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One Key Challenges
1. Responding nimbly to the digital age
2. Providing access to content in an integrated fashion (integrated between each of the cultural institutions, as well as being seamless from the user's perspective)
3. Independence from political influence

Two Independence
I cannot comment knowledgeable on the role of Chief Archivist, but the National Librarian I believe does not have the independence and authority necessary to carry out their statutory responsibilities. This is due to the constraints around their freedom to act inherent in being part of a very large ministry whose overall role is not well aligned with the purpose and mission of the NLNZ. The DIA is a ministry that "serves and connects people, communities and government to build a safe, prosperous and respected nation". There is no acknowledgement in that statement of the mandate of the NLNZ, which exists to "collect, connect and co-create knowledge to power New Zealand". The change in governance structure of five or so years ago has left the NLNZ struggling for profile, identity and purpose. It has not made the inroads into other key ministries (such as education) that might have been hoped for 5 years ago. The layers of DIA bureaucracy that now have to be negotiated for BAU processes and activities is hampering the NLNZ from being an agile, respected and responsive part of the NZ knowledge landscape.

Three Changes
A separate culture and heritage ministry would enable greater focus on the GLAM sector and enable NLNZ, National Archives, Te Papa and art galleries to be brought together with a focus on the value they contribute to NZ life being a priority. Sports might also be added in to the mix. Conversely, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage becomes more than a funding agency for sporting, cultural and heritage activity in NZ. Many would no doubt suggest that this change might be at odds for a government so focused on social capital and social development. But it's because this government is socially conscious that I think this is the time to make these cultural institutions relevant and real for all NZers, not just a cultural elite. We should be proud of our multicultural heritage and be striving to make it more accessible and relevant for all NZers. These cultural institutions are lost within government super ministries, lacking profile and struggling to fulfill their individual mandates and effectively being silenced by a bureaucracy with other priorities. The relationship of cultural institutions with the closed shop that is the Ministry of Education might then be better negotiated as a combined ministry, not as separate individual institutions within the DIA. Relationships with mana whenua and tangata whenua are critical and need to be established and woven in to the fabric.

Four Opportunities
Because of the similarity of these institutions' mandates, there is the potential for reducing duplication of effort, economies of scale, opportunities for shared spaces, storage, skill and resource sharing, collaboration, staff development and greater opportunity to explore new possibilities as a collective. It could be as if He Tohu became normal BAU, not a special project that is undertaken every couple of years. The opportunities offered by digital technology in terms of preservation of and access to our documentary heritage are limitless if these institutions are brought together.

Five 30 Years
For them to be joined up, working collaboratively and effectively.
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Submitter’s Details

Name: Peter Miller

I have been a professional Archivist since 1976. I hold a Postgraduate Diploma in Archives Management from the University of New South Wales, and also a BA and Postgraduate Diploma in Arts (History) from the University of Otago. I am a founding and current member of both the Australian Society of Archivists Inc, and the Archives and Records Association of New Zealand Inc, and am an Honorary Life Member of the latter organisation. I was also a member of the International Council on Archives, the Society of Archivists and the Society of American Archivists for forty years.

I was an Archivist at National Archives Head Office 1976 –77 and then the Archivist of the Hocken Library from 1977-93. In 1993, I was appointed the inaugural Regional Archivist, Dunedin for National Archives and served in that position until my retirement in 2015.

Introduction

My Submission is concerned only with Archives New Zealand.
I believe that my academic and archives qualifications, and my career as a professional Archivist, together with my 24 years of experience with Archives NZ, 22 of which were in a senior position, qualify me well to make the comments which follow. I have considered the five questions the Ministerial Group wishes to receive feedback on, as well as the Group’s Terms of Reference, and the Labour Party’s ‘Internal Affairs’ 2017 Election Policy.

Constitutional Role of Archives NZ

This is set out in secs 3(b), (c), (d) and (f) in the ‘Purposes’ part of the Public Records Act 2005. It gives Archives NZ and the Chief Archivist a critical and key role across Government in enabling the Government to be held accountable, akin to the role of the Office of the Auditor General with regard to it holding the Government to account with regard to its financial management. For this reason, the Chief Archivist is given statutory independence in certain key recordkeeping matters, and is not subject to Ministerial direction in exercising them.

Resourcing and Status of the Chief Archivist

To enable the fulfillment of the above constitutional role, it is vital that not only is there statutory independence, but also that the Chief Archivist has sufficient status across government to hold Chief Executives to account, and, moreover, is also sufficiently resourced to do so.
When Archives NZ was a separate Department from 2000 to 2011, with the Chief Archivist also having the status of a Chief Executive and having its own Parliamentary appropriation (with regular increases in this over the years for additional staff and projects), there were no doubts regarding status and adequate resourcing. Even when Archives was within DIA before 2000, it had its own Vote, was a separate standalone unit, and the Chief Archivist was part of the DIA management team. It was highly regarded by all its stakeholders, including the SSC, Audit NZ and the Treasury, with high ratings from the latter two bodies.
However, since the merger with DIA in 2011, a number of things have occurred to completely undermine the status and resourcing. Successive generic managers have been appointed Chief Archivist, the position has been downgraded to third tier, Archives NZ no longer lays an Annual Report before Parliament, and there is now no direct Parliamentary appropriation. It is completely wrong, and shows a complete misunderstanding of the requirements of the position, to appoint generic and unqualified managers to the position of Chief Archivist and Acting Chief Archivist – akin to appointing a non-accountant as Auditor General, something which would never be contemplated! Also, now the position is third tier, it is very difficult for the Chief Archivist to meet with Chief Executives of departments on a regular basis, let alone give them directions with regard to recordkeeping. Recent Chief Archivist annual reports to Parliament on government recordkeeping clearly show how poorly Chief Executives are performing in this area, 13 years after the Act came in – and they obviously need further direct input from the Chief Archivist to improve. And how could the Chief Archivist deal with poor recordkeeping within DIA, at third tier???

In terms of financial resources, the Chief Archivist is now completely dependent upon DIA senior management, which does not include them, for allocation of a budget, and there has been no substantial increase over the past seven years.

In short, the Chief Archivist is now unable to properly perform the statutory functions in the Act, and one could say is in breach of the Public Records Act!!

Project Failures
When Archives NZ was a department, it undertook a number of major projects successfully. There was the passing of the Public Records Act 2005. It opened a new purpose-built Auckland Regional Office in 2007 and also developed the current Archway online access and management system for its archival holdings. Both were greeted very favourably by stakeholders – and the latter was seen at the time as world-leading by some overseas national archival institutions. However, since its subsuming within DIA, there have been several disastrous project failures which have severely damaged its reputation within Government and with key external stakeholders. The first of these was the vital Government Digital Archive, which was to cope with the new paradigm of born digital and also digitized paper records – millions of dollars were spent on this system before it was abandoned as a failure. It has not been replaced since, with Archives NZ making do with using the National Library’s Rosetta system for small electronic transfers. This is no proper substitute for a full-blown GDA.

Secondly, there was the very public failure of the project to exhibit, at a cost of over $7m, a number of key constitutional and other documents at the National Library. This project (now called He Tohu) was then scaled back to three documents only, a huge and scandalous waste of taxpayer dollars at over $2m per document!! These three documents are some of the crown jewels of Archives NZ and they are now being displayed completely out of their archival context e.g. can one imagine the Constitution and also the Declaration of Independence of the United States being on display now at the Library of Congress, instead of the National Archives and Records Administration, where they are exhibited?? An upgrade of the Constitution Room and adjoining display space at Archives NZ should have been undertaken for a fraction of the $7m.

Thirdly, while not a failure as such, it is appropriate to record that it took from 2010 until this month for DIA to replace the irreparably earthquake-damaged Archives NZ Christchurch Regional Office building – eight years, when it should have been the Department’s highest asset replacement priority, and done much quicker.
It is very telling that all three of these projects occurred during DIA’s stewardship – and are indicative of its management failures, compared with no project failures when Archives was independent.

**Staffing and Morale**

While independent, Archives had a number of professionally qualified archivists on its senior leadership team, and reporting directly to the Chief Archivist, as should be the case. However, this is not the case now alas, with minimal representation, and recent appointments to major units of persons without formal archival qualifications. Also, staff morale has decreased dramatically compared with its level from 2000 to 2011. Some of this can be put down to the loss of independence, some to the project failures, and some to the way in which DIA administers Archives NZ, including treating its specialist buildings as just another general DIA premise. An example of this is the colonization of the Mulgrave Street Head Office by other DA staff!! The intense pressure to raise third party revenue has seen some offices subjected to extremely unwise proposals to use their land or buildings for other DIA and external purposes, so compromising their long-term future.

**Changes to the Structure**

Any suggestion of changes to the role or structure of Archives NZ need to be considered in terms of the ability to fulfill the requirements set out in the Public Records Act. I have already commented on the ability of the Chief Archivist to undertake the independent statutory functions, when they are circumscribed by their inappropriate position in the hierarchy, and a lack of resources. In a situation like this, the mana of the position has been affected in a deleterious way.

Previously, and currently, there have been and are some who have suggested that a merger of Archives NZ with the National Library, along the lines of the situation in Canada, would advance the cause of both institutions. However, the merger in Canada is universally seen as a disaster by both the research community and the archives profession in that country and around the world – see the Royal Society of Canada’s 2014 report entitled ‘The Future Now: Canada’s Libraries, Archives, and Public Memory’ for a damning critique of the merger. A similar proposal in Ireland did not proceed because of trenchant opposition from the research community there. The move in 2017 of the State Records Office of Western Australia back under the administration of the Battye Library was vigorously opposed by the Australian Society of Archivists, among others, as being a huge backward step.

In my opinion, it is muddle-headed and erroneous thinking to propose that national archival institutions and libraries can be successfully merged, on the basis that they are both about collecting and holding information. The constitutional role of a national archives, enabling its citizens to hold the government to account, and documenting their rights, etc, is NOT performed by a national library. There are also other compelling reasons.

There are also people who support a division of responsibilities of the Chief Archivist, with the position’s regulatory public records role remaining with the Chief Archivist, while responsibility for the public archives themselves, including their control and preservation, would be assigned to another person. Such a separation was proposed in the mid 1990s by DIA, but resulted in such strong opposition from stakeholders, that it was dropped. It would be an impossible situation for the Chief Archivist to be relieved of the statutory responsibility for the public archives held by Archives NZ, when they are part of the recordkeeping continuum overseen by the Chief Archivist – from the creation and maintenance of records to the transfer of selected records to the custody of Archives NZ and their access there.
Officer of Parliament

The Labour Party’s 2017 election policy for Internal Affairs stated Labour would ‘Investigate the National Archivist being an Officer of Parliament’.

