1. Introduction

1.1. The 9th General Meeting of the UNESCO Memory of the World Committee for Asia and the Pacific (hereafter, MOWCAP) was convened by the Korean Studies Institute (hereafter, KSI) and the UNESCO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, and was hosted in Andong, Republic of Korea, in coordination with KSI from 24 to 26 November 2022. Due to restrictions arising from the Covid-19 pandemic, the last MOWCAP General Meeting had been held three years prior in 2018.

1.2. The objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Review the activities of the International and Regional Memory of the World (MoW) Programmes;
2. Present Member State reports from the national MoW committees and National Commissions for UNESCO;
3. Present MOWCAP Regional Register nominations and review of recommendations from the Register Sub-Committee (RSC) for voting among accredited delegates; and
4. Announce the successful inscriptions added to the MOWCAP Regional Register.

2. Participants

2.1. MOWCAP Bureau Members

1. Chair
   Mr Kwibae Kim (Republic of Korea), in person
2. Vice-Chair
   Ms Dianne Macaskill (New Zealand), in person
3. Vice-Chair
   Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong (Vietnam), in person
4. Vice-Chair
   Prof. Mitsuru Haga (Japan), in person
5. Acting Secretary-General
   Ms Linh Anh Moreau (France/USA), in person

2.2. Register Sub-Committee (RSC)

1. RSC Chair
   Dr Helen Jarvis (Cambodia), in person
2. Member
   Prof. Kyung-ho Suh (Republic of Korea), in person
3. Member
   Ms Hongmin Wang (China), online

4. Member
   Mr Opeta Alefaio (Fiji), online

5. Member
   Dr Alla Aslitdinova (Tajikistan), absent

2.3. UNESCO Representatives
1. Chief of Documentary Heritage, UNESCO Headquarters
   Mr Fackson Banda (Zambia), in person

2. Regional Adviser for Communication and Information, Chief of Unit, UNESCO Bangkok
   Mr Jo Hiranaka (Japan), in person

3. National Programme Officer, Communication and Information, UNESCO Almaty
   Mr Sergey Karpov (Kazakhstan), in person

2.4. Special Advisors
1. Dr Ray Edmondson (Australia), online

2. Mr Simon Fook-Keung Chu (SAR China, Hong Kong), online

3. Ms Sarah Cheung–Ching Choy (SAR China, Hong Kong), online

4. Dr Richard Engelhardt (Thailand), online

2.5. The full list of participants can be viewed in Appendix A.

3. Opening Ceremony
3.1. MOWCAP Chair Mr Kwibae Kim delivered the Welcome Remarks, thanking the City of Andong Gyeongsangbuk-do Province, and the Korean Studies Institute for their hosting of the 9th MOWCAP General Meeting.

3.2. The 9th MOWCAP General Meeting was opened by Mr Hak-Hong Kim, Vice-Governor of Administrative Affairs of Gyeongsangbuk-do Province who expressed his enthusiasm for the Province to host this meeting and share its documentary heritage with its participants from across the Asia-Pacific region.

4. Adoption of Meeting Agenda
4.1. Ms Linh Anh Moreau, Acting Secretary-General of MOWCAP, introduced an overview of the meeting schedule, and hospitality arrangements including site visits and dinners.

4.2. Ms Linh Anh Moreau was appointed as the meeting’s rapporteur.

4.3. The draft agenda (Appendix B) was adopted.

5. Establishment of Voting Status
5.1. The Acting Secretary-General conducted the roll call for the meeting. She explained that each national “Memory of the World” committee was eligible to exercise one vote. Under the MOWCAP statutes, as for the international MoW programme, in the absence of a National MoW Committee, representatives of UNESCO National Commissions which had responsibility for MoW matters and operated consistently with the MoW General Guidelines fulfilled the function of a MoW national committee in their country. She also explained that under the MOWCAP statutes (Article 4 (iii)) the right to vote at MOWCAP meetings is conditional on the timely submission of an annual report, which is an obligation of membership.

5.2. Accordingly, the following 19 delegates were confirmed as having voting rights:

1. Australia
2. Cambodia
3. India
4. Indonesia
5. Iran
6. Japan
7. Kazakhstan
8. Kyrgyzstan
9. Malaysia
10. Mongolia
11. New Zealand
12. Republic of Korea
13. Solomon Islands
14. Sri Lanka
15. Thailand
16. Timor-Leste
17. Tuvalu
18. Uzbekistan
19. Vietnam
20. Kazakhstan*

*After submission of the report from Kazakhstan, received during Session 3, Kazakhstan was added as a 20th Member State with voting rights at the session’s conclusion by the Acting Secretary-General, as approved by the General Meeting.

