes from the 2002 edition was given in my report to the Experts’ Meeting in March, and is not repeated here, but I summarise below the main features of the revised *Guidelines* under its chapter headings:

## **1 Introduction**

Provides a historical background to MoW and to the compilation of the present edition.

## **2 Foundations**

*The introduction* has been rewritten to anchor more firmly in UNESCO’s constitution and other relevant reference points. *MoW’s objectives* are unchanged. A disclaimer has been added to make clear MoW’s role in identifying documentary heritage but not making historical judgments. *Vision and mission* are unchanged. Comments on the *character of the programme* emphasise MoW’s expert-led nature and its reliance on volunteers. Paragraphs on MoW’s *ethical foundation* reflect ethical issues picked up in the *Recommendation* and point to the new MoW Code of Ethics.

*Definitions* now exactly match their wording in the *Recommendation*. Explanatory information appears in an appendix.

## **3 Description and strategy**

This chapter is based on the structure and content of the *Recommendation*, to which it refers. The sections on *preservation* and *access* re-use some material from the 2002 edition but they are much shorter. What needed to be spelled out in 2002 is no longer necessary – the professional literature today does that.

## **4 Structure of the programme**

This chapter more or less corresponds to chapter 5 in the 2002 edition, though it has been rewritten. The IAC and subcommittees were the subject of considerable discussion in the public submissions, especially in terms of the transparency of appointment, method of selection and obligations/expectations of members. These are dealt with, in part, in the *Code of ethics* (Appendix 1) and also, separately, in the statutes and rules.

This section summarises the terms of reference of the *subcommittees*. The use of the *MoW logo* is mentioned (with the rules elaborated in Appendix 9).

## **5 Memory of the World activities**

This informational chapter sets out the scope of MoW and seeks to put the International Register in context.

## **6 The International Register**

*Criteria for inscription* are now more detailed than the 2002 edition. They are consistent with it, but are designed to be easier to work with, and to overcome some past difficulties. They subsume the previous list of comparative criteria (time/place/people/subject and theme/form and style/ social and spiritual).

*Nomination parameters* are now more elaborate. References to copyright ownership have been dropped as not relevant, but some new considerations have been added.

The *nomination process* and the *RSC assessment process* are more detailed. They aim to balance “transparency” and “confidentiality” and the avoidance of undue lobbying – while keeping the system workable.

*Additions to existing inscriptions* adds a new process adopted at the 2015 IAC meeting, together with an accompanying proforma. *Monitoring and reporting inscriptions* is newly written.

## **7 Further Information**

An informational chapter dealing with “Q & A” topics relating to the *Register*, *Lost and Missing Heritage*, and *Heritage under threat*.

## **8 Conclusion**

A brief chapter to tie up the text.

## **Appendices**

There are 10 appendices. Most of these need no further explanation, but important new additions are the *Code of Ethics* (Appendix 1), *Nominating digital documents for inscription* (Appendix 6), and *Questioned nominations* (Appendix 10).

The *Code of ethics* is developed from the code that was originally adopted by the IAC in 2007 to guide the work of the RSC. It has had a low profile; it is now more formal, public and wider in its application.

The appendix on *digital documents* now makes it practicable to consider born-digital documents for Register inscription.

The statement on *questioned nominations* was adopted at the March 2017 Experts’ meeting and its provisions have been incorporated into the detail of Chapter 6.

## **Note on the MoW *Companion***

The *Companion* was introduced in 2011 specifically as an aid to nominators, to help them prepare their nomination forms. It was written in informal language, in contrast to the formality of the *General Guidelines*, and offered links to existing inscriptions which would serve as helpful case studies. It also elaborated on definitions, concepts, and other areas of the *Guidelines*. It has a “question and answer” function.

However, because the *Guidelines* had not been updated since 2002, the *Companion* increasingly tended to be seen as an additional set of “rules” and this became confusing. For this reason, in the present process of revising the *Guidelines*, parts of the *Companion* have been moved across and incorporated in the *Guidelines*. The intention is that the *Companion* will revert to its original intent of being an explanatory aid to nominators, as well as providing practical information on other parts of the MoW programme.

