E ngā rau rangatira mā, tēnā koutou. Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the future development of the National Archives, National Library and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision. We offer this submission in the spirit of constructive support for each of the institutions concerned and the National Archivist in particular.

Te Pae Whakawairua is the Māori Advisory Group for the National Archivist. It is a non-statutory body that was established in 2002 and currently comprises four members drawn from iwi across the country including local Wellington mana-whenua. The members all have long-standing personal and professional interests in Māori heritage issues and consequently are also end-users of the resources in these institutions. Two were members of the Māori Technical Advisory Group for the development of the He Tohu exhibition in the National Library, one is currently on the DIA management board of the He Tohu exhibition, two have been members of the Archives Council, two are members of the Māori Advisory Group in the National Library - Te Kōmiti Māori, and others have been and still are involved in local and national heritage committees elsewhere.

Our submission will address points relevant to our Committee in relation the five broad issues for public consultation for the review:

1. Investigate options to ensure the Chief Archivist has sufficient independence to be an effective regulator of the public sector (this will include a consideration of whether the Chief Archivist should be an Officer of Parliament, as well as comparing how other statutory officer functions retain independence);

The consensus of Te Pae Whakawairua is that the role of the National Archivist should be transparently independent and immune to instruction from senior government department line managers. Whilst we have every confidence in the current acting National Archivist to act with the utmost integrity in the preservation of the Government record in the current administrative arrangement, there is no guarantee that future National Archivists will necessarily act with the same levels of impartiality. Further, the current structure, in which the National Archives and its CEO, currently the National Archivist, are part of the administration of the Department of Internal Affairs leaves open the possibility of allegations of interference and persuasion in the selection of which government records to preserve. Our Committee’s preference is for the role of National Archivist to become stand-alone independent Officer of Parliament.
2. Consider the implications and impacts including costs of separating the Chief Archivist's regulatory role from the management of the collections held by Archives NZ;

The view of Te Pae Whakawairua is that the National Archivist should become an Officer of Parliament, funded separately to the National Archives. We also believe that the National Archives and the National Library should be split out of DIA and become separate Crown entities in their own right as they were prior to the legislative amendments that created the present arrangements. Our view is that this would negate possible criticism of interference in the preservation of the memory of government and open transparent democratic process in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

3. Consider the impact of the rapid evolution of digital technologies and the likely impacts on both the independent regulatory role of the Chief Archivist and the provision of location neutral digital access to the nation's memory;

In our view, whatever configuration of relationship between the National Archivist and National Archives is decided upon in the NALI review, it is absolutely crucial to the future record keeping of government that deep knowledge of the digital and technological issues of record storage is ensured. There are already well known storage issues relating to the space requirements in the paper records of the present Archives facilities and the digitisation of future records will provide an obvious solution to this. However, there are significant technological and financial issues still to be resolved before these storage solutions can be properly implemented, not least of which is the issue of future-proofing digital storage formats. It is crucial therefore that the National Archivist, in whatever administrative format is decided upon is not just digitally competent but a digital expert.
4. **Investigate options for kaitiakitanga with iwi and Māori for taonga Māori and mātauranga Māori, in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi, that enables access;**

Our Committee membership is of the view that the use of the term “kaitiakitanga” in this context is somewhat inappropriate. In a Māori context, iwi are the kaitiaki of their taonga including their Māori intellectual property holdings (mātauranga Māori) in the National Library, Nga Taonga Sound and Vision and, arguably, in the National Archives as well. These institutions are in fact the “kaipupuri” (holders) of these taonga, while iwi are their kaitiaki. We would like to suggest that a change to this terminology would go a long way to demonstrating a change in thinking in relation to access and ownership of these taonga by iwi Māori. It would also better reflect the Treaty principles of partnership and participation between Māori and the Crown in the care of these taonga records. Māori would also have greater confidence in the Alexander Turnbull Library if various issues of ownership and retrospection of access to deposited records could also be resolved in this review. Too many Māori families have deposited whānau records in the Library for safe-keeping to later discover that they no longer have ownership rights or the ability to change rights of access to deposited taonga. Some Māori are consequently reluctant to deposit materials now and/or engage with the Library at all.

5. **Investigate options for ensuring NTSV has appropriate governance, and a sustainable structure and funding (this will include a consideration of whether NTSV should be established as a Crown entity); and**
To conclude, Te Pae Whakawairua is supportive of the NALI review and we look forward to reading its findings and recommendations.

Ngā mihi,

Peter Adds
Chair, Te Pae Whakawairua, on behalf of committee members Aroha Chamberlain, Ani Pahuru-Hurwai and Marie Tautari
National Archival and Library Institutions – Ministerial Working Group

This submission, on behalf of the Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC), responds to the invitation for public and professional comment on specific questions relating to the work of the National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Working Group, 2018.

LIAC is the statutory advisory body established under the National Library Act 2003, empowered to advise the Minister responsible for the National Library on library and information issues including matauranga Māori. The current membership comprises David Reeves (Chair), Helen Tait, Carolyn Robertson, Matthew Oliver, Judith Johnson, Rachael Ka’ai-Mahuta and the National Librarian, Bill Macnaught.

The Commission is taking this opportunity to make its initial views known via the public consultation process but will provide further information, analysis and advice to the Minister and the Ministerial Group once it has met to discuss the matters in more detail on 3 and 4 September 2018.

Members of the Commission would be happy to answer questions of clarification on the issues raised in this submission at any time.

**Question 1:** What are the two or three key challenges for the national archival and library institutions (Archives New Zealand, The National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?

**Digital plus Analogue**

The challenges posed by the digital environment, both from the point of view of collecting/preservation of born-digital material, and the expectations and opportunities of public access, are substantial. World-wide digital preservation is a continually-developing area with scarce expertise. Unusually, compared with other public services, the shift to digital has not seen a corresponding decrease in demand for physical collecting, preservation and access. The advent of digital is an additive equation not a transfer form one form of engagement to another.

