March 2025

unesco
Regional Committee

MOWCAP Register Guidelines

UNESCO Memory of the World
Asia Pacific Regional Register Process

See index on last page.

A BACKGROUND

The General Guidelines of the Memory of the World (MoW) Programme provide scope for moulding the process for the Memory of the World Asia Pacific Regional Register (hereafter referred to as the MOWCAP Register). The following principles therefore apply to the MOWCAP Register:

1 MOWCAP is the authority that approves inscription on the MOWCAP Register.[1]

2 As far as possible MOWCAP shall work in accordance with the General Guidelines unless specific regional variations are required.

3 The MOWCAP Bureau has the authority to make any required modifications in wording and to determine time-limits for any parts of the Register process outlined below.

4 The criteria for the MOWCAP Register are identical to those for the International Register, except that significance is to be established on a regional (Asia Pacific) scope rather than worldwide.

[1] See *General Guidelines* 7.10 The International, Regional and National Registers

5 Process and structures for managing the MOWCAP Register, as far as possible, parallel those for the International Register.

B THE PROCESS

1 MOWCAP has established its own Register Subcommittee (RSC). It shall assess nominations and provide recommendations for inscription or rejection to MOWCAP's General Meeting.

2 Completed nomination forms must be submitted electronically, **either directly to the MOWCAP Secretary-General MOWCAPnominations@gmail.com) OR through the relevant National Commission/s** (*which are representatives of UNESCO Member States*), the relevant National Commission/s or in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant National MoW Committee. For an updated contact of the relevant body, please email the Communication and Information Unit at UNESCO Bangkok at ci.bgk@unesco.org. The Secretary-General will confirm receipt of nominations by email.

3 Nominations for the MOWCAP Register shall be invited by and received by the MOWCAP Secretary-General who shall support the work of the RSC.

4 Inscriptions to the MOWCAP Register shall be made every two years, unless unexpected circumstances make this impractical.

5 The call for nominations includes a deadline for the submission of the nominations, which shall normally be at least 4 months after the issuance of the call. The call shall also include the selection criteria the nomination must meet.

C INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL REGISTERS

1 The Memory of the World Programme was established to assist UNESCO Member States to preserve documentary heritage at large. There are three types of register which help to draw attention to this need for documentary heritage preservation. The International Register was established in 1995, with the first inscriptions being added in 1997. Nominations to this International MoW Register are invited and processed in biennial cycles. Over time, regional and national MoW committees have established their own registers and the number is constantly growing. The registers serve as a showcase for documentary heritage which, by its obvious significance and symbolism, draws the attention of decision makers as well as the general public to a much larger need for its safeguarding. The inscribed documents represent a small portion of equally important documents. They help to make a generalised ideal – the preservation and accessibility of documentary heritage concrete.

2 The selection criteria for all registers are based on the criteria set for the International Register, although the wording may vary to reflect regional and/or national specificities. The registers are differentiated by their geographic coverage, and whether the influence of the heritage inscribed is judged to be of international, regional or national significance, a term which refers to the values and meanings that items and collections have for people and communities.

3 All MoW registers operate autonomously and to their own time frames. All inscriptions have equal importance. The world's documentary heritage is so vast and complex that a single register would be unwieldy and unworkable. The tripartite approach allows regional and national expertise to be applied to assessing nominations in a way that would be impossible if there was just a single international register. Where a given document or a collection fulfils the selection criteria for inscription, it may appear in more than one register.

4 For each register, all successful nominators receive an official Certificate of Inscription. A formal certificate presentation is potentially a high-profile media event that benefits both the recipient institution and UNESCO. Official Certificates of Inscription are either hand-delivered or delivered by mail. This also provides an opportunity to promote both the document and its moment of inscription.

5 Owners and custodians of inscribed documentary heritage are encouraged to publicise their status and to draw public attention to the items that have been inscribed. Many memory institutions have placed selected items on public display; they have digitised them so that they are readily accessible; they have promoted their recognition through websites and social media; they have sold reproductions as retail products; they have published histories and descriptions of them in order to further explain their significance for communities, nations or regions.

6 The Memory of the World logo permits regional and national MoW committees as well as institutions holding items listed on a register to demonstrate their link with UNESCO. This can be useful in publicising the work of the committee in promoting or protecting documentary heritage, or in highlighting an inscription on a register. However, its use is subject to the provisions which are set out in the Guidelines on Logo Use available on the MoW website. UNESCO determines the conditions under which the logo can be used and may request the cessation of use in the case of unauthorised, or a violation of, usage.