Accordingly, the *Companion* has been revisited to match the revised selection criteria and assessment process.

## **Note on IAC and subcommittees**

The Group has reviewed the IAC Statutes and Rules and passed its comment to the other working group.

It has provided a description of the role of each of the IAC sub-committees in the *Guidelines* text. The terms of reference of each has been reviewed and standardised, and modified to be consistent with the *Guidelines*. The Working Group recommends two significant changes:

- The Register Subcommittee is enlarged by one additional member, to be nominated by ICOM.
- The Sub-committee on Technology (SCoT) is renamed the Preservation Subcommittee (PSC) and its scope has been widened.

The revised terms of reference are appended.

## **Implementation Guidelines for the *Recommendation***

Though not an explicit part of the Group’s terms of reference, the Group is aware of them (they were prepared under contract by Ray Edmondson, as a separate exercise), so the text has been taken into account in the drafting of the *Guidelines* and the *Companion*.



## **A proposal for the MoW website**

For many, MoW's face to the world is the International Register on the Paris website. Because it is styled as "THE Memory of the World Register" it is not obvious to most that there are OTHER MoW registers, and this is a nomenclature issue that needs correction.

Traditionally, too, inscriptions are listed under the names of countries or nation-states. This is problematic for nominations that don't clearly come from a single country, such as joint nominations, or nominations submitted by NGOs. Aligning nominations and inscriptions with nation-states also runs the risk of enmeshing them in political debates, rather than focusing attention on the objective significance of the documentary heritage itself. As an international expert-led programme, MoW should surely be encouraging the latter.

Entries now follow the format:

*Documentary heritage submitted by [country] and recommended for inclusion in the Memory of the World Register in [year].*

We suggest a different formulation:

*Submitted by [institution/organization/person(s) located in country]. Inscribed in [year].*

Bona fide international organizations would continue to be listed without a country affiliation; those created simply to propose a nomination would show locations( eg Baltic States). For example, in practical terms, this would change the following entry:

### ***American Colonial Music: a sample of its documentary richness***

*Documentary heritage submitted by Bolivia, Colombia, Mexico and Peru and recommended for inclusion in the Memory of the World Register in 2007.*

*The documentary collections of music from the 16th to the 18th century from different countries of the American continent are an essential part of the cultural history of the New World in all aspects: religious and lay, civil and political, cultural and popular, vocal and instrumental, mystic and dramatic, renaissance, baroque and classic. They constitute the testimony of different cultures (Indigenous, African and European) which mixed and gave birth, to a new culture, not completely western, nor Hispanic, nor purely American, for three centuries.*

*Year of submission: 2007*

*Year of inscription: 2007*

*Country: Bolivia, Colombia, Mexico and Peru*

to:

***American Colonial Music: a sample of its documentary richness***

*Submitted by libraries in Bolivia, Colombia, Mexico and Peru. Inscribed in 2007.*

*The documentary collections..... .. three centuries.*

*Year of inscription: 2007*

*Institutional location: Bolivia, Colombia, Mexico and Peru*

We propose this idea for consideration by the IAC.

Ray Edmondson

Chair, IAC Guidelines Working Group

9 September 2017

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Review will investigate and report on the current adequacy and practicality of the Memory of the World General Guidelines and Companion and the extent to which these documents provide an effective framework for the management of the Memory of the World Programme.