**Visibility, Profile and Leadership**

The profile and potential of documentary heritage collections has been not as strong as it could have been in recent decades due to fragmentation and constrained resources. The substantial potential for the collections and expertise held by the national institutions to contribute to wellbeing, identity, education, literacy and creative and economic endeavours is not being fully realised. Stronger profile and leadership is needed.

**Te Ao Māori**

The fundamental position of Te Ao Māori is recognised by the national institutions but it seems that they lack the resources and connections to truly enable the value of their collections to be realised for comprehensive community benefit. A related challenge stems from the increasing diversity of New Zealand’s population and the ability for the institutions to respond with collections and services
which reflect—well the range of communities that make up New Zealand’s current and future economy.

Resourcing “Turning Knowledge into Value”
The most urgent matter is the lack of capacity to enact the bold and beneficial moves outlined in the National Library’s “Turning Knowledge into Value” 2030 strategy document which asserts the vital importance of investing in knowledge networks, literacy and reading, and the ongoing contribution of taonga and cultural heritage.

Question 2: Does the position of Chief Archivist have the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator of records and information management within its broad regulatory mandate? Does the position of National Librarian have the independence and authority necessary to carry out the responsibilities of that position? Why / why not?

LIAC’s views on the position of Chief Archivist are focussed particularly on the important national leadership potential of the position, which is akin to that of the National Librarian but in an allied field. We would observe that there appears to be poor visibility and poor understanding of the Chief Archivist’s role by the general public and even the professional library sector.

The position of National Librarian has undoubtedly suffered under the management of the Department of Internal Affairs. There has been considerable loss of visibility in the wider library and information sector. In a time when the rapid evolution of digital information systems is having a profound impact on the sector, there have been no substantial policy initiatives or leadership in professional discussion emerging from the National Library. The lack of regular direct access to the Minister has meant that the potential value of the National Library, its collections and its services, have not had an effective voice in shaping Government priorities.

Question 3: What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

LIAC will be considering options for future structures in some detail in coming weeks and will provide further advice to Ministers.

The most important matter is to analyse and describe the multi-faceted nature of the organisations under consideration. The National Library, Archives New Zealand, Nga Taonga Sound and Vision all have leadership roles nationally, provide public services to access collections, fulfil important kaitiaki responsibilities and are facing digital and storage challenges. There are important distinct aspects of the organisations also, and the future structural, funding and governance arrangements will need to understand and promote these differences appropriately. It is certain that there is great potential in formulating a better arrangement than the status quo.

While the public face of the organisations is predominantly in the cultural /documentary heritage sphere (and this appears to be the salient consideration in the NALI Terms of Reference) it is important not to lose sight of the policy, leadership and support roles played by the National Library. A strong well-resourced locus of expertise is needed to lead national initiatives which enable the whole library and information ecosystem to thrive. Co-ordination of library systems, digital access, digitisation programmes, literacy development and intellectual property frameworks are all vital, and it makes sense for efficiency and the leverage of scarce expertise to have these things led and addressed centrally.
The National Library’s future role and priorities are clearly articulated in its “Turning Knowledge into Value, Strategic Directions to 2030” document. LIAC believes that there is little need to re-examine the core roles of the National Library as the direction and initiatives were widely consulted on and received a good degree of public and professional support in 2015/16. The main issue is ensuring that there are sufficient well-aligned resources to put the strategies into action so that the benefits of public investment and the latent value of the collections and services can be fully realised.

**Question 4:** What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to work more effectively together in collecting, preserving and providing access to New Zealand’s documentary heritage? In particular, what opportunities exist in relation to digital preservation and access?

Some operational areas are already co-ordinated or shared between the three organisations under consideration. However there is scope for greater development of shared expertise, national co-ordination and policy and impact research. Digital preservation, physical conservation and storage and the evolution of public services are obvious candidates. Ideally these synergies would be achieved under a structure that involved minimal administrative overhead – that is where co-ordination was organic and natural and not subject to unnecessary negotiation and contracting.

**Question 5:** What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

The public need to feel a sense of pride and trust in the national institutions. National leadership in matters that contribute to strong democracy, identity, literacy and participation will be important in the long-term. The ongoing evolution of digital services and digital collections will continue to present challenges.

New Zealand’s cultural richness, particularly the value of Māori collections and knowledge frameworks, needs to be more widely recognised both for local benefit to identity and participation and as a rich international point of difference. The public will expect to have trust that collections that record and reflect New Zealand society are in safe hands, are in formats that enable their use by New Zealanders and can say important things to the world about our nation.

The national institutions need to be positioned to respond and change over time for the benefit of the wider library and information ecosystem through the effective use of public resources. There is considerable benefit in achieving greater national co-ordination of the resources and networks of community and government organisations that collect, care for and provide access to documentary heritage collections. A wide range of organisations including schools, libraries, museums, runanga and community hubs assist New Zealanders to have the capability to navigate information resources; strengthened national leadership and expertise will contribute to thriving connected communities achieving their potential.

David Reeves
Chair, on behalf of Library and Information Advisory Commission

19 August 2018
Tēnā koe Minister Martin

Archives Council submission to National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group

The Archives Council in its advisory capacity wishes to appraise you of its preliminary views in relation to the role of the Chief Archivist and Archives New Zealand Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga. These are set out in the enclosed submission which we would appreciate you forwarding to the Hon Grant Robertson and the other members of the Ministerial Group.

We note in our submission that we wish to reserve the right to provide you with further advice once Ministers have come to a proposed future direction.

In summary our submission:
- provides you with our views on the leadership needed from the role of Chief Archivist
- encourages looking beyond what is in place today in order to create something that will meet the needs of New Zealand Aotearoa into the future
- responds to the consultation questions set by Ministers
- provides some additional information pertaining to staffing of Archives New Zealand and its budget.

The Council looks forward to further engagement with you on these important matters.

Nāku noa, nā

Sandi Beatie QSO
Chair, Archives Council
Archives Council submission to National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group

Introduction and Purpose

This is a submission from the Archives Council to the National Archives and Library Institutions Ministerial Group as sought under the consultation process set out in the terms of reference.