7 For National MoW committees and institutions holding items on a register, an application to use the MoW logo can be sent to the MoW Secretariat through a National Commission for UNESCO or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO. The logo is a symbolic graphic in which the concentric circles can be interpreted to represent various document formats, as well as the diffusion and preservation of memory. The breaks in the circles thereby represent lost and missing memory.

8 MOWCAP shall maintain and publish the listing of inscribed Asia Pacific documentary heritage.

D ADMISSIBILITY

The following list of documents are among those that may be regarded by the Register Sub-Committee of MOWCAP as **inadmissible** for nomination:

1 Papers of **contemporary** political leaders and political parties: Normally, these would be relevant to national MoW registers, according to the due decisions of their MoW committees. However, the need to be – and to be seen to be – even- handed and objective can conflict with the current political circumstances in which every MoW committee operates. MoW registers should avoid being subject to any accusations of political partisanship.

2 National constitutions and similar documents: Normally, these would be appropriate candidates for national MoW registers, because their influence is usually restricted to the country concerned. Exceptions would be documents that have clearly had wider geographic influence in the Asia Pacific region or a sub-region, for example in serving as models for other national constitutions, having an impact on wider geo-political developments or in pioneering what have since become universally accepted principles.

3 "Whole of institution" nominations: While the nomination of a collection, a fonds or a group of collections or fonds is welcome, the nomination of the entire contents of a memory institution is unlikely to be successful, unless it demonstrates a significance, unity and coherence beyond the coincidence of material which happens to reside in the same institution.

4 A severely degraded document, if its content and character have been compromised beyond the possibility of restoration.

5 Vaguely described or open-ended nominations.

6 Any documents that promote issues and ideas in opposition to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the UNESCO Constitution and/or promote any form of denial of human rights, foster hate speech or promote racist or discriminatory rhetoric.

E GENERAL CRITERIA FOR INSCRIPTION IN THE MOWCAP REGISTER

Using a consistent set of criteria facilitates more accurate analysis and helps highlight the unique characteristics and meanings of each item or collection. All criteria are considered when making an assessment, but not all may be relevant to the item or collection being nominated. One or more criteria may apply and be interrelated. It is not necessary to find evidence for the application of all criteria to justify that an item is significant. Indeed, an item or collection may be highly significant under only one primary criterion, with clarification added by considering the comparative criteria. The criteria are a prompt for describing how and why the item or collection is significant. They may have different shades of meaning depending on the type of item or collection under consideration.

The following criteria are applied to all nominations throughout the assessment process.

1 **Assessment is comparative and relative**. There is no absolute measure of cultural significance. Selection for inscription results from assessing the documentary heritage on its own merits against the selection criteria, against the general tenor of the MoW General Guidelines, and in the context of past nominations, whether included or rejected.

2 **Authenticity and integrity**. The threshold test of authenticity is whether the documentary heritage being nominated is really what it purports to be and not corrupted from the original. Has its identity and provenance been reliably established? Copies, replicas, forgeries, bogus documents or hoaxes can, with the best of intentions, be mistaken for the genuine article.

For a document, integrity is the quality of being whole and complete. Is part of this documentary heritage being kept elsewhere and not included in this nomination? Is it all of the same age or have missing parts been replaced with newer copies? Is it an original – or if not, is it the earliest known version or generation? What percentage of the heritage remains in its original state?

Identifying the authenticity and integrity of documentary heritage can be a complex matter, depending on the nature of the documents in question. For example, some documents – such as audio-visual media, digital files, and manuscripts may exist in variant versions of the same or differing antiquity, integrity or state of preservation.

F REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

MOWCAP considers documentary heritage as having regional significance if the documentary heritage meets one or more of the following three criteria. Nominators may make comments in relation to one or more of these criteria. *Not all the criteria may apply to a particular nomination – only those relevant should be chosen.*

***Historical significance*.** What does the documentary heritage tell us in relation to the history of the Asia Pacific region as a whole, or to a sub-region such as Central, South, Southeast, East Asia or Melanesia, Micronesia, Polynesia, Australasia?

For example, does it deal with:

- Political or economic developments, or social or spiritual movements;
- Eminent personalities in the history of the Asia Pacific region;
- Events of world-changing importance;
- Specific places relating to times, events or people;
- Unique phenomena;
- Noteworthy traditional customs;
- Evolving relations between or among countries or communities;
- Changes in patterns of life and culture;
- A turning point in history, or a critical innovation;
- An example of excellence in the arts, literature, science, technology, sport or other parts of life and culture.

