



A survey of archaeological archives held by archaeological practices in England, Scotland and Wales

Roland Smith and Adrian Tindall

November 2012

1. Background to the survey

English Heritage and the Society of Museum Archaeologists jointly commissioned a project *Evaluating the archaeological resource in store – informing the future* to gather information on the current extent, location and usage of archaeological archives, and on future provision for their collection, storage and accessibility. Further details of the project may be found on the [FAME](#) website.

FAME members have expressed increasing concerns about archaeological archives, especially the growing problem of completed archives that cannot be deposited in a suitable store. FAME therefore gave its support to the project, and agreed to undertake a survey of the location and extent of completed archives held by archaeological practitioners that cannot be deposited because there is no store or museum able or willing to accept them.

An online questionnaire was sent to archaeological practices in England, Scotland and Wales on 1 March 2012 (Appendix i). It was sent to 72 FAME members and 65 IfA Registered Organisations (with significant overlap between the two), as well as to CBA-affiliated voluntary groups, Cadw, English Heritage, Historic Scotland, and members of the university Subject Committee for Archaeology. The total number of organisations that had the opportunity to respond is unknown, but certainly exceeded 100.

46 organisations responded to the survey, of which 31 (67%) were from contracting organisations in England, including commercial practices, charitable trusts, local authorities and universities. There were three responses from Wales, and one useable response from Scotland.

2. Results of the survey

Question 1: What is the name of your organisation?

All 46 organisations responded to this question, of which 31 were contracting organisations in England (Appendix ii).

Comparison with the list of FAME members and IfA Registered Organisations indicates that 10-12 major contracting organisations did not respond to the survey,

suggesting that the survey represents a sample of around 75% of major contracting organisations nationally.

The responses have therefore been scaled up by a factor of one third to provide a broad estimate of the national totals for England and Wales.

Respondents included two from Scotland (one of which contained no usable data) and three from Wales. These are reported separately, in recognition of the differing circumstances relating to archive deposition in these countries. Given the low return from Scotland, no national estimates for Scotland have been attempted.

Respondents included ten from non-contracting organisations, including consultancies, sole traders and voluntary groups. Their comments have been noted, but they have been excluded from the statistical analysis. There was one anonymous response.

Question 2: How many archaeological project archives do you hold which are ready for deposition but which cannot be deposited because the recipient museum or store is unable or unwilling to accept them (eg 117 projects)?

44 organisations responded to this question, of which ten were nil or unquantified returns.

The number of archives held ranged from three to 1,781. In some cases respondents held uncompleted archives without any funding to complete them, while in others deposition was still under discussion or archives consisted solely of documentary material.

The total number of project archives held by respondents in England was 6,700. This gives an average of 216 per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of around 9,000 undeposited archaeological archives.

No useable data were obtained from Scotland or Wales. The respondent from Scotland stated that archives had not been deposited due to the legal requirements relating to Treasure Trove in Scotland. A respondent from Wales stated that their organisation held legacy archives for which no post-excavation funding exists.

Question 3: For these undepositable archives collectively:

3a. How many boxes of artefacts/ecofacts do you hold? (eg 125 boxes from standard size to small 'Stewart' box)

37 organisations responded to this question, of which two were nil or unquantified returns. The boxes held by respondents ranged in number from four to 6,000, and in size from small Stewart boxes to standard boxes.

The total number of boxes of artefacts or ecofacts held by respondents in England was 21,500. This gives an average of 693 per contracting organisation, and

suggests an estimated national total of around 28,700 undeposited boxes of artefacts or ecofacts.

Respondents from Wales held a total of 180 boxes, suggesting an estimated national total of around 240 boxes. The respondent from Scotland held a total of 220 boxes.

3b. What quantity of document files do you hold? (by length of shelf, eg 2.35m)

38 organisations responded to this question, of which five were nil or unquantified returns. The quantity of document files held by respondents ranged from 1.3-120m.

The total quantity of document files held by respondents in England was 496m. This gives an average of 16m of document files per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of undeposited document files occupying around 0.67km of shelf space.

Respondents from Wales held a total of 35m of document files, suggesting an estimated national total of around 50m. No useable data were obtained from Scotland.

3c. How much digital data do you hold? (eg 1,000KB)

33 organisations responded to this question, of which 12 were nil or unquantified returns. The quantity of digital data held by respondents ranged from 1-900 Gb.

The total quantity of digital data held by respondents in England was 1,654 Gb. This gives an average quantity of digital data of 53 Gb per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of digital data of 2,205 Gb, or 2.15Tb.

Respondents from Wales held a total volume of 150 Gb of digital data, suggesting an estimated national total of around 200 Gb. No useable data were obtained from Scotland.

3d. How many digital files does this represent? (eg 1,000 files)

36 organisations responded to this question, of which 12 were nil or unquantified returns. The number of digital files held by respondents ranged from 80-400,000.

The total number of digital files held by respondents in England was 930,370. This gives an average of 300,012 files per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of around 1.25m digital files.

Respondents from Wales held a total number of 43,941 digital files, suggesting an estimated national total of around 60,000 files. No useable data were obtained from Scotland.

3e. How many black and white films do you hold? (eg 25 rolls)

36 organisations responded to this question, of which 11 were nil or unquantified returns. The number of black and white films held by respondents ranged from 3-2,475.

The total number of black and white films held by respondents in England was 6,950. This gives an average of 224 per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of around 9,300 films.

No useable data were obtained from Scotland or Wales.

3f. How many colour transparencies do you hold? (to the nearest 100 slides)

32 organisations responded to this question, of which 10 were nil or unquantified returns. The number of colour transparencies held by respondents ranged from 100-86,500.

The total number of colour transparencies held by respondents in England was 316,480. This gives an average of 10,210 per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national total of around 422,000 colour transparencies.

Respondents from Wales held a total number of 60,300 colour transparencies, suggesting an estimated national total of around 80,000. No useable data were obtained from Scotland.

3g. What other archive materials do you hold? (eg permatrace drawings, x-radiographs)

38 organisations responded to this question, of which five were nil or unquantified returns.

27 respondents (71%) stated that they held permatrace drawings and 17 respondents (45%) held x-radiographs.

Other archive materials held included colour prints, microfiche, blueprints, video, DVD, and internal and specialist reports. Respondents were not asked to quantify these, and it is not therefore possible to estimate total volumes of each.

