

**Report of 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the International Advisory Committee (IAC)  
UNESCO, Paris  
24-27 October 2017**



**Attendance and Welcome Remarks**

IAC members, David Fricker, Lothar Jordan, Adolf Knoll, Helen Jarvis, Dianne Macaskill, Dietrich Schüller, Jussi Nuorteva, Victoria Okojie, Papa Momar Diop, Hedi Jallab, Victoria O’Flaherty (on the first day).

From the Secretariat, Boyan Radoykov represented the Director-General and Fackson Banda, introduced by Mr Radoykov as the newly recruited Programme Specialist in charge of the MoW Programme, Maria Liouliou and Rajarajeswari Pajany also attended throughout, while the ADG for CI, Frank la Rue attended some sessions. The open sessions were attended by observers from a number of countries.

Boriana Hristova and Vitor Manoel Marques de Fonseca joined the meeting in person on the second and third day respectively and the IAC chair, Dr. Abdulla Alraisi, joined via online connection from 10.00am to 1.00pm of the third day.

Jan Bos, Chair of the Register Sub-Committee, and Ray Edmondson, Chair of the Working group on the Guidelines, and Jonas Palm, Chair of Scot, were also present.

Boyan Radoykov and Frank La Rue welcomed the members of the IAC to Paris and to UNESCO. In the absence of the Chair, Dr. Abdullah Alraisi, the Vice Chairs, David Fricker, Lothar Jordan and Papa Momar Diop were to take the chair in succession (in accordance with Rule 9 of the IAC Rules of Procedure). Victoria O'Flaherty was to continue as Rapporteur.

### **Agenda and Procedures**

The agenda was adjusted to allow for the arrival of Vitor Fonseca for the discussion on the guidelines and the Code of Ethics and the presentation on the Persist project. Items 10 to 14 were to be discussed in the afternoon.

Concerns were raised about the fact that the elections of the Bureau had not been included as a part of the proposed agenda. The representative of the Director-General clarified that in light of the Executive Board decision to ensure a transition to a new IAC, and launch the process of drafting a roadmap for the 204<sup>th</sup> session of the Executive Board, and in line with the Director-General's earlier decision to extend the term of those members appointed for the period 2013-2016 by one year, "on an exceptional basis", in the context of the current review of the MoW Programme, it is preferable to extend exceptionally the Bureau till the end of 2017. Thus, the election of the new Bureau would take place in January 2018 after the appointment of the new members by the Director-General.

Following this explanation, it was decided that the election of the Chairs of the different subcommittee should take place at the Thursday morning session.

The agenda was changed so that items 10 to 12 were to be discussed after lunch. Closed sessions were to take place on Wednesday and again on Thursday morning.

### **Reports**

The IAC proceeded with the reading of the reports. Boyan Radoykov informed the meeting that the Chair, as part of his report, had circulated an email about decisions of the UNESCO Executive Board and his work during that meeting.

Jan Bos presented the report of the Register Sub-Committee pointing out the growing interest in the program as seen by the increased number of submissions coming from a wide range of countries, NGOs and individuals. He also insisted that RSC will always follow the established criteria in its recommendations.

The report of the Sub-Committee on Technology by Jonas Palm emphasized the Magnetic Tape Alert Project as this disappearing medium recorded so many aspects of the 20th century. The matter of the future relationship between SCoT and PERSIST was also raised but discussion was left for later.

Lothar Jordan, commenting on the previously submitted written report of SCEaR (Sub-Committee on Education and Research), spoke of the setting up of two knowledge centres, the use of MoW material in schools and the publishing of the newsletter. He also requested funds of US\$1000.00 for Digital Record Pathways which the Secretariat committed to earmark.

The MOWCAP report was presented by Dianne Macaskill. It spoke of the several seminars and workshops, and other activities held in the region. There were three workshops to develop action plans for implementing the Recommendation and one to support Pacific countries to develop nominations for international registers. These and other activities are fully described on the MOWCAP website. She also noted the setting up of the MOWCAP Office at Gwangju, Korea.

Papa Momar Diop Reported on the project to create a West African Committee in view of the lack of activity from ARCMOW and for enhancing the creation of MoW national committees in the sub region. This initiative was meant to revitalize and not to replace the regional body by raising awareness of the programme. Members noted the importance of oral history in Africa and the fact that its preservation often depended on documenting it, hence the need for cooperation between Intangible Heritage and MoW.

### **Education initiatives and Heritage Knowledge centres**

As Chair of SCEaR, Lothar Jordan gave a history of the evolution of the concept of MoW Knowledge Centres, which started in 2012 in cooperation with the MoW Secretariat. He explained two of them have been established, one in Macau 2016 and the other at Beijing in 2017. They are hosted by local institutions. The SCEaR has a coordinating role. While the MoW Secretariat had created a specific logo for use by SCEaR e.g. in MoUs, Newsletter etc., before the opening of the second centre the UNESCO Secretariat expressed concerns that the logo (with UNESCO in) should not be used by these centres, and they should not make UNESCO part of their names. The IAC agreed that since a change of name is likely to confuse people the centres should keep their names. Boyan Radoykov said that the idea of a network of MoW Knowledge Centres was excellent, but the use of the logo should be regulated. Furthermore, it was explained that UNESCO has a network of Category 2 Centres, which might easily be confused with such 'Knowledge Centres', hence the need to avoid the use of the term 'UNESCO MoW Knowledge Centres'.