The purpose of this submission is to provide the Archives Council’s views and advice in response to the consultation questions. The Council has responded to each of the five questions set out by Ministers but is also providing other advice and information that it considers relevant.

While this submission is primarily focused on the consultation questions we wish to reserve the opportunity to provide further comment and advice once the Ministerial Group has set out its proposals for the future role of the Chief Archivist and Archives New Zealand.

Description of the role of the Archives Council

The Archives Council is an unincorporated statutory body that exists under the terms of the Public Records Act 2005 (PRA). Its purpose is to provide the Minister responsible for Archives New Zealand Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga with advice on matters relating to archives and recordkeeping, including those in which tikanga Māori is relevant.

The Archives Council has responsibility under the PRA to audit the Chief Archivists recordkeeping and to authorise the disposal of the Chief Archivists public records. The Archives Council also provides advice on the approval of organisations to be approved repositories under the Act.

The Archives Council is required to report on its activities annually to the Minister and the Minister is to provide this report to the House of Representatives.

The Archives Council receives administrative and secretarial support from the Department of Internal Affairs.

Members of the Archives Council are appointed by Cabinet on the recommendation of the Minister of Internal Affairs. The current members of the Council are:

- Ms Sandra Beatie QSO (Chair)
- Dr Aroha Harris
- Mr Dougal McKechnie
- Mr David Reeves
- Ms Anna Blackman
- Ms Tracy Puklowski
- Mr Karaitiana Taiuru
Summary key points

- The leadership role of the Chief Archivist and the ability to perform this role effectively is more important than organisational form.

- Subject to certain conditions being met the Council would favour convergence with the National Library and NgāTaonga Sound and Vision so that documentary heritage is not dispersed, but managed effectively with distinct leadership roles and identities being retained and respected. One example of a potential model that we have in mind is the Smithsonian Institution. That is, 'one brand' but a number of distinct organisations with leadership in their respective areas.

- The Council is not convinced that an Officer of Parliament model is the appropriate form and question whether it would really enable the Chief Archivist to do their job better. There are other ways to increase profile, status, and resource that do not involve this change.

- The rationale for potentially splitting the statutory functions from the operational roles of the Chief Archivist would have to be very compelling reasons to outweigh the benefits of cohesively having one role considering the entirety of the recordkeeping spectrum. This continuum includes regulation, standard-setting, monitoring and continuous development and improvement in public record-keeping which are in large measure informed by close experience of implementation of archival practice. The Council is supportive of the desire to ensure independence, visibility and mana of the Chief Archivist but is not convinced that a compelling case does exist to go down the path of separation.

- The Council supports innovative thinking that looks beyond what is in place today and how the respective roles and functions are viewed and what is needed for 21st century leadership. To that end we would encourage the views and interests of Māori are specifically sought, and those of young people, in addition to the current consultation meetings.

Response to Q1 – What are the 2-3 key challenges for the national archival and library institutions (Archives NZ, National Library and NTSV)/ What is the most urgent challenge?

The key challenges facing Archives New Zealand are:

- **Taking archives to the people.** By this we mean extending beyond the traditional forms of access such as reading rooms to the future potential of virtual archivists who can act as advisers and navigators to individuals and communities. Digitisation and online access is important to improving accessibility but there is more than this. We wish to see the promotion of the value of archives to audiences that are not currently served well (including issues such as the digital divide in society), innovation in the ways that archives are described and searched for, and exploration of opportunities for delivery and use of archives both online and offline.

- **Accommodation and storage** (in particular in Wellington). While there is capacity for growth in the holdings in the regional offices the Wellington office cannot accept any more transfers of public archives because it is effectively at full capacity. Additionally the current Mulgrave Street building (a converted printing factory) requires substantial upgrading for earthquake strengthening and because plant, equipment and elements of the building fabric are at the end of their working life (the building is nearly 70 years of age). We also note that the working environment is not conducive to the needs of a modern archive facility and we have concerns about the safety of the building.
There is a need for substantial investment to make sure there is ‘fit for purpose’ archival storage with sufficient capacity for both the current holdings and the forecast growth in holdings. It is expected that the majority of the archival value paper records held by public offices will be transferred in the next 30 years.

- **Digital processes and expertise** - Archives New Zealand has developed very good capability in digital preservation. It has a working Digital Archives repository and has taken in a number of transfers of digital archives. The requirements of digital archiving are only going to grow as public offices become digital by default and have largely ceased to create paper based records (with some notable exceptions). The digital archiving processes currently operate at a small scale and the capability in public offices to prepare digital records for transfers is limited. Meeting the scale and challenge of digital records being the primary form of public recordkeeping will require substantial resource and shifts in emphasis over time. The archive sector is in the midst of a generation-long transition, that is, the demand of paper-based transfers are at a peak as the records of the 1990s are archived at the same time as substantial ramping up of digital transfers requiring new processes and capabilities. It is a moment in history dealing with the overlap of paper legacies and digital immediacy.

- **Sector leadership** - The Chief Archivist has a role and mandate to provide leadership to the wider archives and records sector. The Council is of the view that this mandate has not been fully realised. The leadership role could be strengthened and the Chief Archivist has to have the scope, mana, trust, and sufficient resources to be effective in providing leadership on the changing nature of information management in the 21st century. There is scope and benefit in increased leadership with respect to Local Government, Health and Education public record-keeping in addition to the current focus on core public sector records.

Overall, the most immediate and pressing challenge is probably the accommodation and storage.

**Response to Q2 – Does the position of the Chief Archivist have the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator of records and information management within its broad regulatory mandate? Does the position of National Librarian have the independence and authority necessary to carry out the responsibilities of that position? Why/why not?**

The Archives Council believes that the Chief Archivist has a good number of legislative provisions that support them to be an effective regulator of public recordkeeping. The Council has not seen any evidence of any interference to the Chief Archivist carrying out or exercising their statutory functions.