6. Review and Adoption of Minutes of the 8th MOWCAP General Meeting
6.1. The Acting Secretary-General presented a review of the minutes from the 8th MOWCAP General Meeting (Appendix C) hosted in Gwangju, Republic of Korea from 29 May to 1 June 2018 and hosted by the Asia Culture Center, which included:

6.2. Reports covering the 2016-2018 period by MOWCAP Bureau Members and UNESCO Bangkok,

6.3. MOWCAP operations during the 2016-2018 period,

6.4. Updates on the international MoW programme by UNESCO Headquarters,

6.5. Update on the establishment of the Category II International Centre for Documentary Heritage in Chungju, Republic of Korea

6.6. Reports from Member States,

6.7. Nomination presentations for the MOWCAP Regional Register,

6.8. Register Sub-Committee report and recommendations,

6.9. New inscriptions made to the MOWCAP Regional Register, and

6.10. Election of MOWCAP Bureau Members.

The General Meeting approved the adoption of these minutes.

7. Acting Secretary-General's Report (Appendix D)

7.1. The Acting Secretary-General reminded the meeting of the Secretary-General’s role according to the Rules of Procedure, and announced the resignation of the previous Secretary-General Mr Andrew Henderson, whose dedicated service over the five previous years was acknowledged, especially for leading the Small Grants programme and raising the visibility of the Memory of the World Programme in Asia and the Pacific.

7.2. The Acting Secretary-General informed the meeting that she was asked by the MOWCAP Chair to assume the role of Acting Secretary-General.

7.3. The Acting Secretary-General shared words of remembrance in honour of the previous RSC Chair, Dr M.R. Rujaya Abhakorn, who passed away earlier that year.

7.4. The Acting Secretary-General shared financial information on the MOWCAP Bureau’s operations, and thanked the Asia Culture Center for its support over the years.

7.5. The Acting Secretary-General reported that the Korean Studies Institute (KSI) had become the new hosting institution for MOWCAP, and summarised the process of the formal agreement made between MOWCAP and KSI, whose support for the 9th MOWCAP General Meeting was acknowledged.

7.6. The Acting Secretary-General presented a summary of previous MOWCAP General Meetings, Bureau Meetings and RSC Meetings, as well as a summary of activities conducted in collaboration with the UNESCO Bangkok Office, including workshops, publications and webinars.
7.7. The Acting Secretary-General reminded the meeting that the 20 Member States whose voting rights had been established have submitted country reports, thereby securing their voting rights.

7.8. The Acting Secretary-General requested the Member States communicate new contact details with the MOWCAP Bureau to keep the database updated, and thanked the MOWCAP Bureau members, RSC members, Special Advisors and KSI for their support.

8. MOWCAP Communications Report (Appendix E)

8.1. Ms Dianne Macaskill, MOWCAP Vice-Chair, gave an overview of the website, noting that its format made it easy to update.

8.2. Ms Dianne Macaskill reported the MOWCAP Facebook page's significant increase in engagement, especially in relation to UN Days, when posts promoting documentary heritage related to that UN day are published, and she acknowledged the work of Nicola Cousen who has been dedicated to publishing these posts regularly on a volunteer basis.

8.3. Ms Dianne Macaskill shared that MOWCAP needed to explore more content for its YouTube platform following the successful live-streaming of the International Symposium on the previous day and the current meeting’s Opening Ceremony.

9. Introduction to the Revised MOWCAP Statutes (Appendix F) and Summary of the Process of Updating MOWCAP Documents (Appendix G)

9.1. Dr Helen Jarvis, RSC Chair, thanked previous Secretary-General Andrew Henderson for his support and thanked the organizers for hosting the 9th MOWCAP General Meeting.

9.2. Dr Helen Jarvis, RSC Chair, then specified that the MOWCAP Regional Register is a list, a recognition of significance, evaluated by the General Meeting to be worthy of note. There are different levels for MoW registers: regional, international, and in some cases, a national register. Having a national register can have a significant impact in leading up to a regional, and even international register.

9.3. Dr Helen Jarvis informed the meeting that following the last MOWCAP General Meeting, there were 56 inscriptions to the MOWCAP Regional Register, and invited participants to view the inscriptions on the website, and to contact the Acting Secretary-General to get copies of the MOWCAP 20th anniversary publication.

9.4. Dr Helen Jarvis also acknowledged Dr M.R. Rujaya Abhakorn’s contribution until he sadly passed away last year. She informed the meeting that she was tasked by the MOWCAP Bureau to collaborate with Ms Dianne Macaskill and the former Secretary General to update MOWCAP’s documents, which needed to reflect digitisation and changes in the programme. She informed the meeting that the comprehensive review at the international level was a long and complex process that took from 2017 until 2021 to complete. For its implementation in the Asia-Pacific region, she and Ms Dianne Macaskill spent at times weekly sessions over the course of a year, which culminated in the
Regional Register Process document being approved by the MOWCAP Bureau in line with the authority given at the 2018 General Meeting.

