# The Government 2.0 Taskforce 2009: recordkeeping issues and opportunities

Adrian Cunningham

**Adrian Cunningham** has worked at the National Archives of Australia (NAA) since 1998, where he is currently Director, Strategic Relations and Personal Records. In this capacity he has oversight of the NAA's collaborations with government, industry, professional and international partners, most particularly on matters associated with digital recordkeeping and other modern recordkeeping initiatives. Adrian was Secretary of the International Council on Archives (ICA) Committee on Descriptive Standards (2002–2004), and is Treasurer of the Pacific Regional Branch of the ICA and a member of Standards Australia's Committee IT/21, Records Management. Before joining the staff of the NAA he worked at the Office for Government Information Technology and for many years as a private records archivist and librarian at the National Library of Australia, the Pacific Manuscripts Bureau and the State Library of New South Wales. Adrian was President of the Australian Society of Archivists, 1998–2000 and was inducted as a Fellow of that Society in 2007. In 2009 he was appointed by the Australian Government as a member of its Government 2.0 Taskforce.

*Reviews the work of the Australian Government's Government 2.0 Taskforce during 2009 from the perspective of an archivist who was a member of the taskforce. This article focuses on the challenges, issues and opportunities for archivists, recordkeepers and information management professionals posed by the work and recommendations of the taskforce. The analysis focuses on two main themes, liberating heritage collections and on capturing and preserving authentic and accessible evidence of Government 2.0. The article concludes with a consideration of implementation strategies*

*facing the Australian Government now that it has endorsed almost all of the Government 2.0 Taskforce recommendations.*

## Background: a new commitment to open government

As is currently the case in many Australasian jurisdictions, the Commonwealth Government of Australia has a strong policy commitment to more open 'pro-disclosure' government, with an emphasis on greater transparency and citizen engagement in public administration. A range of reforms to freedom of information laws were announced in March 2009 and introduced into parliament later that same year. These Bills, which were passed by the legislature in May 2010, propose more proactive release of government information via an information publication scheme to be overseen by a new Office of the Information Commissioner.

Associated with these reforms is a strong desire to take advantage of the opportunities presented by Web 2.0 technologies to encourage the re-use of public sector information as an enabler of innovation, citizen engagement and economic growth. In order to advance this agenda and taking as its model the United Kingdom's recent Power of Information Taskforce,[1] Finance Minister Lindsay Tanner and Cabinet Secretary Joe Ludwig announced in June 2009 the appointment of the Government 2.0 Taskforce (the Taskforce). The terms of reference of this taskforce can be summarised as to investigate and make recommendations to the Australian Government about how to use Web 2.0 technologies to:

- make government information more accessible and useable and promote a pro-disclosure culture;
- make government more consultative, participatory and transparent;
- build a culture of online innovation in government; and,
- promote collaboration across government agencies.

The Taskforce was also asked to identify policies and frameworks to assist the new Information Commissioner and to identify and trial demonstrator initiatives relating to the above.

Economist Dr Nicholas Gruen chaired the Taskforce, which comprised fourteen other members drawn from the public and private sectors, and academia. The author, Adrian Cunningham, was one of six Commonwealth public servants appointed to the Taskforce. The secretariat for the Taskforce was run out of the Australian Government Information Management Office (AGIMO).

The taskforce was given just six months to deliberate, consult and finalise its report and recommendations. During this time it released an issues paper on 23 July 2009,[2] maintained a public blog which encouraged commentary from the general public,[3] ran a national roadshow of consultations and open forums, appointed a reference group of international experts,[4] and funded a variety of projects, demonstrators and competitions.

The issues paper was structured around a set of Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) principles for public sector information:

- open regimes of access to and re-use of public sector information;
- availability of information asset lists;
- ensuring quality and integrity of information;
- long-term preservation of information;
- minimising copyright and pricing barriers; and,
- use of best practices.

Other issues canvassed in the issues paper included:

- fostering a culture of openness and online engagement in a risk-averse culture that must comply with Australian Public Service (APS) values and code of conduct;
- open licensing regimes – for example, creative commons and the need to have a more open approach to Commonwealth copyright administration;
- the promise of the Semantic Web or Web 3.0 (and metadata);
- use of open standards and data formats;
- privacy, security and risk management; and,
- recordkeeping challenges.