The profile and status of the position however, does appear to have had some impact on the ability of the Chief Archivist to fully carry out their role. While there is a perception that as a third tier manager within the Department of Internal Affairs the status of the role is not senior enough, we note that there are other statutory officers at the same level both in the Department and in other agencies. The ability to have profile and mana is not simply a matter of position. To be successful a Chief Archivist in today’s environment, the position needs to have a degree of independence and be a knowledgeable contributor and influencer that is seen to add value. The Council does support measures to ensure that the regulatory role of the Chief Archivist is well recognised, respected and adequately resourced. No matter the legislative or organisational form of Archives New Zealand, if there are not enough resources to do the work the role will not be done to its fullest extent and the 2057 vision won’t be realised.

As noted earlier the leadership role of the Chief Archivist is important both within government and for the archives and records management ecosystem. This could most likely be strengthened through addressing both the status of the Chief Archivist and the level of current funding.
The Archives Council collectively, does not have enough insight or knowledge to know whether the National Librarian has the independence or authority necessary to carry out their responsibilities. We are aware however, that there is a perception in the library and information sector that the National Library appears to play a lesser leadership role in the sector and in the information policy sphere than it has done in the past, and that it is struggling to adequately resource and make traction with its longer term strategy.

Response to Q3 – What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives NZ or the National Library

The Archives Council believes that Archives New Zealand should remain part of the executive and that this remains appropriate given the considerable operational and regulatory activities the institution performs.

Being a Crown Entity would mean distance from the responsible Minister and the policy function being performed by the monitoring department. The Council does not think that this would be outweighed by any increase in profile that crown entity status might provide. If a governance board was part of a crown agent structure there could also be a risk or at least a perception that the regulatory role of Chief Archivist could be compromised.

The implications of separation from the Department of Internal Affairs would need to be considered carefully. While at the time of the merger of Archives New Zealand into the Department of Internal Affairs it was thought to be fundamentally wrong, Archives has in fact gained some benefits from being part of a larger department. For example, most notably better access to broader corporate support and from time to time access to some additional funds allocated from elsewhere in the Department. Nevertheless, the Department like all other agencies has not had a baseline increase for some years which in turn has had consequential effects for Archives New Zealand.

If separation is under serious consideration then a Department or Departmental agency form would likely to be the best option as this retains the policy function and would not require a split between the statutory role and operational role. There is some appeal to Departmental agency status as part of a grouping of cultural and heritage entities (the Smithsonian model). This could elevate the role of the Chief Archivist and guarantee direct access to a responsible Minister, whilst retaining the corporate and financial backing of the host Department.

The Archives Council is of the view that Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision (NTSV) should be within the formal ambit of government given its extensive crown funding and the high volume of public record material that it has management responsibility for. The acquisition of the Sound Archive and the administration of the NZ Television Archive in recent years has meant that NTSV has acquired considerable responsibility for archiving of public records.

The ownership of the New Zealand Television Archive (where Internal Affairs owns the land and building, the Ministry of Culture & Heritage the holdings and NTSV has a management contract to run the facility and manage the holdings) seems overly complex and the Council suggests that this review provides an opportunity to simplify this through crown acquisition of NTSV. While there might be some concern for the parts of the NTSV holdings that come from private or community sources (not public records) being transferred to the Crown this situation is analogous to the Alexander Turnbull Library which is almost entirely made up of collections purchased by, or gifted to the Crown from non-Government sources.

There is a strong need to consider arrangements that will achieve scale, a degree of critical mass and cohesion. There is for instance no guarantee that making Archives NZ a stand-alone Department
would deliver advantages and there is a risk that such a small Department would continue to be financially and operationally constrained.

In support of our view that this review represents an opportunity for new and innovative thinking, the Archives Council believes, there is some merit to exploring something along the lines of the Smithsonian Institution model in the United States. This is an example of a model with one high profile brand and a number of separate, distinct organisations under it. This type of federated model could be achieved through a host department and departmental agencies or a Department with separate branches. The benefit of this model is that it provides for a strong centre to be developed from which overarching strategy, plans and budgets and shared services could be led and managed. It would also provide a stronger voice in terms of joined up business cases and proposals for investment from government. Under this model the separate branches would retain their distinctive functions but with the expectation that they would work together collaboratively where that makes sense and the heads of the respective branches would be at the top table at the centre.

The Council would support the type of convergence described above if there was commitment to creating a precinct or combined campus in Wellington that physically houses and joins the three institutions that is, the National Library, Archives NZ and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision with accompanying baseline and capital funding.

Response to Q4 – What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to work more effectively together in collecting, preserving and providing access to New Zealand’s documentary heritage? In particular, what opportunities exist in relation to digital preservation and access?

There is already a degree of co-operation between Archives New Zealand and both the National Library and NTSV. Archives NZ rents space for some of its film holdings at the NTSV facility at Titahi Bay. Internal Affairs owns the land and the building that the NZ Television Archives is located on at Avalon. NTSV have the ability to have films preserved using the film laboratory at Archives NZ (the only film processing laboratory in the country).

There is already close co-operation in digital preservation between Archives NZ and the National Library who share the same basic platform. The He Tohu exhibition is an excellent example of successful collaboration between Archives NZ and National Library.

The above examples are limited in scale and where they are made different agencies or management units there is an administrative overhead in creating and maintaining such arrangements.

The Archives Council thinks that there could be advantages with more convergence of the three institutions, especially between the Alexander Turnbull Library and Archives NZ, who both deal with unpublished documentary heritage including better improved facilities for researchers and members of the public.

If an off-site storage repository for low use or original material once digitised was developed it would also make sense that this catered for both the Archives NZ and Alexander Turnbull holdings and collections and potentially those of NTSV.

The non-Alexander Turnbull parts of the National Library have little or no synergy with Archives NZ in terms of collections, storage requirements and systems and processes. They do however, have a similar leadership role with respect to the national landscape in their spheres of influence.
Response to Q5 - What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

Both Archives New Zealand and the National Library have recently developed long term strategies setting out their direction and we believe that these are relevant in positioning the institutions to meet the needs of the public over the coming decades.