Question 4: How many cubic metres (to the nearest cubic metre) do these undepositable archives occupy?

38 organisations responded to this question, of which four were nil or unquantified returns. The volume of undepositable archives held by respondents ranged from 0.4-95m³.

The total volume of undepositable archives held by respondents in England was 870m³. This gives an average of 28m³ per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national volume of undepositable archives of around 1,160m³.

Respondents from Wales held a total volume of undepositable archives of 7m³, suggesting an estimated national volume of around 9m³. The respondent from Scotland held a total volume of undepositable archives of 4.7m³.

Question 5: How many cubic metres (to the nearest cubic metre) do your total temporary archive holdings occupy?

37 organisations responded to this question, of which five were nil or unquantified returns. The total volume of all temporary archives held by respondents, including work in progress and archives being prepared for agreed deposition in museums ranged from 3-1,250m³.

The total volume of temporary archives held by respondents in England was 4,393m³. This gives an average of 142m³ per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national volume of around 5,860m³.

Responses to this and the previous question suggest that around 20% of archives are temporarily held by contracting organisations in England because they cannot be deposited with a suitable museum or store.

Respondents from Wales held a total volume of temporary archives of 106m³, suggesting an estimated national volume of around 140m³. This suggests that significantly fewer archives temporarily held by contracting organisations in Wales cannot be deposited with a suitable museum or store. The respondent from Scotland held a total volume of temporary archives of 40m³.

Question 6: How much does it cost your organisation annually to store archives that cannot be deposited? Please provide at least a guesstimate (eg c£50k annually)

37 organisations responded to this question, of which ten were nil or unquantified returns. The annual storage cost of undepositable archives held by respondents ranged from £6-£80k.

The total annual storage cost of undepositable archives held by respondents in England was £248,405. This gives an average of £8,013 per contracting organisation, and suggests an estimated national storage cost of around £330k annually.

The annual storage cost for respondents from Wales was £10,075, suggesting an estimated national annual storage cost of around £13,500. The annual storage cost for the respondent from Scotland was £2,000.

Question 7: At 1st January 2012 which museums or stores were not accepting completed archaeological archives from your organisation? If you are unsure of the museum or store, please indicate the county, local authority or location in which you are unable to deposit your archives.

40 organisations responded to this question of which 4 were nil returns. The responses collectively referred to 45 specific museums in England which were not

accepting archaeological archives. These are listed in Appendix iii. A few responses qualified the position for example museums that were 'running out of space' or where contractors 'can only deposit a limited amount annually' or 'archives without finds'.

A number of responses referred to counties or districts rather than specific museums eg Northamptonshire and North Hertfordshire. These have not been included in Appendix iii as they corroborate the areas of England covered by the museums listed in Appendix iii.

The one response from Scotland stated that it was 'difficult in some of the islands (eg Stornaway) and probably Dundee/Arbroath. The bigger issue here is that some archives are just not being 'bid' for when they go through Treasure Trove'.

Only one museum was mentioned in Wales: 'Pembrokeshire Museum may not be taking archives but this position is not entirely clear'.

Question 8: What are the reasons given for not accepting them?

32 organisations responded to this question with the following outcome to the specific prompts:

| | | |
|--|----|-------------|
| 'Store is full' | 20 | (63% of 32) |
| 'No resource to receive or accession them' | 15 | (47%) |
| 'Temporary store closure' | 14 | (44%) |
| 'No store collecting in this area' | 19 | (59%) |
| 'Other' | 11 | |

A range of reasons were cited under 'other' as follows:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Poor communication/lack of response from museum | – 5 responses |
| Issues over transfer of ownership | – 3 |
| Collections review | – 1 |
| 'Curators too busy' | – 1 |
| 'Simply not interested' | – 1 |

The one response from Scotland was due to the 'store is full'.

Question 9: How often do you provide information on your un-deposited archives to the following stakeholders?

The comments section of this question makes it clear that there were problems with the survey interface for respondents. The table below sets out the responses as received. The responses were as follows:

| Stakeholder | Annually | Every 2-5 years | Every 5 years or more | Only when asked | Never | Response Count |
|------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|
| Relevant museum or store | 7 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 27 |
| The local authority archaeological | 3 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 19 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|
| curator | | | | | | |
| The client | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 22 |

The responses do show a pattern which one might have intuitively expected, namely that contractors make reasonable efforts to inform museums and stores, less so local authority curators and clients hardly at all.

This is reflected in the following comments that were also received:

'Depends on collecting area. In general we should probably be more proactive at informing client and curator of archive storage issues if only to highlight issues'

'IFA regularly requests details of sites that are un-deposited after 5 years'.

The only people who enquire regularly regarding our un-deposited archives are the IFA. Museums and curators may enquire once in a blue moon: clients never!'

'At the beginning of each year our archives officer contacts all museums in our working area with a list of archives we have done in the area and at what stage they are at in the process'.

'We have some quantification of our archives but it needs significantly updating. This is a labour intensive process that is taking place alongside attempts to get some sites published'.

'We contact museums regularly, each time we prepare archives for deposition, every two months or so. Museums may be officially 'collecting' yet are non-responsive to attempts to arrange deposition resulting in the long term 'temporary, holding of archives'.

'We always provide relevant information to any external request during the year'.

'It is rare for a client to ask whether archives are deposited unless they are a consultant archaeologist. It is very rare for the local authority curator to ask about un-deposited archives'.

'There is a marked lack of interest amongst the groups listed....for information on un-depositable archives'.

'It is very rare anyone asks for them'.

'Generally only when asked – have tried regularly notification prior to fieldwork but eventually proved pointless as figures provided were not accurate and didn't seem to be used. So instead we now would liaise during fieldwork where [there are] a lot of finds and emphasise structured discard working together with the museum'.

Question 10: Do you receive requests for access to archives that you hold temporarily (whether depositable or not)?

41 organisations responded to this question. 31 (76%) responded yes and 10 (24%) responded no.

When asked how many requests for access they had received since January 2007, the responses ranged between 3 and 50 but with one contracting organisation stating 'one per week'. The total for all respondents was 585 requests since January 2007.

The following comment was made by one organisation 'in general the public are not aware of the existence of our archives'.