Nineteen different projects were funded by the Taskforce, with project reports for each published on its website.[5] These included projects on:

- demonstrating the economic value of public sector information for cultural institutions;

- enhancing the discoverability and accessibility of government information;

- early leadership in the Semantic Web;

- survey of Government 2.0 practices;

- identifying barriers in agencies to Government 2.0 take-up;

- whole-of-government information publication scheme;

- copyright law and intellectual property issues;

- Government 2.0 governance and institutions;

- online engagement guidance and Web 2.0 toolkit; and,

- preservation of and recordkeeping issues associated with Web 2.0 content.

Two contests were run, the first being the MashupAustralia Competition[6] which encouraged innovative re-use of government data sets made available on the <*data.australia.gov.au*> website; and the second being a contest to encourage the re-shaping of public sector information to comply with World Wide Web Consortium accessibility guidelines.[7]

The Taskforce endorsed a blog post by Canadian open government advocate David Eaves, who proposed the following three laws of open government information:

> 1. if it can't be spidered or indexed, it doesn't exist
>
> 2. if it isn't available in open and machine readable format, it can't engage
>
> 3. if a legal framework doesn't allow it to be repurposed, it doesn't empower.[8]

The final Taskforce report, *Engage: Getting on with Government 2.0*,[9] contains a central recommendation focussing on the need for a high-level declaration of open government and twelve subsidiary recommendations under the following headings:

1.      Coordinate with leadership, guidance and support;

2.      Improve guidance and require agencies to engage online;

3.      Encourage public servants to engage online;

4.      Awards;

5.      Make public sector information open, accessible and re-useable;

6.      Addressing issues in the operation of copyright;

7.      Information publication scheme;

8.      Accessibility;

9.      Security and Web 2.0;

10.     Privacy and confidentiality;

11.     Definition of Commonwealth Record (regarding recordkeeping issues and the use of third-party collaborative and social media websites) and the need to use endorsed information management and metadata standards; and,

12.     Encourage 'info-philanthropy'.

Eight key points summarised at the front of the report are reproduced in the appendix to this paper.

The Government 2.0 Taskforce report was presented to Ministers Tanner and Ludwig on 23 December 2009. The Australian Government issued its response to the report on 3 May 2010.[10] The government response endorsed eleven and a half of the thirteen recommendations. The only recommendations it did not endorse were the recommendation calling for taxation concessions for info-philanthropy, and part of the recommendation on the operation of copyright which recommended that policy responsibility for Crown copyright administration be shifted away from the Attorney-General's Department. Because many of the recommendations related to the foreshadowed creation of the Office of the Information Commissioner (OIC) and because the enabling legislation for that office had yet to pass through parliament at the time the government issued its response, those recommendations were endorsed 'in principle', meaning that they would be implemented if and when the Freedom of Information and OIC Bills were passed into law. As it happened, the Bills in question were passed by parliament later the same month that the government response was released.

## A recordkeeping perspective on the work of the Government 2.0 Taskforce

The foregoing provides a high-level overview of the work of the Government 2.0 Taskforce. What then are the issues, implications and opportunities for archives and records highlighted by the Taskforce?

It is reasonable to infer that the Australian Government recognised that archives, records and information management more generally were matters of some significance in the context of Government 2.0, because it took the trouble to appoint an archivist to be one of the fifteen members of the Taskforce. In addition, Barbara Berce, a staff member of the National Archives of Australia, was seconded to work for the Taskforce secretariat, based at AGIMO, for the duration of the Taskforce.

Archival involvement in recent trends towards opening up access to public sector information is a common theme in the jurisdictions that the Australian Government looked to for inspiration and successful models. In the United Kingdom the Office of Public Sector Information (OPSI), which has an explicit mandate to promote open access to and re-use of public sector information and is headed by Carol Tullo, is a division of the National Archives of the United Kingdom.[11] The OPSI works closely with the UK's Information Commissioner under the terms of a formal memorandum of understanding and has a similarly close relationship with the Director of Digital Engagement, who is based in the Cabinet Office. In the United States of America the Obama Administration has recently created a new Office of Government Information Services, headed by Miriam Nisbet, as a division of the National Archives and Records Administration. This office has a mandate under the *Open Government Act 2007* to provide policy leadership and mediation services for government-wide *Freedom of Information Act* activities.[12]

Despite the technological connotations of the phrase 'Government 2.0', it is important to view the public policy direction signified by the Taskforce as being less about technology and more about establishing a whole new approach to governance, for which technology is merely an enabler. The terms of reference for the Taskforce run to almost 400 words, but do not even mention web technology, instead using only the rather general term of 'online'. The focus of the terms of reference is squarely on opening up the processes of public administration to both

public scrutiny and also public participation, in addition to unlocking the under-utilised potential of public sector information as a national strategic resource, and an enabler of innovation, economic growth and a more informed and engaged citizenry.