Over the next 20-30 years it is expected that the creation of paper based records will largely cease and the majority of the legacy of archival value public records in public offices will need to be transferred. Beyond 30 years it is likely that the volume of physical archives being transferred will be quite low and the weight of archiving will have shifted to being digital.

Developing digital archiving so it is regular and routine must happen if it is to be done on a scale that matches the level that the volume of material will demand. The demand for access to digital archives will grow considerably. At present digital archiving is primarily about preservation and the processes for access are not as well developed.

Greater linkages with public offices outside of central Government (i.e. local authorities, district health boards and schools) is also desirable. While local authority recordkeeping is regulated to an extent by the Public Records Act, the main emphasis of Archives NZ activities is currently on central government.

Other information

The Archives Council is aware of concern expressed about loss of professional roles at Archives New Zealand. The Department of Internal Affairs at the Council\'s request has provided human resources data from the 2011-2018 period. This shows that while staff numbers have gone up and down over these years (largely due to fixed term staff working on project teams stopping and starting), the core permanent professional staff has been quite consistent and while some roles have changed the overall number of professional roles has not dropped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As at 30 June</th>
<th>Headcount (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>116.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>98.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>106.8875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>116.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>125.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>104.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>113.0125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this doesn\'t reflect is the changing nature of the professional workforce of Archives New Zealand. As more digitisation of paper material occurs, and they take receipt of more digital format
material, then the skill sets required will evolve. Archives already reports that the level of technical capability among the New Zealand population is scarce. It can therefore be assumed that the National Library, Nga Taonga, Te Papa and other relevant institutions are facing the same workforce challenges.

Financially, resources in terms of both operating and capital are tight and the Archives Council does support an increase in resources to ensure that the regulatory, operational and leadership roles are able to be performed effectively. The Department of Internal Affairs has provided financial information for the period 2011-2018 and this shows that funding has remained relatively constant which is in line with many other areas of Government spending.

![Fig 3. Normalised Archives Controllable Expenditure](image)

Archives New Zealand has received a fair allocation of capital from the Departments capital programme including:

- development of a new archives facility in Christchurch which will open in 2018;
- replacement of the Auckland office roof (funding approved but yet to be completed);
- development of the film preservation laboratory and funding an accelerated programme of film preservation;
- investment in digitisation of holdings, including completing the WW1 service personnel files digitisation;
- investment in the finding aids and description, including the creation of 800,000 (15% of the total) item level descriptions;
- development of the He Tohu exhibition.
Excluding the Christchurch Archives New Building capex, average capital outlay is $2.985M per annum.
GUARDIANS/KAITIAKI RESPONSE TO NALI CONSULTATION INVITATION

Key Points Summary:

Outcomes:
- NALI institutions have adequate independence, authority and resources
- They work collaboratively to ensure best use of funds to meet future needs in protecting and providing access to the nation’s documentary heritage

Key Challenges:
- Need for greater resources
- Need for greater visibility and status

Need for Independence:

Heads of NALI institutions require
- Direct access to political decision makers,
- Responsibility for their own vote and priorities
- Responsibility for their own operational model
- A visibly independent voice
- A core policy development and advisory role

Preferred Operational Model:
- Chief Archivist as an Officer of Parliament. Archives collections go to NLNZ as a separate govt. dept. NTSV maintains Board, but funded through NLNZ
- Also considered: separate crown entities, overseen by MCH

Opportunities for Collaboration:
- Includes most activities. Institutions have more commonalities than differences
- Better service to users as well as more effective use of funds

Directions for Next 30 Years:
- Resourced to roll out already agreed strategic directions to achieve statutory roles
- Protecting and reflecting New Zealand’s cultural identity
- Inspiring and supporting creative re-use of our taonga by making it easily accessible
FULL SUBMISSION:

We have identified the following desired outcomes of the NALI review opportunity:

- The Chief Archivist has the independence and authority to carry out the constitutional role of protecting and preserving the record of government.
- The National Library, including the Alexander Turnbull Library has the independence and authority to undertake their roles of library and information sector leadership and caring for and making accessible the documentary heritage of New Zealand.
- All institutions (Archives NZ, the National Library (NLNZ), the Alexander Turnbull Library, and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision (NTSV) are appropriately funded to carry out their roles.
- Archives NZ, the National and Turnbull Libraries and NTSV can work together to ensure that there is synergy in their operation, that there is the most effective use of government funds and that users have a seamless experience of accessing the national documentary heritage.

We have considered the role of all institutions and opportunities for their future contribution, and in line with our statutory role as advisors to the Minister responsible for the National Library on matters relating to the Alexander Turnbull Library, we have highlighted these matters where relevant.

**Question 1:** What are the two or three key challenges for the national archival and library institutions (Archives New Zealand, The National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?

**Key Challenges:**

- **Resources:** *The most urgent challenge.*
  Insufficient funding over many years is now not only limiting new capabilities, but cutting into traditional roles and programmes.
  - **Turning Knowledge into Value,** the NLNZ strategic directions document, sets out exciting proposals for national collaboration. Funding to support the required programmes, and the NLNZ leadership role is urgently needed
  - **Digital Collecting.** The nation’s documentary heritage will be increasingly collected and held in digital form. This allows universal access, but requires significant investment in new technologies and new capabilities, at the same time as the traditional responsibilities for analogue material remain essential.
  - **Digitising at Scale.** In addition to the capture, preservation and provision of access to born digital material, funding for digitising at scale is required to make existing collections fully available. This should be done on a collaborative national basis, but requires leadership and modelling through NLNZ, (and Archives NZ in the case of the public record).
- **Visibility**
  The NALI institutions should be the natural leaders and thought stimulators of library and information initiatives, and public records initiatives. To do this they need the authority to play a leadership and national coordination role, encompassing:
  - policy advice to government,
  - leadership status within the public sector
  - recognised status and presence nationally and internationally
  - respect as culturally appropriate custodians of the heritage of all NZ communities, and notably of Mātauranga Maori.

