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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?

(text) My submission relates solely to Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision.
The most urgent challenge for this institution is to digitize all the videotapes and audiotapes in its collection before their condition deteriorates such that their content is lost. It has at most five years to achieve this goal. This will not be attained without a massive increase in resources.
The other challenge is to move to a form of governance appropriate to its role as the national audiovisual archive.

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?

(text)
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3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

(text)

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?

(text) Although Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision incorporates the TVNZ Archive, access to that collection by researchers and filmmakers is still controlled by TVNZ, whose charges are based on the sale of library footage to commercial enterprises internationally. These charges are extremely high and make incorporation of any more than a tiny amount of TVNZ footage in, for example, a local independent documentary virtually impossible. It is vital for the health of our audiovisual culture and heritage that the TVNZ Archive comes fully under the control of Ngā Taonga and that charges for the re-use of footage are placed on a minimal cost basis as with the National Film Unit footage held by Archives New Zealand.
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5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

(text)

6. Any other comments?

(text) I do not consider a charitable trust an appropriate vehicle for an organisation that is becoming increasingly a national audiovisual archive. Ngā Taonga is the guardian of many thousands of items, the great majority of them created under government auspices or with public funding, that together constitute much of New Zealand’s audiovisual heritage. These items, being subject to physical deterioration, require constant expert care. The public has a strong interest in ensuring that this caretaker role is undertaken responsibly. A private trust which is not answerable in any formal or legal way to the people of New Zealand except through temporary funding contracts does not cater to this interest. A more satisfactory model would be a Crown entity acting under its own legislation, as with the National Library and Archives New Zealand.
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Russell John Clarke

Archives NZ in particular faces many challenges. To name just three - they face a major challenge on remaining relevant and credible for Public Offices. For the last 20 years Archives has wrestled with the dichotomy at its heart. At one level the agency knows that it needs to get out there and lead how government record keeping and information management is undertaken to ensure that key business records are created, captured and can be protected over time. However the comfort spot and collective skill set of the agency appears to remain more about being the passive ambulance at the bottom of the cliff happily picking up the fragments of what survives of the documentary record. The majority of staff are still focused on preserving, arranging and making available physical records in secure reading rooms in what are effectively four document museums. Secondly, rapid technology changes in the ways in which public offices create, share and manage business records far exceeding the limited resources Archives is putting into developing or finding solutions for modern business record keeping challenges. Thirdly, there is a challenge for Archives to articulate a clear IM vision and to engage effectively with the public sector at CE levels in terms of both information management and technologies. I am less familiar with the other two agencies but note that the statutory basis of NTSV as an independent charitable trust should be regarded as unacceptable. Governance and addressing their status must be a priority. It was always a hospital pass to impose responsibilities for the TVNZ Archive and the Sound Archives onto the Film Archive structure and its unsustainable on many levels. ANZ and Natlib need constancy of structure and surety of resourcing. It has not been good for either agency to be restructuring playthings of the government of the day - in DIA, out of DIA, back into DIA. My hope for this review is that they can be put on a more stable basis.

The CA has statutory authority by virtue of the Public Records Act 2005 but in reality its a bit of a paper tiger. The role is hamstrung in being an effective regulator and influence on agencies by the agency being subsumed into a larger amorphous government department (DIA), being subject to DIA's competing priorities and oversight, difficulties in influencing agency CEs, and the operational burden and distraction of running four document museums. I have no comment on the role of the National Librarian, I just don't know enough about the needs of that role and I am unaware of that position having any regulatory role, but I do suspect that they are in the wrong government department. Status as an ACE (similar to Te Papa) with a board reporting to MCH would appear to a more appropriate model.

I would like to see the Chief Archivist role and office split off from the repository, preservation and access functions of the current Archives New Zealand. The Office of the Chief Archivist should be reconstituted as an Independent Crown Entity (modeled on the Ombudsman and Office of the Privacy Commissioner). The CA's office should be purely focused on leading modern information management across the public sector and heavily engaged with the GCIO and the GCDS. The Chief Archivist should in effect be seen as the Government Chief Information Management Steward (GCIMS). The CA should be supported not by Archivists but by business and information analysts, developers and enterprise architects. The CA would retain their statutory powers and still be the gateway for material to enter the public archive but the care and provision of access to that material should reside elsewhere. I propose National Library be reshaped to become...
the national repository, and responsible for preserving and making available, for the physical and the electronic records of both community archives (the collecting archive - ATL) and the public archives. I would expect there to be significant economies of scale and opportunities for the public in such alignment through shared skills and resources.