Broadly speaking, the deliberations of the Taskforce fell into two main areas: encouraging and enabling citizen engagement; and opening up access to and opportunities for the re-use of public sector information. As an information management professional, the author's input into the work of the Taskforce focussed mainly on the second of these two areas. Nevertheless, as a Commonwealth public servant, I also became heavily involved in discussions with the Australian Public Service Commission (APSC) about revising its interim guidelines for public servants using social networking technologies. The Taskforce took the view that the APSC's interim guidelines, issued in early 2009, were not sufficiently encouraging of government agencies wishing to support their staff to use Web 2.0 technologies to engage in dialogue with the wider community and their clientele. Instead, the interim guidelines tended to emphasise the risks associated with the use of these technologies in terms of the potential for breaches of APS values and code of conduct, rather than the benefits that can be gained from opening up the processes of government to more interactive community engagement. These discussions with the APSC led to one of the first outcomes of the Taskforce, five weeks before its report was finalised, when the APSC issued revised online engagement guidelines on 18 November 2009 – guidelines that reflected the arguments put to the APSC by the Taskforce.[13]

Each member of the Taskforce was encouraged to contribute posts to the Taskforce blog. I contributed two posts in September 2009. In fact, these were originally written as a single blog post, but were split into two parts reflecting the two main dimensions of my particular concerns:

- Part 1: Liberating heritage collections[14]
- Part 2: Capturing and preserving authentic and accessible evidence of government 2.0[15]

It is no coincidence that this division reflects the dual roles and mandates of government archives and records institutions: the cultural

heritage role, and the accountability or public administration role. In short, memory and evidence – the two sides of the same archives and recordkeeping coin.

### *Liberating heritage collections*

The issues here are all about digitising collections, discovery metadata, crowdsourcing of user-tagging and user-contributed content, and copyright. Archival institutions have proved to be somewhat innovative in their use of Web 2.0 technologies to open up access to and opportunities for the use and re-use of archival holdings. Examples of innovation of this kind such as the National Archives of Australia's *Mapping our ANZACS* website[16] were highlighted both at the launch of the Taskforce at Senator Kate Lundy's 'Public Sphere' event in Canberra on 25 June 2009[17] and during many of the discussions and deliberations of the Taskforce. Of particular note is State Records New South Wales excellent use of Web 2.0 technologies in its *Archives Outside* blog to engage and interact with its communities.[18]

Despite these laudable innovations, archival institutions have a long way to go before they can claim to be taking full advantage of the opportunities presented by Web 2.0 technologies. Partly they are of course severely limited by funding restrictions, as it costs large amounts of money to digitise more than just small samples of archival holdings. In addition, however, they are also limited by the mindsets of the past. Under these mindsets a mission based on an overly narrow interpretation of the 'physical and moral defence of the record' and an emphasis on the professional mediation skills of trained archivists can tend to make archivists: reluctant to open their systems up to 'unprofessional' user-generated tagging and content; reluctant to make their holdings available for re-use, lest they lose control of their collections; and sometimes, even reluctant to open up the metadata in their archival databases for harvesting by search engines, lest it generate more demand for reference services than overworked reference archivists can cope with.

While I was very aware of the need for some archival reinvention if we are to realise the promise of what Eric Ketelaar calls 'People's Archives',[19] the Government 2.0 Taskforce was arguably not the forum in which to air matters that are essentially the internal concerns of our

profession.[20] In any case, the open and interactive groundswell signified by Web 2.0 and Government 2.0 will perforce encourage the change of professional mindset that archivists, together with many other closed shop professions and vested interests, need to accommodate if they are to survive and prosper in the twenty-first century.