The review should consider matters including *but not restricted to* the following:

1. The degree to which the stated Vision, Mission and Objectives of the Memory of the World Programme support the objectives of UNESCO and reflect the *2015 Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form*.
2. The degree to which the definition of the responsibilities, role and function of the International Advisory Committee reflects its purpose as the principal adviser to the Director-General on all matters related to the performance of the overall programme.
3. The adequacy and practicality of the definitions and criteria for inscription of documentary heritage on the MoW registers, including born digital documentary heritage.
4. Opportunities to further harmonise procedures and criteria for the international, regional and national Memory of the World registers.
5. The degree to which the Guidelines and Companion documents provide a sound operational basis for the continuing growth of Memory of the World.
6. Opportunities to improve the nomination proformas, to gather additional information upon which decisions can be made regarding initial inscription and ongoing maintenance or verification of the documents inscribed on the registers.
7. Opportunities to introduce more transparency into the procedures, decisions and recommendations of the International Advisory Committee and its sub-committees.
8. Opportunities to identify more explicitly additional elements to the Memory of the World Programme, over and above the registers.
9. Opportunities to improve the relationship between the Memory of the World Programme and other programmes and Conventions of UNESCO.
10. Review the role and functioning of the Register Sub-Committee and other IAC Sub-Committees and collaboration between them.
11. Setting standards of acceptance of nominations in terms of objectivity of argument and language, accuracy and adequacy of information and neutrality of intent.
12. Management of sensitivities related to potentially controversial nominations and inscriptions.
13. Inclusion of ethical protocols concerning confidentiality, relations with nominators, conflicts of interest, lobbying and inducements.
14. Marketing and the use of the Memory of the World logo.
15. The Programme's engagement with its communities: public, professional, academic, commercial and philanthropic.

## **MoW IAC PRESERVATION SUB-COMMITTEE (PSC)**

Rules of procedure as adopted at the 7th IAC meeting, Lijiang, 13-16 June 2005, modified by the 11<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Gwangju, Republic of Korea, 18-21 June 2013 and by the 13<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Paris, France, 24-27 October 2017

### **Rule 1 – Membership**

1.1 The PSC shall be composed of six members, including a Chairperson appointed by the IAC in discussion with UNESCO. Assisted by the Secretariat and in discussion with appropriate professional bodies, the PSC chair selects the members on the basis of their expertise within the spectrum of conservation, technical, information technology and curatorial expertise.

1.2 The PSC selects a rapporteur from among its members.

1.3 Observers or temporary members may be invited to attend a specific meeting if the PSC feels that their special expertise is required for the discussion of a particular topic.

1.4 Members shall serve for a term of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment. To ensure continuity of work and corporate memory, no more than four members may be replaced every four years.

### **Rule 2 – Functions**

2.1 The PSC functions are specified in the *General Guidelines*. It 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. It shall discharge other functions assigned to it by the IAC.

### **Rule 3 - Sessions**

3.1 PSC shall normally meet in person at least every two years. Virtual meetings and consultations shall be conducted through electronic media as needed.

### **Rule 4 – Agenda**

4.1 The agenda shall be drawn up by the Secretariat in consultation with the PSC Chairperson and communicated to members six weeks before the opening of each session.

## **Rule 5 – Functions of the Chairperson**

5.1 The Chairperson shall declare the opening and closing of all meetings, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions. He or she shall rule on points of order and, subject to these Rules, shall control the proceedings and the maintenance of order.

5.2 If the Chairperson is no longer able to hold office, the IAC shall choose a member of the PSC to fill the chair for the remaining portion of the term of office.

## **Rule 6 – Secretariat**

6.1 A representative of the Director-General of UNESCO shall participate in the work of the PSC without the right to vote. He or she may at any time submit either oral or written statements on any matter under discussion. The Secretariat of MoW shall provide the secretariat of PSC.

## **Rule 7 – Working language**

7.1 The working language of the PSC shall be English.

## **Rule 8 – Working documents**

8.1 Working documents shall be communicated to members one month before the opening of each meeting of the PSC.

## **Rule 9 – Points of order**

9.1 During the discussion on any matter, a member of the PSC may at any time raise a point of order, which point of order shall be forthwith decided upon by the Chairperson. Any member can appeal against the ruling of the Chairperson which can only be overturned by a majority of the members present and voting.

