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

The Review Group welcomes submissions from all parts of the Memory of the World structure, including the IAC and subcommittees, national and regional Memory of the World committees, and the four recognised NGOs which relate to MoW (ICA, ICOM, IFLA, CCAAA)., as well as UNESCO national commissions, in order to assist in the development of its recommendations; either in response to issues raised in this discussion paper or on matters relating to the appended Terms of Reference. Please direct your submissions to m.liouliou@unesco.org and mowsecretariat@unesco.org at the Memory of the World Secretariat, before 30 October 2016.

In order to uphold the transparency of the review process, it is intended that submissions will be made publicly available. Please indicate in your submission if you wish to retain confidentiality over all or any part of it.

Throughout this paper, paragraph references to the current Memory of the World **General Guidelines** are shown in **(bold).** Page or section references to the Memory of the World *Companion* are shown in *(italics).* Both documents can be accessed online at the MoW home page, www.unesco.org/webworld/mow

INTRODUCTION

At the 12th meeting of the MoW International Advisory Committee (IAC), held in Abu Dhabi in October 2015, it was determined that a comprehensive review of the two principal documents that describe the governance and procedures of the MoW programme, the **Guidelines** and the *Companion*, should be undertaken. The **Guidelines** were last revised in 2002; the programme has grown and developed considerably since then.

A Review Group was appointed to undertake the task. Its membership, timeline and terms of reference are appended at the end of this paper, together with a list of other reference documents relevant to the programme. These include, most recently, the Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form adopted at the UNESCO General Conference in November 2015.

Revisions to both the **Guidelines** and the *Companion* need to be specific enough to avoid ambiguity, but any changes will not invalidate past decisions, such as existing MoW Register inscriptions. The character of MoW also remains unchanged: it is an expert-led programme..

VISION, MISSION AND OBJECTIVES

The **objectives** of the MoW programme are listed in the Terms of Reference. The vision of MoW is **that the world's documentary heritage belongs to all, should be fully preserved and protected for all and, with due recognition of cultural mores and practicalities, should be permanently accessible to all without hindrance (2.3.1).**

 The **mission** of MoW is to **increase awareness and protection of the world's documentary heritage, and achieve its universal and permanent accessibility (2.3.2)**

The preamble to the Recommendation concerning the Preservation of and Access to Documentary Heritage, including in Digital Form, agreed by Member States at the 2015 UNESCO General Conference, underlines the importance also of documentary heritage "to promote the sharing of knowledge for greater understanding and dialogue, in order to promote peace and respect for freedom, democracy, human rights and dignity."

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? 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)? **(5.12)**

The MoW programme does not make historical judgments, or allocate blame or praise to historical actors: the nature of historical research and interpretation is that it never ends, and that judgments change over time.[1] MoW concentrates on the documented evidence of past events – whatever the perceptions of their nature. These are all part of memory: they allow us to avoid amnesia, to learn from history, to build harmony, reconciliation and understanding – and to raise interest in and curiosity about other eras and other cultures with a view to**sharing of knowledge for greater understanding and dialogue, in order to promote peace and respect for freedom, democracy, human rights and dignity.**

DEFINITIONS

MoW is based on terms and concepts such as **document, documentary heritage, preservation, access, carrier, content** which are set out in the **Guidelines (2.6, 3.2, 3.3)**, explained in depth in the *Companion (especially sections 1 and 5)*, and also cited in the Recommendation.**[2]** Do they need to be revisited? 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?

STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT

The structure of the MoW programme is explained in the **Guidelines (5.1 to 5.13)** and *Companion (Section 1).* There is a tripartite committee system: the International Advisory Committee (IAC), Regional MoW committees[3] and National MoW committees.[4] In each

---

[1] History is "an unending dialogue between the present (interpretations) and the past (primary sources)". [E H Carr: *What is history?*, 1961]

[2] UNESCO Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form (2015)

[3] MOWLAC (Latin America/Caribbean), MOWCAP (Asia Pacific). ARCMOW (Africa). A European regional committee is in process of formation.

[4] There are currently about 65 committees worldwide.

group, there are also usually subcommittees charged with specific tasks. Committee members are typically drawn from the "memory" professions and institutions (libraries, archives, museums and similar) as well as from related government ministries and academia. Can this structure be improved?

All committees adhere to the **Guidelines.** They follow a general model but operate autonomously, each with its own link to the UNESCO structure, and each with its own approved statutes or rules or comparable reference point.