- **Alexander Turnbull Library**
  All of the points made above relate to the Alexander Turnbull Library, with particular emphasis on the importance of having the appropriate status and a trusted reputation to foster positive relationships with donors and potential donors, as a fundamental basis of the future collecting and the understanding and meeting of the access needs of a 21st century research library.

  All communities must see themselves reflected in the documentary heritage which is preserved. This includes embedding Mātauranga Maori and Tikanga in all activities.

**Question 2:** Does the position of Chief Archivist have the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator of records and information management within its broad regulatory mandate? Does the position of National Librarian have the independence and authority necessary to carry out the responsibilities of that position? Why / why not?

In fulfilling the Public Records Act requirement to ensure that all agencies have appropriate records management regimes in place, a clearly independent authority, such as an Officer of Parliament, is essential. Currently, the Chief Archivist (CA) is “buried” as a third tier manager without sufficient authority to have the respect of, and gain compliance from, managers of government departments, local authorities, DHBs, and other public agencies.

We do not believe that any of the three statutory roles – CA, National Librarian (NL) and Chief Librarian of Alexander Turnbull Library – have sufficient independence or authority to exercise their statutory roles. They require:
  - Direct access to political decision makers – on the basis of regular meetings as the recognised source of expertise in their relevant statutory area.
  - Responsibility for their own vote – to establish and review priorities for expenditure;
  - Responsibility for their own operational model, not having their goals compromised by being fitted into the artificial construct of a department with a wider range of responsibilities.
- A visibly independent voice in order to play a national leadership role to support networking of shared national collections
- A core policy development and advisory role, as in the past, which is both built on and enhances the credibility of the institutions in critical, national decision making.

**Alexander Turnbull Library**

The requirement for recognition and independence in fulfilling his/her statutory role applies, as noted above, to the Chief Librarian. However, we support the continuation of the operation of the Alexander Turnbull Library within the NLNZ and would see the National Librarian and the Chief Librarian continuing to work together on the statutory roles and requirements of the Alexander Turnbull Library.

**Question 3: What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?**

We considered several options in detail and rejected the following:

1. **Status Quo (Archives NZ and NLNZ in DIA, NTSV a Charitable Trust)**
   - Disadvantages
     - As a third-tier manager the Chief Archivist lacks the authority to protect the records of government.
     - As a third-tier manager the National Librarian lacks the public authority for his/her public leadership role.
     - Neither the Chief Archivist or the National Librarian has regular direct access to the relevant minister.
     - As a fourth-tier manager the Chief Librarian of the Alexander Turnbull Library lacks the public authority or profile required for trust and confidence.
     - Archives NZ, NLNZ and the Turnbull Library have become increasingly stretched financially and as third tier managers outside the DIA leadership team, the NL and CA have difficulty arguing for or ranking their budget bids.
     - Given the central importance of IT in the future operations of both Archives NZ and NLNZ/ATL, lack of control over specialist IT is a major problem.
     - As a charitable trust, NTSV is underfunded for its important public role.
     - There has been limited cooperation between NTSV and NLNZ/ATL.

(Variation on a.) **Both Archives NZ and NLNZ become Departmental Agencies within DIA (or MCH)**

This option retains almost all of the disadvantages above. The CA and the NL would have direct access to the minister and could be perceived to have authority in their...
area of responsibility, but would in fact still not have control over budget priorisation and operational models, or the required status and authority.

b) Both Archives NZ and NLNZ are returned to being separate departments of government.

Advantages
- The CA has some of the independence and authority to carry out the constitutional role of protecting and preserving the record of government, although as one (small) department Archives NZ is not superior in authority to the departments whose records it regulates.
- The NLNZ/ATL have the independence and authority to undertake their roles of library leadership and caring for and making accessible the documentary heritage of New Zealand.
- As first tier managers, both the CA and NL would have direct access to ministers with the advantages in terms of influencing policy and setting budget priorities which this brings.

Disadvantages
- Archives NZ and NLNZ become competing government departments with no institutional incentives to work together.
- Setting up all the bureaucracy of separate departments is expensive.
- Users of the documentary heritage of NZ (researchers, genealogists and students) will need to continue to work two systems.
- NTSV remains an isolated orphan.

c) The CA (and all the functions of Archives NZ) becomes an Officer of Parliament; and NLNZ becomes a government department.

Advantages
- The CA has the independence and authority to carry out the constitutional role of protecting and preserving the record of government
- The NLNZ/ATL have the independence and authority to undertake their roles of library leadership.

Disadvantages
- The Office of the Chief Archivist and NLNZ have no institutional incentives to work together.
- Delivery of an operational public service is not a normal or appropriate activity for an Officer of Parliament, and could cause a conflict in priorities
- Users of the documentary heritage of NZ will need to work two systems.
- NTSV remains an isolated orphan.
Given the range of common issues and synergies in the information landscape across the institutions, we believe that the following options merit further consideration:

\[ d \] The Chief Archivist becomes an Officer of Parliament with full regulatory functions, while storing, protecting, conserving and making accessible the records of government is delegated to NLNZ/ATL as a Government department and an approved repository. Funding and oversight of NTSV is channeled through NLNZ (with NTSV initially remaining a charitable trust, but ultimately being fully integrated into the department, once governance issues can be worked through)

**Advantages**
- The Chief Archivist definitely has the independence and authority to carry out the constitutional role of protecting and preserving the record of government.
- The NLNZ/ATL have the independence and authority to undertake their roles of library leadership and caring for and making accessible the documentary heritage of New Zealand.
- Storing, conserving and making accessible the complete documentary heritage of the country is brought together in one system making best use of resources and preventing duplication (See Q4 below).
- This also makes accessing the documentary heritage easier for users as disparate systems come into alignment.