***Form and style significance*.** Significance may lie in the physical nature of the documentary heritage.

Some documents may seem unremarkable in this respect – for example, hand written manuscripts or typescript paper records – but can, for example, have stylistic qualities or personal associations that deserve attention. Other forms of documentary heritage may display innovative qualities, high levels of artistry or other notable features.

For example:

- The documentary heritage may be a particularly fine example of its type;
- It may have outstanding qualities of beauty and craftsmanship;
- It may be a new or unusual type of carrier;
- It may be an example of a type of document that is now obsolete or superseded.

Social, community or spiritual significance. It may be that the documentary heritage attached to a specific existing community is demonstrably significant. For example, a community (or a specific part of that community, clan, tribe or family etc.) may strongly relate to the heritage of a beloved (or even a feared or hated) ancestor, spiritual leader, saint, prophet or leader, or to a specific incident, event or site. Often oral or written records or stories are seen to bear witness to the community's history or embody moral lessons and traditions. The community therefore may consider it has a special obligation to preserve such documentary heritage, passing it down over generations. The nomination form should provide information on what the nominated item represents and how this attachment is expressed. Special efforts should be made to encourage and facilitate nominations from Indigenous and minority or marginalised groups.

G COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

MOWCAP needs further information on the character of the documentary heritage itself.

Comparative analysis. The nominator has a responsibility to make an effort to discover any similar examples at national, regional or international level, and to compare the nominated item to these others, whether they are listed on any of the Memory of the World registers or not.

Nominators should consult the websites of both MOWCAP and MoW and view the nomination dossiers of inscribed items, as a basis for comparison with their proposed nomination, and should also compare their nomination to other similar documents not yet inscribed.

This comparative analysis should outline the similarities between the nominated item or collection and these others as well as the differences, and should provide reasons that make the nominated item or collection stand out, explaining the importance of the nominated item in its national, regional and even international context (if applicable).

Uniqueness or rarity. Can the document or the collection be described as unique (the only one of its kind ever created) or rare (one of a few survivors from a larger number)?

This quality may need elaboration: a collection, manuscript or other item may be rare but not necessarily unique. There may be other collections or items which are similar but not identical.

H GENDER

Gender equality is one of two global priorities of UNESCO. If there are any specific aspects of the nomination that relate to gender equality, please describe them in detail, explaining what the nominated documentary heritage tells us about the lives of women and girls in Asia and the Pacific, and any impacts on women and girls or on gender equality in the region. For more information on the Gender Equality Baseline Study of the Memory of the World in Asia-Pacific
see https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372840.

Previous successful inscriptions include documentary heritage created by women ('Sultana's Dream' by Rokeya S. Hossain, Bangladesh, inscribed on the MOWCAP

Register in 2024; the 1893 Women's Suffrage Petition, inscribed on the International Register in 1997; and Naebang-gasa - Songs of the Inner Chambers, Republic of Korea, inscribed on the MOWCAP Register in 2022); documents that attest to improving the lives of women and girls (Archives of the Initial Dasheng Spinning Factory, China, inscribed on the MOWCAP Register in 2022); or acknowledging the contribution of women and girls (Printing Blocks Housed at the Derge Printing House, China, inscribed on the MOWCAP Register in 2024; Archives of the Taean Oil Spill, Republic of Korea, inscribed on the MOWCAP Register in 2022).

I STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Nominators should include in their nominations a statement of significance. This crucial part of the nomination is a summary of the points made under the primary and comparative criteria, the test of authenticity and integrity and comparison with other items or collections, whether inscribed on a register or not. If relevant, findings from the gender analysis should also be included.

It should go on to explain:
Why this documentary heritage is important to the memory of the world, and why its loss would impoverish the heritage of humanity.

What its impact – positive or negative – is or has been on life and culture beyond the boundaries of a single nation state.

J PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

Decisions about the inclusion of any documentary heritage in any register are based primarily on an assessment of its significance, not on an assessment of its location or management at the time of nomination.

However, it is important for MOWCAP that nominators provide information on the protection and management of the nominated documentary heritage, including the following:

Condition. The condition of a document may not, in itself, be a test of its significance but it is relevant to its eligibility for inscription. A severely degraded document may be ineligible if its content and character have been compromised beyond the possibility of restoration. Conversely, a document may be in good condition but be poorly or insecurely housed, and may therefore be at risk. Depending on the nature of the document or the collection, the description in the nomination form needs to be sufficiently detailed to allow an appreciation of current risk and/or conservation needs. It provides the baseline from which, if inscribed, their ongoing condition and security is

monitored.