The concept of more open, transparent and participatory archives taking advantage of Web 2.0 technologies is gaining momentum within the profession.[21] Ultimately, harnessing the potential of Archives 2.0 is all about being able to relinquish control in order to build value through collaboration. This is a cultural rather than a technological issue. This resonates with the major conclusion of the Government 2.0 Taskforce, which was that the main obstacle to successful Government 2.0 is neither economic nor technological, but rather cultural. Just as the culture of the public sector has to experience fundamental change to become more innovative and much less risk-averse if Government 2.0 is to become a reality, so to the culture of archives has to change if Archives 2.0 is to become the norm rather than just the exception.

Nevertheless, there are very real moral and legal barriers and issues for Archives 2.0 and those barriers are privacy and copyright, even though it is my view that many risk-averse archivists often exaggerate the risks associated with these issues to the point of paralysis or as an excuse to justify institutional inertia and conservatism.

Privacy is usually dealt with by limiting online access to name-identified personal information to information about deceased individuals – the logic being that the dead have no right to privacy. In practice, this is not so simple or easy. First, it is not usually easy or feasible to establish whether or not a named individual is dead or alive – so compromises are usually made whereby series of name identified records are only made available online when everyone so-named could be reasonably expected to be deceased. Even then, though, immediate family members of the deceased may have legitimate grievances about sensitive personal information being made available online for the whole world to see.

Copyright and licensing barriers to access and use of public sector information were a major concern of the whole Government 2.0 Taskforce, especially those members of the Taskforce who were lawyers

and economists. In that context, the copyright barriers affecting cultural collections were but a small subset of a much larger set of concerns. In my blog post I chose to highlight the absurdity that, under the Australian *Copyright Act 1968*, unpublished manuscripts are in *perpetual copyright*. Section 5.8.2 of the final report of the Taskforce was devoted to copyright law and cultural heritage. Before that section of the report could be written the Taskforce needed to decide whether its definition of public sector information was limited to information generated by the public sector, or whether it was broad enough to include third-party-generated information acquired by the public sector, including third-party copyright material held by cultural collecting institutions. Fortunately, from my point of view, the Taskforce agreed to a broader definition of public sector information, thus making archival concerns about copyright very much in scope for the attention of the Taskforce.

The Taskforce deliberated at length about laws regarding orphan works, works for which a copyright owner cannot easily be identified. It finally signed off on recommendation 7.3, which called on the Office of the Information Commissioner to examine the current state of copyright law with regard to orphan works (including section 200AB of the Copyright Act), with the aim of recommending amendments that would remove the practical restrictions that currently impede the use of such works.

While this fell short of my desire that the Taskforce recommend the abolition of the perpetual copyright provision for unpublished manuscripts it should nevertheless have the same practical effect, if the OIC is able to recommend suitable amendments to the Copyright Act and if those amendments are enacted.

Apart from the issue of third-party copyrighted material in cultural collections, the Taskforce was also very concerned to remove copyright restrictions on the use of older Crown copyrighted material, much of which is held in archives and libraries. Recommendation 6.7 recommended that copyright policy be amended so that works covered by Crown copyright be automatically licensed for use under a creative commons BY licence at the time at which Commonwealth records become available for public access under the *Archives Act 1983*. This picked up a recommendation made to the Taskforce by the National Archives of Australia in its formal submission responding to the Taskforce issues paper.

## *Capturing and preserving authentic and accessible evidence of Government 2.0*

This strand of Taskforce deliberations was all about recognition of how good information and records management is a prerequisite of effective ongoing access to public sector information (PSI). The Taskforce recognised that to deliver open and re-useable PSI, it has to be well managed at the point of creation and for as long as it continues to have value. There was also a recognition that, in a world of mash-ups, information re-use or re-purposing, wikis and blogs, it is vital for governments to be able to retain accurate and authentic 'original' versions of PSI as a guarantee against misuse and misrepresentation.

Just as the challenge of Web 2.0 to the cultural heritage role of memory institutions will require some 'archival reinvention', so too does Government 2.0 require some fundamental reinvention of records management mindsets and processes. That topic, which has been provocatively opened up by Britain's Steve Bailey,[22] was not, though, a particular focus of the Government 2.0 Taskforce, which focused instead on how Government 2.0 requires a reinvention of something much more important: governance.