I have to say that I strongly support this policy, for the following reasons (in no particular order):

- It would give the Chief Archivist the mana and standing needed to fully perform the functions and purpose set out in the Public Records Act – and so serve the public much better
- It would be welcomed by Maori in view of the taonga the institution holds
- It would send a strong message to all the agencies of the view that Parliament takes of the position and of Archives NZ
- It would finally give the institution the long-term stability it desperately needs, and end it being a political plaything – being in DIA, being moved out of DIA to become a department, then being subsumed into DIA yet again!!
- It is far more likely to be adequately resourced as an Officer of Parliament and therefore allow it to take on essential projects which have been sadly neglected in recent years
- It would give a real lift to staff morale and would attract professional archivists and others to want to serve in the institution
- It would be seen as world-leading by national archival authorities in other countries – and hopefully would encourage similar changes
- It would have a significantly higher profile and enhanced public image
- It would fit in well with the current three Officers of Parliament – and there could possibly be some sharing of back office functions between them, resulting in budget savings
- It would not stop sensible co-operation with the National Library
- It would halt the downward spiral of the organization into mediocrity which has occurred in the past seven years
- The legislative change could easily be achieved by some drafting changes to the current Act

Conclusion

In short, I conclude that DIA’s administration of the National Archives of NZ/Archives NZ has not resulted in the flourishing of the institution. Indeed, it was recognized to be in such a parlous state in 2000 that the Government of the day removed it from DIA and established it as a separate department. As I have stated above, it was highly successful for the next ten years. But, with its absorption into DIA in 2011, it has yet again languished.

It is high time that a new age dawned for Archives NZ, one in which it can flourish yet again – and have long-term political stability.

This new age can only be achieved by making the Chief Archivist/National Archivist an Officer of Parliament.

18 August 2018
General Comments:

I am pleased to see the establishment of the Ministerial Group (NALI) set up to consider the best options in the future for the National Library of New Zealand (NLNZ), Archives New Zealand (ANZ) and Nga Taonga Sound and Vision (NTSAV). As CEO and National Librarian 2003/2011 and Chair of the Conference of Directors of National Libraries (CDNL) 2007/2010, I am able to provide comment on the contribution that National Libraries typically make to the social, cultural, educational and economic endeavours of nations, as well as the contribution they make to the principles of freedom of access to information within open democracies.

Underpinning this submission is a document prepared for Hon Grant Robertson by five senior colleagues from the Library and Information sector which describes what a “good” National Library could and should be. This has been sent as a submission to the NALI as a separate document and provides a guide to the final outcome preferred in this submission as well as the scenario developed in Question 5 which invites comment on what New Zealanders will want from these three national institutions in 30 years’ time.

While there is evidence that the NLNZ has struggled to be effective in the past eight years within the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA), the comments made in this submission will largely focus on the future. Ahead of us we now have a unique opportunity to realise synergies between these three national institutions and to reposition them to establish an internationally recognised concept which is much better positioned to make a significant contribution to the lives of New Zealanders in the future.

This submission:

**Supports** the establishment of a new independent and separate government department under the banner “Libraries, Archives, Film Aotearoa” (LAFA) which leverages the clear
synergies between these three organisations while continuing to respect and reflect the unique mandate of each.

Response to questions

Question 1.

What are the two or three key challenges for the national archival and library institutions?
What is the most urgent challenge?

Key challenges for NLNZ and ANZ

Under the current arrangements the NLNZ and ANZ:

1. Have lost considerable trust and visibility with the Library and Information and Archives sectors

2. The NLNZ is compromised in its ability deliver on the requirements of the NLNZ Act 2003 particularly in relation to furthering the work of other libraries in NZ and the interchange with other nations.

3. There is no longer a separate vote NLNZ or ANZ nor is there a Minister with Responsibility for the NLNZ and ANZ

4. Crucial specialised technical capability has been watered down and absorbed into the parent department

5. There are significant capacity and capability issues in the NLNZ as many specialist positions have been lost.

6. Specialist policy capability for the NLNZ and ANZ is weakened and less able to respond to sector needs.

Most urgent challenge

The most urgent challenge is to ensure that NLNZ and ANZ are funded and empowered to act as independent national institutions. For the NLNZ this means the freedom to interact across local and central government and with relevant sectors including GLAMS, education, research, digital strategy, culture and heritage, open access interests, both within NZ and internationally.
Question 2

Independence and authority of the Chief Archivist and National Librarian

1. National Librarian

As a tier 3 manager within DIA the position of National Librarian has been significantly curtailed in relation to independence and the authority to act.

A high level timeline, plotting significant policy and strategic activities of the NLNZ 2000 to 2018, demonstrates a stalling of NLNZ activities from 2011 when it was absorbed into DIA.

The National Librarian no longer has the authority or independence to discharge many of the requirements of the NLNZ Act.

Concrete examples of the loss of responsibility and authority to act

- the lack of a separate vote NLNZ
- the absence of specialist policy advice to the Minister with responsibility for the NLNZ (currently no minister with this responsibility)
- the inability to actually deliver NLNZ Strategic Directions
- a lack of interagency collaboration and joined up policy development generally across central and local government including joint initiatives with education, research, GLAMS, science, culture and heritage sectors and digital strategy generally

Less obvious examples

There is enormous sadness in the library and information sector and GLAMS generally that the independent voice of the National Librarian is no longer heard on issues such as freedom of access to information, the knowledge society, open access, digital preservation, literacy and digital strategy generally.

The nation-wide partnerships established (e.g. digitisation) with the library and information sector, local government and the education and research sectors have not flourished in recent years and in many cases have been under-funded.

There was also an unstated “soft” authority the National Librarian once had to speak out and give legs to some world-leading initiatives in the information sector.

During the time in DIA, the loss of independence and authority of the National Librarian within the DIA structures has been an unintended casualty of the merger. There is ample evidence that the voice of the National Librarian has been curtailed under this arrangement.
2. Chief Archivist

Many of the issues raised above for the National Librarian are also relevant to the Chief Archivist in relation to the formal independence and authority act; however, there appears to be one significant difference between these two roles. To some extent the Chief Archivist’s role is better understood by government agencies and so the authority is unchallenged and the independence is clear. That said, as a 3rd tier manager within a government department the Chief Archivist’s role has appeared to be devalued and the apparent authority and independence diminished.

**Question 3**

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

As separate government departments both the NLNZ and ANZ were well functioning, trusted, agile, innovative, and respected institutions providing a professional voice directly to the Government. The NLNZ and ANZ Acts are relatively new and are regarded as progressive legislation both in NZ and internationally so they don’t need major revision. The role of the National Librarian and Chief Archivist are clearly described in each Act.

In the past, neither organisation has flourished within a parent government department. The NLNZ operated within the Department of Education in its early history and within DIA more recently.

**While it is tempting to suggest reverting to the pre 2011 merger by re-establishing NLNZ and ANZ as separate government departments** NALI now has a unique opportunity to take a more progressive approach to repositioning these three national institutions in a way that will benefit all New Zealanders and position these organisations to play a proactive role internationally.

Any new arrangements will need to leverage the shared expertise of each entity while respecting and protecting the unique contribution of each. It needs to be acknowledge that while the NLNZ and ANZ have the capability and history to adapt to new structural changes relatively easily, the move for Nga Taonga Sound and Vision will be more challenging and will need to be sensitively handled both for the organisation and its stakeholders. An incremental approach may be advisable and additional capability building and appropriate funding will be needed.
Structural Options

There are several structural options presented to NALI for consideration.

Option 1
Status quo (not supported)

Evidence suggests that both ANZ and NLNZ have struggled to be effective within DIA, and the expected benefits of this merger have not been delivered. Importantly, sector trust had been eroded.

Option 2
Departmental Agency within a host department (not supported)

The Departmental Agency model described in the SSC Machinery of Government supplementary advice is not a favoured option. The disadvantages of being controlled by a host Department remain. There are few, if any, advantages over Option 1, with greater independence likely to be a perception rather than a reality. Because the NLNZ is a broad church in terms of its reach and interests, there is no one government department that is a natural host. The Ministries of Education, MBIE (science and digital strategy), Culture and Heritage, and the research sector generally (Universities and CRIs) are where the natural synergies for NLNZ lie. It is problematic to shoehorn the NLNZ into any one ministry as that would compromise the broad range of relationships a National Library needs to have.

Option 3
ANZ/NLNZ/NTSAV as separate or joined up Crown entity/entities (partially supported)

This option does have some merit and, if it was progressed, this submission favours one Crown entity bringing together ANZ/NLNZ/NTSAV as one entity.

The advantage of establishing a crown entity would mean the independence of each agency would be enhanced and the four national GLAMS (Galleries Archives Libraries Museums Sectors) institutions including Te Papa could be structured to work together more closely under a single agency, presumably the Ministry of Culture and Heritage.

However there are clear disadvantages for ANZ and the NLNZ in becoming a Crown entity

- It is less than optimal for the National Librarian and Chief Archivist to be in a Crown entity. In particular it could be seen to undermine the independence and authority of the Chief Archivist and National Librarian. If this option were preferred the Chief
Archivist position would need to be made an Officer of Parliament and the National Librarian would need to lead the new entity.

- Evidence suggests that neither ANZ nor the NLNZ have succeeded as organisations under a larger parent organisation. While a Crown entity has greater independence with a Board there are some downsides including the lack of; a separate uncontested vote, specialist policy advice, professional leadership, and reporting directly to a Minister. These are all potentially compromised and filtered through the parent Ministry under the Crown entity model.

Option 4

New government department established bringing together NLNZ/ANZ/NTSAV as one national institution. Libraries Archives Film Aotearoa (LAFA)

Some of the advantages and synergies of establishing LAFA are more fully described in question 4 and 5; the more immediate advantages being:

- Direct professional advice to Minister restored
- Vote LAFA assured
- Specialist policy advice to central and local government, sectors and communities assured
- Across government agency collaboration and policy development strengthened
- Independence and authority of the National Librarian and Chief Archivist assured
- New Zealanders have seamless access to information important to all aspects of their lives
- Specialist technical capacity and capability restored
- Significant potential to share capability and professional expertise across the 3 agencies
- Improved researcher and public experience through joined up front of house services.