***Threat*: Is its survival in danger? (Even if preservation and security measures are already in place, secure vigilance must be applied.)** (A need for conservation is not a barrier to inscription. This information may assist in finding support for such conservation.)

Management plan: Is there a plan which reflects the significance of the documentary heritage, with appropriate strategies to preserve and provide access to it?

K FORMALITIES FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS

The instructions set out in the Nomination Form, available on the MOWCAP website, are part of this Register Process.

1 The documentary heritage may be publicly or privately owned.

2 Completed nomination forms must be submitted electronically, either directly to the MOWCAP Secretary-General MOWCAPnominations@gmail.com) OR through the relevant National Commission/s (*which are representatives of UNESCO Member States*), the relevant National Commission/s or in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant National MoW Committee. For an updated contact of the relevant body, please email the Communication and Information Unit at UNESCO Bangkok at ci.bgk@unesco.org. The Secretary-General will confirm receipt of nominations by email.

Please note that this is a change from the previous requirement for all nominations to both International and Regional Registers of MoW. Such letters of support are no longer mandatory, but highly recommended.

3 For practical reasons, nominations are limited to three (3) per country in each two-year cycle. When there are more than three, the relevant national MoW committee or UNESCO National Commission or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, shall be asked to make a choice and explain their reasons for the choice.

4 Two or more nominators in different Member States may submit joint nominations where collections or groupings are divided among owners/custodians. There is no limit on the number of such nominations nor on the number of partners involved. Nominators from outside Asia and the Pacific may join as nominator(s) with at least one nominator in Asia and the Pacific.

In such cases, **nominations must be submitted to the MOWCAP Secretary-General,**

and preferably accompanied by support letters from each of the nominators' National Commissions for UNESCO (*which are representatives of UNESCO Member States*) or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant National MoW Committees.

5 **Custodian.** Where the nominator/s are not also the owner/s and or custodian/s, the owner/s and or custodian/s would normally need to consent to the nomination. If the owner/s and or custodian/s withhold consent or are unable to be contacted, the nominator should explain the reason.

6 There are some specific limitations on the types of documentary heritage which may be nominated. More information is provided on this issue above (See under D. Admissibility)

7 **Catalogue or registration details.** A nominated bibliographical or archival collection or fonds must be finite, with clear beginning and end dates, and must be closed. Vaguely described or open- ended nominations won't be accepted. Typical examples are closed archival fonds identified by box and location numbers, a database of fixed size and content, or an inventoried collection. If catalogue or registration details are too unwieldy, provide a description of the contents with sample catalogue entries, accession or registration numbers, add such details as an appendix or provide a link to an online inventory.

8 **Additional copies or variant versions.** Where documentary heritage exists in more than one copy or in similar but variant versions, the nomination shall be deemed to apply to the work itself, rather than just the specific copy or copies proposed for nomination. Under certain circumstances, further copies can be proposed for addition to an existing Register inscription (See below under Section O Additions to Existing Inscriptions on the MOWCAP Register).

9 **Brevity**. Nominations should be comprehensive but no longer than necessary: they are judged by quality, not quantity. There is no mandatory length, but a maximum of about twenty A4 pages is usually sufficient.

10 **Images.** Pictures, lists, graphics or digital files can be added as appendices when needed, and these can be very helpful to the RSC and MOWCAP General Meeting's assessment. However, large files can be difficult for both the nominator and the MOWCAP Secretary-General to handle, digital files submitted at the time of nomination should be kept to a reasonable size. Three to six digital images of the documentary heritage may be provided as attachments to this form in JPG or PNG format

11 **Copyright and Creative Commons status.** By providing the images you are agreeing that they can be used by MOWCAP and UNESCO for the purpose of promoting Memory of the World e.g. newsletters, website etc. To enhance the visibility of the proposed item in the fields of education, research, and culture, we suggest that the image(s) be attributed a Creative Commons CC-BY-SA license. This mechanism ensures attribution of the image(s)

to its/their owner(s) and thus protects the rights of the image's owner(s). Please clearly note on this form if you do not wish MOWCAP and UNESCO to use the images for publicity or promotional purposes (for instance if not permitted by tradition or custom of the originating community).