## **Rule 10 – Adjournment and closure**

10.1 Any member of the PSC may at any time propose the adjournment of a meeting or the adjournment or closure of a debate. Such a motion shall be put to the vote immediately and decided upon by a majority of the members present and voting.

## **Rule 11 – Voting rights**

11.1 Each member of the PSC shall have one vote. Consensus will be sought as the normal basis for decision making on each topic. Otherwise decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote of those present. In the case of a tie, the Chairperson shall have the casting vote.

## **Rule 12 – Suspension**

12.1 Any provision of these Rules, except where it reproduces provisions of the Statutes of the MoW programme or decisions of the General Conference of UNESCO, may be suspended by a decision taken by a two thirds majority of the members present and voting.

## **Rule 13- Reports**

13.1 The PSC shall present reports on its work and recommendations to the IAC.

## **MoW IAC REGISTER SUB-COMMITTEE (RSC)**

Rules of procedure as adopted at the 7th IAC meeting, Lijiang, 13-16 June 2005, modified by the 11<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Gwangju, Republic of Korea, 18-21 June 2013 and by the 13<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Paris, France, 24-27 October 2017

### **Rule 1 – Membership**

- 1.1 The RSC shall be composed of ten members, including a Chairperson appointed by the IAC in discussion with UNESCO. Four members are nominated by professional NGOs (one each, respectively, by ICA, IFLA, CCAAA, ICOM) Assisted by the Secretariat and in discussion with appropriate professional bodies, the RSC chair selects the members, who are chosen across cultural and geographic regions and from specialisms within different areas of documentary heritage.
- 1.2 The RSC selects a rapporteur from among its members.
- 1.3 Observers or temporary members may be invited to attend specific meetings where appropriate to the topics under discussion.
- 1.4 In carrying out its evaluations, the RSC shall ensure that advice is sought from appropriate experts from the region of each nomination.
- 1.5 Members shall serve for a term of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment. To ensure continuity of work and corporate memory, no more than four members may be replaced every four years.

### **Rule 2 – Functions**

2.1 The RSC functions are specified in the *General Guidelines*. It undertakes 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. It shall discharge other functions assigned to it by the IAC.

### **Rule 3 - Sessions**

3.1 RSC shall normally meet in person at least once every two years. Periodic virtual meetings or consultations shall be conducted through electronic media as needed.

#### **Rule 4 – Agenda**

4.1 The agenda shall be drawn up by the Secretariat in consultation with the RSC Chairperson and communicated to members six weeks before the opening of each session.

#### **Rule 5 – Functions of the Chairperson**

5.1 The Chairperson shall declare the opening and closing of all meetings, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions. He or she shall rule on points of order and, subject to these Rules, shall control the proceedings and the maintenance of order.

5.2 If the Chairperson is no longer able to hold office, the IAC shall choose a member of the RSC to fill the chair for the remaining portion of the term of office.

#### **Rule 6 – Secretariat**

6.1 A representative of the Director-General of UNESCO shall participate in the work of the RSC without the right to vote. He or she may at any time submit either oral or written statements on any matter under discussion. The Secretariat of MoW shall provide the secretariat of RSC.

#### **Rule 7 – Working language**

7.1 The working language of the RSC shall be English.

#### **Rule 8 – Working documents**

8.1 Working documents shall be communicated to members one month before the opening of each meeting of the RSC.

#### **Rule 9 – Points of order**

9.1 During the discussion on any matter, a member of the RSC may at any time raise a point of order, which point of order shall be forthwith decided upon by the Chairperson. Any member can appeal against the ruling of the Chairperson which can only be overturned by a majority of the members present and voting.

#### **Rule 10 – Adjournment and closure**



10.1 Any member of the RSC may at any time propose the adjournment of a meeting or the adjournment or closure of a debate. Such a motion shall be put to the vote immediately and decided upon by a majority of the members present and voting.

### **Rule 11 – Voting rights**

11.1 Each member of the RSC shall have one vote. Consensus will be sought as the normal basis for decision making on each nomination. Otherwise decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote of those present. In the case of a tie, the Chair shall have the casting vote.