<Three_Changes>

As mentioned above there are many opportunities for all three of these agencies (in their current form) to share expensive and scarce skills, technology, and knowledge together. The key barriers to this will largely be cultural and each agency being prepared to change and maybe merge in places. There is a need for a formal governance layer that coordinates and advocates for these agencies. Overlaps exist (or should exist) between all three in terms of the following: - Advocacy and influence building - Physical preservation (conservators) - AV preservation (Film, TV, audio, oral histories etc.) - Access channels and service arms for the above. - Arrangement and description - repository systems - digital ingest and access e.g. NDHA etc. etc. </Four_Opportunities>

<Five_30_Years>
The public need confidence in these institutions and to be able to trust in the public record. They need surety of access, integrity of the records, and for accountability to be paramount. In thirty years time I would like the general public to see Archives New Zealand not as a quaint paper museum for researching family history, but to recognise and believe in its role in ensuring the creation and appropriate management of public records that document and protect citizen rights and entitlements. </Five_30_Years>

<Six_Comments>
This seems to me to be the last chance for Archives New Zealand to be positioned in a form that allows for its regulatory role to develop as credible for government. Currently it is sliding into irrelevance through under funding, a lack of visible influence, advocacy and consensus building. The nearest suitable model for a reformed Chief Archivist function should be that of the Privacy Commissioner and the Ombudsman. The role needs to have the powers and capacity to investigate but it also need so lead, build engagement, work with the GCIO and GCDS. </Six_Comments>

</form1>
While I am sure there are significant challenges ahead for both the National Library and Nga Taonga Sound and Vision, my main concerns are with Archives New Zealand and the office of Chief Archivist. 1. The first and most immediate priority is to re-establish the position of Chief Archivist as the senior, overarching and fully effective official, with complete independence, responsible for the integrity of the record of government in New Zealand (legislative, executive and judicial), whatever its form, as mandated in the Public Records Act 2005, before subsequent amendment in 2010. This is a necessary precondition for meeting successfully other, long-term challenges. 2. The second major challenge, almost as urgent, is dealing with the tsunami of government information in digital form, both digitised and born-digital, including from legacy systems, so that the permanently valuable record of government is accurately identified, securely stored, and appropriately accessed. Efforts in this direction have so far have had decidedly mixed results. At present, without strong, well-resourced action, there is great risk of loss. 3. A third challenge is striking a good balance in selecting records for permanent preservation that meets the legitimate needs of all stakeholders—legal, administrative, Māori, academic, cultural, and individual. This, of course, is primarily a matter for the Chief Archivist to decide. In the past, however, there has been a tendency philosophically to favour 'high-level' centralised, policy documentation and to undervalue files/data relating to individual actions and cases. The latter, however, are of most value to individual citizens and best ensure long-term, historical accountability. Cost is always an issue, but it should not be an overriding consideration.

As far as the the Chief Archivist is concerned, the answer is an unequivocal no, for two reasons: 1. It is constitutionally anomalous and impractical administratively to expect the Chief Archivist to be fully effective as a regulator and custodial steward from its present positioning within the Department of Internal Affairs, located at third tier reporting at one remove to a mid-level Chief Executive, who appoints the Chief Archivist. It is anomalous as the Department of Internal Affairs itself as a major record-keeping department, over which the Chief Archivist has, in principle, statutory oversight. This was not the case when Archives New Zealand was an independent department, with the Chief Archivist as Chief Executive, able to deal impartially with all arms of government. It is impractical as the 2010 downgrading has led to a major loss of profile and prestige, and access to other chief executives through their forum, compromising the office's advocacy role. The Chief Archivist's control functions with respect to official records across the whole of government, national and local, are directly analogous to those of the Auditor-General, and like it should not only be similarly independent, but also seen to be independent within and outside government. 2. There has arisen a number of ill-defined overlapping jurisdictional offices that if not competitive with the Chief Archivist, are confusing in their responsibilities. Notable are the Chief Digital Officer (also Chief Executive of the Department of Internal Affairs) and the Chief Data Steward (also the the Government Statistician). In addition there is a Chief Technology Officer, still to be appointed, and the Privacy Commissioner. As far as I am aware, only two of these, the Chief Archivist and Privacy Commissioner are statutory. While it might be argued that all of these, with the exception of the Privacy Commissioner, are primarily concerned with the technology of record keeping as opposed to content, the main interest of the Chief Archivist, in practice the two have now become almost inseparable. The
current subordinate standing of the Chief Archivist does not bode well for dealing on even equal terms with these other more senior placed officials, but over which the office has nominal statutory authority.