12 **Objectivity**. Every nomination stands on its own merits. Nominations should be based on fact, and written in impartial and objective language. The use of grandiose or unprovable claims, or derogatory, propagandistic or polemical language, is counter-productive and makes assessment more difficult. Any nomination form that uses inappropriate language, denigrating or insulting individuals, groups or nations shall be returned to the nominator/s by the MOWCAP Secretary-General on the advice of the RSC for amendment. Nominators should be careful to word their nominations in a neutral and objective manner.

12 **Accessibility**. Any access restrictions should be explicitly stated below (for instance if advance permission is required, or if general access is not permitted by tradition or custom of the originating community). Nominators are encouraged to make their documentary heritage publicly accessible, whether on-site or on the internet, wherever practicable. While this is not a precondition for inscription, accessibility is an objective of the MoW Programme and is obviously helpful in the assessment process.

13. **Legal.** Provide details of the legal and administrative powers in force for the preservation of this documentary heritage. The posting of nominations on the MOWCAP website or the inscription of documentary heritage on the MOWCAP Register does not place any legal or financial obligations on UNESCO and MOWCAP. It does not formally affect ownership, custody or use of the material. It does not, of itself, impose any constraint or obligation on owners, custodians or governments. By the same token, it does not impose any obligation on UNESCO and MOWCAP to resource conservation, management or accessibility of the material. It does, however, represent a commitment of the owners/custodians of inscribed heritage to its preservation and accessibility.
Please ensure to acknowledge the owners and traditional practitioners of Indigenous/ community knowledge, oral literature and oral history.

L SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS AND PROCESSING BY MOWCAP

The nomination must be submitted electronically on the MOWCAP nomination form and sent via email to the Secretary-General (mowcapnominations@gmail.com).

1 When received, the Secretary-General initiates the following process:

2 Records each nomination, confirming receipt to the nominator.

3 Verifies its contents and accompanying documentation; in the case of incomplete nominations, the Secretary-General immediately communicates with the nominator and invites supplementary or amended information from the nominator, to be submitted within a stipulated time limit. Processing will normally not commence until all substantial information is complete.

4 Transmits the completed nominations to the Register Sub-Committee for a ruling on admissibility as prescribed above (under D. Admissibility). If ruled admissible, the RSC proceeds with assessment and recommendation (as outlined below under M. Assessment of Nominations by the MOWCAP Register Sub-Committee).

5 Informs the Bureau of any inadmissibility rulings by the RSC.

6 Posts on the MOWCAP website the title and a summary for each nomination form that has been ruled admissible by the RSC. The summary will be based on the information provided in section 2 of the nomination form. A full text of nominations accepted for assessment shall be provided on request (by email to the MOWCAP Secretary-General (mowcapnominations@gmail.com).

7 The RSC shall report to the Bureau and the General Meeting with an explanation on what grounds any files were deemed inadmissible. The RSC Chair's Report is made publicly available as part of the minutes of the MOWCAP General- Meeting.

8 Invites comments on the posted list of accepted nominations from National MoW Committees and National Commissions or from any interested individual or organisations, to be submitted to the MOWCAP Secretary-General within a stipulated time limit, normally allowing at least 3 months. Comments that a) support; b) provide other information or c) raise any initial concerns relevant to aspects of any current nomination, may be sent by any individual or entity to the MOWCAP Secretary-General. For instance, the sender may wish to provide information to supplement the nominator's case. All comments received shall be transmitted forthwith to the Chair of the RSC for consideration by the RSC in the process of its assessment.

Please note that this Comments process is quite separate from Contestations under the Incidental Process outlined under Section N. Given that the Incidental Process has the status of a formal contestation among one or more Member States, MOWCAP members are advised to consider whether any concerns they have might be able to be resolved more smoothly and amicably by first utilising this Comments channel, involving informal dialogue between the parties facilitated by the Secretary-General. To encourage such informal resolution, contestations may only be submitted following the end of the period determined for submitting comments.

9 Acts as the principal channel of communication to and from the nominator on behalf of the RSC, including requests for further information or amendment of language; rulings on admissibility; preliminary expressions of concern submitted in the Comments phase; as well as preliminary, subsequent and final assessment recommendations from the RSC. In the event of a contestation, the National Commission for UNESCO or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant National MoW Committee, shall be copied in the communications between the contestor and the nominator.

10 Provides a brief, summary report to the MOWCAP Bureau and the relevant National Commission for UNESCO (or equivalent) on any major steps in communication on nominations, including rulings on inadmissibility, initial expressions of concern, RSC recommendations and contestations raised (both ongoing and resolved).