Question 11: Do you have any comments you wish to make regarding the specific issue of un-depositable archives?

26 free text responses were received from contracting organisations based in England. These are set out in full in Appendix iv, which also includes one response received from an organisation based in Scotland and two responses from organisations based in Wales.

In addition a response was received from Kent County Council's Heritage Team. Given the exceptional position in Kent their response merits citing in full as follows:

The situation regarding storage in Kent is critical. Except in rare cases, e.g. where museums will accept archaeological archives particularly relevant to their existing collections or where KCC has taken responsibility for the HS1 archive, all the contractors have to hold their archives until a long-term solution can be found. We are working to do this but as the county needs c. 875 cubic metres of storage to cope with current backlogs plus c. 1000 more for the next 20 years we have a huge and expensive problem.

Question 12: What solutions to the problem of un-depositable archives would you suggest?

27 free text responses were received from contracting organisations based in England. These are set out in full in Appendix v, which also includes one response received from an organisation based in Scotland and three responses from organisations based in Wales.

In addition a response was received from Kent County Council's Heritage Team which, again, merits citing in full as follows:

It is unlikely that the HLF will fund many (if any) archaeological archives. Local Authorities do not generally have the resources to look after them and so a range of options may have to be considered. For example:

1. Multi-county archives e.g. one for Kent and the adjacent counties. This might be financially viable but may not gain support from local people who wish to see artefacts back in their own county. If mechanisms can be arranged to allow for local display and for artefacts to be loaned to local groups this may work.

2. Assessment of backlog collections to determine if it all needs to go to an archive. Some backlog sites in Kent have not been assessed yet so the

collections requiring long-term storage would be substantially reduced if resources could be found for post-excavation assessment and analysis.

3. Changes in approaches to archiving. Can we be more selective about what artefacts are retained for long-term storage? Should museums specialise in particular archaeological periods? Could the level of post-excavation analysis be increased to reduce the quantities requiring storage?

4. Remote storage with very limited access to collections.

5. Could local communities curate archaeological archives? There may be problems however with long-term sustainability of such arrangements.

Appendix i: The survey questionnaire

Evaluating the archaeological resource in store – informing the future

Evaluating the archaeological resource in store – informing the future: a FAME survey of archaeological practices in England, Scotland and Wales

English Heritage and the Society of Museum Archaeologists have commissioned a project to explore a range of issues relating to archaeological archives. Its aim is to gather information on the current position of archaeological archives, and compile a report to inform the profession about both the current situation and the future of collection, storage and the provision of expertise. Further details of the project can be found on the FAME website at www.famearchaeology.co.uk.

FAME members have expressed a number of concerns relating to archaeological archives, especially the growing problem of completed archives that cannot be deposited. FAME has therefore given its support to the project, and has agreed to gather information on the quantity and nature of completed archives held by archaeological contractors that cannot be deposited because there is no store or museum able or willing to accept them.

We are extending this survey to all archaeological contractors in England, Scotland and Wales, and urge you to participate, so that we can build up the fullest possible picture of the present situation across the UK. Only by gathering this information can we make a robust case for improved provision.

Please answer as many questions as you can, even if you are unable to supply all of the information requested. If possible, organisations with regional offices should provide one response for their organisation as a whole.

All respondents will be entered into a prize draw for an Amazon Gift Voucher. The closing date for responses is 31 March.

1. What is the name of your organisation?

Evaluating the archaeological resource in store – informing the future

4. How many cubic metres (to the nearest cubic metre) do these undepositable archives occupy ?

5. How many cubic metres (to the nearest cubic metre) do your total temporary archive holdings occupy?

6. How much does it cost your organisation annually to store archives that cannot be deposited? Please provide at least a guesstimate (eg c£50k annually)

7. At 1st January 2012, which museums or stores were not accepting completed archaeological archives from your organisation? If you are unsure of the museum or store, please indicate the county, local authority or location in which you are unable to deposit your archives.

8. What are the reasons given for not accepting them?

- Store is full
- No resource to receive and accession them
- Temporary store closure
- No store collecting for this area

Other (please specify)

Evaluating the archaeological resource in store – informing the future

9. How often do you provide information on your undeposited archives to the following?

| | Annually | Every 2-5 years | Every 5 years or more | Only when asked | Never |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| The relevant museum or store | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The local authority archaeological curator | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The client | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Comments

10. Do you receive requests for access to archives that you hold temporarily (whether depositable or not)?

- Yes
 No

If yes, how many requests for access have you received since January 2007 (eg 25 requests)

11. Do you have any comments you wish to make regarding the specific issue of undepositable archives?

12. What solutions to the problem of undepositable archives would you suggest?

Appendix ii: Responding organisations

Albion Archaeology

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Ltd

AOC Archaeology Group – South

Archaeological Project Services

Archaeological Research Services Ltd

Archaeological Services & Consultancy Ltd

Archaeological Services WYAS

Archaeological Solutions Ltd

Archaeology South-East

Archaeology Warwickshire

Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln

Bournemouth University

Cambridge Archaeological Unit

Canterbury Archaeological Trust

CFA Archaeology Ltd

Colchester Archaeological Trust

Cotswold Archaeology

Dept of Archaeology, University of Sheffield

Dyfed Archaeological Trust

Essex County Council Field Archaeology Unit

Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust

Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service

GUARD Archaeology Limited

Gwynedd Archaeological Trust

Heeley City Farm

Heritage Network Ltd

Independent researcher

Isle of Wight County Archaeology Service

John Moore Heritage Services

Kent County Council

Museum of London Archaeology

Neil Archaeological Services

Nexus Heritage

Northamptonshire Archaeology

Northamptonshire County Council and Northamptonshire Districts

Oxford Archaeology

Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd

Southampton Archaeology

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit

Surrey County Council Archaeological Unit

Thames Valley Archaeological Services

University of Leicester Archaeological Services

Wessex Archaeology Limited

Winchelsea Archaeological Society

Worcestershire Archaeology

York Archaeological Trust (incl Northlight Heritage, ArchHeritage, Trent & Peak Archaeology)