9.5. Dr Helen Jarvis shared with the meeting the changes to the Regional Register Process that stakeholders should be aware of, namely:

9.5.1. How it reflects the International Guidelines, while emphasising regional significance rather than international, whereby an item’s significance has to be beyond local. It can be sub-regional (i.e. South Asia, Pacific), or regional (Asia-Pacific).

9.5.2. Nominations must be accompanied by a letter of support from the National Commission for UNESCO (or equivalent). Three nominations this year did not have this support letter, which made their nominations inadmissible. As a result, Dr Helen Jarvis advised the meeting to consider the time required to obtain this, and suggested we reach out to the National Commissions for UNESCO at least one month in advance of the deadline for nominations.

9.6. Dr Helen Jarvis drew attention to the new admissibility level for a nomination to be passed as admissible: the documents should respect the Charter of the UN and the UN Constitution.

9.7. For establishing regional significance, nominators are invited to establish a comparative analysis, including how the documents relate to others in the region and beyond.

9.8. Gender analysis: the new nomination form asks the nominators to state if the documents have any connection to the lives and impact on women and girls in the Asia-Pacific region, a priority UNESCO has been focussing on. Dr Helen Jarvis noted that some nominations in this year’s round included nominations related to the impact of and on women and girls.

9.9. Formalities: the form can be daunting but it is manageable. The Form should be followed seriously in order to best reflect the value of the nomination.

9.10. Among the elements from the International Guidelines integrated in the MOWCAP Regional Register Process international level: the nominations are published on the website and available for comment, providing possibilities for formalising what can be a contestation. When a contestation is triggered, it initiates the incidental process. Dr Helen Jarvis specified that maintaining dialogue is valuable, and that facilitation through the experts can contribute towards this dialogue.

9.11. Comments from the floor:

9.11.1. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur (India): In regards to the timeframe to submit nominations, Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur suggested providing six months so that there is sufficient time for preparation. Regarding the nomination process, including the revised guidelines, there is a lack of awareness on how to prepare the dossiers. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur suggested hosting a workshop on dossier preparation in India to support stakeholders, and that additional webinars can be organised.
9.11.2. Dr Helen Jarvis welcomed the idea of providing a longer period between the nomination announcement and deadline, and explained that for this round the MOWCAP Register process documents had to be revised and approved by the Bureau before the call could be issued, and that was not possible before February, and so an expedited timing was followed to make sure the inscriptions could take place at the 9th MOWCAP General Meeting meeting.

9.11.3. Mr Imam Gunarto (Indonesia) informed the meeting that Indonesia had inscribed five items on its national register, with the intention for these nationally registered items to be submitted to the Regional Register, and then the International one. In regards to the comparative analysis, he requested some clarification on how to best complete this section in the form.

9.11.4. Dr Helen Jarvis replied that one method would be to consult the MOWCAP website and view other nominations with their respective summaries as a basis for comparison.

9.11.5. Prof. Kyung-ho Suh (RSC Member) provided further suggestions on the comparative analysis section of the nomination form by reading the nomination dossiers of the successful inscriptions, both to regional and international registers. Even if one cannot give a complete picture to start with, following this with a consultation with experts, relying not only on the documents themselves, but also on the historical background of these documents to make a larger picture surrounding the documents.

9.11.6. Dr Helen Jarvis invited Roslyn Russell (National MoW Chair Australia) to comment.

9.11.7. Ms Roslyn Russell (Australia) invited the meeting to the website to view various resources, such as how to use the Gender Equality Baseline Study.

9.11.8. Dr Ray Edmondson (Special Advisor) encouraged the establishment of national registers, as this is good practice in writing nominations, and gives a picture of any potential items that can be submitted to the regional register.

9.11.9. The session’s chair, Mr Kwibae Kim, invited Ms Dianne Macaskill to comment.

9.11.10. Ms Dianne Macaskill invited the meeting to view additional resources, such as the Let’s Explore the Memory of the World children’s book and the Women in History HERstory exhibition, both of which are available online.

9.12. In reference to the revised MOWCAP Statutes (Appendix F), Ms Dianne Macaskill reminded the meeting that these are important because they set the scene for how MOWCAP operates. The last time the Statutes were reviewed was in 2006, and Ms Dianne Macaskill acknowledged the great work that the previous drafters had done, as there were few changes to make other than to reflect technological developments.

9.13. Ms Dianne Macaskill gave the meeting an overview of how the proposed MOWCAP Statute revisions were developed.

9.14. Ms Dianne Macaskill then shared the proposed changes to the MOWCAP Statutes, which included:

9.14.1. MOWCAP name and status to be consistent with international guidelines,
9.14.2. Changes in Article 2 on Objectives,
9.14.3. Changes in Article 3 on Membership, including how to proceed in the absence of a national MoW committee,
9.14.4. Change to Article 4 on clarifying the status of virtual and hybrid meetings,
9.14.5. Changes to Article 5 on Voting,
9.14.6. Changes to Article 8 on The Bureau to add UNESCO Bangkok and for consistency with other articles, and
9.14.7. Change to Article 11 to make a more general statement.