11 On the request of a nominator withdraws their nomination at any point up to voting on its inscription at the MOWCAP General Meeting.

Submits the recommendations of the Register Sub-Committee regarding inscription or not of all assessed nominations to MOWCAP in advance of its ordinary biennial meeting.

12 Following voting in the General Meeting, notifies nominators of MOWCAP's decision, and advises them on the presentation of successful nominations to the media. It also advises the relevant National Commission for UNESCO or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant National MoW Committee. Updates the MOWCAP Register and website to include any newly inscribed items of documentary heritage.

M ASSESSMENT OF NOMINATIONS BY THE MOWCAP REGISTER SUB-COMMITTEE

1 As stated in section L, the Secretary-General manages the processing of nominations for the regional register. This includes where necessary seeking further information from nominators, responding to enquiries and comments, setting deadlines for acceptance of revised nominations or making other appropriate arrangements for the timely handling of nominations-in-process. These administrative arrangements shall be posted on the MOWCAP website. The MOWCAP Register Sub-Committee (RSC) shall treat all nomination files equally, taking into account the process outlined below.

2 As part of the process, the RSC, in consultation with the Secretary General, shall determine the admissibility of each nomination, taking into account the list of inadmissible documents prescribed above (under D Admissibility).

3 The RSC's decision as to whether a particular nomination is inadmissible is final and shall be communicated to the nominator by the MOWCAP Secretary-General. A reasoned decision shall be reported to the MOWCAP Bureau and included in the RSC Chair's report to the MOWCAP General Meeting.

4 The RSC oversees the assessment of nominations. It is charged with the thorough investigation of each nomination and, in due course, the presentation to MOWCAP of a reasoned and documented recommendation that the nomination be either added to the MOWCAP Register, rejected, provisionally inscribed or referred for possible resubmission.

5 The RSC may seek expert evaluation and advice on each nomination from whatever appropriate sources it considers necessary, comparing the nomination to similar documentary heritage, including material already listed in the registers. The RSC may normally call on the advice of experts on the historical, socio- economic, political, cultural and literary background of the Asia Pacific region, and may also consult relevant bodies or professional NGOs in addition to the experts suggested by the nominator/s

6 In submitting their advice, the experts consulted may be asked to check statements and claims made in the nomination form or to express a view on whether the nomination does, or does not, meet the Selection Criteria. They may also be asked to identify any legal or management issues needing further attention before a recommendation to the MOWCAP General Meeting can be finalised.

7 In reaching its recommendation, the RSC may take into account the advice of the experts consulted, and any other advice it has sought or has been submitted as comments. The nominator/s shall be given the opportunity to comment on the assessment before submission to the MOWCAP General Meeting for voting,

8. The General Meeting shall consider the final recommendation by the RSC for all nominations assessed in the current round, with MOWCAP Members each having a single vote by their accredited delegate.

The report of the RSC Chair to MOWCAP's ordinary session shall include its decisions and recommendations, the rationale for acceptance or rejection of each nomination, and any other comment it may wish to add. This shall also include nominations deemed inadmissible by the RSC as well as any withdrawn by the nominator after submission and prior to a vote on its inscription.

N THE INCIDENTAL PROCESS

1 The newly revised *General Guidelines* (8.6), have introduced a new "Incidental Process" by which nominations may be contested on either "technical"

(admissibility or criteria in assessing the nomination) or on "other" grounds.

2 This "incidental process" is also now being introduced for nominations to the MOWCAP Register., in addition to, and quite separate from the Comments on nominations as outlined above (under section L).

3 This MOWCAP Incidental Process has been designed to be consistent with the international Incidental Process, taking into account the regional structure of MOWCAP. For example, MOWCAP's General Meeting and Bureau largely play the role at the regional level of the Executive Board and the International Advisory Committee at the international level. **Please note that, given that this Incidental Process has the status of a formal contestation among one or more Member States, MOWCAP members are advised to consider whether any concerns they have might be able to be resolved more smoothly and amicably by first utilising the channel of Comments on nominations as outlined above (under section L). Accordingly, the period set for submission of contestations shall follow that for comments, and Member States are urged to submit any contestations as early as possible during the contestation period window, to facilitate the possibility of resolution of the contestation within the current nomination cycle.**

4 Nominations may be contested on technical or other grounds. The nature of the contestation shall determine who is eligible to submit a contestation as well as the process employed for a possible resolution of the issue.