There are some possible disadvantages of establishing LAFA

- Perception that an increase in government departments is undesirable and that LAFA is not a good fit as a government department
- Perception that there will be tension between the respective roles of the Chief Archivist and National Librarian within LAFA.
- Perception that it will be more expensive to locate and fund LAFA as one entity.
Question 4

What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to work together?

While it is true that librarians and archivist will argue strenuously about the differences between the two professional perspectives, an objective view suggests that professional similarities outweigh these differences. The connective power of the digital age has further diminished these perceived professional boundaries. If LAFA is the favoured option it will be important to both maximise the area where collaboration and shared expertise makes sense while still maintaining and respecting the unique professional perspective each of the 3 organisations will bring. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the move for NTSAV is gradual and respectful and that it is not dominated by NLNZ and ANZ.

Potential Collaborations

- Shared storage and building on the existing NLNZ site extending into the vacated area where the Ministry of Defence was located
- Leveraging the expertise of curators, conservators, exhibitions and front of house services etc.
- Maximising interoperability of systems connecting the online experience so there is a one stop search for the public
- Shared policy capability
- Leveraging the government investment (Estimated NZ $38M since 2003) in digital preservation so that NZ’s digital output (including records, web, sound and vision) is accessible forever. www.digitalpreservation.natlib.govt.nz
- Improved access to NZ digital content by leveraging the existing capability of Digital NZ (currently access to over 30Mill unique NZ objects) www.digitalnz.org
- Shared administration systems: finance, human resources, staff development etc.

Question 5

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

Scenario

In 2048 every New Zealander is connected to information important to all aspects of their lives through a powerful knowledge network powered by LAFA. Through the network there is open access to all New Zealand’s publically funded intellectual output including research outputs and everything ever published in NZ. All the taonga held in LAFA and the wider GLAMS has been digitised and is now online. All new Zealanders have uninhibited access to the information they seek.
**Digital NZ** is the online access connector of all NZ content including central and local government, GLAMS, education, health, science and research sectors. Wherever content has been publically funded it is expected that it be publically accessible for reuse and repurposing for the creation of new knowledge and ideas. There is a “pay once use many times” philosophy for publicly funded content and this means that government is getting real value from their investment.

Importantly New Zealand has become the first country in the world to ensure that NZ digital content is accessible forever. Government investment in digital preservation from 2005 has been built on and LAFA is now delivering digital preservation services to all central and local government agencies across NZ.

It was a good move in 2018 to establish Libraries Archives Film Aotearoa (LAFA) and to extend the physical footprint of these organisations. All services are now joined up so from a researchers perspective there is a one stop shop that is defined by need rather than institutional boundaries. LAFA has become the democratic heart of the nation. Located near parliament, as part of the civics curriculum, all NZ school children visit LAFA and connect with the founding documents of the nation and celebrate our vibrant democracy.

The libraries and archives and museums of NZ (GLAMS) are now all connected with each other by LAFA through the knowledge network. The Public Libraries Act passed in 2022 has ensured there is a public library in every town in NZ and each New Zealander has access to the one card system which means they can access information from any part of NZ or other parts of the world.

In 2048 NZ kids have again topped the world in all literacy and reading assessments. NZ schools and the libraries of NZ have continued to collaborate to ensure that libraries, literacy and learning remain a potent cocktail for future success in the lives of all young New Zealanders.

The scenario for 2048 assumes the following:

- NLNZ/ANZ/NTSAV will be brought together a one institution leveraging the shared capability across these institutions
- The footprint of the existing NLNZ will be expanded on the Aitken street site to house ANZ and NTSAV
- Government investment in the digital preservation capability in NLNZ and ANZ will expand to include digital preservation services to all publically funded institutions in NZ
- An all-of-country Knowledge Network will be developed, leveraging the capability of DigitalNZ
- Civics education will be added to the school curriculum
- Literacy and reading programmes will be given priority in the school curriculum
- There will be a national digitisation programme funded through central government
- NZ-Goal and Creative Commons Aotearoa will continue to be supported and funded
Collaborative projects across the libraries of NZ are expanded and funded e.g. Peoples Network Kaharoa [www.aotearoapeoplesnetwork.org](http://www.aotearoapeoplesnetwork.org), Kotui [www.kotui.org.nz](http://www.kotui.org.nz), EPIC (Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration) [www.epic.org.nz](http://www.epic.org.nz), WorldCat [www.worldcat.org](http://www.worldcat.org) and Te Puna [www.natlib.govt.nz](http://www.natlib.govt.nz) will continue to be funded and other collaborations developed.

Penny Carnaby
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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 Nga Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?)

(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?)
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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?) I will restrict my comments to the National Library of NZ. I believe it is essential to reinstate the National Library in its own right. It sits at a very important intersection of the information and digital ecosystem and should not be fitted within another area of government. It needs to be autonomous unit within government to work on projects across government, the sector and internationally and ensure it delivers on its purposes under the Act. This will ensure the policy and leadership roles are acknowledged and visible, address the commitment to Matauranga Maori, bring together collections across Archives, National Library and Nga Taonga and strengthen the role of LIAC.

The role, in terms of the National Library Act, would be summarised as supporting and furthering the work of other libraries, collaborating with other institutions and organisations nationally and internationally and collecting, preserving and protecting Taonga and its accessibility.

(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 opportunities for the three areas to proactively foster...
collaboration, avoid duplication, partner and encourage thought leadership. Also to be a catalyst in digital innovation. There could be one approach to digital preservation for the three institutions encompassing the collection, preservation and protection of Taonga and ensuring its accessibility. This would ensure that NZ's documentary heritage in all formats is collected and held in perpetuity for NZ. It would require appropriate funding and resources.
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(5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?) New Zealanders need freedom of access to information to enable digital citizenship. There needs to be a tiered approach to information - trusted advice, no barriers and culturally appropriate access.

The public and the sector require the institutions to have stability and not be political footballs, exhibit strong leadership and provide workable guidance so that people can have faith that mandates can be fulfilled and the agencies lead work to enable public access.

The public needs to see the National Library being able to champion literacies and lifelong learning and connecting the one knowledge network of New Zealand. It will be important to ensure that Matauranga Maori and Tikanga continue to be embedded in all that it does.

(6. Any other comments?) I believe that this investigation process should not have been led by DIA. The CEO will have a vested interest in retaining the Archives and the National Library in the DIA. Independent advice and leadership should have been sought.
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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 Nga Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?)

1. The collecting of digital information and records of permanent archival value.

2. Preserving and making digital information, records and audio-visual media of archival value available for future use.

(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. The Chief Archivist and National Librarian should be chief executives of independent government departments, not subsumed within the Department of Internal Affairs. Moving Archives New Zealand and the National Library into the Department of Internal Affairs was, in my view, a mistake and they have lost their authority and stature as a result of this.

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

For both institutions to be restored to independent government department status, as they originally were. It has been suggested that the Chief Archivist could be an officer of parliament, but I do not think this would be appropriate. As keeper of the Government’s records, Archives New Zealand naturally sits in the executive branch rather than the legislative.
(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? ) These institutions should concentrate on their own areas of jurisdiction and expertise: Archives New Zealand on the collection and preservation of primary government information and records only; the National Library on published books and information only; and Nga Taonga Sound and Vision on audio-visual media only.

Page 3 of 4

(5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?) The collection, preservation and access to key digital information and records of archival value. This needs to be carefully appraised at the point of its collection to ensure that the vast amount of digital rubbish is identified and disposed of quickly.

(6. Any other comments?) Archives New Zealand should be re-named the National Archives of New Zealand or "NANZ".

The Alexander Turnbull Library should be disentangled from the National Library and become a stand-alone national research library, as Alexander Turnbull himself originally intended it to be when he gifted his collections to the nation.

Nga Toanga Sound and Vision should become the official national repository for all audio-visual media.

The Public Records Act 2005 (PRA) is now 13 years old and needs to be updated.

Audit compliance with the Public Records Act and the Information and Records Management Standard 2016 (IRMS) should be part of Audit New Zealand’s responsibility. It audits the finances of public offices annually, so why not get it to also audit PRA and IRMS compliance as well? This would carry more weight and public offices might take more notice of Audit New Zealand than Archives New Zealand trying to do this. The fines for non-compliance with the PRA and IRMS should also be significantly increased. A $100,000 fine would make chief executives take notice!
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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 Nga Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?

ANZ is not resourced to effectively influence how government agencies manage digital information, which means that agencies are largely finding their own solutions to problems - or, at worst, are not even aware that they have problems. If nothing changes, this will undermine the ability of New Zealand to preserve documentary heritage of government practices and decision-making, as the diversity and complexity of solutions increases. Information will be lost or inaccessible. Additionally, information that agencies wish to transfer to ANZ may be both technically diverse and also structured in very different filing systems. Both could create barriers to access.

ANZ needs demonstrable expertise in how to solve current problems organisations have with managing digital information and to comment on what the future will bring. This is not necessarily about being more prescriptive or applying tighter standards, but about being able to speak with authority and in plain terms about real life examples of good and bad practice.

ANZ needs to be seen as a desirable place to work, where real change can happen. I’m an information management professional and in my opinion the general perception is that ANZ is poorly resourced and mired in the wider bureaucracy of DIA. Senior IM professionals have said to me they would not apply for jobs at ANZ because it would be too great a pay cut.

I’m unclear whether budget and resourcing is in scope of this Group’s TOR, but it needs to be addressed or ANZ to face the external challenges it faces.

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 Chief Archivist does not have the independence or authority necessary to be effective.

The single greatest opportunity for influence on system design to embed good information management practice is to influence the messages from the GCDO that shape ICT services and their design across government. However, currently the GCDO (as DIA CE) is the Chief Archivist’s manager - and not even directly, there is another management layer between them - which I think makes the position no stronger than an advisor. I don’t think that is a strong enough position of influence.

An effective cross-government system of information management must consider access to information and specific needs related to personal information, which requires close links with the Ombudsman and the Privacy Commissioner. It would make sense to me for the Chief Archivist’s position to be an officer of parliament, like those others, in order to be on equal footing with them and to hopefully give the position both greater independence and authority.

I don’t have a clear view on the National Librarian’s position.
3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?

I would separate ANZ and NLNZ from each other and from DIA. As an information management practitioner and consultant, I have seen and heard no clear benefits from the current arrangement (including no administrative efficiencies - there are many stories of being unable to update websites, maintain specialist tools, etc. without additional bureaucracy).