As future centres may have the wish to use such a logo, Ray Edmondson proposed that they - in addition to the cooperation with the SCEaR – may run e.g. “under the auspices of a National UNESCO Commission” and use its logo. Boyan Radoykov confirmed that this would be in accordance with the rules. The IAC also felt that the matter of whether the management of Knowledge Centres should be within the ambit of the relevant National Committee should be investigated.

## **Safe Havens**

Jussi Nuorteva explained that this was a way of preserving records of jurisdictions that were experiencing social upheaval and war, as well as natural disasters, by providing secure, temporary storage of documents in a time of crisis, or through digitisation. Swisspeace and the National Archives of Finland were already working on this. They had digitised records of Lebanon during the war there and more recently, the same was done for Syria. Because of the complex problem of who these records should eventually be returned to, it was noted that the concept of Safe Havens should be rules and policy driven, and that other areas of danger should be considered, for example small countries prone to natural disasters. The cost has so far been born by digitisers who will return digital copies of documents to the legitimate government of a country. Reference was made to the concept of “Displaced Archives” and the relaunch of this project by ICA whose expert group was trying to find 21st century solutions to ensure that communities had access to their own records.

## **Initiatives and Partnerships**

Particular reference was made to the World Digital Library and the British Library’s Endangered Archives projects. WDL had shared its tools with some partner institutions and it was suggested that this might be done with more partners.

The need for closer cooperation between MoW, World Heritage and Intangible Heritage was once again raised as a pressing need and the members agreed to continue to explore connections between the three programmes and work towards highlighting these through a publication.

## **Branding and Resources**

Boyan Radoykov said that the programme was viewed as very important and explained the possible ways in which a specific Documentary Heritage Fund could be set up for it in the future. The IAC members felt that the Secretariat had to advise on the way forward regarding funding to ensure that any such initiatives complied with UNESCO’s rules and policies.

Once again, the meeting agreed that guidance of the Legal Affairs unit at UNESCO was required to ensure that the MoW brand was used appropriately.

## **Nominations for the MoW International Register, 2016-2017 round**

The discussion of nominations was started. Throughout the voting, members involved in a nomination abstained from casting a vote.

- 132 nominations were submitted.
- 78 were recommended for listing on the International Register
- 3 were recommended for listing as additions to existing inscriptions

- 2 were recommended for postponement pending dialogue, Regarding these two nominations, the IAC sent the following message to the Director General - *“The International Advisory Committee of Memory of the World Programme, following the decision of the Executive Board of UNESCO in its meeting of the 16 October 2017 (202EX/PX/DR 15.8,item 15) recommends to the Director General that UNESCO facilitates a dialogue among the nominators of nominations No 101 “Voices of the ‘Comfort Women’ “ and No 76 “Documentation on “Comfort Women’ and Japanese Army discipline” and concerned parties. The IAC also recommends setting a place and time convenient to the parties for this dialogue, with a view to leading to a joint nomination to encompass as far as possible all relevant documents.”*
- After in-depth examination, 49 nominations were not recommended for inscription on the MoW International Register.

### **Sub-Committee Chairs**

The chairs of the subcommittees were appointed. Papa Momar Diop nominated Lothar Jordan to chair SCEaR, seconded by Hedi Jallab. This was accepted by the IAC. Lothar named the other members of the committee: Roselyn Russell, Martin Porter, Papa Momar Diop, and Luciana Duranti.

David Fricker, seconded by Dietrich Schüller, nominated Jan Bos to continue as Chair of the Register Sub-Committee. Jan Bos advised that he would be happy to continue as chair, but that as he will be retiring next year he felt it would no longer be appropriate for him to serve as the IFLA representative on the RSC, and so IFLA would be nominating a new representative. This too was accepted, and the member would be nominated in the near future.

Dietrich Schüller nominated Jonas Palm to continue as Chair of SCoT. This too was accepted.

### **Implementation Guidelines for the 2015 Recommendation on Documentary Heritage**

Ray Edmondson, who had been commissioned by UNESCO to prepare these Implementation Guidelines, explained that implementation was often a problem as people did not always know how to proceed. The implementation guidelines deal with the practicalities of the provisions of the Recommendation but while the Recommendation was arranged thematically, the Implementation Guidelines were based on the responsibility of Governments, memory institutions and others for ensuring that the Recommendation was followed. He then gave an overview of the document.

Helen Jarvis and Dianne Macaskill described how the implementation guidelines had been used to develop an action plan for implementing the Recommendation in ASEAN countries and in Western and Central Asia. A workshop based on the guidelines had been held for Pacific countries but the action plan was not yet finalised.