5 Any contestation by a concerned Member State must be submitted on the appropriate form to the MOWCAP Secretary-General, stating clear grounds or reasons on which this contestation is made, and with specific reference as to what part or aspect of the nomination is being contested.

6 A contestation may be submitted only within the time period allocated by the MOWCAP Bureau (normally 60 days) that shall follow the time allowed for public comment following the publication of the title and summary of the nomination on the MOWCAP web site. The Secretary General shall inform the Bureau and the RSC Chair of any contestation, and bring the matter to the attention of the nominator/s.

7 From the day nominators are notified by the MOWCAP Secretary General of contestations expressed over their nomination, nominators have 30 days to respond, extended upon request by a Member State up to a maximum of 90 days. Member States expressing such contestations may indicate within 30 days of the date they receive the response by the nominators if they maintain or withdraw their contest. At the expiry of this period, and if there has been no reply from such Member States, their contestations shall be considered to have been withdrawn.

(a) Nominations contested on technical grounds

- Nominations are contested on technical grounds by Member States, or, as appropriate,

by other stakeholders, if they raise issues associated with the list of inadmissible nominations specified in **Section D** and/or the criteria for inscription specified in **Section E**. Such contestations may be expressed by any individual or entity through Member States, using the National Commission for UNESCO or, in the absence of a National Commission, the relevant government body in charge of relations with UNESCO, involving, if one exists, the relevant national MoW committee.

- The RSC shall promptly examine the nomination based on the criteria for inscription and admissibility, and offer technical advice as to how the questions raised in the contestation may be addressed by the nominator in an attempt to reach a mutually acceptable solution. If the parties concerned are satisfied by the advice of the RSC, the nomination gets back on track as de-contested and therefore proceeds for formal RSC assessment. If any concerned party is not satisfied, within 30 days from the receipt of the final advice from the RSC, the concerned parties may use the procedure indicated below in Paragraph (b). for contestation on other grounds**.**

(b) Nominations contested on other grounds

- Nominations may be contested on other grounds only by a concerned Member State of UNESCO (i.e. with a direct interest in a particular nomination) and if the reasons advanced for the contestation fall outside the scope of the admissibility threshold and the criteria for inscription as set out above Paragraph (a).

  If a nomination file has been formally contested by one or more concerned Member States on other grounds, an expert evaluation of the file by the RSC may be conducted and results of such evaluation are kept confidential and not notified
  to anyone, unless the concerned parties agree that the RSC evaluation could prove helpful in resolving the contest. Any further processing of the file through the cycle shall be pending on the results of the dialogue process established by the concerned parties.

- If either party is not satisfied with the evaluation process, then that party may file a further written request to the Secretary-General of MOWCAP indicating that they are ready to engage into a mediated/facilitated dialogue process, in which case the mechanism of dialogue through a mediator/facilitator nominated by UNESCO Bangkok is automatically invoked. The costs incurred for the mediation/facilitation process shall be covered by the concerned parties or through voluntary contributions made for this purpose.

- The Secretary-General shall immediately inform the other members of the Bureau and instruct the RSC that the evaluation and all other subsequent steps of processing the file through the cycle shall be withheld and dependent on the results of the dialogue process.

- Within a period between 3 to 6 months after the receipt of the written request from the MOWCAP Secretary-General on the mediated dialogue process, UNESCO Bangkok, after consultation with the concerned parties, shall nominate a mediator/facilitator agreed by the concerned parties, who shall engage in good faith and in a spirit of understanding and cooperation among nations, into a genuine dialogue process without time limit.

- The outcome of the dialogue may not be prejudged but the Member States concerned are expected to conduct such dialogue in the spirit of the 2015 Recommendation, "underlining the importance 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.

  While the dialogue process of mediation/arbitration is underway, the nomination file shall be held confidentially by the MOWCAP Secretary General, under the name "Pending Nominations", accessible only by the parties, the Bureau and the Chair of the RSC. The title and a short, factual explanatory note on the state of the file shall be published on the MOWCAP web site.

- A brief report on any dialogue in process and its outcome shall be included in the report of the RSC to every General Meeting.

- The nomination file shall be reintroduced with priority in the ongoing cycle after the MOWCAP Secretary-General has been informed by the concerned parties that the contest has been resolved.

O ADDITIONS TO EXISTING INSCRIPTIONS ON THE MOWCAP REGISTER

1 As mentioned above (under K. Formalities), where individual documents exist in multiple copies and variant versions the nomination shall relate to the intellectual entity – the work – itself, rather than just the specific copy(ies) cited. If further copies of comparable integrity and antiquity are subsequently identified, they may be proposed for addition to an existing inscription.