9.15. The Session’s Chair, Mr Kwibae Kim, invited comments and objections to the Statutes.

9.16. The meeting agreed to vote on the revised Statutes during Session 4 after delegates have reviewed the revisions more carefully.

9.17. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur (India) asked if there was any provision in the Statutes on the creation of sub-committees.

9.18. Ms Dianne Macaskill replied that there were no current plans to have regional sub-committees as MOWCAP works well as a regional entity.

9.19. Dr Helen Jarvis added that sub-committees can indeed be created as deemed necessary.

9.20. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur specified that there might be interest in forming a sub-regional committee for South Asia or Central Asia, for example.

9.21. Ms Julian Chinogolo (Solomon Islands) enquired on the process of creating a national MoW committee. Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau replied that a national MoW committee is usually hosted/administered by a relevant ministry, such as education or culture. UNESCO Headquarters Chief of Documentary Heritage, Mr Fackson Banda, added that the is usually a coordination bureau somewhere, and that its management and activities are the responsibility of the Member State’s government.

Ms Julian Chinogolo (Solomon Islands) explained that in the case of her country, there was a weakness in the system as there is no active National Commission for UNESCO nor a national MoW committee in the Solomon Islands. Mr Fackson Banda replied that an individual can propose and initiate a national MoW committee, but that such initiative has to be endorsed by the National Commission for UNESCO or the Bureau in charge of UNESCO Affairs at a relevant ministry.

1.1. Mr Jaafar Sidek bin Hj. Abdul Rahman (Malaysia) enquired about joint nominations, and suggested conducting an activity on joint nominations. Dr Helen Jarvis replied that, in the case of a joint nomination, one needs the permission from the National Commissions for UNESCO of all Member States involved. She added there is no limit on the number of joint nominations, and encouraged joint nominations as a means to strengthen relationships between countries.

Ms Linh Anh Moreau recalled that a past workshop had been organized on joint
nominations in Bangkok in June 2019, therefore an additional one would be justifiable. Mr Imam Gunarto (Indonesia) suggested a joint nomination for ASEAN, adding that SARBICA could be the focal point for a regional nomination. Dr Helen Jarvis supported the idea of setting a regional joint nomination for ASEAN as an objective, sharing the example of the Bandung Conference, for which African and Asian countries involved are looking for documents for the event’s anniversary. Africa and Asia covers a much broader part of the world, but exciting nominations like these should be encouraged.

1.2. The Session’s Chair, Mr Kwibae Kim, thanked the participants and invited applause for Ms Dianne Macaskill and Dr Helen Jarvis.

1. **MOWCAP Finances** (Appendix H)

1.1. Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau summarised the main items, most of which were financed by the Asia Culture Center before the transfer of the MOWCAP Secretariat to the Korean Studies Institute (KSI).

1.2. Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau emphasised the significant financial contributions from the Asia Culture Center, especially for the Small Grants Programme and general operations.

1.3. Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau added some specifications on yearly costs to run the website and Google storage, inviting the meeting to share suggestions on more affordable and efficient solutions.

2. **UNESCO MoW Reports**

1.1. **UNESCO Bangkok** (Appendix I)

1.1.1. Jo Hironaka (UNESCO Bangkok) welcomed the Member States present and thanked the co-hosts for organising the meeting. He reminded participants of the disaster in Bosnia after which the Memory of the World programme was born, and that documentary heritage takes diverse forms that need protection, including the Confucian woodworks seen the previous day, and demonstrates the region’s great linguistic and cultural diversity. The report he gave reflected the activities of eight (8) field offices in the Asia-Pacific region, and invited participants for future collaboration and suggestions, and suggested referring to the potential of UN Days to attract visibility.

1.1.2. One area UNESCO Bangkok has been focussing on is Gender Equality, with the launch of the Baseline Study which helps to assess the gender sensitivity of inscriptions. This has been translated into Mongolian, and UNESCO Jakarta supported Indonesia with the identification of Gender Equality related items, as UNESCO Beijing did with supporting Mongolia in the same endeavour.
1.1.3. UNESCO Bangkok built an Indigenous audiovisual archive in Cambodia, launched the children’s book, illustrated by Sali Sasaki, and organized a series of webinars on universal access to documentary heritage, a task also undertaken by UNESCO Beijing.