ANZ and NLNZ face very different future challenges, as described in following answers.

There was a 2016 cabinet paper from the Minister of Internal Affairs that endorsed the use of off-shore cloud solutions for office productivity and asked all agencies to basically demonstrate how they would move to doing this. The paper talks a lot about security assessments and similar, but shows absolutely no consideration for wider information management issues. ANZ was already a part of DIA at this point and yet clearly had no position of influence on one of the most significant decisions in recent years regarding information management practices. I'd hoped that might be a benefit of being in DIA along with the then GCIO, but it's clearly not.

I would explore separating off the regulatory functions of ANZ from the collection management and research functions. I would be looking at it as a means of increasing the focus for both areas, which carry out very different activities and therefore require very different skills and resources. As it stands, I get the impression they compete for resources, despite being fairly distinct on the day to day. The activities of the former would still strongly affect the latter's ability to collect new digital information, so this relationship would need to be worked through. Other jurisdictions, e.g. the UK, have this split.

The key points at which information management practice can be influenced is during (government or ICT) system change, so there needs to be a better way for information management expertise to be actively engaged at those times. The regulatory function could be somehow more closely connected to the GCDO, GCPO, etc. but it would be important to establish equal footing. There may be other ways to achieve this without splitting off ANZ's regulatory functions.

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 think the opportunities for working more effectively together are largely limited to technical digital preservation conversations about storage media and individual files, e.g. how to maintain access to information on out-of-date physical media or in out-of-date file formats.

NZ's needs for collecting and providing access differ greatly from NLNZ and NTSV. Broadly, ANZ collects records of government activities in any form, the other two collect published objects.

Providing access to government records in their context is very different to providing catalogue information about a publication. A transfer will involve many files, which often need to be presented together and ANZ needs to collect a database of information about those files as well. This is so that the public can access the records with as much of their original context as possible. Every agency has different file systems, ways of describing their records, and IT systems, which need to be somehow ameliorated by ANZ without losing anything of the context. Individual files will almost never make sense on their own (unlike publications), so relationships between files need to be clear, agency file systems need to be maintained, and how to do this needs to be determined for every agency and every system. At another level again, ANZ has historically maintained descriptions of government changes, including the succession of different departments and ministeries, and this needs to be maintained and ideally presented to the public when they access the records.

The range of file format challenges will differ too. All three institutions will collect many digital documents. But, increasingly, records of individuals' and groups' rights and entitlements are in databases, e.g. births, deaths, marriages, land, tax and benefits. ANZ will collect some of this data and must find how to provide access to it. Beyond the data that documents outcomes, ANZ may need to collect evidence of how government systems calculate eligibility for services or identify populations at risk, such as using the IOI. As machine learning increases, this may introduce new challenges to ANZ's collection policies and approaches that NLNZ and NTSV will not face to the same extent.
Mostly thinking of government archives, I think the public needs confidence that high value public records are well-maintained and accessible as appropriate, so that the machinery of government is transparent, so lessons can be learnt from social policy changes and approaches, and so that key cultural events and issues are documented. For ANZ, these considerations apply to information in its own collections, but equally to its regulatory role across public offices including local government archives.

In the case of information about individuals held by the state, the public needs assurance that the rights of individuals related information about themselves are upheld, and that access is handled appropriately and with sensitivity. For NLTN and NTSV, these considerations only have limited application to their collections, as in most cases it is clear cut that a publication is by its nature already public. For ANZ there is significant complexity in this area for different types of archives in the collections, not to mention their regulatory role in encouraging good practices across public offices. For example, ANZ may hold adoption records, records of people who have been in state care, records of military personnel, and records of individual testimonies to Commissions of Inquiry, all of which have different access considerations and points of sensitivity.

As information becomes increasingly digital, the public needs confidence that the diversity and inter-connectedness of this information is not a barrier to access. The convenience and apparent value of money online services must be balanced with an assurance that using such services doesn’t revent a barrier to public data being handled well and retained for as long as it is needed. This could apply to government use of social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc), public cloud document or data storage (e.g. Microsoft, Google, Amazon Web Services), survey tools for public consultation (e.g. SurveyMonkey), or commercial geospatial and mapping tools (e.g. Google Maps), etc.

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

6. Any other comments?
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Proactively released by the Department of Internal Affairs
INTRODUCTION

The focus of this submission is the NZ Film Archive – Nga Taonga Sound and Vision. It details my personal views regarding the way the Archive operates, its deficiencies and my suggestions for correcting these deficiencies. Considerable funding support will be necessary to implement my suggestions. Throughout for reasons of brevity I refer to Nga Taonga – Sound and Vision as the Film Archive.

For over fifty years I have been professionally involved in the Film Industry. I’ve had a significant involvement in the development of the technical infrastructure of the early independent film industry and was actively involved in both management and creative roles. During recent years I have been involved in a number of restoration/digitisation projects including initiating and producing of the significant restoration project ‘UTU Redux’. As a result I have had extensive involvement with the Film Archive.

THE ARCHIVE BACKGROUND

In 1981 the New Zealand Film Archive Charitable Trust was created. The stimulus behind the formation of the trust was recognition that New Zealand’s early heritage films were rapidly degenerating and ongoing preservation would be required for these and the new films being created by the increasingly active independent filmmaking sector. Previous to the formation of the Film Archive film-making organisations, whether under state or private ownership, had minimal obligation to preserve the film material they produced.

The new Film Archive actively encouraged filmmakers to lodge their completed film material and undertook to take care of this material long-term while the filmmaker retained ownership and access rights. This arrangement was enthusiastically embraced by filmmakers. However, over the years as the Film Archive has grown, filmmakers have become increasingly isolated. Their input into the aims and development of the Film Archive has disappeared and as a result recognition of their requirements has diminished. Filmmakers have become increasingly frustrated dealing with the Film Archive when discussing preservation priorities and the difficulty involved in accessing their film material.

Those of us who have an active involvement with the Film Archive, view with deep concern the current lack of consultation and the disengagement of filmmakers. This concern is not a directed at the staff or the daily running of the organisation. Since the review undertaken in 2009 the preservation and restoration functions of the Archive have been carried out to a high standard. The frustrations and concerns filmmakers have go to the very heart of the Film Archive mandate: namely how it perceives its responsibilities and its relationship with filmmakers and their films.
RESPONSIBILITIES AND RELATIONSHIP WITH FILMMAKERS

Filmmaker Representation

The current Board of Trustees members have no specific experience as independent filmmakers. The current board’s experience is in diplomacy, public service, arts administration, law, business, media and television. This experience is all very valuable however without significant input from working filmmakers on the board, it is understandable that filmmaker requirements have been neglected.

Filmmakers Stake In The Collection

Archive personnel seem to lack the understanding that the Film Archive collection, in the main, belongs to and is an important ongoing creative resource of professional filmmakers. This is our collection and we want to be closely involved in the way it is managed and have practical access to it.

Change in Digitisation Priorities

When the Film Archive was first formed its initial restoration responsibilities focused specifically on restoring the oldest and most at risk film material. There was little need for filmmaker involvement in this activity. The rapid change-over to digital production and exhibition significantly increased the scope of the Film Archives restoration responsibilities. Now, all the material made on film since the 1960’s (an active and significant period in New Zealand historically), would also require digitising in order to make it accessible. Unfortunately the Archive management have been slow to respond to this change.

Easier Access to Film Material and Information

This change is significant as filmmakers have a requirement to access their material. They want to use it as a production resource for their filmmaking endeavours and they also wish to be involved in the process of helping digitise their own material. The Film Archive has never seemed to quite understand or respond to this change and has neglected the opportunity to work in a closer partnership with filmmakers. Such a partnership would widened the understanding of the importance of the collection as more than simply a preservation facility but also as an extremely valuable creative resource for filmmakers.

Urgency To Digitise 1960-2000 Film Material

Re-engaging film-makers with the Film Archive and their material is not only crucially important: it is urgent. The Film Archive collection is a living collection. It is a work in progress. There is a huge amount of ongoing work to be done. At the beginning the very early films were an obvious priority, however the urgency now is the films from 1960’s to 2000. The major technical change has made all films from this era impossible to view on modern media unless they are digitised. This must be done in the lifetime of the filmmakers who made these films.
Filmmakers Involvement Digitising Their Films

The involvement of filmmakers in the digitisation/restoration of their own films is particularly desirable. The filmmakers are the ones who have the original technical and creative knowledge relevant to their film. This is crucial with regard to the colour grading of the film for which the Director of Photography or Director should oversee.

Production Company Collections

The Film Archive holds a significant body of material in ‘Production Company Collections’. This often includes unfinished films which may contain screen material of significant historical value. Locating and understanding this material is best done by the filmmakers who created this material. The largest of these ‘Production Company Collections’ is that of John O’Shea’s Pacific Film Productions. I worked at Pacific Films for 3 years in the late 1960’s. I am the only staff member remaining who worked at Pacific throughout that period. I have considerable knowledge of the finished and the unfinished film material from that period as I either photographed or directed it. The importance of filmmaker involvement in restoration initiatives is shown by the following;

Recently I located overseas some extremely valuable film of our worst modern maritime disaster the Wahine Sinking and the Storm. This film had not been seen before in NZ and comprised 6 cans of unseen 35mm and the Movietone Newsreel created from it shown only once in NZ fifty years ago. The return of this valuable film was the result of my memory as cameraman and my enquiries establishing that this film was not in the Pacific Films Collection. Until then the existence of this film, was unknown. My knowledge of its existence has enabled its repatriation to New Zealand.

THE SOLUTIONS TOWARD CREATING A VIBRANT FILM ARCHIVE

I consider it crucial that filmmakers become more involved in the decision making and restoration activities of the Film Archive. This will require the willingness of current management to fully engage with professional filmmakers, understand requirements, involve them in decision making, and give them better access to the collection.

The recent NZIFF screening of Heperi Mita’s film ‘Merata : How Mum Decolonised the Screen’ was a triumph of filmmaking using filmmaker material sourced from the Film Archive Collection. Heperi is a Film Archivist who has worked and is well known within the Archive. His film indicates what is possible if other filmmakers from outside the organisation were to be given the incentive and welcomed into the Archive as he was, so that they too could undertake similar extremely worthwhile archival projects.