No changes are needed to the broad role or structure of Archives New Zealand as such, except that it be removed from the ambit of the Department of Internal Affairs, with its stripped strategic policy, information technology, staffing, budgetary and accommodation capacities restored to what they were before the 2011 amalgamation. Without these the institution is beholden to a parent department which may well have other competing priorities at odds with those of Archives New Zealand, hindering both strategic vision and operational efficiency. Its alternative placement will be a matter of debate, but two options suggested can be discounted: 1. Confining the office of Chief Archivist to regulation only, with custodial stewardship as head of the Archives New Zealand repository placed elsewhere. This would be most undesirable for the simple reason that independently guaranteeing the integrity of the public record is not just a matter of regulation or authorising disposal, but extends to the whole of its life before and within Archives New Zealand, how it is accommodated, organised, conserved, displayed, and provision of public access. It is also vital that the Chief Archivist's decisions, and those of his supporting staff, regarding regulation and disposal should be closely informed by the use made of records already preserved as archives, no matter their form, digital and otherwise. Finally, it is reasonably the universal public expectation that the one function most expected of the Chief Archivist is that the office should have direct, secure and unfettered charge of the public archives. 2. Amalgamating the Archives New Zealand repository and reading services with the National Library. Not only would this be an undesirable for reasons given above, it would also confuse what ought not to be confused. Official records preserved as archives not only have a completely different legal standing from library materials in origination, selection, and provision of access, but are organised and described on quite distinct principles, requiring separate processes. From my own, long experience as a user, librarian and archivist, there would be little advantage in placing the two together, and some disadvantage, not least dilution of staff expertise, and public misapprehension of what public records and are. There is confusion enough already.

There will always be some opportunities for collaboration, though they can be overstated. The areas that are most likely to be of benefit is where there are similarities. The following areas could be considered: 1. Storage accommodation. The security, climate control, and building requirements are very similar for the holdings of both institutions. Purpose built remote storage for little consulted materials under joint governance would be a possibility. If entered into, this should be without diminution of the Chief Archivist's stewardship. 2. Conservation. The expertise required for restorative conservation by both institutions is very similar. A single major workshop facility could be considered, again under joint governance. 3. Exhibitions. Use of holdings from differing institutions, not just Archives New Zealand and the National Library is now commonplace, and will be doubtless will be continued. The exhibition of the Treaty is exceptional, displayed under the Chief Archivist's sole authority in the National Library building. 4. Outreach. There is some opportunity for collaboration here, but it is also shared with museums and regional institutions. The Community Archive, previously supported by Archives New Zealand alone, could be revived jointly. 5. Digitisation. This is expensive and best for long-run, particular instance, potentially high use, records of consistent format, such as passenger lists, wills, World War I personnel files, which are mostly at Archives New Zealand. The National Library's PapersPast, however, has had enormous success and doubtless will be ongoing. The setups for individual projects are distinct and efficiency requires that these should operate undisturbed as far as possible on their own premises. Photographs, paintings and maps are also natural candidates.
If one reflects on the changes of the last 30 years, this is a practically unknowable. And what the public needs and what it wants can be quite different, and how would you distinguish between them? However, here are two observations about what is needed now and might be hoped for in 30 years time. 1. A secure, trusted and complete permanent public record as public archives. This was easier with paper records of the past. With the transition to born-digital and digitised records, this is more complicated to guarantee. While digital records offer great search, access, and manipulation capabilities not available in paper form, they are inherently fragile. The software and platforms for keeping them are difficult and expensive to maintain, requiring emulation or forward migration. They are also more susceptible to hacking, loss, sequestration, unauthorised alteration, and improper use. For these reasons alone government digital information should be stored on New Zealand servers alone, not on overseas in the cloud. The use of overseas servers for this purpose not only impairs our national sovereignty, but would also detract from public confidence in the integrity of the public record. 2. A comprehensive online search tool covering all archives, public and private, in all holding institutions, not just Archives New Zealand and the National Library. At present a very large portion of our documentary heritage is passed over by those who would benefit from it. 3. More access to digitised resources, including photographs, paintings and maps, while at the same time respecting the materiality of the original object for which reading rooms staffed by archivists will continue to be needed.

Continuing from 3: The current placement of Archives New Zealand and its Chief Officer, within the Department of Internal Affairs, the lowest of any western Westminster system of government, is deplorable. The experiment of amalgamation with a national library in Canada has not been happy, and has been considered and rejected in both Ireland and the UK. There are three other more acceptable possibilities: 1. Reestablishing it as a separate department, reporting directly to a Minister. This, however, does make it more susceptible to political pressure, and vulnerable to arbitrary rearrangement within the public service, as happened in 2010. 2. Establishing it as a crown agency on similar lines to Te Papa. This would confer a greater degree of independence, but perhaps making it too separate from the mainstream of government. However, this would be an ideal status for the National Library. It could also give the Archives Council a greater governance role. 3. Making the Chief Archivist at the head of Archives New Zealand an Officer of Parliament. This would confer the greatest degree of authority and independence, and maximise the office's accountability function, placing it at the very centre of our democratic system of government. The Auditor-General is a good example. Desirably, the solution should have cross-party support, as indeed happened in 2005, but not 2010.
National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group

The National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group is seeking your feedback on how to strengthen the contribution to New Zealand’s culture and democracy made by Archives New Zealand, the National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision.