1.1.4. UNESCO Bangkok is always in search of suitable local experts to help safeguard and promote documentary heritage.

1.2. **UNESCO Headquarters (Appendix J)**

1.2.1. Mr Fackson Banda presented the MoW international programme’s activities.

1.2.2. He then called on Member States to explore the possibility of jointly organising conferences to enhance international cooperation, and to seek out partnerships across diverse sectors, such as when UNESCO Headquarters wrote to Google Arts and Culture.

1.2.3. Among other forms of documentary heritage we need to pay attention to was building an archive of software source code which can expand the bounds of accessibility.

1.2.4. Mr Fackson Banda thanked the Korean National Commission for UNESCO for organising training sessions on preparing nomination dossiers previously.

1.2.5. The Session’s Chair Mr Mitsuru Haga invited questions to Fackson Banda from the floor.

1.2.6. Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, MOWCAP Vice-Chair, introduced herself and her background with SARBICA. In regards to the implementation of the 2015 Recommendation, activities were conducted at national, regional and inter-regional levels. In Vietnam, one training on the topic has been organised. With the deadline to submit their activities on the 2015 Recommendation due the following week, she suggested that UNESCO Bangkok or Headquarters continue to promote the implementation of the 2015 Recommendation.

1.2.7. Prof. Kyung-ho Suh (RSC Member) asked to raise a question and comment on the ongoing attempt to decipher and make computers learn the complexities of short-hand writing in China. The more users there are, the more investment is made. However, many writing systems remain in an inactive market, therefore companies are not showing any interest in these markets. It might be important for UNESCO to pay attention to the neglected writing systems to use these as a pilot activity for the application of source code.

Mr Fackson Banda replied that there have been attempts to make this more explicit in the Guidelines, and that, conceptually, a lot has happened. Even structurally, a preservation sub-committee has been set-up within the International Advisory Committee to take up issues, such as approaching companies to take action as a social responsibility rather than a market-driven endeavour.

1.2.8. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur (India) asked, as Chair of the IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) Committee, how to approach UNESCO about
promoting heritage in libraries, such as through webinars or creating a comprehensive programme.

Mr Fackson Banda replied that UNESCO has been working with IFLA to support the translation of software source code, and uses IFLA’s registry of libraries on a regular basis.

1.2.9. Ms Dianne Macaskill added that, on the topic of cooperation and the 2015 Recommendation, MOWCAP had organised three regional workshops on the 2015 Recommendation before COVID-19. In the Pacific, PARBICA is very strong and has a good relationship with MOWCAP, with the support of UNESCO. Since COVID-19, not a lot has happened, and activities need to be re-encouraged. She stated that quite a lot has been achieved through the cooperation with PARBICA and invited participants to look at the MOWCAP website.

Mr Fackson Banda mentioned that UNESCO Headquarters agreed on the importance of cooperation and was happy to have supported the meeting in Adelaide, and went to great lengths to translate the materials that were developed for that meeting. Since then, the materials have been used in Africa.

1.2.10. Dr Helen Jarvis added that the section “including digital form” in the 2015 Recommendation’s title had been debated at length. There were two schools of thought: one supporting that it had to be emphasised, and the other supporting that digital forms should be implied as a general rule of practice and thought. Dr Ray Edmondson (Special Advisor) added that there is still an ongoing debate as to what is a complex issue within the UNESCO MoW programme, and that these issues are quite common when it comes to digital media and digital databases.

3. Other Items

3.1. The Session’s Chair, Prof. Mitsuru Haga, invited Ms Dianne Macaskill to the floor.

3.2. Ms Dianne Macaskill asked the floor for their feedback on the form.

3.3. Prof Kyung-ho Suh (RSC Member) commented that, after reviewing many dossiers, he has noted that when nominators are asked to provide specify the document’s history, this refers to how the document was born, where and how it was transmitted, and how it got to where it is now, suggesting that “Provenance of the Document” be used as a more effective wording than history to avoid confusion with the history of the events referred to in the documents.

4. Country Reports (Appendix K)

4.1. Among the countries that had submitted country reports to the Acting Secretary-General, all Member State delegates made brief online presentations of their activities during the 2018-2022 period, except for Sri Lanka and Tuvalu. The Session’s Chair, Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, Vice-Chair, specified that all written reports were included in the working papers shared with the meeting (Appendix D).
4.2. The Session Chair, Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, announced the addition of a country report submitted by Kazakhstan, which was added as the last item in Session 3.

Mr Sergey Karpov (UNESCO Almaty) presented the country report from Kazakhstan on behalf of its delegate due to the language barrier.

Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau informed the meeting that Kazakhstan’s submission and presentation of its country report provides its delegate with voting rights, and announced Kazakhstan as an eligible voting member, raising the number from 19 to 20 voting delegates.

4.3. The Session’s Chair, Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, wrapped up the session on country reports by congratulating the Member State delegates for their efforts despite the effects of COVID-19 in continuing to preserve and promote documentary heritage through online meetings, virtual exhibitions, publications and the development of national registers, submissions to regional and international registers.