Non-contracting organisations excluded from statistical analysis

Organisations in Scotland reported separately

Organisations in Wales reported separately

Appendix iii: Museums that survey respondents cite as ‘not collecting completed archaeological archives’

| Region | Local authority: museum and/or area (number of respondents reporting if more than one) | Comments |
|--------|--|---|
| EE | Bedford Museum (3) | Comment from one respondent: Store closure until 2014 |
| EE | Bedfordshire | |
| EE | Cambridgeshire County Council County Archaeology Store (2) | Comment from one respondent: [Not accepting] for sites of over 200 finds boxes. Any Cambridgeshire sites excavated with English Heritage grants as Cambridgeshire County Council's county store is not EH approved. |
| EE | Essex: Braintree Museum (Braintree District) (2) | |
| EE | Essex: Chelmsford | |
| EE | Essex: Epping Forest District Museum (2) | |
| EE | Essex: Saffron Walden Museum (Uttlesford District) (3) | Comment from one respondent: Until at least 2013 |
| EE | Hertfordshire: some, inc Lowewood Museum | |
| EE | Hertfordshire: North Hertfordshire (2) | |
| EE | Peterborough Museum (?) | |
| EE | Suffolk: St Edmundsbury Museums and all other five districts except Ipswich | |
| EM | Northamptonshire (11) | |
| EM | Northamptonshire (except Northampton) (2) | |
| EM | Nottinghamshire | |
| EM | Nottinghamshire County Museums | |
| EM | Nottinghamshire: All except Nottingham City | |
| EM | Rutland | Without finds |
| NE | Newcastle City Museum | |
| NW | Cheshire East (2) | Comment from one respondent: Records office |
| NW | Cumbria: Kendal Museum | |
| NW | Cumbria: Penrith Museum | |
| NW | Lancashire Museums Service (2) | Comment from one respondent: partly |
| NW | Lancaster City Museum | |
| NW | Manchester Museums | |
| NW | Wigan: Museum of Wigan Life | |
| SE | Berkshire | |
| SE | Berkshire (outside of Reading Borough Council area) (4) | Comment from one respondent: Reorganisation of stores, collecting policies and areas |
| SE | Berkshire east: Wokingham Museum | |
| SE | Berkshire: West Berkshire ¹ | Until 2014 |
| SE | Brighton Museum and Art Gallery | |
| SE | Buckinghamshire | |
| SE | Hampshire: Winchester Museum Service | We are aware of limited space |

¹ The Acting Archaeological Officer for West Berkshire Council informed FAME in November 2012 that 'West Berkshire Museum building in Newbury is closed till 2014 pending redevelopment but the museum service covering the unitary authority of West Berkshire is still very much in place. They are continuing to issue accession numbers and accept archaeological archives - see <http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=18817>'

| Region | Local authority: museum and/or area (number of respondents reporting if more than one) | Comments |
|--------|---|--|
| SE | Kent (9) | Comment from one respondent: All Kent museums have limited space apart from Folkestone Museum, Sandwich Museum, Bromley Museum, Gravesend Museum, Maidstone Museum, Sittingbourne Museum, Dartford Borough Museum (limited space), Rochester Museum, New Romney Museum, Ashford Museum, Sevenoaks Museum, Tunbridge Wells Museum which do not collect archaeological archives presently. Comment from one respondent: All areas except Maidstone, Canterbury & Dover |
| SE | Medway | No stores collecting |
| SE | Oxfordshire County Museum | We are aware of limited space |
| SE | Oxfordshire: Ashmolean Museum | |
| SE | Surrey: (all) | Museums are now running out of space and we therefore can only deposit a limited amount of archives with them annually. |
| SE | Surrey: East | |
| SE | Surrey: Chertsey Museum, Chertsey (2) | |
| SE | Surrey: East Surrey Museum, Tandridge | |
| SE | Surrey: Elmbridge Museum, Weybridge (2) | Comment from one respondent: Unless very small archive |
| SE | Surrey: Spelthorne Museum, Staines (2) | |
| SE | Surrey: Surrey County Museums (partly?) | |
| SE | Surrey: Surrey Heath Museum, Camberley | |
| SE | Surrey: Surrey History Centre | |
| SE | Sussex (all) | Museums are now running out of space and we therefore can only deposit a limited amount of archives with them annually. |
| SE | Sussex West: Horsham District Museum (pre 2011 archives) | |
| SW | Devon: Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter (3) | Comment from one respondent: Temporary closure until at least 2013 |
| SW | Dorset County Museum (3) | |
| SW | Gloucestershire: Corinium Museum | Will not accept split archive, or archive without transfer of title |
| SW | Swindon Museum | |
| SW | Wiltshire: North Wiltshire Heritage Service | We are aware of limited space |
| SW | Wiltshire: Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum | |
| WM | Staffordshire County Museum (Stoke on Trent) | |
| WM | Warwickshire | |
| WM | Warwickshire: Stratford District | |
| WM | West Midlands: Birmingham City Museum (2) | |
| WM | West Midlands: Dudley | |
| WM | West Midlands: Solihull Metropolitan Council (2) | |
| WM | West Midlands: Walsall | |
| WM | West Midlands: Wolverhampton City Council (2) | |
| WM | Worcestershire County Museum | |
| YH | North Yorkshire: Selby District | |
| YH | South Yorkshire: Barnsley | |
| YH | South Yorkshire: Doncaster Museum (2) | |

| Region | Local authority: museum and/or area (number of respondents reporting if more than one) | Comments |
|------------|---|----------|
| YH | West Yorkshire: Kirklees | |
| YH | West Yorkshire: Wakefield Museum | |
| YH & EM | Sheffield Museum (5) | |

Appendix iv: Do you have any comments you wish to make regarding the specific issue of undepositable archives?

1. Largest amount of undeposited archive is for [name] Museum – this is undergoing major refurbishment and will start collecting again in 2013. Archives need re-defining – it is no longer about re-creating the site from scratch but accepting a certain level of analysis has already taken place (ie we don't necessarily need to retain the whole assemblage) and making sure that each aspect retained meets criteria of significance and value.

2. The problem is getting worse. For our office it is an issue of space rather than storage costs. It does however create financial issues in terms of large amounts of negative work-in-progress we cannot release. [county] has indicated there will be a county store shortly and have suggested re-boxing and deposition charges will be applied. The fact that we have been [storing the material] for up to six years means this is not very fair – why should we shoulder additional costs? There is a concern no-one knows what archives we've got and their value.