**Disadvantages**
- The possibility of some initial institutional tension between librarians and archivists. (We recognise that some submitters may emphasise differences in focus and practice between the two professions, but we believe that the commonalities are far greater. See Q4. Below)

\[ e \] Archives New Zealand, NLNZ/ATL and NTSV become Crown Entities reporting to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

**Advantages:**
- The CA has some independence and authority to carry out the constitutional role of protecting and preserving the record of government, although that office would not have as much authority as an officer of parliament.
- The NLNZ/ATL have the independence and authority to undertake their roles of library leadership and caring for and making accessible the documentary heritage of New Zealand.
- MCH would provide institutional structure and incentives for the three institutions to work together.
- NTSV would be treated equally with the other archival institutions.
• There would be an opportunity for further structured interaction with other
Crown Entities – Te Papa and Heritage NZ.
• Each entity has a culturally-appropriate governance Board through which the
CE is accountable to government.

Disadvantages
• Users of the documentary heritage of NZ (researchers and genealogists and
students) may need to continue to work separate systems.
• The Chief Executives of Archives NZ, NLNZ and NTSV will have direct access to
ministers but their budget bids will be ranked by MCH.
• The operational incentives for cooperation and shared activities would be
less strong than under d.) above

Our preference is for Option d), which we believe offers the most significant advantages,
compromised by the fewest disadvantages.

We see the NLNZ as a department continuing to manage and deliver services from the
separately identified collections of the Alexander Turnbull Library, Archives NZ, NTSV and
Services to Schools, but sharing a very wide range of common services and support (see Q4
below).

Alexander Turnbull Library:
Options d.) and e.) would allow the Chief Librarian more direct access to the relevant
minister and opportunities to work with the NL on the statutory responsibilities of the
Alexander Turnbull Library within an institution with documentary heritage as its primary
focus.

Both options would provide opportunities for Turnbull Library expertise to be applied more
cost effectively over a wider range of collections. As noted, we see an even stronger
incentive for this to be achieved in option d.)

Question 4: What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to
work more effectively together in collecting, preserving and providing access to New
Zealand’s documentary heritage? In particular, what opportunities exist in relation to digital
preservation and access?

There are natural areas of existing and future commonality for all collecting institutions,
which can be achieved to a greater or lesser degree under any operational arrangement.
Requirements for expertise, technology solutions, storage infrastructure and access
provision are very similar, and should sensibly be provided through shared effort.

As noted in Q3, we believe that the commonalities in library and archive goals and practices
are far greater than any critical differences, particularly when viewed from a user
perspective. There are opportunities for extensive cooperative and shared effort in almost every operational area:

We identified the following

- **Digitisation of Analogue Collections and Capturing of Born Digital Material**
  Focus of national collaborative efforts may vary, but technology solutions, capabilities required and opportunities for economy of scale are common

- **Digital Preservation and Planning for Digital Repositories**
  The Preserving the Nation's Memory and Accessing the Nation’s Memory projects demonstrate the logic of coordinated planning (and that this can be done within operational models other than those we recommend, but the more closely aligned the goals, outcome requirements and reporting responsibilities are, the more effectively such collaboration can be set up and managed).

- **(Physical) Conservation,**
  The Alexander Turnbull Library has world class conservation capability, which should be an appropriate base to meet the needs of all collections.

- **Collection Care**
  Coordinated repository planning and maintenance, formalised long term plans for the varying requirements of all formats and collections, and best practice in delivering items from all storage locations, will make the best use of space, different control zones, and staff time.

- **Acquisition**
  Although sources and means of acquisition vary with different collections, many administrative tasks of receipting and handling incoming material are common.

- **Arrangement and Description / Cataloguing, Metadata**
  The arrangement and description of unpublished material and archives will continue to be an essential specialist task which is key to access to the nation’s heritage. Varying systems and practices are becoming more closely aligned and should continue to do so to support ease of user access. It is essential that focus is on commonality, not historic differences in approach and practice.

- **Single Access Point(s) for the Public – On site or On-line**
  Reading rooms, delivery of collection items and services of reference staff should be in shared locations for optimum economy. This would also have an advantage in enhancing visibility if the main access is in co-located buildings in Wellington
- **Outreach**
  Support to local government and community groups in archives and local history management, conservation, oral history etc. could be aggregated to good effect and optimise use of resources.

- **Public Programmes, Exhibitions and Lectures**
  Both in the high profile Wellington location, and through travelling lectures, exhibitions and programmes, the visibility of all collections and institutions would be enhanced through collaborative effort.

**The Alexander Turnbull Library**

The Alexander Turnbull Library has high capability across a number of the areas discussed above, which should be applied to other collections. Under the one department model, maintaining the separate identity of collections, (at least in the initial stages) would allow the managers responsible for other collections to work with the Chief Librarian in specifying standards and priorities.

**Question 5**: What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

Both Archives NZ and NLNZ have already undertaken robust, consultative processes for strategic planning. What is required is the political will and resourcing to enact the key principles and practices.

Although we endorsed *Turning Knowledge into Value*, one reservation we had was a lack of explicit visibility of the Alexander Turnbull Library.

The Alexander Turnbull Library should be fully integrated into achieving the strategic directions, plus we consider it needs special focus on:

- A broadened donor and user base;
- Existing expertise applied as widely as possible – curatorial skills, conservation, collection care, audio visual.

The following can be achieved by an adequately resourced roll-out of agreed directions:

- The nation’s memory is preserved, protected and accessible through national leadership in the development of networked national collections;
- Communities to see themselves reflected in the documentary heritage. This includes embedding Mātauranga Maori and Tikanga in all activities;
- Freedom of access to information for an open democracy;
- There is a national narrative, resulting in social cohesion, and support of economic, cultural and social wellbeings. Trust is essential to achieving this;
• There is visionary thought leadership as well as independent and trusted advice and advocacy relevant to the library and archive sector;
• The VALUE of cultural and heritage institutions and collections is communicated;
• Publicly funded research outputs are accessible;
• Economic development is supported through facilitation of creative reuse of collections – there are sound rights management regimes;
• Digitising at scale, collecting born digital at scale and making it accessible. Digital innovation and leading contribution to government digital services and access;
• NZ is part of a global network providing services for globalised collections.