Nevertheless, a reassertion of some basic principles of records and information management will be necessary if the Government 2.0 vision is to be realised. First of all, government agencies need to know the PSI that they own or for which they are responsible. This requires exerting corporate control over the information assets of government in addition to an awareness of the value and usefulness of those various assets. Secondly, if PSI is to be accessible and useable, people need to be able to find it online. Thirdly, PSI of long-term value needs to be preserved to guard against losses resulting from technological obsolescence in software and hardware platforms.

The Taskforce issues paper, 'Towards Government 2.0', did a very good job of highlighting the important issues here. It highlighted *inter alia* the value of ensuring the discoverability, quality and integrity of PSI, and the need for long-term preservation of these assets through successive generations of new technology by the use of open standards and open file formats. The so-called Semantic Web or Web 3.0 was discussed in some detail, with its emphasis on the deployment of standardised metadata.

The dynamic and ever-changing nature of Web 2.0 resources poses particular challenges for recordkeeping professionals. Section 6.4 of the Taskforce report was devoted to information and records management as an enabler of open government. Alongside some boxed text on the Semantic Web, the value of metadata standards and the National Archives of Australia's approaches to digital preservation, the text emphasised the importance of building a culture of information and records management in government agencies. The risks associated with use of the so-called 'Cloud' or third-party websites for storing government records were highlighted. While government agencies embracing Web 2.0 are encouraged to 'go where the people are' to social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter and Flickr in order to engage with their communities, it is vital that any records of such activity be captured and stored by government itself in order to guarantee the public record of those interactions.

Recommendation 12 of the Taskforce report, somewhat misleadingly titled 'Definition of a Commonwealth record' was delivered in two parts. Part one focussed on the property-based definition of Commonwealth record in the Archives Act, warning agencies that records stored on third-party sites may not legally be Commonwealth records, as the Commonwealth does not own the servers on which the data is stored. As such, in order to protect the public record, the interests of the Commonwealth and the rights and entitlements of citizens, it is vital for copies of such records to be kept in the control of the Commonwealth. Part one of recommendation 12 also intended to call on the Australian Government to review the definition of Commonwealth record in the Archives Act with a view to replacing it with a definition that defines Commonwealth record as any information created or received by the Commonwealth in the course of performing Commonwealth business. Unfortunately, a misprint in the hastily assembled final report used the word 'reviewed' rather than 'review' in this recommendation, thus completely changing the sense of the recommendation from one calling for action to one noting that action (which has in fact not been taken) has already been taken. Unfortunately, this misprint was compounded in the government response to the recommendation, which merely noted the matter rather than committing the government to action.

Part two of recommendation 12 urged agencies to adopt information management and metadata standards issued by the National Archives of Australia and by AGIMO to assist the discovery, sharing and re-use of public sector information.

## What next?

There was considerable debate within the Taskforce regarding the various possible bureaucratic arrangements for taking carriage of the Government 2.0 implementation agenda.[23] While there was some opinion that the Australian Public Service Commission was the most logical agency to push through cultural change in the APS, there was a much stronger body of thought that the logical place to take ownership of the reforms was the proposed Office of the Information Commissioner within the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Undermining this logic though was the absence of any reference to promoting citizen engagement in the OIC enabling Bill, even though that Bill had much to say about the need for the OIC to promote open government and open access to government information. In the end, the Taskforce made no recommendation on which agency should be the overall lead agency, merely saying that the government should appoint such an agency, notwithstanding the fact that specific Taskforce recommendations are directed at particular policy agencies such as the Office of the Information Commissioner and the Australian Public Service Commission.

The Australian Government's response to the Taskforce report was to appoint the Australian Government Information Management Office (AGIMO) in the Department of Finance and Deregulation as the lead agency with overall carriage of implementing the Government 2.0 policy agenda. AGIMO was allocated additional appropriations in the 2010 federal budget to fund activities such as the <*data.australia.gov.au*> facility and other Government 2.0 initiatives. Given that AGIMO's preoccupation hitherto (despite the name of the agency) has been almost exclusively on government information technology matters rather than on information management and the culture of governance (open or otherwise), this will represent a significant shift of focus for the agency. It is, however, not surprising, as the primary proponent of Government 2.0 within cabinet was recently retired Finance Minister Lindsay Tanner. It will be interesting

to see how successful AGIMO, primarily an IT policy agency, is at pushing through cultural change in government, an approach to implementation that seemingly belies the non-technical and pro-cultural-change focus of both the terms of reference and the final report of the Government 2.0 Taskforce. It will also be interesting to see if the momentum behind Government 2.0 can transcend the patronage of a single powerful cabinet minister now that Lindsay Tanner is no longer Finance Minister.