3. Finding where to ask for an archive to go in the first place is difficult as each area/county/district/borough is different.

4. It is a growing problem and likely to get worse. Some museums and local authorities are using it as a political issue. In [county] the local authority has tried to impose a policy that prevents non-commercial excavations on the basis that the regional collections museum is not currently accepting archives because they do not have an archaeological curator to accession them. This has created widespread and vocal discontent as it has marginalised research and community excavations. This policy has been contested and it has now been out for consultation and we await to hear [city] Council's response.

5. To date, undepositable archives have not proved a significant issue for [contracting organisation]. However, our work profile consists of mostly small-scale works (watching briefs etc), many of which are negative. There seems little point in depositing archive for these: all relevant information is contained in the project report and the relevant HER, and the archive contains nothing that is ever likely to warrant future study.

6. [contracting organisation] has noticed in the last few years that it is becoming increasingly difficult to deposit archaeological archives in certain areas of the South East. Although everyone seems to acknowledge the problems that the contracting units and museums face there does not seem to be any progress in resolving these problems. Museums and units alike could do more to combat the problems we are all facing, by adopting new technology and digital data.

7. These responses are very generalised and it has been necessary to base the answers upon a fraction of our archives only. These are stored in three places in [name]. The answers given here relate to the so-called 'cold cases', fieldwork projects that have taken place since 1968 but have not reached publication stage and in many cases where there has been no post-excavation project. Two other archive categories can be identified: 1 Teaching collections, preponderantly human remains and faunal remains which are stored in separate rooms. 2. Current archive from active summer field archaeology. This too is stored separately.

8. Every effort must be made to have these deposited (including relaxation of

conditions, box-charges and EH accreditation etc.)

9. The greater problem for us is that the post excavation process often gets stalled, leaving [contracting organisation] indefinitely responsible for archives that are not yet ready to deposit. If these were included within the 'undepositable' category, a much larger proportion of the c. 260 cubic m of material we currently hold would be relevant. We also have a very large amount of active post excavation work currently in progress; thus within the next 12 months a significant number of additional project archives will be ready to deposit.

10. Most of our store is full of sites that are not there because the appropriate museum will not accept them but that we cannot afford the accessioning fee ([name] Museum £30 a box). Or more commonly we have many sites that either the company went into liquidation or for whatever funding reason have not paid us for finishing the job so those site will probably sit with us forever. For example on one site we have produced an immense number of finds than expected and our entire post-excavation budget was used just to conserve the small finds (4000 when normal site that size here yields about 400...) and couldn't get any further funding from developer.

11. The issue is likely to become more serious for [contracting organisation], undertaking more projects in [county] and [county].

12. It is only partially a problem of the museums. Slowness of archaeological contractors in presenting the archives to the museums has perhaps masked the true scale of the problem. Early consultation by contractors and long term forecasting needs to be done so that museums can plan ahead and make more provision for storage – resources allowing, of course.

13. This is not currently an issue in [county], but I anticipate that it will become one within the next year or so.

14. Our problem arises from a series of projects undertaken several years ago for which there is no funding to archive. There is also a shortage of funded time for establishing an efficient archiving system for current projects. Backlog projects require organising and documenting to make them suitable for archiving.

15. I'm aware through research that many archives are full. Some do not have enough staff to fully accession the material.

16. The majority of museums and stores require microfilming of archives, however, some museums have begun to accept data only in its digital form, refusing to accept archives that contain microfilms. This is not an issue in itself, but becomes an issue where submission of data to the NMR is concerned. The NMR is currently unable to accept digital archives, with all digital archives going to ADS. The NMR does not foresee the acceptance of digital archives in the near future. Therefore, all sites require microfilming to be submitted to the NMR, at extra cost, where the museum will not accept microfilm. It would be useful if this were clarified in national guidance, as well as further guidance about digital archiving.

Despite the obvious problems and logistics, standardising procedures across the UK or England, or even regions eg South, South East, South West etc would help to create a single system for preparation of archives. There is at present no link between guidelines issued by one county or another, in terms of Transfer of Title for instance: some counties issue their own transfer documents, some expect the contractor to

prepare a document; some counties require the entirety of an archive to be kept together and if a landowner requests to retain the artefacts and cannot be persuaded to deposit them, the entire archive must be retained by the landowner, whereas other counties allow the artefacts to be retained by the landowner as long as the rest of the archive is deposited; box sizes vary across the board, and whilst it's impractical to require one box size as stores have different sized shelving, it makes the preparation of archives more challenging, with minimum orders of box types (where these cannot be acquired from the museum) needed, for smaller units both cost and storage can become a problem. The development of a national policy and standards, for all accessioning institutions would improve the quality of the archives and allow for more efficient and cost effective preparation.

A national standard for retention and dispersal would be useful, and although institutions might wish to retain different materials or artefact types, there must be common grounds for developing a national policy or even publishing all of the various collections policies in a single document to make the current guidelines clearer.

Issues with 'accessioning': Although it is clearly a problem when museums announce that they are no longer taking archives due to lack of space, there is a period before this announcement during which it becomes difficult to deposit archives with the museums due to lack of response. In this interim period the museum in question is still officially 'accepting' yet will not accept archives, which can lead to a backlog that cannot be cleared when the museum officially stops accepting. This can become a problem with not only discharge of the planning condition (see below), but also if another museum in the area agrees to take these archives, they may only accept those for the period after they officially stopped accepting and not for the period that the museum was unresponsive, leaving archives in limbo unable to be deposited. Authorities in an area not currently accepting archives are still issuing briefs meaning that the condition cannot be fulfilled until an archive has been deposited by the archaeological contractor, even though it is known that there is no repository in the area eg [county] Council issue briefs for [borough], which does not have an archive repository, archives for [borough] cannot be deposited at [county] Museum. On occasion we have been told that the condition cannot be discharged until deposition has taken place, even though deposition is not possible as there is no accessioning museum in the area.

17. We haven't actually prepared many archives for deposition in the areas where we know there is no repository as we tend to concentrate on those that we can actually deposit therefore our figures, especially for the digital material, are a bit vague. Also it is difficult to prepare archives when there are no specific guidelines to follow so we don't know what requirements we should be meeting.