4.4. The Session’s Chair, Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, gave a special mention to Australia for opening a Memory of the World Knowledge Centre, to Cambodia for its plans for host an upcoming workshop to develop a national register, to Japan for having hosted the Third MoW Global Policy Forum, to Malaysia for hosting more than 30 activities, to Mongolia for the Documentary heritage e-Handbook, to New Zealand for its 18 new inscriptions to the national register, to the Republic of Korea for hosting a variety of MoW activities, to Thailand on developing a bilingual video, to Uzbekistan for conducting online seminars, and to Vietnam for the establishment of the law and circular on MoW.

4.5. The Session’s Chair, Dr Vu Thi Minh Huong, then invited applause from the floor for the Member States and thanked the City of Andong and KSI for hosting the 9th MOWCAP General Meeting.

5. Nominations

5.1. Nominators presented a total of 13 items for the MOWCAP Regional Register, presented in the order the nomination was received by the previous Secretary-General Mr Andrew Henderson:

5.1.1. Singapore: Asian Historical Children’s Collection, presented by the National Library of Singapore.

5.1.2. Republic of Korea: Naebang-gasa - Songs of the Inner Chambers, presented by the Korean Studies Institute.

5.1.3. Republic of Korea: Taean Oil Spill Experiences, presented by the Chungcheongnam-do Provincial Government.

5.1.4. Republic of Korea: Samguk Yusa - Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms, presented by Gunwi-gun County.

5.1.5. Vietnam: Sino-Nom Documents in Truong Luu Village, presented by Ha Tinh Province.
5.1.6. Vietnam: Ma Nhai Inscriptions in the Marble Mountains, presented by the City of Da Nang.

5.1.7. Iran: Collection of Documents of Goharshad Mosque, presented by the Iran national MoW committee delegate.

5.1.8. Indonesia asked if the national MoW committee of Indonesia could present their nominations in a different order, starting with Suharso Rehabilitation Center Archives. The Session’s Chair agreed.


5.1.11. China: Shui Character Documents of Guizhou Province, presented by Guizhou Province.


5.1.13. Bangladesh: Sultana’s Dream, presented by the Liberation War Museum. While the Nominator could not connect to the Zoom platform, the Acting Secretary-General connected the Nominator to the meeting using WhatsApp via phone.

5.2. RSC Chair Report (Appendix L)

5.2.1. Dr Helen Jarvis, RSC Chair, reported that the Register Sub-Committee (RSC) was very impressed with the nominations, and invited applause from the meeting. After much time and consideration, her understanding of the items had been further enhanced through the presentations, which demonstrated the region’s vibrant history, and inclusivity, including disability.

5.2.2. Dr Helen Jarvis, RSC Chair, began her general report by presenting the RSC’s composition and her appointment to the role as RSC Chair following the passing of Dr M.R. Rujaya Abhakorn. She invited Ms Hongmin Wang, RSC Member (China) to say hello online, and added that Mr Opeta Alefaio, RSC Member (Fiji) and archivist, has been a great addition to the RSC from the Pacific.

5.2.3. Dr Helen Jarvis announced a new member, Ms Aijarkyn Kojobekova, from Kyrgyzstan who recently accepted the invitation to join the RSC.

5.2.4. Dr Helen Jarvis reminded the meeting that the RSC do not represent Member States, but are a body of academic and technical expertise, taking into account gender balance and regional representation.

5.2.5. Dr Helen Jarvis then provided specifications on nomination activities: On 15 February 2022, the call for submissions was posted on the website. Dr Helen Jarvis took this opportunity to acknowledge and agree with Indonesia’s comment that more time should be given. By the deadline, 16 submissions had been received. However, since a letter of support from the relevant National Commission for UNESCO (or equivalent) is a requirement, and three did not have this letter, one from Mongolia.
and two from Malaysia, then those three submissions did not meet the requirement for admissibility, so could not be assessed in this round.

Dr Helen Jarvis shared that the submissions were allocated among members for preliminary assessments, and were discussed over the course of five meetings. While this work had been done successfully, the effects of COVID-19 and not having in-person meetings were felt as a hindrance. She further specified that to maintain neutrality, a national from the country of a nomination does not evaluate a dossier from that country.

Dr Helen Jarvis also specified that communications should go through the MOWCAP Secretary-General and not directly to and from a Member State in order to maintain arm’s length assessment and to benefit from facilitated dialogue and expertise.

Dr Helen Jarvis then shared that dossiers were evaluated and some were sent back to nominators to ask for revisions or additional information. There were three rounds of revisions, bringing the total number of submissions recommended by the RSC for inscription up to nine, while four, the RSC felt, needed more work.