For more information visit www.dia.govt.nz/National-Archival-and-Library-Institutions-Ministerial-Group

Submitting feedback

All first and middle names
Suzanne (Sue) Findlay

Surname
Sutherland

Organisation, if relevant

Email address

Best phone number

☐ I wish to keep my details confidential

Once your feedback has been received this becomes a public document and may be made publicly available to anyone who requests it. You may request that your contact details be kept confidential, but your name, organisation and your feedback itself will become a public document.

The Department of Internal Affairs will manage any personal information you supply in your submission in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. We will use your contact details for the purposes of processing the application that it relates to (or in exceptional situations for other reasons permitted under the Privacy Act 1993). Where your feedback is made publicly available, your contact details will be removed only if you have indicated this as your preference in the tick box above.

The Department of Internal Affairs may post your feedback at www.dia.govt.nz. We also may make your submission available in response to a request under the Official Information Act 1982.
**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?

For the National Library one of its key challenges is realising the Strategic Directions adopted in December 2016. These have not been able to start being implemented because of a lack of resources. The NLNZ has been increasingly constrained by lack of resources and is now almost 90 FTE fewer than when it went in to the DIA. A small amount of this may be because some staff moved to centralised services but mostly it is about budget reductions which have meant the National Library has not been able to fill vacancies as a result of significantly reduced budgets.

There is a lack of transparency of budget spend. The Vote National Library was not retained (in spite of being promised during the Select Committee process) and later versions of the DIA's annual reports are opaque and it is not possible to determine what is being spent on National Library or Archives NZ, or any other of the department’s discreet services.

Another challenge is the lack of visibility and accountability. The National Library is not taking the leadership role within the sector and is rapidly becoming irrelevant as a leader of library and information policy and in working with other libraries to strengthen services to New Zealanders. It is difficult for the public and government to have visibility of what is happening inside the National Library and there has been no separate annual report for one of the nation's foremost culture and heritage institutions since it became a part of the DIA.

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?

The National Librarian does not currently have the independence or authority commensurate with the statutory role. The position of this role as a 3rd tier manager, which is not part of the Executive Leadership team, in a large and disparate government department, has limited authority to make decisions. Decisions on capital and operational spending on National Library priorities have to compete with other unrelated parts of the DIA and the National Librarian has no decision making input into how these decisions are made.

The National Librarian does not have access as of right to the Minister responsible for the National Library and is seldom the voice of the National Library. There are constraints on the National Librarian being able to provide leadership to the sector and during the past seven years there has been a reduction in collaborative activity. An example of the changed approach to collaboration with the sector was the revision of the Public Libraries Strategic Framework. The original work was done in collaboration by the National Library with public libraries; when the refresh was done in 2012, the National Library was not able to be part of the process at all.

There is limited or no opportunity for the National Librarian to have input or lead on policy that is important to the library and information sector, such as copyright, digital developments and data repositories - areas that are being worked on by other government departments to which DIA policy and not National Library will have input.

There is a loss of status internationally.

To combat this we need strong, visionary leadership from the National Librarian, with freedom to operate in an open and responsive environment. S/he needs to have the authority and accountability for library and information policy, and to be able to set the priorities for investment in conjunction with the relevant Minister.
3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is imperative that the National Library (and Archives NZ) have their own vote, direct access to the Minister responsible for the service and the ability to set their own priorities for the services that they are responsible for. The National Library sits at a very important intersection of the information and digital ecosystem: research, economic and cultural enrichment, heritage, digital developments, education and learning and social wellbeing. For it to take its legitimate leadership role it is vital it is not pigeon holed inside another area of government. The National Library needs to be an autonomous unit within government, able to work on projects across government, the sector and internationally to deliver on its purposes under the Act. While it has been part of the DIA the second and third purposes of the Act have not received any priority. The second purpose is to 'supplement and further the work of other libraries' and the third purpose is to 'work collaboratively with organisations having similar purposes, including international'. The leadership role required of the National Library in working with other libraries, museums, archives and galleries needs to be emphasised in any changed structure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My preference is for the three collection agencies, National Library, Archives NZ and Nga Taonga Sound and Vision to be brought together in a single entity as a stand alone government department. This reinstates the former two organisations to the status they had prior to going into DIA which had worked well and was not broken before. Bringing the organisations together allows for greater collaboration as outlined in question 4 response below and should result in economies of scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My second preference is for a Crown Entity with its own Board. However, this diminishes the ability of the organisations to influence government policy in the areas crucial to libraries and archives as they are at 'one remove' from government. This option, however, might be the more acceptable to Nga Taonga. I do not favour a departmental agency because from my reading of the information this does not give the National Library and Archives one of the crucial requirements which is control of their own Vote and budget. Nor will retaining the NL as departmental agency of the DIA address the issue of broken trust which has occurred during the tenure by that department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The three organisations have more in common than they have differences. The have the same need for digitisation of analogue collections, the same need to collect and preserve digital born content, and similar needs to provide greater access to their collections for use and creative re-use of material. They also have growing needs for storage both of physical collections and for digital storage for fast growing digital collections. Some of this collaboration could take place without the three institutions being one organisation but it would certainly be much easier if they were.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both the National Library and Archives have responsibilities to collaborate and work with other organisations to provide support, advice and services that smaller organisations find difficult or impossible to do on their own. National Library needs the ability to continue and expand this work, such as the work done to digitise and make accessible newspapers and early government and parliamentary papers for New Zealanders through Papers Past. Other examples of this collaborative work are Kōtui, the shared library management service and Aotearoa People's Network Kaharoa (APNK) done in collaboration with public libraries. Both of these collaborations were made more difficult by the National Library's position within DIA and the lack of support and belief that this was a legitimate role for the National Library to have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