18. It is unfair of [county] Museums Service to have a policy re collecting, including fee charged, agree pre-project to accept assemblages, and then to refuse assemblages AFTER the watching brief has taken place. Considerable administrative effort spent needlessly. Argument that a small archive is of less value seems odd when no previous archaeological work has taken place in the village concerned, and any archaeological evidence (medieval pottery + World War I military brooch from watching brief in churchyard) would potentially be useful in the future.

19. Our stores do not adhere to Museum guidelines (roof leaks) they were just intended for short term storage during the post-excavation stage of each project. Therefore long term storage means we often have to re-box archives, which adds greatly to our costs both in staff time and materials (intensive curation). In addition, it

reduces storage space for ongoing projects and it makes us prioritise the archiving of larger projects which we know can be deposited. Undepositable archives in the context of our RO status means that we are unable (in a number of cases) to fulfil the IfA guidelines (deposition within 5 years).

20. 1. A large problem is caused by the sudden cessation of work on a project due to the bankruptcy of the client meaning that archives cannot reach the standard required by a receiving museum, although some of these will be outside the remit of this survey.

2. When a museum re-opens after an extensive delay they often still expect a deposition fee to be paid at current rates rather than that which was applicable when they closed despite us having to have paid storage costs ourselves sometimes for some years whilst the relevant museum was renovated or closed for reasons not always disclosed to us.

3. Box charges applied to projects emerging from a long post-excavation period may become subject to large deposition charges which were not applicable at the time the museum were originally notified of the project and the client contract agreed. This retrospective charging is impossible to fund and makes it impossible to deposit archives to museums that are open. eg [name] Museum and proposed new charges at [unitary authority] Museum.

4. Whilst [contracting organisation] employ rigorous selection and retention policies and we are happy to negotiate discard policies on major archives with the receiving museum on a site by site basis we find it difficult to access clear general museum guidance on this issue. At some museums the collecting policy changes with staff restructuring giving us concern as to the archaeological principles behind it and suspicion that some policies are based on size of store available which will undermine the value of a regional collection.

21. It [the specific issue of undepositable archives] needs to be addressed asap.

22. The answers given refer only to those archives actually fully ready to be deposited. A number of further archives have not been fully prepared yet based on lack of available museum, and would take the total to nearer 100 archives. Most prepared recently had agreements to take from museums from years ago, so it is the upcoming sites which are going to prove a greater issue.

23. Local authorities state in their brief that archives should be deposited but there is no way of doing it. Also local community groups are being told that there is no way to store their finds (even where Museums take archives).

24. The survey has only requested completed archives which cannot be deposited at this time. [contracting organisation] hold almost an equivalent amount of artefacts and paper records for on-going projects for [county] and [name] Museum knowing there is no ability to deposit these archives. In effect, the true figures represented for questions 1–4 should be doubled.

- The longer the problem is left the more likely it is that the ability to view slides and microfiche will become more difficult as the equipment required to view will become obsolete (if it is not already) and not held by museums.

- The onus is left on responsible commercial units to maintain, conserve and monitor depositable archives using internal manpower at no cost to the museum but cost to the

company.

- [contracting organisation] is holding a growing amount of maritime related artefacts and paper records which have little or no facility for them to be deposited to a permanent store. These again require specialist monitoring which costs are borne by the company.

- [contracting organisation] also hold a large surplus of specific sized boxes required by many of the museums (our holdings are approx. 500 accumulated empty boxes which is estimated at 13 cu m) which can only be ordered in a minimum amount. This represents a storage problem for the company after archives are deposited as they cannot be returned to the manufacturer and a credit received.

- The return of archives by museums is accepted IF they are not produced to the required guidelines. There are instances, however, where the entire archive has been returned due to one or two minor errors which can be quickly adjusted or corrected. This is an unacceptable amount of double handling and very time consuming.

- [contracting organisation] is currently exploring the option of returning archives to landowners after a set period of storage, or, in some instances, of discarding the archive partially or completely. Neither option is ideal, although the option of selective discard at least follows accepted guidelines.

- Monoliths and cores have, again, not been referred to in the questionnaire or the issue of the retained residues which accompany FLOTS until the point of deposition. This holding for [contracting organisation] is currently estimated at a further 180 cu m.

25. Since this issue has been building for a long time much of the material concerned relates to legacy projects which it is now not easy to re-assess for purposes of discard in particular. Greater planning and awareness would perhaps have been helpful locally as archaeologists are now responding to the current crisis, and could have responded earlier if more had been said about storage capacities at an earlier date. Getting clarity from museums generally about their current capacities would be helpful – ie it is not always easy to establish what the real situation is, as there is seemingly a reluctance to declare this. Also their collection policies are generally focussed on everything and this does not help in the current situation, nor indeed does the apparent dread of de-accessioning.

26. In our case we hold over 500,000 items and various archives in around 10,000 sq ft (60,000 cu ft) of storage at an annual rent of £50K and with the equivalent of two curatorial staff giving with incidentals an annual cost of between £120K and £130K. Unlike most Units we have however three accredited museums so that although we may feel that this material should be held by local museums we find that having museums of our own means that we must respond to the realities. Usage of the archives varies but currently supports the activities of 4 PhD students and four high level research projects.

SCOTLAND

1. The problem in Scotland is different to the problem in England (although we do some work in England and N Ireland and have had problems depositing archives there). In Scotland the RCAHMS takes all our paper/digital records without any problems. The problem is for finds with the Treasure Trove system, as (I'm told) the panel can only process 30 archaeological site archives per sitting (3–4 times a year).

We have waited over a year for them to process our last batch of reported finds, and so far all they have done is claim the finds, they have not yet been allocated – we will have to wait for their next meeting for that, so just finding out where the archive has to go can take almost 2 years, then we have to arrange delivery (and often there is no response to contact for some time, or the store is full). In England I've had problems getting archives accepted in the [county] area, although it has happened eventually (and the [name] Museum has been very difficult in NI).

WALES

1. Large artefact collections from excavations are rare from [area of] Wales. It's now almost 30 years since we collected a very large artefact [assemblage]. Most of our fieldwork results in a paper record with no finds, or finds that can be accommodated into one or two boxes. Normally archives without artefacts are deposited with the NMR (RCAHMMW), and those with finds are deposited with county museums or the National Museum Wales. As the [name] Trust also maintains the regional HER many of our small archives have been temporary lodged with the HER. We are currently slowly depositing these with the NMR.