2 The same mechanism shall also apply to inscribed collections that prove to be

incomplete: for example, where the collection is spread over multiple institutions and further parts of the collection are later identified. Further, as inscribed collections grow incrementally there may be a case for updating an existing inscription, provided this does not change the character or attributes of the inscribed collection.

3 The retention of dynamic born digital material on the MOWCAP Register may require an update subsequent to the original inscription.

4 In all these cases, the Additions process may be initiated by the owner/custodian, by the MOWCAP General Meeting, its Bureau, or the MOWCAP Secretary-General, the attendant case work is assigned to the RSC and may involve:

- reviewing the existing nomination and establishing standards of authenticity, uniqueness, integrity and rarity appropriate to the particular case
- identifying the proposed examples, their owners/custodians and relevant management plans
- preparing the case for adding the examples to the existing inscription reviewing whether the currently inscribed document(s) continue to meet the selection criteria

5 The MOWCAP Secretary-General then contacts the relevant owners/custodians to obtain their agreement to add the copies to the inscription.

6 Proposals for Addition shall utilise a simplified nomination form to be developed by MOWCAP and made available on the website. Beyond this, the closing date and other processes required for the biennial intake of nominations apply, with the outcome announced at the same time as the list of new inscriptions. A Certificate of Inscription is awarded to the owning/custodial institutions concerned.

P MONITORING AND REPORTING

MOWCAP intends to introduce a process of periodic Monitoring and Reporting, as recently added to the *General Guidelines* for items inscribed on the International Register. The Bureau may discuss how to develop such a process and bring a proposal to a future General Meeting for adoption.

Q REMOVAL FROM THE MOWCAP REGISTER

1 Documentary heritage may be removed from the MOWCAP Register in cases where it has

deteriorated, or its integrity has been compromised, to the extent that it no longer meets the selection criteria on which its inclusion in the register was based. Removal may also be justified if new information causes a reassessment of the registration and demonstrates its non-eligibility.

2 Proposals for removal of an item from the MOWCAP Register may be initiated by any person or organisation (including MOWCAP itself) through an expression of concern, in writing, to the Secretary-General. The matter shall be referred to the RSC for investigation and report. If the concern is substantiated, the Secretary- General shall contact the original nominator/s (or, if uncontactable, other appropriate body) for comment. The RSC shall, in turn, evaluate the comment, and any additional data by then assembled, and make a recommendation to the MOWCAP Bureau or General Meeting on removal or retention, or any appropriate corrective action. If MOWCAP decides on removal, the commenting bodies shall be informed.

R LOST AND MISSING HERITAGE

1 Developing a public record of lost and missing heritage is a crucial means of placing the Memory of the World Programme in context, and is a precursor to the possibility of virtual reconstruction of lost and dispersed memory. It adds both urgency and perspective to the challenges of identifying and protecting the surviving heritage.

2 It is envisaged that, in the future, the Asia Pacific Memory of the World Register may include a section devoted to the listing of lost and missing heritage which, had it survived, would have been eligible for inclusion in the main body of the register. Lost heritage is material that is known to no longer survive – its decay or destruction is reliably documented or can be reliably assumed. Missing heritage is material whose current whereabouts is unknown, but whose loss cannot be confirmed or reliably assumed

INDEX For the Register Process

A	**BACKGROUND**	**1**
B	**THE PROCESS**	**2**
C	**INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL REGISTERS**	**2**
D	**ADMISSIBILITY**	**4**
E	**CRITERIA FOR INSCRIPTION IN THE MOWCAP REGISTER**	**4**
F	**REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**	**5**
G	**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**	**6**
H	**GENDER**	**7**
I	**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**	**7**
J	**PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT**	**8**
K	**FORMALITIES FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS**	**8**
L	**SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS AND PROCESSING BY MOWCAP**	**11**
M	**ASSESSMENT OF NOMINATIONS BY THE MOWCAP REGISTER SUB-COMMITTEE**	**12**
N	**THE INCIDENTAL PROCESS**	**14**
O	**ADDITIONS TO EXISTING INSCRIPTIONS ON THE MOWCAP REGISTER**	**16**
P	**MONITORING AND REPORTING**	**17**
Q	**REMOVAL FROM THE MOWCAP REGISTER**	**17**
R	**LOST AND MISSING HERITAGE**	**18**

[end]