The public needs to be able to trust that these organisations are being properly funded and managed to deliver on their purposes, responsibilities and accountabilities. The public needs greater transparency on what is being invested and the outputs and outcomes of these investments and expenditure. Currently neither Archives NZ or National Library report separately to Parliament and the financial statements in the DIA’s annual report are opaque. It is impossible to tell what is being spent on these institutions, and what that money is being spent on. What is the split between expenditure on direct service delivery and what is departmental overhead? How have the decision on budget cuts and priorities been made? Currently both institutions have to compete for funding against completely unrelated businesses within the DIA and the decision making on priorities is not made by the National Librarian or the Chief Archivist as far as it is possible to tell.

The public also needs for these institutions to stop being political footballs and kicked from one government department to another. A nation’s National Library is a symbol of the importance a country places on democracy, culture, equality of access to knowledge, truth, openness, transparency and accountability. It must play the long game, looking to the future, protecting the past and providing access today for all New Zealanders. It will do this in partnership with other libraries, archives, museums and galleries which are part of the eco system that collects, protects and makes accessible the knowledge of our place and of the world.

A nation legislates for those things which are important. We have good legislation for the National Library but it needs to be strengthened to prevent succeeding governments making expedient or ill informed decisions on its governance. The public also needs the National Library to support and lead the development of public library legislation that will ensure the purpose and roles of public libraries take their proper place in our country. New Zealand is one of the few western world countries that does not have public library legislation.

6. Any other comments?

I commend the Ministerial Group for undertaking the review and for the engagement with stakeholders. I see this engagement as the first step in consultation and would strongly recommend there is a further opportunity once the Cabinet has a proposed solution as to how it sees the three institutions being governed in the future.

I would urge Ministers to be bold. Do not be put off making bold decisions on the grounds that it might cost too much to disentangle ANZ or NLNZ from the DIA, or that the shared back office services are the most cost effective way of providing these. No work has been done on whether the savings that were projected were realised. What was the cost of integration? And how did these changes benefit or otherwise, the two institutions? I am not suggesting this work be done now but the point to note is that assumptions made at the time of the merger were never evaluated and it should not be assumed it is a more cost effective solution to have these institutions as part of a larger government department.

The National Library will need its own policy and strategy capability, digital and specialist technology capability, organisational change capacity and its own marketing, communications and promotions. Ideally it should address the commitment it has to Mātauranga Māori through a mechanism of co-governance with Māori

I thank you for the opportunity to have input into this review.
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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)?

The National archival and library institutions need to ensure that New Zealanders have improved access and ability to reuse the digitised held or created by those institutions. To do this the National archival and library institutions need to increase the amount of digitised content available to New Zealanders. The National archival and library institutions need to determine whether the digitised content is in the public domain, is under a copyright license allowing reuse, or whether reuse would infringe copyright. They then need to give clear, consistent guidance to the New Zealander public on their ability to reuse that digitised content.

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?

I don’t feel informed enough on this issue to comment.

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

The structure of Archives New Zealand and the National Library should be changed to ensure there is an emphasis on digitisation and reuse of that digitised content. There should be more resources allocated to copyright determination of digitised content in order to facilitate the reuse of the same. Databases should be enhanced to
allow for the storage and interlinking of metadata about the digitised content, to give clear and consistent copyright statements and to allow for the download of the digitised content and relevant metadata for reuse by New Zealanders. Both Archives New Zealand and the National Library, as institutions, need a more active mindset in seeking opportunities to share their content in the digital spaces most commonly frequented by New Zealanders. Both institutions should take a more active role in encouraging reuse of their content by organisations such as the Wikimedia Foundation, the Internet Archive and the Biodiversity Heritage Library.

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 national archival and library institutions databases should be interlinked to ensure that content is more easily discoverable by the New Zealand public. They could combine their efforts when engaging with outside institutions or organisations to increase the impact of their digitisation efforts.