International Advisory Committee (IAC)[5] (5.2)

This is the peak body responsible for advising the UNESCO Director-General on the planning and implementation of the MoW programme as a whole. It comprises 14 members serving in a personal capacity, each appointed by the Director-General for 4 years, and chosen for their authority in the field of safeguarding documentary heritage. Ordinary meetings are convened every 2 years. Included in its responsibilities, the IAC is responsible for approving additions to or deletions from the international MoW Register.

How should the Director General-choose members? Should a call for CVs be periodically put out to member states, MoW committees and experts, professional bodies, etc? Should prospective members make a written commitment to promote MoW is some way, and later give account of it? Should there be equitable balance in terms of gender, geographical spread, diversity of expertise? What range of skills should be present? What should be the duration of appointment? How should the Chair and the Bureau be appointed/elected? How can the IAC retain its own corporate memory?

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

IAC Subcommittees (5.3)

Currently there are five subcommittees:

- The Bureau comprises the chair, 3 vice chairs and the rapporteur as elected at each ordinary session of the IAC. It maintains an overview of the programme between sessions, makes tactical decisions in liaison with the Secretariat, and undertakes other tasks as needed.

---

[5] There is a parallel but separate review of the IAC's Statutes and Rules currently in process.

- The <u>Marketing Subcommittee</u> (MS) develops strategies for awareness raising and promotion of the programme.[6],.

- The <u>Subcommittee on Technology (SCoT)</u> promulgates information guides on the preservation of documentary heritage, and offers advice on technical and preservation matters as requested.

- The <u>Register Subcommittee</u> (RSC) works in liaison with the Secretariat, and undertakes research and initial assessment of register nominations, providing recommendations (with justifications) for inscription or rejection to each meeting of the IAC.

- The <u>Subcommittee on Education and Research (SCEaR)</u> works to strengthen MoW's network of expertise and promote MoW and related research in the academic and educational environment.

Each subcommittee has its objectives and membership structure, as determined by the IAC and, where appropriate, defined relationships with NGOs.[7] **(5.13)** As expert groups, they allow for observers and others to be invited on occasion, based on their expertise. Should this arrangement be changed or augmented? Does it meet the needs of the future? Is the work of these groups sufficiently well known?

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 subcommittees? Such a group could include former IAC and subcommittee members, widening the pool of expertise and helping in the retention of MoW's corporate memory.

The Secretariat **(5.4)**

The MoW Secretariat is located at UNESCO headquarters in Paris and is the default front-line contact for MoW. It provides general administration, monitoring and support services to the IAC and its subcommittees. The Director-General or his or her representative participates in their meetings but without the right to vote.

---

[6] Authorising the use of the MoW logo is the prerogative of the Director General and UNESCO governing bodies.

[7] The four NGOs formally recognised by MoW are IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions), ICA (International Council on Archives), CCAAA (Coordinating Council of Audiovisual Archives Associations) and ICOM (International Council of Museums). For documents on the subcommittees go to: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/flagship-project-activities/memory-of-the-world/about-the-programme/international-advisory-committee-iac

As the programme has grown, there is an evident need for greater resources and written delineation of its functions to guide new staff, and protect them from external lobbying. What services and activities should be expected of the Secretariat?

Monitoring of inscribed heritage **(5.11)**

As the MoW registers have grown, the need has been recognised to monitor the status of inscribed documentary heritage on an ongoing basis. A draft methodology has been developed but needs to be finalised and adopted by the IAC or Bureau. There are resource implications. How often should monitoring be done, and by whom?

REGISTERS (4.1 to 4.9)

The **Guidelines** explain the structure and principles of the international, regional and national MoW Registers **(4.1 to 4.8)** and the whole *Companion* is a guide to those preparing nominations. All the registers work independently, to essentially the same principles and criteria, and UNESCO ascribes equal importance and value to all. They are differentiated only by the extent of the geographic influence of the documentary heritage they include.

Being the oldest, largest and best known, for simplicity this paper discusses only the International Register. (Comments on any of the regional and national registers are also welcome, of course, and the differences between them will be considered by the Review Group.)

Nominations may be submitted directly by any person or organisation, including governments, NGOs and private individuals. There are no gateways. Where collections are divided among several owners or custodians, joint nominations involving two or more countries are strongly encouraged. Although the IAC has the right to initiate nominations itself, it rarely does so in practice. Should it take a proactive role in encouraging and soliciting nominations?