**Question 6: Other comments – statutory bodies, advice, governance**

We could see an appropriate role (with variations) for statutory body advice under each of the options we consider worth further exploration. Finalising detail depends on the operational model chosen:

Under Option d.) **NLNZ as a separate department with responsibility for all documentary collections, including Archives, NTSV and the Alexander Turnbull Library:**
- NTSV Board role could transition over time from governance to advice relating to the NTSV collections,
- Archives Council and Guardians/Kaitiaki of Alexander Turnbull Library (perhaps smaller than at present?) could continue to provide advice relevant to those collections and services,
- LIAC would continue its overview advice role in relation to the wider library and information sector.

Under Option e.) **Institutions as separate Crown Entities:**
- The advisory committee function of the Archives Council would be translated into full governance,
- A governance Board established for NLNZ, with Guardians/Kaitiaki of Alexander Turnbull Library as a subset of that board. A function of the NLNZ governance board could be the wider overview advisory role currently exercised by LIAC.

We commend the provision for overlap in appointments across boards, which has proven valuable and should be continued. In any structure, if the statutory boards were combined into one overarching board, representation across the sector would be critical, as well as a genuinely bicultural structure.

**Consultation:**

In fulfilling our responsibility to provide advice to the Minister, a copy of this submission will be sent to her, and we look forward to providing advice in person at an appropriate time in the process.
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Questions

1. What are the two or three key challenges for the national archival and library institutions (Archives New Zealand, the National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?

1) Elevating the differential between culture and heritage institutions as independent crown entities for growing expert capability of unique and skilled specialisations as quality information managers, archivists, librarians, and sound, vision technicians

2) Resourcing support to grow content, to enable connectivity, and build the confidence of all New Zealanders to access information currently stored and preserved safely within the three cultural and heritage organisations

3) Providing quality advice to Ministers with Responsibilities for strategically planning the 30 year vision for these institutions that have a duty of care, protection and preservation of our nation's recorded histories.

2. Does the position of Chief Archivist have the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator of records and information management within its broad regulatory mandate? Does the position of National Librarian have the independence and authority necessary to carry out the responsibilities of that position? Why/why not?

Chief Archivist and National Librarian - neither has the necessary independence and authority to be effective regulators of records and information management at the current time.

I believe this to be the case because they are currently 3rd and 4th tier managers within the overall DIA organisational structure that is predominantly bureaucratic in nature and in operations. This undesirable situation is highlighted when one views across the layers of the organisational structure to find other roles and functions of equal and/or higher status that goes to an undermining, and at the least a diminishing effect on their separate specialisations and vital roles on behalf of the nation. For example, the management and organisation of dog licences and passports does not reconcile or equate to the expertise required in the work of the Chief Archivist or National Librarian.

Neither individual is able to lead and guide change or improvement for their national institutions or act with independence or authority for effectively regulating their roles to meet the expectations of New Zealanders without the need for prolonged discussions as part of an agenda, rather than either being empowered to set their own agenda.

In summary, it is absolutely vital that their independence and authority as Chief Archivist and National Librarian are elevated to a equal level and status as full partners alongside the DIA Chief Executive. It is only at this higher plane that collaborative solutions with one another and including the leading executive for Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision can truly demonstrate recognition of their unique differences and roles, and lead to a fair and equitable sharing of material and human resources. Such collaboration is evident in the resounding successes and accolades heaped on the HE TOHU exhibition from the general public as well as national and international groups.
3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

A strengthening of their current roles, duties, and responsibilities as leaders of independent crown entities who are enabled to exercise independence and authority for the full governance and operations of their separate national institutions.

A commitment to building the outreach capacity of each culture and heritage institution so that all New Zealanders can gain access to the content knowledge and expert resource personnel in each and all of these national institutions.

An explicit commitment to the principles and practices of active leadership as Te Tiriti o Waitangi partners.

A strategic plan that highlights regular occasions, events, etc that reveal and illuminate collaborative connection of content knowledge with pre-schools, schools, and tertiary institutions relating to the nation’s culture and heritage.

A strategic direction that embraces a vision for the next 30 years that sees the national archives, documents and information, vision and sound operating in collaborative, enterprising ways.

4. What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to work more effectively together in collecting, preserving and providing access to New Zealand’s documentary heritage? In particular, what opportunities exist in relation to digital preservation and access?

The opportunities are endless.
Just ask the New Zealand citizens and clients!
Ensure that Māori stakeholders are included at the table and in the decision-making from the outset in a true Tiriti partnership forum.
Organise thinking into SMART objectives and action plans with key stakeholders.
Engage with experts in the fields - archivists, librarians, conservators, technicians, digital innovators, etc
Secure the necessary overview and strategic plan based on vision, values, principles, actions.
Provide sufficient resources both material and human to purchase outcomes and outputs.
Ensure clear recording and reporting requirements.
Reap the benefits of evaluation and review for taking the next steps.
5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

Access 24/7 through improving connectivity both human and digital
Assurance of quality content knowledge to myriad of stories our nation has to share about our unique cultural heritage
Access to specialist staff as information managers, cultural experts and enablers
Specialist field workers who liaise with communities throughout New Zealand
Confidence in the quality staff the public wish to engage with in those institutions
Pride in our national institutions as jewels in the crown of Aotearoa-New Zealand, and our rich associations with other nations
Contribution of the national institutions to our children becoming global citizens
Assurance of the protection and preservation principles of cultural taonga in all national institutions
Marketing and promotions to open the doors and windows into our national institutions
Leadership as guardians and custodians of our national heritage
Continuation of service for the collection of legacies - individuals, families, groups, organisations, government agencies, people, people, people
Opportunities to engage directly with historical records
Investment in education for the people and with the people

6. Any other comments?