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

The national archival and library institutions need to be forward thinking on digital engagement. Each institution should have an active and robust digitisation strategy. They need to ensure that the content that is digitised has consistent and clearly marked reuse statements. The institutions should ensure that their content is discoverable and easily reusable by the public. The National Archive, the National Library and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision should all be actively engaged in encouraging the reuse of their content on digital platforms other than their own. They should be encouraging and facilitating other organisations such as the Wikimedia Foundation, the Internet Archive, the Biodiversity Heritage Library to reuse New Zealand digitised content on their platforms. This would increase the ability of New Zealanders to discover content held and digitised by the Archives New Zealand, the National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound and Vision.
National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group

The National Archival and Library Institutions Ministerial Group is seeking your feedback on how to strengthen the contribution to New Zealand’s culture and democracy made by Archives New Zealand, the National Library of New Zealand and Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision.

For more information visit www.dia.govt.nz/National-Archival-and-Library-Institutions-Ministerial-Group

Submitting feedback

All first and middle names
William Newton

Surname
Sheat

Organisation, if relevant
Founding Chairman NZ Film Commission.

Email address
$9(2)(a)

Best phone number
$9(2)(a)

☐ I wish to keep my details confidential

Once your feedback has been received this becomes a public document and may be made publicly available to anyone who requests it. You may request that your contact details be kept confidential, but your name, organisation and your feedback itself will become a public document.

The Department of Internal Affairs will manage any personal information you supply in your submission in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. We will use your contact details for the purposes of processing the application that it relates to (or in exceptional situations for other reasons permitted under the Privacy Act 1993). Where your feedback is made publicly available, your contact details will be removed only if you have indicated this as your preference in the tick box above.

The Department of Internal Affairs may post your feedback at www.dia.govt.nz. We also may make your submission available in response to a request under the Official Information Act 1982.
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?

There are significant gaps in the coverage of the full spectrum of materials of national importance which should be kept for posterity. This is due to the piecemeal way in which the sector developed. There had long been a policy dating back to NZBS of keeping an archive of its own material. This now forms part of Ngā Taonga. There was no film archive until one was set up during my term as Chairman of the Film Commission. The Commission’s Act includes amongst its list of functions the setting up of an archive. When the then Government (it was a Labour Government) sold off the National Film Unit the important library of the Film Unit films was included in the deal which gave NZBC the right to use the material. Ownership remained with Crown. It was under the administration of the National Archives who did not have the resources or worse still sufficient interest to manage the material in the best interests of the nation. The Film Unit material remains to this day in what can best be described as a limbo. A new archiving facility has been developed by New Zealand on Air under the name of NZ On Screen. At the same time the Film Commission has set about sorting out the tangle of the ownership rights of NZ made feature films. Preservation of the ownership right is equally as important as preservation of the actual material. There is no repository for sound recording materials such as commercially made recordings of popular songs.

There is a lot of work to be done.

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?

No comment
3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

I think that National Archives should get out of the film area.
I think that the sound archives if the National Library should be handed over to Nga Taonga.

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?

I do not think that digital considerations have anything to do with working together. There is room for a lot more collaboration and less protecting of patches.
5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?
Accessibility.
Outreach
Awareness of the richness of our heritage in these areas.

6. Any other comments?
No thanks
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Credentials

During 20 years at the Turnbull Library I held the positions of Chief Cataloguer, Reference Librarian, and Assistant Chief Librarian – the latter for 10 years. I then served 10 years as the Director and Chief Archivist of Archives New Zealand. In 1969 I was awarded an Anzac Fellowship to identify and negotiate the copying of NZ historical research material held in Australian libraries. I have also paid professional visits to leading state and national archives and libraries in the US, Scandinavia, Germany, Holland and Britain. On retirement I served for 3 years as a Trustee of the National Library, 10+ years as a member of the Ministry of Culture History Group Advisory Committee and 15 years on the Archives and Research Committee of the National Army Museum. I am a Fellow of the NZ Library Association and an Honorary Life Member of the Archives and Records Association of New Zealand.

I have also had considerable experience as a researcher using the facilities of the Turnbull and Archives NZ. Of the 5 books I have published, 4 were dependent on research done in the two institutions and elsewhere including the British Library and the National Library of Scotland. Of these, two received awards. They were:

New Zealand: Volume 18, World Bibliographical Series which led to the John Harris Award for Bibliography, 1982.

Cork of War: Ngati Toa and the British Mission which received the New Zealand Book Award for Non-fiction 1983.

My submission will concentrate on issues relating to Archives New Zealand.
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?

The key challenge for Archives New Zealand is to gain recognition that it is a unique public entity. Ignorance of its special character has bedevilled archives administration in New Zealand since 1840 when Governor Hobson was instructed to establish a public record office.