Dr Helen Jarvis mentioned that the comparative analysis was very well done for Vietnam’s Ma Nhai Inscriptions on the Marble Mountain. As this was the first time a comparative analysis was included in the criteria, the RSC is pleased with what this brings to highlight the value of an item. The Gender criteria was interesting, as some left it completely blank but were able to add elements upon request. One nomination received was related to an Indigenous language. However, there needs to be more consideration given to the significance of documents, rather than the site itself when it comes to documentation related to a place (i.e. heritage site).

Dr Helen Jarvis concluded on the nomination process that this round had resulted in a process of reflection on the application of the revised guidelines, and that it would be interesting to ascertain how the process went in Latin America.

5.2.6. On the issue of contestation, Dr Helen Jarvis shared with the meeting that there was some ambiguity as to what are the parameters, and that posed a challenge. Another issue, as mentioned previously by Professor Suh, was confusion between the provenance of the document versus the history behind the significance. In some cases, these points merited attention and some reflection, possibly some revision. She drew the attention of the meeting to a similar process being undertaken by the World Heritage Committee, regarding inscription of sites of memory associated with recent conflict, and MoW might benefit from consideration of the recommendations of the WHC Open-Ended Working Group that are now being considered regarding how we might better handle nominations dealing with “negative” aspects of history.

5.2.7. Dr Helen Jarvis then invited comments on the revised guidelines and nomination forms, thanked the UNESCO Bangkok Office and the Republic of Korea for hosting the meeting, and expressed her thanks to colleagues on the RSC on an exhausting process. She also gave a warm welcome to Mr Opeta Alefaio from Fiji, thanked Prof. Alla Aslitdinova ( Tajikistan) for her work over the years, and looked forward to Ms Aijarkyn Kojobekova’s contribution. She also expressed her thanks to her late predecessor, Dr M.R. Rujaya Abhakorn, whose wisdom, grace and passion set
MOWCAP on a firm footing, and welcomed the Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau.

5.2.8. Prof Kyung-ho Suh, RSC Member (Republic of Korea) recommended that nominators fill in the form with the mind of creating a narrative, rather than taking an exam where one feels like one needs to choose the correct answer. This can make the information in a nomination redundant, and avoids using the same information too many times.

5.2.9. Dr Helen Jarvis thanked the nominators for their presentations, specifying that they demonstrated all the preparation that has gone into the nomination. For some, it has been the result of a long process of working with the community. She was impressed with the symposiums, exhibitions and publications produced prior to or as a result of some nominations.

5.2.10. Dr Helen Jarvis proceeded with the RSC’s recommendations, explaining that the order is according to the date of submission:

- Singapore - Asian Children’s Collection: curated as a special collection. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Republic of Korea - Naebang-gasa: a collection that was part of the HERstory exhibition. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Republic of Korea - Taean Oil Spill: documentation of the event and recovery, noting the impact on the women fishery workers, especially the divers, which were recognised with higher compensations awarded to them. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Republic of Korea - Samguk-yusa: a historical document of significance. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Vietnam - Sino-Nom Documents. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Vietnam - Ma Nhai Inscriptions on the Marble Mountain: provided an excellent comparative analysis. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.
- Iran - Documents of Goharshad Mosque: the RSC appreciated the presentation and the nomination, and recognised the value and the justification; however, the nomination focussed too much on the mosque itself, rather than the documents; while there were references, these needed more development; no specifications were provided on the social impact nor on Gender, therefore more work should be done. Recommended by the RSC to be referred for resubmission after developing the nomination in more detail.
- Indonesia - UNESCO Global Geopark Ciletuh-Palabuhanstra Archives: focussed too much on the park itself rather than the value of the archive. The RSC recommended referral, looking at the impact of the geopark’s archives on the community.
- Indonesia - Archives Segara Anakan: similarly, while there is no question that this is an important site, too much focus was on the site, and more work was needed on the regional impact. For everyone’s consideration, the regional significance needs to be given from a broader rather than national lens.
Indonesia - Suharso Rehabilitation Center Archives. Recommended for inscription. The RSC Chair shared that this was an exciting nomination, bringing disability into the picture, and that even a global visibility was established. More was developed after the RSC’s recommendation, such as the Gender Analysis which then mentioned the work of Suharso’s wife, and that number of patients and staff were women. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.

China - Shui Character Documents: very dramatic video which gave a much better understanding than reading the file; very interesting and timely as we start celebrating the International Decade of Indigenous Languages. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.

China - Initial Dasheng Spinning Factory: documents are well preserved and showed the impact of modern management techniques introduced into business; the experiences were not exclusive to China as these were shared by neighbouring countries; a set of rare and unique documents, showing earlier examples of corporate social responsibility; there was also a school for girls established, showing the Gender impact. Recommended for inscription by the RSC.

Bangladesh - Sultana’s Dream: exciting nomination, but can not be recommended for inscription at this time due to the unknown whereabouts of the original edition. When more research was conducted, the nominators discovered an earlier version in India. Referred for resubmission, maybe as a joint nomination with India, given that the latest first edition identified was published in Calcutta.