2. (Please note the National Panel for Archaeological Archives in Wales will be looking into this and related issues in a Welsh context – contact Elizabeth Walker Amgueddfa Cymru National Museum Wales or Andrew Marvell GGAT.)

Appendix v: What solutions to the problem of undepositable archives would you suggest?

1. 1) Regional depositories. Museums are possibly not the most appropriate place to store archives, one must seriously question the capacity of museums to provide suitable facilities for use of archive by general public or for research. As more local authorities see themselves as commissioning bodies and as more 'services' are spun off, contracting units might be best placed to bid for funding and run regional depositories for the benefit of the wider community (to include HER and other relevant archives).

2) Recognising that the contractors can only practically and ethically take responsibility for ensuring that the archive is collated and ready for deposition. By the time an archive gets to deposition, charges allowed in the original agreement with the client have probably increased (and may increase substantial in the future) and even if it were possible to seek variations the client probably went bust long ago. Where stores do not exist, the planning authority should take responsibility for the archive ensuring that relevant planning charges are in place to allow contracting units to hand their archive over at the earliest opportunity.

2. It should be mandatory for each county to have a store. There should be petitioning from ALGAO members. When open, they should accept archives over 3–5 years old free of charge.

3. In an ideal world, have regional stores eg East Midlands and that would also address areas having different requirements for archiving and box sizes. Digital archiving partially solves the problem, but still left with the physical archive. Consistent and robust discard policies (to be developed at curatorial level).

4. Government needs to be made aware of the problem that is building up. Ultimately it will be a case of either the developer pays, the museum (state) pays and/or more archaeological archives will be thrown away by units who cannot cope with storing the volumes of material. Perhaps archival material should be scored as to its importance so that certain material that does not meet that criteria can be discarded as a matter of course.

5. As there are a number of different reasons for archives to be undepositable, there is no simple solution, though provision of adequate resources to the receiving bodies (museums, HERs) would go some way towards providing a solution. I believe that we, as archaeologists, have to ask serious questions regarding why we are keeping all this material, and what it is ever realistically going to be used for, if at all.

6. I would suggest that the museums and units work together to reduce the amount of space existing archaeological archives take up and that there are more stringent guidelines on disposal of artefacts for each category of artefact. In addition (and specifically in relation to legacy archives) employing a three strike rule with regards to transfer of title. This would show the units/museums due diligence in attempting to obtain legal title prior to deposition, which would allow for more speedy deposition after project completion. Having a uniform national or regional standard of packaging and archive guidelines for units to follow would also allow for quicker turnaround of archaeological archives and dissemination with the public. Ideally regional stores (based on the LAARC model) would ensure a regional hub which local museums could loan exhibition pieces from and allow deposition of previously undepositable archives.

7. A pathway towards a solution to the problem at [university-based contracting organisation] has been in place for the past four years where an academic member of staff has been given the responsibility of working towards the publication of the 'cold cases' including assessment of archive, constructing research proposals, application for grants, and the publication of reports. Dialogue with local museums has been opened. All of this is a long job and costly on the basis of staff resource. Disposal of low priority archive is being considered but this is a sensitive issue that will require careful consideration.

8. Surveys should be undertaken to ascertain the character of archive use/need; for finds, stringent / realistic discard policies must be implemented based on real 'use' / research value (eg: discard all bone assemblages less than, say, 5000 pieces unless there are intrinsic-value reasons to keep). Also support idea of using salt mines to store archaeological archives.

9. Some investment in museum/archaeological storage in Kent. Anything else (eg robust disposal/retention policies) will mitigate the problem but not adequately address it.

10. I would suggest perhaps whether the museum would agree to take sites where there was no funding without charging us a fee, but it wouldn't happen as many of our unfinished sites are Council ones so it is unlikely they would volunteer to take finds of a site they haven't the funding to pay us to write up! With cuts at our local museums more and more people are coming to us for information as the museum has been turning them away. We also regularly contact the smaller museums and ask them how much of it they really want and have started disposing of unimportant artefacts once recorded.

11. A temporary central repository. Long term regional archive stores. Digital replacement of 'paper' records which can be destroyed. More ruthless finds discard policy from curators and museums.

12. This is a prime Heritage Lottery Fund project. Public accessibility and use of archives needs far greater promotion and facilitation. County or perhaps regional depositories should be established – set up with HLF funding and run with income from storage fees. County depositories would provide maximum local access, relevance, etc.

13. A more robust attitude to what types of archaeological archives do not warrant deposition with a museum would be useful. At present there are a whole range of archaeological projects (negative watching briefs or evaluations, or small scale works) which add very little to knowledge of a site or produce archives with any reasonable research potential. All useful information is transferred to HERs, but units continue to deposit the records and finds with museums as this is more cost-effective for them than to undertake the current procedures for non-deposition.

14. Two archives have found a new life as teaching collections within university conservation courses.

15. Improved retention/dispersal policies. Funding for examining pre-existing archive collections in museums. Negative watching brief/evaluation report archives could perhaps be submitted in the form of a microfilm or digital copy only. External independent archive repository with links to museums and contractors that rents space for archive storage in controlled and secure conditions. In several cases, particularly

with [county], which has not been able to accept archives for several years, either at the central store or at regional museums, Curators have been able to recommend appropriate local or volunteer run museums, which have a demonstrable connection with the site. Where this has been the case, these archives have been deposited with a local museum on the advice of the Curator eg [site name] archive went to Y Museum following advice and links set up by Z Museum. A site from 2007 in [parish], [borough] went to [borough] Local Studies Centre who were able to make it accessible to the public after 5 years. Though this is not ideal if the museums are not MLA registered, the local MLA registered museum has suggested it and is aware of the location of the archive.

16. Funding should be sought for county or region wide resource centres which would enable all local archives to be stored and curated in one place and which would facilitate study and allow access to a much wider audience. This way responsibility for storage space would not fall on small and underfunded local museums but they would still be able to access material for displays etc.

17. Various out-stores in [county] have been investigated by [name] Consultancy, including a 'publicly accessible store' in [city] – great idea, but difficult to fund in present economic climate. Temporary measure needed for whole counties, while longer-term solution is investigated.