The purpose of a national archives or a public record office is to preserve evidence sufficient for governments to be held to account. Another way to put it is that the Chief Archivist is the government’s chief pathologist – the final resort for investigation into what actually happened. The Waitangi Tribunal, for example, could not have carried out its investigations over the years without resort to public archives – not all of which, because of inadequate management, have survived. The enquiry into state care of children will also be highly dependent on official records — and not only for generations past. It will, however also be found, when searches for evidence are made, that because of past indifference and neglect, there will be gaps in recorded information that can never be filled.

Which brings us to the management of current records by public entities: it is impossible to have a responsive official information programme without effective and efficient management of the records of those entities. It is essential therefor that the record keeping of those entities be monitored (and, when necessary, corrected) by auditors with professional expertise.

Other functions such as those relating to our national heritage, are a secondary spinoff. Unfortunately this secondary function is mistakenly held as prime not only by those who pursue historical research for its own sake but also by the majority of research librarians who believe that a national archives is a variation of a research library. Nearly all politicians, bureaucrats and citizens insofar as they are aware of public archives at all — and few are — share this view.

The other key challenge for Archives NZ is for it to be provided with the power to ensure the effective management of the records created by public entities in the course of their business and then the identification, preservation, and provision of means of access to what archivists term ‘records of permanent value’, i.e. the minority of records which contain significant information on the functions of government.

The necessary step towards this is the removal of Archives NZ from the Department of Internal Affairs. Neither should it ever be associated with any other executive agency. Its purpose and functions are unique. And one of these unique qualities is that a national archives is not part of the executive of government. It is in fact, a monitor of government, similar to Audit New Zealand.
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?

When Archives NZ was returned to DIA its priorities again became subordinate to those of DIA. DIA is a department which has many responsibilities; some of them, like Local Government, Citizenship, Gaming, and Censorship, have relatively high political profiles to the degree that they can affect government policies overall or sometimes even have an influence on whether or not the minister will be returned in the next election. Consequently issues raised by these branches make pressing demands on the DIA top decision makers. Other branches lower in public profile are therefore considered less important. The political and public pressures on DIA regarding its archival responsibilities, in comparison with these branches, is low. So that in one case, a CEO, as I was informed some months after the event, on his retirement, demonstrated his esteem for Archives Act and the institution he was responsible for, by taking it upon himself to have his secretary destroy all the records he kept under lock and key in his office — an unqualified breach of the law he had been paid to enforce.

It was also my experience that by being a tier three functionary I had to work to senior departmental staff who were, nine times out of ten, in near perfect ignorance of the functions of a Chief Archivist -- educating my betters took up a lot of time and I would by no means guarantee success. (It was not uncommon when one was explaining the constitutional role of a functioning national archives, for one's remarks to be received with a superior smile.) These were the people who were entrusted with the task of putting the Archives case to the Minister, Treasury, and the SSC.

The ramifications of the above were pretty well inevitable: under-resourcing generally so that Archives NZ had neither the standing nor the resources to enforce the Act; inability to service adequately the records that happened to find their way into the institution; severe editing of annual reports; and rare and tightly controlled access to the Minister (until a change of CEO and minister in my last years). Recent reports of losing accommodation and finance to other DIA branches are therefore wholly unsurprising. And often when DIA upper levels did show interest, too often it was to meddle. Taking their cue from them, the DIA staff who performed administrative services were also not averse to rationing

New Zealand’s treatment of the public record has been a sorry one, marked by loss through fire and shipwreck but chiefly through neglect and indifference. Around 1979/80 the situation of the then National Archives after 40+ years of DIA administration was so bad that the archives community in New Zealand were able to bring about a SSC/DIA management audit. One of the results of this was my appointment. When I arrived at the then National Archives in 1981 the total staff numbered 18 and the accommodation in both Wellington and Auckland were warehouses. If further evidence were needed of dire straits, appraisal staff were still, in 1981, identifying 19th century records — often mildewed and covered in rat shit.
Then, later in my tenure, I had the amazing luck of having a Minister and a CEO who each had an interest in archives. It was because of these two gentlemen that overdue improvements in accommodation were achieved. But please note that it took over 40 years of DIA administration before this happened.

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

Establishing a Controller of the Public Record as an Officer of Parliament granted the powers to enforce compliance with the provisions of an effective Public Records Act. These provisions would include the enforcement of current record keeping standards by all public entities, their identification for preservation because of their ‘permanent value’ (i.e., those which contain significant evidence of performance of functions), the controlled disposal of the remainder (the vast majority), the housing of the permanent value archives in accommodation which will ensure their preservation, the arrangement and description of them, and the provision of reference services that will provide access to users.