5.2.11. The RSC Chair concluded that these were the RSC’s individual recommendations for the General Meeting’s consideration and decisions.

5.2.12. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur (India) mentioned that the Bangladesh submission could be a joint nomination as the item was created before the partitioning, and asked MOWCAP to facilitate an online meeting with Bangladesh for mutual support in strengthening the nomination.

5.2.13. Acting Secretary-General shared that the requirement for a letter from the National Commission for UNESCO made community nominations difficult, therefore negatively impacting some potential submissions from NGOs and communities.

5.2.14. Mr Boldsaikhan Sambuu (Mongolia) felt that an explanation for Mongolia’s inadmissible nomination was owed through the lack of a support letter from the National Commission for UNESCO: it was very unfortunate that the nomination was submitted without the Mongolian National Commission for UNESCO’s review and support. The latter had been contacted very near the deadline, giving them no time to review the dossier needed before giving its support. As a productive suggestion, Mongolia expressed its support for Indonesia’s comment for more time to prepare the dossiers. The National Commissions for UNESCO should be contacted when the round is announced, and the request for the letter of support should be submitted at least two weeks before the deadline for submission.

5.2.15. The RSC Chair replied that this was really unfortunate given the interesting nature of the dossier from Mongolia. The Bureau would review whether additional advice could
be given in the MOWCAP General Guidelines to ensure that there was enough time for
the relevant National Commission to review a dossier.

5.2.16. The Acting Secretary-General reminded the meeting that the National
Commissions for UNESCO and national Memory of the World committees should
inform MOWCAP and UNESCO Bangkok of changes in roles and personnel to keep
the database of contacts up to date.

5.2.17. Prof Kyung-ho Suh asked that MOWCAP and UNESCO take measures to address
issues that have been identified during the assessment process.

6. Discussion on and adoption of revised MOWCAP Statutes

6.1. Ms Dianne Macaskill, MOWCAP Vice-Chair, put forward recommendations to the
General Meeting while the MOWCAP Regional Register votes were being counted. She
recommended that the proposed changes to the Statutes be accepted.
The Recommendation was approved by the GM.

6.2. Further recommendations were made to ensure that the Bureau had the authority
to make appropriate changes before the next meeting.

6.3. Both were unanimously accepted by the GM. These were:

6.3.1. that the MOWCAP Bureau is authorised to make changes to its own processes
while maintaining consistency with international guidelines

6.3.2. that the MOWCAP Bureau and the RSC reflect on the lessons learned from
assessing nominations using the revised register process and share this with the MOW
Secretariat.

7. Voting on the MOWCAP Regional Register

7.1. Following the count by the Acting Secretary-General and overseen by the UNESCO
Bangkok Chief of Unit and Regional Advisor Mr Jo Hironaka, the nine following new
inscriptions were added to the MOWCAP Regional Register:

- Singapore: Asian Historical Children’s Collection
- Republic of Korea: Naebang-gasa - Songs of the Inner Chambers
- Republic of Korea: Taean Oil Spill Experiences
- Republic of Korea: Samguk Yusa - Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms
- Vietnam: Sino-Nom Documents in Truong Luu Village
- Vietnam: Ma Nhai Inscriptions in the Marble Mountains
- Indonesia: Suharso Rehabilitation Center Archives
- China: Shui Character Documents of Guizhou Province, presented by Guizhou Province
- China: Archives of the Initial Dasheng Spinning Factory, presented by Nantong Municipal Archives

8. Other matters

8.1. Appointment of MOWCAP Secretary-General
8.1.1. With the consent of all delegations, the MOWCAP Mr Kwibae Kim Chair appointed Ms. Linh Anh formally as the Secretary-General until the next General Meeting scheduled for Bureau election.

8.2. Next MOWCAP General Meeting

8.2.1. Prof. Ramesh C. Gaur (India) proposed New Delhi as the venue for the next MOWCAP General Meeting.

8.2.2. Mr Mirakhmadjon Rikhsiboev proposed Uzbekistan as the venue for the next MOWCAP General Meeting.

8.2.3. The Chair informed that the Secretary-General would confirm the intention of national MoW National committees to host the GM in writing, which expressed their interest to host the next GM and after receiving the concrete proposals, the Bureau would make a decision at the next Bureau meeting in 2023.

9. Closing Remarks

9.1. The MOWCAP Chair Mr Kwibae thanked the meeting’s participants both online and in-person, the MOWCAP Bureau Members, the RSC Members, UNESCO Secretariat’s Fackson Banda, UNESCO Bangkok’s Jo Hironaka, and the Acting Secretary-General Ms Linh Anh Moreau.

9.2. The 9th MOWCAP General Meeting closed.