The promotion of a close and positive relationship between the Film Archive and filmmakers will enable the organisation to develop as a vibrant educational and creative filmmaking resource for all filmmakers. I consider the following initiatives will go a long way towards doing this.
1. **Filmmaker Board Representation.**

Having robust filmmaker representation on the Film Archive Board is important. This will enable appropriate filmmaker representation and requirements to be satisfied. Ongoing filmmaker collaboration is important for the development of the Film Archive as an efficient, evolving and vibrant resource for the Film Industry.

2. **Filmmaker Access Person and Facilities & Funding.**

The main frustration filmmakers have regarding access to their material is that there is currently no single contact person to engage with who will follow through on the filmmakers requirements. Having in place a specific contact person who understands both filmmaker and archival considerations would be a great leap forward. It would be necessary for this person to be a knowledgeable and dedicated filmmaker advocate who could make things happen.

Filmmaker access to the material would be further eased if there was a dedicated viewing/working/editing area with appropriate facilities, film & digital, within the Archive for the exclusive use of filmmakers. Such a facility would be a huge help for filmmakers accessing their material or engaged in production or research projects.

3. **Restoration Priority Review & Funding.**

Filmmakers have frustration and concern regarding the way the digitisation/restoration projects are allocated priority. It is true that funding and resource limitations put tremendous pressure on this important area of the Archive’s operations but current policy ignores the desire of senior filmmakers to have restoration work done on their films. It is extremely important that increased funding is made available and this policy is reviewed to enable the restoration of the pre-digital (1960-2000) films while the filmmakers involved in those films are still alive.

4. **Filmmaker Initiated Restoration & Funding.**

The current prioritisation policy is a massive disincentive for filmmakers who wish to initiate the restoration of their own material. It forces them to fund this activity themselves using expensive independent industry facilities. Not using this valuable and willing filmmaker resource is a huge waste and a lost opportunity. It would be better to give filmmakers strong motivation to initiate the digitisation of their own material. This could be done with three initiatives.

(a) Increase the capacity of The Archives digitisation technology by operating the digitisation facility on a 24 hour basis thereby increasing capacity and enabling support for filmmakers undertaking their own restoration.

(b) Provide direct funding to filmmakers who undertake their own restoration using independent facilities.
(c) Reimburse filmmakers on completion of approved self-funded digitisation projects for material held in the Collection.

These initiatives would stimulate filmmaker involvement in restoration and take pressure off existing archive resources.

5. Production and Research Scholarship & Funding.

The formation of a Production and Research Scholarship would stimulate imaginative and worthwhile projects and demonstrate that the Film Archive was much more than a storage and restoration organisation: it was a vibrant and creative resource for all filmmakers.

It would also create a mutually beneficial partnership between the Film Archive and filmmakers.

Entertaining and informative productions stimulated by the scholarship would open a window into the country’s vibrant history for all New Zealanders via the Film Archive collection.

6. Filmmaker Audio Archive & Funding.

An important aspect of any archive is to have good records regarding the background information of each item. The filmmakers who have knowledge of the film items are able to provide this for the Film Archive. The information they can give would be a valuable restoration resource. Gathering such information using an audio archive approach would be a relatively quick and cost effective way to gather a useful volume of information for this purpose.

The six initiatives along with adequate funding that I have documented above are by no means all, or the only ways to stimulate the unrealised potential of the Film Archive. I consider however, that the implementation of these initiatives would promote more productive collaboration between the Film Archive and filmmakers and enable the organisation to develop as a vibrant educational and creative resource for filmmakers and all New Zealanders.

Graeme Cowley
15/8/18

--------
PERSONAL CREDENTIALS
Graeme Cowley

I have been professionally involved in the Film Industry in senior, administrative, creative and technical roles for 50 years. I had a significant involvement in the development of the technical and communication infrastructure of the independent film industry in the years 1975-95.

I funded and imported the first film equipment to be made freely available to the independent industry via the company Film Facilities Ltd. I initiated with Sue May the industry’s first independent film magazine which became the respected voice of the developing industry for over 15 years. I developed the ‘Production Village’ centres in Wellington and Auckland, providing, production offices, studios, recording studios, editing rooms and screening facilities as well as onsite camera equipment facilities. By 1995 there was a skilled staff of fifty based in the Auckland and Wellington Production Villages servicing a broad spectrum of production requirements.

During this early period of the industry’s development I was also involved in a number of creative production roles on iconic NZ productions including, ‘Goodbye Pork Pie’ (Camera and Investor), ‘Smash Palace’ (Director of Photography) ‘UTU’ (Director of Photography) and ‘Carry Me Back’ (Producer, director of Photography).

More recently I was involved in the Restoration Digitization and Archiving of a number of early films. In particular I initiated, funded and produced the complex reconstruction and restoration of the film UTU. This was a film for which the original had been disassembled and destroyed in a re-edit then for the following 30 years was totally neglected and forgotten by the NZ Film Commission and the Film Archive.

Shocked, when I learned of its condition, I initiated and undertook its restoration. I consider it is true to say, that my vocal criticism of the neglect and also the success of the restored film, ‘UTU Redux’ awakened Government organisations to the urgency of restoring digitally the feature films made prior to the change to digital production.

My film restoration activities have necessitated working closely with a variety of organisations involved in archival activities. I have gained a clear understanding of the requirements for this work and the value of having a quality documented film archival collection.

Graeme Cowley
August 2018
Phone: §9(2)(a)
Email: §9(2)(a)
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Question 1:

1. Managing transformation to collecting and storing collections digitally in a way that ensures long term access to digital materials.

2. Working together in a way that enables each organization to fulfill its purpose (or a modified purpose from updated legislation) and work with its community, while collaborating on issues such as digital preservation.

3. Finding organisational structures appropriate to the enduring and heritage nature of these institutions that build strong relationships with stakeholders to ensure adequate funding and attract collections while giving them sufficient professional independence.

Question 2:

Structure of Archives NZ and National Library

Neither of these institutions are well served by their current positioning within Department of Internal Affairs. Neither the Chief Archivist nor the National Librarian have sufficient independence or professional autonomy to carry out their responsibilities. The safeguards that were promised around transparency of budget have not materialized and it seems likely that both organisations have reduced budgets compared to when they were separate institutions. Putting them within the Department of Internal Affairs, which is a largely administrative collection of services which don't have a strong connecting thread has reduced the status and standing of these important institutions of memory and materially affected their ability to carry out their responsibilities. The argument for placing them within a grouping of Culture and Heritage institutions is much stronger and would support their purpose more strongly.
Archives NZ

The legislative mandate of the Public Records Act provides for the Chief Archivist to develop and support government recordkeeping, and to enhance public confidence in the integrity of public records and local authority records. The requirement to develop and support recordkeeping is best served by an agency working collaboratively across the wider state sector encouraging good recordkeeping by building the case for the value of recordkeeping and its contribution to transparency and accountability and helping at a practical level by establishing standards, good practice documentation and providing training.

Archives NZ also has a legislative responsibility to enable the Government to be held accountable by ensuring that full and accurate records of the affairs of central and local government are created and maintained. It is a challenge for Archives NZ to balance this requirement against the helpful, collaborative partnerships with state sector agencies that will improve good recordkeeping across the State Sector. In my experience, the state sector agencies who do not maintain good enough records to enable accountability of their organisations for their decision making and actions are prioritizing other activities and functions and do not allocate sufficient resource to recordkeeping to meet an acceptable standard of transparency. Agencies may not see a connections between recordkeeping and information management and transparency. While good recordkeeping does not guarantee that an agency will be transparent and accountable, it is not common to find an agency which is transparent and accountable that does not have good recordkeeping and information management practices.

One of the options under consideration for Archives NZ is to make the Chief Archivist an Officer of Parliament. Based upon 12 years of working as Parliamentary Librarian and Group Manager, Information and Knowledge in the NZ Parliament followed by 5 years of international consulting on information management, library and research issues in developing parliaments I do not support this option. The NZ Parliament has 3 Officers of Parliament. The Chief Ombudsman and the Auditor-General are successful Officers of Parliament because they support Parliament’s work. The Auditor-General provides staff to work with Select Committees to provide financial analysis and guidance in the important work of reviewing budgets and expenditure of state agencies. The Chief Ombudsman provides critical support to the functioning of the Official Information Act, and reviewing and making recommendations to ensure that government agencies share information with the public and provide adequate answers to information requests. In particular the role that the Office of the Ombudsmen plays in reviewing the way government agencies respond to information requests has potential for duplication if the Chief Archivist were to become an Officer of Parliament.
MPs have an important role to play in holding the government to account and they constantly seek information to enable them to do so. Almost all of the information they require is current information, rather than archival. In my career as an information manager, while managing archives has much greater professional status, managing records is more useful to institutions because there are many more issues that are focused on recent decision making than historic decisions. I would like to see the name of the institution and the role title of the leader of the institution changed to match the change of the enabling legislation to the Public Records Act to reflect a focus on recordkeeping and information management. This would improve the ability of Archives NZ to deliver on its key statutory purposes.

Organisational structure for the National Librarian

There are not such complex issues to consider for the role of the National Librarian. From within DIA at third tier, the role does not have sufficient professional autonomy and independence to collaborate with other libraries both in NZ and internationally to achieve its purpose. Significant gains were made, particularly since the National Library Act (Te Puna Matauranga o Aotearoa) 2003 was passed in digital preservation and in collaborative initiatives with all NZ libraries, the research community and international relationships which have significantly slowed or stopped since the National Library has been constrained within DIA. The current organisational structure does not allow the National Library to create the relationships or build status and standing with its stakeholders and community that are necessary to support its collection building work and collaborative initiatives because of the constraints of being within DIA.

Question 3:

I strongly support a change in the organisational structure of the National Library and Archives NZ so that they are no longer within DIA. However, there is merit in an organisational structure that strongly encourages the three institutions (NL, ANZ and Nga Taonga Sound and Vision) to work together on big issues such as digital preservation along with other institutions of memory.