The role and responsibilities of the Controller of the Public Record would be analogous to that of the Controller and Auditor General. As with the Auditor General, the position is that of a Controller, not an advisor, with all staff working directly under the holder of the position. This would include those working on appraisal, access and housing, etc., under a Deputy Controller of the Public Record in a similar fashion to the Audit Office which reports to the Controller and Auditor General via a Deputy Auditor General. The monitoring staff would not only need training for the skills required, but also have to qualify for top security clearances so that agencies such as Foreign Affairs, Defence and security services, do not abuse their need for secrecy by evading the provisions of the Act in a manner that would jeopardise their eventual accountability -- however far away that eventuality might be.

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?

Much has been made of ‘savings’ to be achieved if ‘national archival and library institutions work more effectively together’. In such an arrangement one party is almost inevitably subordinate. However, because of the professional skills required there would still have to be a head of the subordinate institution — which 99 times out of 100 would be an archivist. The salary of course would be lower than if the holder were independent, but overall the cost of the salary for an independent manager would count for little.

As for the cost of accommodation of the materials, they would be exactly the same for each. Then there is the cost of reference aids and services. As demonstrated below there would still have to be librarians cataloguing library materials, archivists arranging and describing archives, reference librarians providing bibliographical services and archivists providing agency information to facilitate the use of records. I have yet to see an authoritative cost analysis of how much would actually be ‘saved’ and what efficiencies each
institution would achieve by it. Until such an exercise is undertaken, the proponents should keep their bright ideas to themselves. There is indeed much to be gained by cooperation in which each institution and profession respects, and at least tries to understand, the role of the other.

During my professional life as both an archives and library administrator I travelled extensively to Australia, North America, and Western Europe. I never saw one state or national archives which functioned effectively when linked to the state or national library. Because of a higher profile, larger size, better political and public understanding of their role, the libraries always prevailed over the archives. Given that invariably, because of these factors, a librarian would be the CEO of the combined organisation, and the priorities of national and state libraries prevailed over those of national or state archives.

Archives and research libraries have one factor in common: the provision of facilities to those whose concern is historical research. But apart from requiring the same standard of accommodation, I know, as one who has managed (and researched) in both libraries and archives, that everything else is different.

Research libraries are mainly concerned with books. Books are written about subjects — discrete items created by authors, printers and publishers. The user accesses them by means of author, title, or subjects.

Archives, however, are the product of functions. The majority are files containing letters and memos arising out of the performance of those functions. Some files can continue for years. There can be over 100 ‘authors’ in a single file. They have neither a publisher nor a printer. They are not designed to provide information on a subject; they exist as records of activities. If every national archives were financed by a billionaire it might be possible to compile a subject catalogue along the lines of a book catalogue for some of the files. But even for a well-funded national archive, the only practical way to provide access to users is by ‘arrangement and description’. This is a process which is guided by knowledge of the organisation and functions of the agency concerned. If a researcher knows what the functions of an agency are, s/he then has a fair likelihood of what information it will contain on particular historical subjects. More often than not an experienced researcher only goes to an archives repository after becoming cognizant with the subject information contained in books.

Apart from donations, and regardless of whether they are hard copies or online, libraries generally acquire books from a publisher or bookseller. An acquisitions librarian has skills in assessing from publishers’ and dealers’ brochures the relevance of the books on sale to the purposes of the library.

Acquiring archives is an entirely different process. When an agency announces that they have records which they no longer need to hold (and there is no guarantee that under the present system that they will so announce) an archivist is sent to ‘appraise’ the records, i.e. decide which are worthy of preservation and which are not — another process entirely unknown to librarians.
Then we come to reference services. Why not combine the two? To be a reference librarian it is necessary to have bibliographical knowledge about particular subjects. A reference archivist, however, cannot operate effectively without knowledge of administrative history and systems, the relationships of agencies with each other and which and when agencies came into being and when and which were then done away with.

Regarding technology, it needs to be applied according the needs of the materials and of the institution concerned. Practical experience, and much wasted money, has confirmed that one size most definitely does not fit all. In the future it may be possible for subject and nominative cataloguing of archives to be performed, but even if that becomes a reality it will be as different in form for records as it will be for books.

(It is noted that research libraries often hold the records created by individuals or private organizations, but these, have nothing like the complexity of public records.)

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

What they have not had for the best part of a decade: properly functioning institutions. In case of Archives NZ, the structural changes outlined above should be instituted followed by a crash programme for professional archival training. When I took over I was expected carry out my responsibilities with 2 professional archivists. Because of the dire situation which the institution was in, I was given a smallish increase in staff. Given the paucity of archival training in New Zealand at the time, I had no option but to send one a year to the University of New South Wales for professional training — even when they had been professional librarians. Other steps to be taken should include a continuing P.R. programme directed at all public entities emphasising their responsibility to maintain the integrity of the public record with sanctions on CEOs who do not comply. We also must remember that the term ‘public entities’ does not only encompass the agencies of central government but also local government whose history of care for their records, current and past, is indeed patchy.

6. Any other comments?

I would be happy to appear before the Ministerial Group.