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

Without changing their fundamental meaning or consistency with past usage, do the criteria still communicate effectively? Many suggestions for rephrasing them have been received over the years. For example, the assessment criteria **(4.2.5)** covering time, place, people, subject and theme, form and style, social and community significance tend to

produce repetitious explanation. 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 stand-alone statement that precedes them? 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? 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?**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? **(4.5.2)** For practical reasons, **(4.2.7)** (*Section 5)* certain types of documents are normally ineligible for inscription: for example, nominations for the entire collection of an institution. Is this appropriate? Should this list be shortened or lengthened? 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?

Design and preparation of the nomination form (Companion appendix)

Since 2002 the nomination form has been progressively redesigned to make it easier to use, and another update is probably needed!

Is the 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? (MoW traditionally lacks the resources to always send independent experts to verify authenticity and condition: it is reliant on information supplied by the nominator, and established by research and referees.)

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?

Preparing nominations **(4.5)** *(Companion 3)*

Nominations are placed on the MoW website for all to see. They need to be written with that knowledge. It is open to anyone to react to a nomination and lodge a comment with the Secretariat.

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?

Submission and initial process **(4.6)** *(Companion 4)*

Nominations may be submitted as hard copy or electronically. [8] Should it be possible, instead, to submit them entirely electronically?

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?

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?

Assessment by RSC **(4.7)**

Nominations are received and acknowledged by the Secretariat. After the closing date, the RSC chair allots them to individual members for research and referee comments, and preparation of an initial report. In camera, the RSC meets to collectively discuss these reports. Any contact with nominators (i.e. seeking additional information or providing feedback) is handled at arm's length by the Secretariat, not by RSC members. The RSC produces a consolidated report for the IAC containing its assessment and recommendation in respect of each nomination. Nominators are advised individually and fully of the RSC's recommendation on their nomination.

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? To what

---

[8] The signature page needs to be an original document but digitally signed forms are also acceptable

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?

There are complex issues here. For example, 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. Where there is external lobbying, to what extent should media speculation be responded to? And by whom?

Role of IAC (4.7)

Currently, most of the IAC's biennial meeting is open to observers. For reasons of historical experience, and to minimise lobbying, discussion on new nominations is held in camera. The RSC's report is reviewed, and agreement or disagreement with its recommendations is noted. The IAC can choose to further deliberate on specific nominations, before arriving at their final decisions for endorsement by the Director-General, who subsequently issues a press release listing the successful new inscriptions. Does current practice represent an appropriate balance?

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? 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)?

Access to the International Register

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.

Provision for objections and removal (4.8)

The **Guidelines** contain provision for the removal of existing inscriptions on several grounds, including reassessment where new information demonstrates that the selection criteria are no longer being met. 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 <u>during</u> 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?

ETHICS AND PROTOCOL

In 2011, the IAC adopted the protocol and ethics statement at <u>Appendix 2</u> 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?

THE OTHER MoW ACTIVITIES

To date it is the Registers that have tended to dominate the public perception of MoW, but as a visit to its websites will show, the Programme is about much more than the Registers. How to develop these other aspects of MoW's objectives poses a major challenge. The following is an indicative list of these activities:

Publicity and awareness raising

- **World Day for Audiovisual Heritage –** 27 October every year, organised under MoW auspices by the CCAAA, is a strategic opportunity to highlight the work and needs of audiovisual archive

- **Helping institutions to leverage the value and prestige of inscriptions –** including the public presentation of register inscription certificates, promotion of the MoW logo, MoW presence on social media

- **Publications -** A range of popular and professional publications, including journal articles, postcards, bookmarks, brochures and coffee table books, promote the programme and present the international, regional and national registers to a wider

audience. In addition, MoW publishes standards and manuals designed for memory professionals. These are produced in both hard copy and electronic formats.

Normative instruments and advocacy

- Periodic special events such as international conferences, seminars, exhibitions and special interest meetings, either organised directly by MoW or in conjunction with NGOs or individual institutions happen around the world.

- The recently adopted <u>Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form</u> (2015) provides a reference framework for governments and institutions in dealing with their documentary heritage

- The <u>Vancouver Declaration </u>(2012), the outcome of the international conference *The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitisation and Preservation,* is a clarion call for all countries to rise to the challenge of technological change

- These join earlier UNESCO normative instruments relating to the preservation of digital heritage, disaster preparedness and the safeguarding of moving images

Prizes and projects

- The prestigious <u>Jikji </u>Prize, funded by the Republic of Korea, is awarded every two years to an institution which has made a significant contribution to the preservation and accessibility of documentary heritage.