National Library

I suggest that the National Library would be better placed within the oversight and coordination of a ministry such as the Ministry of Culture and Heritage with a high degree of professional independence, and oversight and evaluation of its professional programmes by a specialist Board, with either significant representation of Maori or a parallel influential Maori body.
The role of the National Library is appropriately articulated in the National Library of New Zealand (Te Puna Matauranga o Aotearoa) Act 2003. It is the structure which needs changing. Ideally, the organisational structure of the National Library should give it a high degree of professional independence. It is an enduring heritage institution, which needs a security of funding and programmes over the long term. Unusually for a government department it has the capacity of attracting funding and of attracting donations of significant collections which build the asset base. While the National Library Foundation has been created within the DIA structure, the profile of the National Library is so constrained within the DIA environment that the Foundation will be fettered in a crowded field of organisations seeking funding and promotional opportunities. Almost as significant is the National Library's ability to attract significant donations of materials, rather than having to purchase them. Again, the profile of the institution is vital in its success in this area. The third area for consideration in building the collection in a manner consistent with its status as documentary heritage and taonga is to ensure that the National Library builds trusting relationships with Maori that enable it to be viewed as an appropriate kaitiaki for Maori materials.

More effective governance and advisory bodies than the current arrangements would assist the National Library in its overall positioning and influence within the Research and GLAMs sector both within NZ and internationally. The current bodies are unusual in being advisory to the Minister rather than to the Chief Executive.

Archives NZ

I suggest that Archives NZ would also benefit from being placed within the oversight and co-ordination of a ministry such as the Ministry of Culture and Heritage with a high degree of professional independence and oversight and evaluation of its professional programmes by a specialist Board with significant input from Maori.

I recommend that there should be further consideration of the role of Archives NZ and whether the focus on current recordkeeping and information management should be further strengthened to support the focus of the Public Records Act. Consideration of how to build ongoing collaboration with open government and with information management programmes as well as recordkeeping programmes would be worthwhile.

Question 4:

The area of digital preservation is the big area where there are opportunities to work together more effectively. In my view, the organisations should maintain their identities, and their collections but use the same digital infrastructure and share the work on digital preservation.
While there is much more that could be achieved to improve access to digital resources for New Zealanders, the collaboration needs to be within sectors as well as across the three named institutions. An example of an initiative which would greatly benefit working New Zealanders and therefore contribute to the National Library's mission of supporting New Zealand's economic life would be collaborative purchasing of the resources used in training trades (e.g. NZ Standards) and professions such as nurses so that qualified tradespeople and working nurses would continue to have access to those resources in their working lives.

Question 5:

Easy to use access to relevant, timely materials (preferably digital, but also in print) that are well curated so that they have context. Easy to use access means that New Zealanders will be able to find what they are looking for, and also to find relevant and interesting materials they were unaware existed, without understanding much about the organisations that collect and store our documentary heritage.

The materials, especially digital materials, need to be stored in such a way that they continue to be accessible as the technology used to store and access them changes.

The national archival and library institutions need to support access to current information as well as to historical collections and to underpin and support the effective operation of local GLAMs institutions.
Question 1:
The national library and archive institutions hold the records of the nation. Their health is essential to our existence as an informed democracy. The taonga they hold tells us about ourselves and supports our creativity to develop our national identity.

To function they need adequate resources to:
- Digitise at scale
- Adequately collect born digital material
- Lead a national network of distributed collections with universal access
- Plan and provide appropriate repositories
- Share and promote their services through exhibitions, lectures and programmes
- Share their expertise through outreach programmes to support community efforts

They also need autonomy and visibility to give the status for the necessary interactions internationally, nationally across government and the library and information sector.

Question 2:
The Chief Archivist needs greater independence and authority to fulfil his/her role under the Public Records Act – to have the necessary status to require heads of government departments and CEs of other institutions to comply with the Act. An Officer of Parliament or similar placement would be appropriate.

Neither the Chief Archivist or the National Librarian 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.

Question 3:
Chief Archivist as an Officer of Parliament – with responsibility for ensuring the fulfilment of the Public Records Act and specifying the standards and provision for ongoing storage of and access to national archives.
The archives themselves, all current NLNZ collections and the collections of Nga Taonga Sound and Vision to be the responsibility of NLNZ as a new (revived) department. The collections to be separately identified in the first instance, but being merged and redefined over time as needs change. NTSV might retain a governance board in the short term, with funding channelled through NLNZ, but be more fully merged over time.

There will be sensitivity about the name. National Library of New Zealand should be fine, with “library” understood in its widest sense, but, if this is a stumbling point for institutions and users currently outside the NLNZ, Te Puna Matauranga o Aotearoa could be given prominence, giving a nice complementary status to Te Puna and Te Papa.

This department would have sufficient status and authority to meet the requirements outlined in 2 above. As the primary agency dealing with library and information issues, it would also appropriately have a greater role in government digital services, in rights management legislation, in research support and in education.

To achieve the status, authority and independence required, the National Librarian must be the Chief Executive of the department.

**Question 4:**

Requirements for expertise, technology solutions, storage infrastructure and access provision are very similar, and should sensibly be provided through shared effort. There is far more commonality than difference in the capabilities and activities of the existing agencies, particularly when viewed from a user perspective. It is important that the opportunity of the review is not wasted by being diverted by professionals and supporters overly focussed on the uniqueness of aspects of services.

Note: This cooperation is not to SAVE costs but to make the most effective use of investment of resources, both financial and in capabilities – particularly in specialist areas such as conservation, repository planning and management and specialist IT.

Examples of areas for cooperative effort.

- **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**

  There is a shortage of specialist conservation staff, whose expertise should be shared 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.

These 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, but will be most effective under common management.

**Question 5:**
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.

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.
• 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:
There will be short term costs associated with any restructuring. It is important that the opportunity for significant long term improvement is not lost through unwillingness to meet those costs. New operational models can be put in place over a period of time, but clear commitment needs to be made as a result of this process.

To meet New Zealand’s needs more resources are required. Using this process is not about savings, it is about increased effectiveness – for funders, and more particularly for users
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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 Nga Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?

Each institution must have the ability to do their respective tasks. Each institution must have the mana and independence needed to ensure that all community authorities, central, local, educational institutions (universities) and even NGOs keep and preserve their stories and records.

A common need is for specialised storage space and the ability to preserve. This will cost money; both capital and operating budget.

Each institution should have the independence to lead through standard setting and support, the institutional archives, the libraries in towns and schools and those working with sound and film.

Another priority is for these three institutions to have the trained staff able to carry out their duties.

Urgent priority is the mana and independence that allows them to have direct access to Ministers, to raise their voices in national debate on the relevant issues and to provide leadership.

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?
(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, the Chief Archivist does not have the necessary independence to ensure that the responsibilities set out in the Public Records Act 2005 (sections 11, 12, 20 and 30) are carried through, or is certainly not seen to have them in the current third level position within the Department of Internal Affairs.

I presume that at that third level the Archivist has to bid for money up against passports, and the enormous "alia" managed by Department of Internal Affairs. The Archivist does not have a Minister arguing for Archives New Zealand legislatively or financially. The budget round is carried out at armslength from the Cabinet.

I am not convinced that the Chief Archivist would have the authority to challenge the record-keeping of Treasury or even of the department of Internal Affairs! I presume that the Chief Archivist does not attend the regular heads of Departments meeting (used to be held on Friday mornings.

The independence has to be seen if it is to function effectively.

In terms of the National Librarian, operating at level three within the Department of Internal Affairs does not give him/her the mana or independence to engage in public discussion on the value of libraries or the necessary standards at which they should operate. And as with the Chief Archivist, without direct access to their Minister, they cannot have a voice at the cabinet table. It is contributing to the devaluation of libraries everywhere.

The same would apply if Nga Taong were to become a state institution.
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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?

(3. What changes, if any, would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives New Zealand or the National Library?) The minimum change is to return them both to independent government departments directly answerable to a Minister of the Crown.

But in my lifetime I have seen them seesaw between independent status and third rung of the Department of Internal Affairs, and with regard to the constitutional importance of Archives New Zealand, this is acting against the spirit of the Public Records Act, which I took through the House as the then Minister for Archives New Zealand.

I would support strongly that the Chief Archivist be appointed as an Officer of the New Zealand parliament, just as the Auditor-General.

And The National Library must once again be an independent government department.

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?

(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?) Firstly, whatever we have jointly managed by Archives New Zealand and by the National Library needs also to be shared with Nga Taonga.

Although I want the distinct kaupapa of all three institutions to be recognised and continued, that does not prevent better collaboration especially as concerns digital preservation and access.

I am neither a librarian nor an archivist, but I think there are some different recording/cataloguing methods. While respecting these I think we could share specialist storage, we could share the expertise in preservation and definitely share the lessons learnt in digital access, as in access to all the newspapers of New Zealand in Papers Past.
5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?

(5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?) The public needs to have legitimate questions about past government activity answered. For example, in 1969/1970 the Education Development Conference held a series of professionally facilitated conversations on the direction of education throughout New Zealand. Right now we are doing something similar. I asked where were the findings from the Education Development Conference conversations. Neither in the Ministry of Education nor in Archives New Zealand can this material be found. There are lessons we could learn from re reading what was discussed at that time.

That is what I think the public needs in thirty years time.

It also needs continued access to good libraries. Yes there are ebooks and there are also many more books because of self publication, but the need for a place to gather what has been "printed" does not lessen just because we can search on line. Libraries often serve as forums where people can discuss what has been written, can share knowledge. It is increasingly one of the last institutions to promote such community discussion of ideas. Libraries remain important for the health of communities, and the National Library is the leader of this.

And while we are focussing on books, there are also the sound and film recordings. The Film Festivels bring people together for shared viewing: we need to be able to view our past in the same manner.

In 2048 there are to be no gaps in our preserved documentation of events and decisions in new the last thirty years of New Zealand life.

6. Any other comments?

(6. Any other comments?) To achieve these goals we need professional guidance and leadership from these three institutions.

We obviously need some large initial capital investment.

The public needs to know what is preserved, so there needs to be a programme of promotion and outreach.

And then the access must be made simple and accessible from wherever you are in New Zealand. Progress towards that goal should be reported on each year to Parliament.

To do all this we need a constant core of trained archivists, librarians and audio/visual archivists...therefore there must be training facilities/degrees.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit. I have been so saddened by the steps backward since my time as Minister.

Marian L.Hobbs

(Click here to submit by email to nalifeedback@dia.govt.nz)
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To whom it may concern

Question 1. What are the two or three key challenges facing the three institutions and which is most urgent?

In this era of rapidly changing technology it is a huge challenge to collect material in the wide range of formats available so that it is representative of our society. It is just as big a challenge to ensure that the material will be available for future researchers as formats and technology continue to change.

Increasingly material is in digital formats but hard copy materials also grow at a rapid rate in all these institutions, so storage is a big issue for all of them.