### **Rule 12 – Suspension**

12.1 Any provision of these Rules, except where it reproduces provisions of the Statutes of the MoW programme or decisions of the General Conference of UNESCO, may be suspended by a decision taken by a two thirds majority of the members present and voting.

### **Rule 13- Reports**

13.1 The RSC shall present reports on its work and its recommendations to the IAC.

# **MoW IAC EDUCATION AND RESEARCH SUB-COMMITTEE (SCEaR)**

Rules of procedure as adopted at the 11<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Gwangju, Republic of Korea, 18-21 June 2013 and by the 13<sup>th</sup> IAC meeting in Paris, France, 24-27 October 2017

## **Rule 1 – Membership**

- 1 The SCEaR shall be composed of a minimum of five members, including a Chairperson appointed by the IAC in discussion with UNESCO. The SCEaR Chairperson selects the members, who are chosen for their specialist and academic expertise.
- 1.2 The SCEaR selects a rapporteur from among its members.
- 1.3 The Chairperson may invite corresponding members to join SCEaR. They may be invited to attend specific meetings where appropriate to the topics under discussion.
- 1.4 Members shall serve for a term of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment. To ensure continuity of work and corporate memory, no more than three members may be replaced every four years.

## **Rule 2 – Functions**

- 2.1 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. It shall discharge other functions assigned to it by the IAC.

## **Rule 3 - Sessions**

- 3.1 The SCEaR shall normally meet in person at least once every two years. Periodic virtual meetings or consultations shall be conducted through electronic media as needed.

## **Rule 4 – Agenda**

- 4.1 The agenda shall be drawn up by the Secretariat in consultation with the SCEaR Chairperson and communicated to members six weeks before the opening of each session.

## **Rule 5 – Functions of the Chairperson**

5.1 The Chairperson shall declare the opening and closing of all meetings, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions. He or she shall rule on points of order and, subject to these Rules, shall control the proceedings and the maintenance of order.

5.2 If the Chairperson is no longer able to hold office, the SCEaR shall choose one of its members to fill the chair for the remaining portion of the term of office.

### **Rule 6 – Secretariat**

6.1 A representative of the Director-General of UNESCO shall participate in the work of the SCEaR without the right to vote. He or she may at any time submit either oral or written statements on any matter under discussion. The Secretariat of MoW shall provide the secretariat of RSC.

### **Rule 7 – Working language**

7.1 The working language of the SCEaR shall be English.

### **Rule 8 – Working documents**

8.1 Working documents shall be communicated to members one month before the opening of each meeting of the SCEaR.

### **Rule 9 – Points of order**

9.1 During the discussion on any matter, a member of the SCEaR may at any time raise a point of order, which point of order shall be forthwith decided upon by the Chairperson. Any member can appeal against the ruling of the Chairperson which can only be overturned by a majority of the members present and voting.

### **Rule 10 – Adjournment and closure**

10.1 Any member of the SCEaR may at any time propose the adjournment of a meeting or the adjournment or closure of a debate. Such a motion shall be put to the vote immediately and decided upon by a majority of the members present and voting.

### **Rule 11 – Quorum, voting rights**

11.1 The quorum of the SCEaR is three members. The Chairperson must participate to make up the quorum. If the Chairperson is not able to participate in the meeting, the

Chairperson may by explicit decision for that meeting authorise any of the other members as acting Chairperson for the meeting.

11.2 Each member of the SCEaR shall have one vote. Consensus will be sought as the normal basis for decision making. Otherwise decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote of those present. In the case of a tie, the Chair shall have the casting vote.

## **Rule 12 - Suspension**

12.1 Any provision of these Rules, except where it reproduces provisions of the Statutes of the MoW programme or decisions of the General Conference of UNESCO, may be suspended by a decision taken by a two thirds majority of the members present and voting.

## **Rule 13- Reports**

13.1 The SCEaR shall present reports on its work and its recommendations to the IAC.