- An ongoing range of MoW workshops and other training are organised by various sponsors and partners at national and international levels. This work includes the mentoring of new national MoW committees, coaching on the preparation of nominations, training in preservation skills and other capacity building exercises.

- **UNESCO/PERSIST** is the outcome of a recommendation in the <u>Vancouver Declaration. </u>The ICT industry, governments and heritage institutions are working together to develop a digital roadmap to enable the sustainability of digital documentary heritage.

- MoW connection with the <u>World Digital Library </u>whose objectives are aligned with MoW. It aims to provide on line resources to educators, and build knowledge and capacity in the developing world.

Connections, support of NGOs Within its means, the MoW programme offers financial and practical support to professional associations to assist them in running training

workshops or other projects, including assistance to participants from developing countries to attend professional conferences and other events.

Much more can be done if the means are available. How can MoW engage further with professional, academic, commercial and philanthropic bodies?

RESOURCES

The International MoW programme is serviced by a small Paris-based Secretariat of 1.5 people, while around the world, regional and national committees are supported to varying degrees by UNESCO offices, UNESCO National Commissions, various government agencies, NGOs and others. Collectively it is an inadequate resource base for such a large and expanding global programme, a fact which has long been recognised.

By far MOW's largest resource is volunteer effort. This may have been an acceptable approach a decade ago, but the programme's growth and visibility has required ever increasing levels of professionalism and efficiency which it is unrealistic to continue expecting of a volunteer operation. A far greater level of administrative support is now needed to maintain the programme's independence and objectivity.

How can this be provided?

Appendix 1

A Review of the Memory of the World Guidelines and Companion Documents

BACKGROUND

The Memory of the World Programme recognises documentary heritage of international, regional and national significance, maintains registers of it, and awards a logo to identify it. It facilitates preservation and access to documentary heritage without discrimination. It campaigns to raise awareness of the importance of documentary heritage to world memory, to alert governments, the general public, business and commerce to preservation needs, and to raise funds.

A truly international undertaking with a central secretariat, international, regional and national committees, and with partners in government, professional and commercial sectors, the Memory of the World Programme maintains a global perspective embracing all countries and peoples, whose collective efforts will be needed to ensure that the *Memory* is retained undistorted and undiminished.

The Memory of the World Programme has three main objectives:

- **To facilitate preservation, by the most appropriate techniques, of the world's documentary heritage.** This may be done by direct practical assistance, by the dissemination of advice and information and the encouragement of training, or by linking sponsors with timely and appropriate projects.

- **To assist universal access to documentary heritage.** This will include encouragement to make digitized copies and catalogues available on the Internet, as well as the publication and distribution of books, CDs, DVDs and other products, as widely and equitably as possible. Where access has implications for custodians, these are respected. Legislative and other limitations on the accessibility of archives are recognised. Cultural sensitivities, including indigenous communities' custodianship of their materials, and their guardianship of access, will be honoured. Private property rights are guaranteed in law.

- **To increase awareness worldwide of the existence and significance of documentary heritage.** Means include, but are not limited to, developing the Memory of the World registers, the media, and promotional and informational publications. Preservation and access, of themselves, not only complement each other - but also raise awareness, as access demand stimulates preservation work.

At its meeting of October 2015 in Abu Dhabi, the International Advisory Committee determined that a comprehensive review of the two principal documents that describe the governance and procedures of the Memory of the World Programme, the Guidelines and the Companion, should be undertaken.

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.

The review may seek the approval of the Chairman of the International Advisory Committee to expand the terms of reference of its work.

TIMETABLE

A key milestone in the review process will be the *Memory of the World Summit*, to be convened in Abu Dhabi in January 2017.

From a deep understanding of the role of documentary heritage in global societies and an informed view of the challenges they face, the Summit will reaffirm the significance, importance and objectives of the MoW programme.

The Summit will bring together all MoW programmes, projects and initiatives, who will hold their own sessions and report to the conference in Plenary. It will, as part of this broader agenda, confirm revisions to the General Guidelines and the accompanying Register Companion. The revised guidelines will apply to the submission and evaluation of nominations for the next cycle. The conference program will include workshops on the revised guidelines for members of national and regional committees.