18. Review of Museum collections on a county basis (research agendas) with stricter retention and dispersal policies
Input from Museum staff and finds specialists/environmental specialists (assessments for future retention/disposal)
Setting up temporary regional stores at a cost
Resource centres with controlled use of finds archives for outreach purposes
More communication from Keepers of Archaeology (in some case a response would be helpful).

19. A tiered archaeological specific collecting policy.

1. Collect a deposition fee at the outset of a project when the site is notified which may be based on size of project or cost of project. This should be paid directly to a relevant regional repository binding them to agree to accept the archive at the end and also ensuring that the money is not lost if the developer or contractor goes bankrupt or there is an overspend in post-excavation.

2. The money from 1. should be used to fund regional stores which act as clearing houses for all archaeological archives and are staffed by archaeologists. This would greatly simplify the collecting guidelines eg box sizes and charges, and allow a unified approach to selection and retention relevant to the local planning and archaeological frameworks. All archives must pass through this repository for checking before being divided according to the following criteria; display items – which can then be borrowed by or sent to the relevant local museum, regular use collections eg human remains which are frequently consulted which can remain at the regional repository and finally deep storage archives consisting of elements used less often.

3. Deep store archives could be housed at any economically and environmentally approved repository eg Deep Store salt mine in Cheshire. The cost of initial input should be met by the depositor. Long term storage costs may be met by grant / upfront fee investments and access costs must be met by the researcher. Logistical management issues surrounding the access to deep store archives would be the

responsibility of either the regional store or local museum curator for the site. Failure to deposit should be monitored by Local authority curators in conjunction with the regional store managers to ensure that rogue contractors are being sanctioned. Where bankruptcy affects the deposition of an archive the regional store and local authority archaeologist must assume control or responsibility for the archive. Documentary archives could be approached in a much more publicly accessible way. eg scanned hard copy PdfA archives uploaded for free to OASIS alongside the report would ensure that information is available wherever access to an internet is available alongside the artefact archive and could be used to reduce storage. A single set of national digital deposition guidelines is needed urgently.

20. I would suggest disposing of all but museum quality finds which could be touted round the museums. If the finds have been properly catalogued and assessed by a specialist there is no real need to keep them. Specialists I have spoken to rarely want to see the finds themselves but want to see reports and catalogues. This should be the case for all sites as pretty soon all archives will be full. The specialists should be forced to set down national guidelines for a much reduced retention policy.

21. We [initials of organisation] aim to bid for HLF funds to create an archaeological resource centre to act as a repository for archaeological archives in [county] minus [city] probably combined with an Archives repository.

22. More museum storage is clearly required, although not necessarily possible. Digital archives seem to be the only obvious space-saving solution.

23. In the case of clients refusing to pay for the final post-excavation stage then in the first place the local archaeological curator should be forceful with the Local Planning Authority to not permit the discharge of the condition. If this does not work, then the archive should be considered complete and depositable (in those areas still collecting) so that it was available for research. In the case of areas refusing to collect then it is up to the Local Planning Authorities, who are still putting conditions on development, to fund a store. The bleak truth is that there is no point in undertaking the project if there is no provision for the archive. Failing a locally funded store then a number of options should be considered. These include:

- returning the archive to the owner;
- dispersing the archive to interested local societies / schools;
- depositing with local non-registered museums.

All the above after full recording of the archive.

24. Rigorous discard policy – eg negative watching briefs: if they're recorded on the HER and the report is good enough do we need an archive?

25. • The current situation regarding archaeological archives as a whole is unsustainable. This situation is much larger than those archives that currently cannot be deposited. It is clear that more and more museums and stores will become full in the near future and the difficulties will only get worse. At present there are no arrangements at all for marine archives.

• Local Planning Authorities regularly specify as part of a planning condition that archives should be deposited with a designated museum in the knowledge that this condition cannot be met in the foreseeable future. As such, these planning conditions are non-compliant.

• After a national consultation process conducted by the appropriate bodies, planning conditions should identify the storage costs borne by contractors as well by museums and stores and specify that storage is a material consideration.

- Current archaeological retention policies have been overtaken by the massive increase in developer-funded projects. A fundamental reworking is required of what is retained on site, how and why it is studied and recorded, and how that information is made accessible. The urgent need for this exercise is knowledge driven, not cost-driven.
- Doing nothing is not an option.

26. Though undepositable archives may now have become too much part of the current scene for any easy solutions there, there are strategies that could reduce further such outcomes to a minimum eg:

- a) adopting discard as a core element of archaeological work by concentrating on collecting data with reference to reference collections in many more areas than just pottery (or indeed including pottery in many areas still);
- b) using technology to maximise space-saving, primarily through digitisation and digital-born data being the norm as is happening already (with the option then that other parties such as ADS, but also locally, might through their participation reduce the physical space needed in the museum – eg could paper archives then be put into deep (cheaper) storage elsewhere instead?);
- c) and by developing the concept in museums that museum archaeology is largely the examples worthy of retention for specific reasons (?research, exhibition etc) and not the bulk materials (unless for the same reasons). Such changes of direction would be very challenging and go against the grain but there is clearly a need for some radical rethinking of how we practice archaeology in regard to project archives.

27. In 2002 The Yorkshire Collections Access Project involving many partners was developed but failed due to lack of capital and perhaps because it developed too wide a remit. Since then museums have proved, probably unwisely, resistant to expanding their role as custodians of the heritage; this has the effect of reducing external funding for stores. At the same time there has been from museums professionals ever higher and more costly specification for stores. The solutions seem to lie with expanding ADS type facilities. Low cost storage in buildings with sunk capital costs funded by HLF? A renaissance in the museum world.

SCOTLAND

1. In Scotland, change the Treasure Trove system. I would like to have a national meeting or series of meetings about this issue with all relevant bodies involved. In England, large centralised stores seem the best way forward.

WALES

1. There needs to be more clear guidelines and policies on the types and quantities of material that is archived. Disposal policies need to be firmed up.

2. The Trust is working in partnership with [name] University on a project to itemise, scan and make available the images held by the Trust. External funding is required to help archive early projects.

3. Written agreement of specialists identifying material that can be disposed before deposition. Museums and approved stores/archives review retention policies. Central/regional deposit points/ARCs from which museums can draw down material.