In tandem with these reforms the Australian Government will also be implementing its freedom of information reforms which, for the first time, allocates functional responsibility for whole-of-government information management to a specific agency of government, in this case the Office of the Information Commissioner. The OIC legislation requires the creation of an information advisory committee to work with the Information Commissioner, former Commonwealth Ombudsman Professor John Macmillan. This committee is to include representation from the National Archives of Australia, specifically to ensure congruence between government recordkeeping policies and information management policies and practices.

Only time will tell the extent to which the seemingly good intentions of the Labor Government to promote open and interactive government are translated into real and meaningful change at the coalface of public administration. There is much political and institutional inertia and many vested interests to overcome. Change will not happen overnight and it will require much determination, goodwill and strong leadership to overcome the inevitable barriers, resistance, roadblocks and setbacks that await such an ambitious reform agenda. Ensuring that Government 2.0 is not quickly forgotten as '2009 hype' or yesterday's 'flavour of the month' will require genuine commitment and clear and level heads.

For archivists and records management it is a daunting and an exciting time: daunting because of the scope and complexity of the challenges that face us; exciting because we stand on the threshold of a new and more relevant professional mission, one in which our unique skills can find new applications and appreciation. There is a 'light on the hill' of open, transparent democratic governance that values and relies on the information wealth of the nation, a wealth that promises to deliver much in terms of public good and good governance, if only its latent potential can be recognised, unlocked and harnessed.

**Appendix: Key points of the Government 2.0 Taskforce report 2009**

- Government 2.0 or the use of the new collaborative tools and approaches of Web 2.0 offers an unprecedented opportunity to achieve more open, accountable, responsive and efficient government.

- Though it involves new technology, Government 2.0 is really about a new approach to organising and governing. It will draw people into a closer and more collaborative relationship with their government. Australia has an opportunity to resume its leadership in seizing these opportunities and capturing the resulting social and economic benefits.

- Leadership, and policy and governance changes are needed to shift public sector culture and practice to make government information more accessible and useable, make government more consultative, participatory and transparent, build a culture of online innovation within government, and to promote collaboration across agencies.

- Government pervades some of the most important aspects of our lives. Government 2.0 can harness the wealth of local and expert knowledge, ideas and enthusiasm of Australians to improve schools, hospitals, workplaces, to enrich our democracy and to improve its own policies, regulation and service delivery.

- Government 2.0 is a key means for renewing the public sector; offering new tools for public servants to engage and respond to the community; empower the enthusiastic, share ideas and further develop their expertise through networks of knowledge with fellow professionals and others. Together, public servants and interested communities can work to address complex policy and service delivery challenges.

- Information collected by or for the public sector is a national resource which should be managed for public purposes. That means that we should reverse the current presumption that it is secret unless there are good reasons for release and presume instead that it should be freely available for anyone to use and

transform unless there are compelling privacy, confidentially or security considerations.

- Government 2.0 will not be easy for it directly challenges some aspects of established policy and practice within government. Yet the changes to culture, practice and policy we envisage will ultimately advance the traditions of modern democratic government. Hence, there is a requirement for coordinated leadership, policy and culture change.

- Government 2.0 is central to the delivery of government reforms like promoting innovation; and making our public service the world's best.

## Endnotes

[1]   See Power of Information Taskforce website, available at <*http://powerofinformation.wordpress.com/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[2]   See Government 2.0 Taskforce, 'Towards Government 2.0: An Issues Paper', issued 23 July 2009, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/blog/2009/07/23/official-issues-paper-released/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[3]   See Government 2.0 Taskforce blog, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[4]   Dutch Archivist Professor Eric Ketelaar was a member of the international reference group, specifically because of his involvement in a similar initiative in the Netherlands called 'Civil Servant 2.0'.