The schedule of key milestones is:

December 2015	Review Group formed and begins work on discussion paper.
March 2016	Discussion paper issued. Call for Submissions issued.
March to August 2016	Consultation period (see below) Analysis of submissions
August to October 2016	Draft of revised Guidelines and Companion developed by the Group; consultation with MOW Secretariat; physical meeting of the Group in September
November to December 2016	Draft circulated to International Advisory Committee members, and subcommittees. Feedback and dialogue as final draft developed.
January 2017	Memory of the World Summit – Abu Dhabi - Back to back meetings of RSC and Bureau (in Abu Dhabi) discuss the drafts - Endorsement of revisions to Guidelines and Companion
February 2017	Arrangements for transmission of the draft final text to UNESCO Executive Board for Member State consideration and decision, and its publication and circulation to be developed.

CONSULTATION

A consultation process over a 4-month period will involve all parts of the Memory of the World structure, including the IAC and subcommittees, national and regional Memory of the World committees, and the four recognised NGOs which relate to MoW (ICA, ICOM, IFLA, CCAAA). It will be open to UNESCO national commissions. The Review Group will design a process and will collate the results.

If you want to share any comments and suggestions with the Review Group, please send your input to Ms Maria Liouliou at the following email address: m.liouliou@unesco.org

MEMBERSHIP OF REVIEW GROUP

Jan Bos: current chair of Register Sub-Committee (nominee of IFLA)

Alissandra Cummins: former chair of International Advisory Committee, former president of ICOM, former chair of the UNESCO Executive Board.

Ray Edmondson (convenor): former member of International Advisory Committee, former member of Register Sub-Committee (as CCAAA nominee), former chair of MOWCAP, author of 2002 Memory of the World General Guidelines and the Memory of the World Companion

David Fricker: current Vice President of International Advisory Committee, current President of ICA

 Roslyn Russell: former chair of International Advisory Committee, current member of Register Sub-Committee, chair of Australian Memory of the World Committee, co-author of 1995 Memory of the World General Guidelines

Joie Springer: current member of Register Sub-Committee, former head of Memory of the World Secretariat, Paris.

The composition of the group embodies depth of knowledge, experience and involvement in the Programme at international, regional and national levels, an informed awareness of the workings of UNESCO, and also contains connections with the four Memory of the World-recognised NGOs.

The group is intentionally small and workable. It will meet electronically throughout, and face to face in September. Others in the Memory of the World network will be invited to participate on an ad hoc basis as needed, and input from anyone who wishes to make a contribution is welcome. The Memory of the World Secretariat and the International Advisory Committee Bureau will be kept informed of progress and will receive copies, as needed, of the Group's working documents.

Appendix 2

MEMORY OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME

RSC/IAC PROTOCOL and ETHICS

Adopted at 2011 IAC meeting

Introduction

The following principles are set out for the specific guidance of the IAC Register Subcommittee. They apply also to members of the IAC when evaluating nominations, and with relevant adaptations, to regional and national MOW committees.

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

Mentoring and advisory role

It is appropriate for RSC members to provide encouragement and technical advice to nominators and intending nominators in developing nominations for the International Register. This will usually happen in the following ways:

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

"Technical advice" means helping nominators to interpret the nomination form and to provide the fullest range of relevant information for the informed assessment of their nomination.

Relations with nominators

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

RSC members may **not:**

- Prepare a nomination form, or prepare the argument or "case" for inscription, on behalf of a nominator. This must be entirely the work of the nominator.
- Offer an opinion to the nominator concerning the likely success or otherwise of the nomination
- Express a partisan stance in relation to a nomination and its passage through the MOW process

- Express or imply personal support for a nomination through the acceptance of gifts or inducements of any kind
- In any other way compromise the objectivity of the assessment process

Committee protocol

Where an RSC member has a real or apparent conflict of interest in relation to any nomination, that conflict is to be declared and its resolution documented in the RSC minutes. For example:

- Where an RSC member is cited as an expert referee in a nomination
- Where the nomination comes from the RSC member's own country
- Where the nomination comes from an organisation with which the RSC member has a relationship

In such cases, the RSC member may provide information or otherwise contribute to RSC discussion when invited by the Chair to do so, but will abstain from any RSC voting in relation to the nomination.

Lobbying, gifts and inducements

Inscription is prestigious and desirable, and it is the experience of the MOW programme that governments and institutions will engage in lobbying activities in an effort to maximise the possibility of a successful outcome for their nomination. This can take many forms, including gifts and offers of travel and hospitality. The practice has different implications and nuances in different cultures; what isdeemed improper in one culture may be no more than good manners in another. Careful judgment is required in order to avoid conflict of interest on the one hand, and giving needless offence on the other. At the same time, countries or institutions in a position to fund lobbying activities must not thereby gain an assessment advantage over nominators who are not in such a position.

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

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

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