A number of comments were made about the Implementation Guidelines, and in particular more needed to be said about:

1. International cooperation,
2. The importance of the Regional committees,
3. Case studies from other parts of the world

Ray Edmondson welcomed the suggested changes and said he would appreciate more case studies that demonstrated international cooperation.

The term “legislative basis” in the Background of the document provoked a discussion on how binding a Recommendation was. It was pointed out that, although Recommendations are legally non-binding, the Constitution of UNESCO stipulates that there is an obligation by Member States to report on the implementation of all adopted Recommendations in national policies, strategies and legislation. It was recognized that this gave the MoW Programme a solid normative foundation for further action.

## **PERSIST**

David Fricker explained that this is a project designed to ensure the ongoing access to digital documentary heritage created by UNESCO after the Vancouver declaration of 2012. He said that it would benefit from a merging with SCoT.

Jonas Palm Chair of SCoT explained that this subcommittee was created in 1994 and has created guidelines and projects dealing with preservation. As PERSIST is concerned with digital preservation it was important for the two to work together. He discussed this idea in a paper shared during the second day of the current meeting.

Similarly, a paper on advancing the PERSIST initiative was also earlier made available to the members of the IAC. David Fricker explained that digital documentary heritage faced some particular problems that needed to be addressed quickly. He explained that the formation of a Digital Sub Committee would facilitate the much-needed network to tackle the problems.

Several members said that SCoT had been created to deal with preservation both digital and analogue and that, in Berlin in 2017, it had been decided to change its name to the Preservation Sub-Committee. There were concerns that by creating a new subcommittee on digital material, the preservation of analogue documentary heritage would be side-lined. It was decided that a working group consisting of Jussi Nuorteva, Adolf Knoll, Dietrich Schüller, Jonas Palm, Vitor Fonseca and David Fricker should examine how PERSIST can be integrated into the framework of MoW. The IAC asked the Working Group to make proposals on this within six months

## **Discussion Points arising from the Nominations**

Helen Jarvis circulated a number of general points arising from the nominations, which were discussed by the IAC. It was agreed that artefacts that are integral to a collection of records might be considered part of a nomination, but that the existing exclusion of artefacts as such should be maintained.

It was reiterated that language should be neutral and without inflated claims.

On the question of how experts are consulted Jan Bos explained that experts were often people who were familiar with the field to which the nomination applied and they were asked to answer specific questions. The referees listed in the nomination should not be prominent people in the community named simply because of the position they hold but persons who had knowledge of the nominated heritage. This should be mentioned in the Companion.

On additions, these would normally be further exemplars of the inscribed item, but at times these can replace the item nominated as in the case of Metropolis, a more complete example could replace the originally inscribed item (as in the case of the film Metropolis) or be added to the nomination as in the case of the Magna Carta.

Nominations from poorly represented countries should be given consideration. Similarly those from countries that were not as influential as the empire builders should be given careful consideration so as to ensure a more balanced representation of the diversity of cultures.

The IAC took note of the fact that 27 October – the last day of the meeting – was the World Day for Audio Visual Heritage. The day had initially been introduced as a way of drawing attention to the problems faced by nitrate film collections. Currently it should draw attention to the disappearance of magnetic tape especially the equipment on which they can be played back.

### **MoW Guidelines**

The discussion on the draft revised Guidelines was started with the reminder that the Executive Board expects input from member states. The full package of revised documents had to reach the Executive Board by April so that the time table for completing this review was very tight.

Ray Edmondson directed the IAC through the draft. The members pointed out areas where amendments were necessary and made their suggestions. The process was repeated for the review of the draft appendices to the Guide i.e. Code of Ethics, the Forms, Inclusions and Exclusions, Definition of Documentary Heritage, Nomination of Digital Heritage, Model terms of reference for National MoW Committee, Logo Rules, and Questioned Nominations.

Regarding the Companion the IAC agreed to drop or replace the word “value” where it occurred, normally referring instead to “significance”. Ray Edmondson reminded members to send in their suggestions as early as possible.

Helen Jarvis moved that the reports should be accepted. She was seconded by Victoria Okojie. The progress report was unanimously approved subject to amendments discussed. It was agreed that Mr Edmondson would prepare a timetable that allowed for the documents to be completed in time for the next meeting of the Executive Board. Dianne Macaskill suggested and the IAC agreed that WG2 led by Mr Edmondson should also complete any revisions required for the Statutes and Rules of Procedure and ensure that all documents were consistent. Several observers underscored the need for continued consultation with UNESCO Member States.

At the end of the meeting, an observer asked for the floor and the Chair agreed to it. Dr. Heisoo Shin then read a statement raising the question about the leaks in the press concerning the discussion by the IAC on some of the nominations. In response, the IAC assured that the assessment process is totally confidential and that it does not issue any statements to the press and communicates its recommendations to the Director-General of UNESCO only.

The meeting was then brought to a close.