Probably the most urgent issue of all though is the organisation of these bodies. I am an ex National Library staff member, so my comments are from that perspective but I think the issues are much the same at Archives NZ and Nga Taonga. It became more difficult, and less satisfying, working for the Library when it became part of DIA.

Our role within this huge organisation was never clear. It felt as if we had just been put there as an economy measure. Our poor sense of belonging within the department was represented in staff morale, shown to be very bad in successive engagement surveys.

Where once we had IT help within the building now we had to wait till someone was available from Featherston St. I know the IT service has subsequently changed (since I left work), so my comments may not be as valid but it was an awful situation when computers were not working in the reading rooms. You felt that the readers lost faith in the service we offered.

I did not have direct dealings with finance but I can imagine it would have been harder fighting for a share of the cake in a large department, as compared with running your own budget as we did when we were a government department in our own right.

Question 2. Do the Chief Archivist and National Librarian have the independence and authority necessary for their roles?

Again the issue is that they are both 3rd tier managers within DIA so their autonomy and independence is not guaranteed. It is particularly essential for the Chief Archivist to have this independence to ensure good government recordkeeping, a cornerstone of democracy.

Question 3. What changes would you suggest to the role or structure of Archives NZ or the National Library?

To increase their autonomy it would be great if Archives NZ and National Library could be returned to being their own government departments but I recognise that this is probably unlikely.

It would be better not to put them with any other existing government department. Archives NZ and National Library are the two bodies charged with collecting and making available government and non government material documenting our heritage. No other department has this as a brief.
I understand the CASS model in government operates using shared services, specifically for IT, Information Management, Human Resources and Finance. Conservation is another area that could probably work as part of a shared model.

The collections and document delivery need to be kept separately as they are very different collections, accessed through different catalogues/finding aids. We had the experience of delivering both archives and Alexander Turnbull Library material in the same reading room at Archives NZ when we were out of the building, while work was being done, from 2010 to 2012.

This was a good experience in terms of collegiality but confusing for staff and researchers. There was never enough staff resourcing for staff to get up to speed with both collections and researchers did not know if they were talking to a librarian or an archivist.

Question 4. What opportunities exist for the national archival and library institutions to work more effectively together in collecting, preserving and providing access to NZ's documentary heritage, particularly in relation to digital preservation and access?

I have written about the possibility of some shared services in the above question. Relating specifically to digital preservation and access, the National Digital Heritage Archive (NDHA) has been in operation at the National Library for many years and now works with Archives NZ to ensure that all digital material will be available in the future, as well as now.

I am not sure what systems Nga Taonga has for ensuring ongoing access to its digital formats, nor do I know if it would be feasible for it to go in with the NDHA, but I imagine that this is probably an issue that is being looked at.

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

The public needs access to any material, within scope, whatever the format, as required not just for the next 30 years but in perpetuity. The collections also need to continue to grow so there have to be clear policies about what is being collected, and adequate financial and staffing resources to make the work possible.

Question 6. Other comments

I would like to emphasise that staff morale is a very important part of any institution and, as a previous long-term employee of the National Library, I observed this change markedly under DIA. I think we could not see where we belonged in this much larger organisation and our work became more difficult, particularly in terms of IT.

Best wishes with this important exercise. I want my submission to remain anonymous.

Jocelyn Chalmers

s9(2)(a)
One_Key_Challenges> 1. Space and appropriate building meeting requirements including earthquake standards 2. Memory of NZ is collected and preserved for generations to come 3. Born digital collection and ongoing digitization of collections remains flexible and adaptable to ongoing format changes over the years to come, including the cloud etc 4. As well as administering New Zealand’s legal deposit scheme and providing digital access to New Zealand’s cultural heritage, the National Library has a key purpose to supplement and further the work of other libraries in New Zealand It does this by contributing significantly to key initiatives such as taking the lead on delivering internet access to the public through the Aotearoa People’s Network Kaharoa and providing whole of country services such as EPIC, Any Questions and Te Puna. This initiative needs to continue and expand especially in the light of the governments push to all things online.</One_Key_Challenges>

Two_Independence>There is now no separate Annual Report issued by the National Library and it no longer reports separately to a Select Committee. To achieve its goals and work for New Zealander’s it needs to have it’s own CE This is important for the National Library to have this autonomy. It is important 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);
</Two_Independence>

Three_Changes>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; work with Iwi and other partners to combine and bring it all together.</Three_Changes>

Four_Opportunities>Adopt Labours option</Four_Opportunities>

Five_30_Years>Libraries continue to be an important part of New Zealand communities. Working in an unpredictable environment combined with changing expectations of service is a reality facing the library sector across the globe. The rapid pace of technological development means the National Library needs to be more agile to support New Zealand libraries, to continue to innovate and to be a centre of excellence in our field. National Library need to enable New Zealander’s to access knowledge and share it more easily; how to ensure that New Zealander’s have the right skills and literacies to succeed; and how to ensure that National Library preserve the knowledge created for the future. To ensure that all New Zealander’s will have the literacy skills to achieve social, educational and employment success and be inspired to create new knowledge. That there there is easy an sustainable access</Five_30_Years>

Six_Comments>The National Library of New Zealand plays a key role in the preservation of this country’s culture and heritage by collecting New Zealand’s documentary taonga in words, sounds and pictures, by connecting New Zealanders to resources through knowledge networks and helping New Zealanders working together to turn knowledge into value As well as administering New Zealand’s legal deposit scheme and providing digital access to New Zealand’s cultural heritage, the National Library has a key purpose to supplement and further the work of other libraries in New Zealand It does this by contributing significantly to key initiatives such as taking the lead on delivering internet access to the public through the Aotearoa People’s Network Kaharoa and providing whole
of country services such as EPIC, Any Questions and Te Puna. In 2011 the National Library of NZ and Archives NZ were restructured to become a part of the Department of Internal Affairs. In 2012 VOTE National Library was rolled into a single VOTE Internal Affairs which also covers Internal Affairs, Community and Voluntary Sector, Emergency Management, Local Government, Ministerial Services, National Archives, and Racing. There is now no separate Annual Report issued by the National Library and it no longer reports separately to a Select Committee. The Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC) advises the Minister on Library and Information matters including Mātauranga Maori. It is not, however, charged with monitoring the National Library to ensure it meets requirements under the Act. Therefore I support Labours idea and would like to see separate entity for National Library too. 

</Six_Comments>
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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 Nga Taonga Sound and Vision)? What is the most urgent challenge?) Please note that I have been working in the archives and records management field in New Zealand and England for over 25 years now and my response to this question only relates to Archives New Zealand.

In my experience, currently two key challenges for Archives New Zealand are the lack of investment in building and developing internal regulatory resources and capability, and a similar lack of investment in improving internal experience with digital information management.

The most urgent of these challenges is the lack of staff resource and capability to regulate, monitor and enforce compliance with the Public Records Act 2005 (the Act).

Since the introduction of the Act, Archives New Zealand has not built and maintained internal capability to meet its increased regulatory responsibilities, and since completion of the first audit round in 2015, Archives New Zealand no longer has any staff with any audit experience and capability.

(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?) Please note that I have been working in the archives and records management field in New Zealand and England for over 25 years now and my response to this question only relates to the position of the Chief Archivist.

In my experience, I do not consider that the Chief Archivist currently has the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator for the following four reasons:
1. There is a perceived and actual conflict between the Chief Archivist’s advisory and regulatory roles, both internally (within Archives New Zealand as well as the Department of Internal Affairs) and externally (within the New Zealand public sector).

2. The current location of the Chief Archivist and Archives New Zealand within the Department of Internal Affairs has diminished the independence and authority of both the Chief Archivist and Archives New Zealand, and has added to the growing confusion around who is responsible for regulating public sector information management.

3. Although the Public Records Act 2005 appears to give the Chief Archivist this authority, there has been a historic reluctance from both past Chief Archivist’s and Archives New Zealand to fully use and exercise this mandate.

4. Since the introduction of the Public Records Act in 2005, the Chief Archivist and by association, Archives New Zealand, have failed to maintain their role and reputation as a leader in New Zealand public sector information management.
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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?) Please note that I have been working in the archives and records management field in New Zealand and England for over 25 years now and my response to this question only relates to Archives New Zealand.

In my experience, Archives New Zealand was most effective and respected in public sector information management during the period when it was an independent public office. The Chief Archivist was supported by a Statutory Regulatory and Policy teams, and Archives New Zealand was managed by a General Manager. Although this was an internal division, it worked well because the business of creating and maintaining public records is inextricably entwined with the business of managing and preserving public archives.

(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? ) From my limited experience with digital preservation but long experience with accessing public archives, there are huge opportunities for the national library institutions to learn from the national archival institutions, particularly in relation to long-term preservation for accountability, integrity and authenticity, as well as usability and re-usability, for now and for the future.
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(5. What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?) Please note that I have been working in the archives and records management fields in New Zealand and England for over 25 years now, and my response to this question only relates to the national archival institutions.

What the public need from the national archival institutions is trust:

- Trust that the New Zealand public sector is creating and maintaining an accessible "public record" of their activities and decisions;
- Trust that this "public record" has accountability, integrity and authenticity as evidence;
- Trust that this "public record" is, and will remain to be, usable and reusable over time; and
- Trust that this "public record" supports New Zealand democracy.

(6. Any other comments?) I have worked at Archives New Zealand three times (1987 - 1997, 2001 - 2008 and 2014 - current) and in my experience, the Chief Archivist was most effective and respected in the role as a regulator of public sector records and information management during the period when Archives New Zealand was an independent public office.

I love my job, I love what the national archival institution stands for and represents, and I would love it even more if the Chief Archivist and Archives New Zealand were supported in building, exploring and more fully utilising their regulatory experience, capabilities and powers.
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Responses to 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?

In my feedback I will be concentrating on Archives NZ (ANZ).

1. A challenge for both ANZ and the National Library of New Zealand (NLNZ) will be re-presenting themselves to the NZ public in the structures that emerge from this review and re-establishing trust in the ability of these institutions to carry out their mandated functions. The last 8 years have seen the removal of the branding relating to these institutions, and profiles presented as parts of a branch of DIA. There has been a blurring of the distinctions between the two in terms of both their activities and their physical location. Depending on the result of the review this will be urgent.

2. A major challenge will be the raising of the level of professional expertise within ANZ from the top down. Currently there are no people with archives training in the management team and few below that level. This is an urgent consideration given the constitutional role this institution plays. That decisions
on the retention of records are being made by people in the CA position with no training or experience in this area is unacceptable. This lack of expertise is also affecting staff morale.