[5]   See Government 2.0 Taskforce projects webpage, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/projects/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[6]   See Government 2.0 Taskforce, 'Posts tagged "Mashup Australia"', available at <*http://gov2.net.au/blog/tag/mashup-australia/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[7]   See World Wide Web Consortium, Web Accessibility Initiative Guidelines and Techniques webpage, available at <*http://www.w3.org/WAI/guid-tech.html*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[8]   See Davis Eaves, 'The Three Laws of Open Government Data', available at <*http://eaves.ca/2009/09/30/three-law-of-open-government-data/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[9]   See Government 2.0 Taskforce, 'Engage: Getting on with Government 2.0: Report of the Government 2.0 Taskforce', Department of Finance and Deregulation, Canberra, 2009, available at <*http://www.finance.gov.au/publications/gov20taskforcereport/index.html*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[10]   See Australian Government, 'Government Response to the Government 2.0 Taskforce', Department of Finance and Deregulation, Canberra, May 2010, available at <*http://www.finance.gov.au/publications/govresponse20report/index.html*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[11]   See the United Kingdom's Office Of Public Sector Information webpage, available at <*http://www.opsi.gov.uk/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[12]   The first significant policy pronouncement by the recently appointed US National Archivist David Ferriero was NARA's *Open Government Plan* issued in April 2010, available at <*http://www.archives.gov/open/open-plan.html*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[13]   See the subheading 'Participating online' in 'Chapter 3: Managing official iInformation' of the Australian Public Service Commission, *APS Values and Code of Conduct in practice,* available at <*http://www.apsc.gov.au/values/conductguidelines5.htm*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[14]   Adrian Cunningham, 'Liberating heritage collections (Part One)', Government 2.0 Taskforce blog, 11 September 2009, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/blog/2009/09/11/ liberating-heritage-collections/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[15]   Adrian Cunningham, 'Capturing and preserving authentic and accessible evidence of Government 2.0 (Part Two)', Government 2.0 Taskforce blog, 14 September 2009, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/blog/2009/09/14/capturing-and-preserving-authentic-and-accessible-evidence-of-government-2-0-part-two/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[16]   National Archives of Australia, *Mapping our Anzacs* website, available at <*http:// mappingouranzacs.naa.gov.au/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[17]   Kate Lundy, *Public Sphere 2: Government 2.0* webpage available at <*http://www. katelundy.com.au/category/campaigns/publicsphere/open-gov/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[18]   See State Records NSW, *Archives Outside*, available at <*http://archivesoutside.records. nsw.gov.au/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[19]   Eric Ketelaar, 'Being Digital in People's Archives', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 31, no. 2, November 2003, pp. 8–22.

[20]   For a stimulating and inspiring insight into what is possible see Tim Sherratt, 'Emerging technologies for the provision of access to archives', October 2009, available on the *Sribd* website at <*http://www.scribd.com/doc/24402148/Emerging-technologies-for-the-provision-of-access-to-archives-issues-challenges-and-ideas*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[21]   Joy Palmer, 'Archives 2.0: If We Build It, Will They Come?', *Ariadne 60,* July 2009, available at <*http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue60/palmer/*>, accessed 14 October 2010; Kate Theimer, *Web 2.0 tools and strategies for archives and local history collections,* Neal-Schuman Publishers, New York, 2010. There was also an Archives 2.0 Conference held in Manchester, England in March 2009, see in particular Brian Kelly, 'A Risks and Opportunities Framework for Archives 2.0', video of the talk is available on UKOLN at the University of Bath website at <*http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/cultural-heritage/events/archives2.0-2009*>, accessed 14 October 2010.

[22]   Steve Bailey, *Managing the crowd: rethinking records management for the Web 2.0 world,* Facet Publishing, London, 2008. See also Stephen Clarke's review article on Bailey's book: 'Crowded Out: Records Management and the Web 2.0 Phenomenon', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 37, no. 1, May 2009, pp. 118–133.

[23]   See also a report by Ian Reinecke, 'Information Policy and E-governance in the Australian Government: A report for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet', March 2009, available at <*http://www.dpmc.gov.au/publications/information_policy/index. cfm*>, accessed 14 October 2010; and the report of Government 2.0 Taskforce Project 13: 'Government 2.0 Governance and Institutions: Embedding the 2.0 Agenda in the Australian Public Service', December 2009, available at <*http://gov2.net.au/projects/ project-13/*>, accessed 14 October 2010.