3. Currently few records are being transferred to ANZ. A further challenge will be working with government departments to ensure the regular transfer of both hard and electronic files systematically and with an understanding of how this programme will continue into the future.

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 the current structure the position of Chief Archivist (CA) does not have the independence and authority necessary to be an effective regulator of records and information management within its broad regulatory mandate. At third tier level the CA does not have the status to interact with CEOs of government departments to ensure the creation and preservation of records as required under the Public Records Act. Additionally it is clear that the independence within DIA is insufficient to ensure the CA has control of funding and the freedom to meet the requirements under the Public Records Act 2005 that the Chief Archivist is responsible:

in relation to public archives,—
(i) to control and administer public archives; and
(ii) to ensure the preservation of public archives; and
(iii) to facilitate public access to, and promote the use of, public archives. (Section 11(1)(c))

It is not possible to identify the funding lines for ANZ within the DIA Annual Report but an analysis shows that while the funding for DIA has risen by some 20% since 2010 the funding for Civic Functions (which covers both ANZ and NL) has fallen by some 5%.
After the passing of the Public Records Act 2005 stakeholders were assured by the then Minister and CEO that nothing would change for the institutions under the new structure. These assurances only lasted until that CEO moved on. As long as the CA reports to a Section Head within DIA, a CEO can consider he/she has the right to dictate directions for the organisation. Should the CEO decide to make a change that the CA does not agree with there is no avenue for the CA to contest the change. In the 1990s when this happened to the then CA, approaches to the SSC and Crown Law (after a structure change was proposed that the CA considered was not permissible under the Archives Act 1957), were met with instructions to discuss the situation with the CEO who did not wish to listen to any contrary arguments. Under the present structure this could happen at any time. If the CEO can treat the CA in this cavalier fashion why should other departments respect the position?

The position of National Librarian has in like fashion been diminished by the current status. As the library of last resort for the people of NZ there needs to be clearer understanding of what funding the institution has and what this is being spent on. The Alexander Turnbull Library is currently turning away potentially valuable donations as it does not have the funds to manage more material.

Both institutions are struggling to provide nationwide leadership in their respective fields.

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

Structure

The policy of the current government is quite clear:

Labour will:
- Protect the independence of Archives New Zealand and the National Library
- Commit to Archives New Zealand and the National Library being established as independent and separate entities outside of the Department of Internal Affairs

- Investigate the National Archivist being an Officer of Parliament.

Given this policy statement it is appropriate to consider how this can be achieved. A useful model for Archives New Zealand is that of the Audit Office. Both ANZ and the Audit Office have a requirement to ensure certain functions are carried out by government departments - ANZ to ensure the creation and protection of records and to make the ultimate decisions on which records will form part of the permanent record held by ANZ; The Audit Office to examine the fiscal propriety of government department expenditure. The Auditor General is an Officer of Parliament. The Audit Office is managed by the Deputy Auditor General with the Auditor General having oversight of its activities. Such a model would give the Chief Archivist and Archives NZ the independence and standing to move forward into the future exercising the responsibilities set out under the Act.

A suggestion that the CA be separated off to be an Officer of Parliament with the day to day operations of the archives being combined with National Library is analogous to a proposed funder/provider split considered in the mid 1990s. At that time, legal opinions considered this was not possible under the 1957 Archives Act as going against the requirement that the CA is responsible for the care, custody and control of the records of government. It would also appear to be contrary to the responsibilities set out in Section 11(1)(c) of the Public Records Act 2005 set out above. The CA is the guardian of the public record from its creation, through its active life to a final disposal decision, and then over the records retained as archives. To have the care of the records transferred to National Library cuts across this responsibility.

As commented above international literature and comment on the Canadian model where the national library and the national archives (LAC) have been combined warn against this structure as it has resulted in “drastic reductions in number and quality of services, collections, and
collaboration.” (http://radicalteacher.library.pitt.edu). This article goes on to further comment: “LAC has been unable to fulfil its mandate to ‘preserve and make accessible Canada’s documentary heritage as well as serve as the continuing memory of the Government of Canada and its institutions’”. Ian Wilson, one of the architects of the amalgamation, has stated that “LAC has not achieved the vision that was put forth with the initial convergence and that the convergence model espoused by LAC should in no way be seen as a trend to be implemented internationally”. (Journal of International Ethics, Fall 2013 p85)

It would be extremely unfortunate if New Zealand does not take to heart and learn from the experiences of international sister institutions.

With regard to National Library it should be noted that this institution was a successful separate department (like Archives NZ) until the merger with DIA in 2010. As it does not exercise a constitutional role, return to this structure should be considered to enable it to carry out its leadership role.

**Branding**

Both institutions are suffering under DIA from the removal of their institutional branding

- The key founding government record, the Treaty of Waitangi, has been moved from ANZ to NLNZ, creating confusion in the eyes of the public over where this and other documents belong. I have been asked why ANZ has passed the Treaty to NLNZ;
- the buildings have been used to house units of DIA which threatens to render them indistinguishable from any other generic departmental office building. Entering the Archives building one is met by Births Deaths and Marriages etc with no clear indication that this is where the public records are held.
- Staff now all have DIA mail addresses. The contact address for ANZ enquiries is general.enquiries@dia.govt.nz
- Display space has disappeared.

Clear branding is important to raise the profile of these institutions.
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?**

Opportunities for the National Library and Archives NZ to work together have always existed and have occurred through discussions between the National Librarian and the Chief Archivist. There is no reason why this should not continue under new structures. Nor why discussions should not include also Nga Taonga Sound and Vision.

Having said that, it should also be noted that these are distinct institutions with different responsibilities and special types of material to manage. International literature has advised strongly against the merging of these national institutions because of their different requirements.

One system to manage both collections has been mooted. Internationally such systems have been explored but have not been successful. The current lack of progress on the Government Data Archive suggests New Zealand has not cracked this either. Whether better access to the individual institutional systems to provide some cross searching capabilities is possible would be an area to explore. In the immediate future, concentration should be on managing material 'born digital' as currently each government department has the ability to implement its own electronic document management system.

Paper files in heavy use should also be considered for electronic conversion but the size of the archives holdings makes total conversion an extremely expensive proposition and opens up the quandary of whether these hard files should be kept in any case as the life-span of electronic materials is not yet fully understood.

There may also be opportunities for working together in the area of preservation of material with ANZ and the Alexander Turnbull Library having similar requirements in the preservation of paper-based documents.
5. **What does the public need in the next 30 years from the national archival and library institutions?**

The public needs an assurance that the structure of these institutions is agreed and will not be tampered with again. Only with appropriate structures, appropriate and sufficient funding and the ability to attract appropriately trained staff will these institutions be able to take on the challenges of an increasingly electronic world. It is disturbing to hear that these institutions are currently unable to accept material and do not have the resources to manage the material they do hold. It is in such a climate that valuable material is lost and it affects the respect with which the institutions are held.

The public also needs to feel confident the process of examining and making retention decisions on the records of government is happening with the requisite professional knowledge and training. Currently departments are being given considerable leeway to make recommendations on what records should be held. Such decisions need a broad understanding of government going back over decades and experience of what records may be called upon for what reasons. It also impinges on the Official Information Act and the Privacy Act. The lack of professionally trained staff at ANZ gives rise to the acceptance of these recommendations without the knowledge and experience to assess them. This will impact on the availability of information on government activities in the future.

6. **Any other comments?**

**A challenge not covered by the above is for DIA.**

I was invited to talk with the consultant hired by DIA to make an “independent” assessment of the statutory role of the Chief Archivist. This would have seemed to have been an opportunity to examine a variety of options for the placement of ANZ within the government structure. However, in reading his draft report I was disturbed to find his terms of reference were “to consider what opportunities exist to improve the Chief Archivist’s role within DIA”. He further stated that establishing ANZ as a
“departmental agency under the State Sector Act, with the Chief Archivist as its head” lay outside his terms of reference. It would thus appear that his “independent assessment” was to focus on what was needed to keep ANZ within DIA and why the proposal of setting it up as an Office of Parliament was not possible.

The challenge for DIA is to impartially consider the options for each of these institutions to enable them to fulfil their functions under their respective acts. These can then be presented to the ministers for further consideration.

**Professional leadership**

An additional point to consider is that this institution has fared badly for some time with lack of professional training and leadership in its managerial roles. There appears to be no succession planning; career opportunities are lacking, staff are poorly trained, increasingly decision-making over retention and disposal is being passed to departments. There is an urgent need for the institution to show proper professional guidance to raise its profile in the eyes of departments. Without a strong national archives, open government and the Official Information Act are compromised. Clear understanding of the creation and retention of documents is essential if the actions of government are to be discoverable and examinable in the future. This cannot happen with the continuing appointment of Chief Archivists who do not have the training or understanding to perform the leadership role required.

**Archives Council**

Whether or not the Archives Council continues depends on the future model for Archives New Zealand. However it is worth examining how this body had evolved since 2005. Initially the members were of a reasonably high status with regard to the roles they had held within the public service or professionally as archivists. This has diminished over the years with increasingly the appointment of people with little knowledge of this field and/or with lesser status either in the public service or professionally. For this body to adequately advise the Minister, the calibre of appointees must reflect the importance of the institution.
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<One_Key_Challenges>Ensuring the integrity of both the National Library and Archives New Zealand's collections including consideration of what records and documents might have been missed, especially in recent years where it may still be possible to obtain copies. Establish what level of support the National Library should provide to ensure New Zealander's access to our documentary heritage and to the resources New Zealander's need to support their social, educational and employment success and their personal development. I would rather the bar was set high and a realistic budget set each year than aim low. I.e. this is what we need but what we can spend this year is just XXX. Seek public funding to support additional resources.</One_Key_Challenges>

<Two_Independence>I don't know but I am very concerned about this aspect as friends who have more knowledge don't feel the Chief Archivist is does have the appropriate independence.</Two_Independence>

<Three_Changes/>

<Four_Opportunities>I think they need to work independently but be encouraged to communicate and work together on initiatives where relevant and possible.</Four_Opportunities>

<Five_30_Years>To feel more confidence that national archival and library institutions are being adequately funded and supported to protect our heritage and our access to information. </Five_30_Years>

<Six_Comments>The Terms of Reference for the MInisterial Group are a good statement of what is required. This is much needed.</Six_Comments>