

**Archaeological archives: new models for archive creation, deposition, storage, access and research**

What can the sector do to redefine the archaeological archive and realise its public value?

**7 April 2017**

**Draft write up for circulation 11/05/2017**

Jan Wills

**Proposed actions:** *The proposed actions will be discussed further at a follow-up meeting to be convened by Historic England, to discuss priorities and who might lead and resource them*

Topic	Actions	Link to summary points	Who
Input to/influence on the DCMS Museums Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion with review team</li> </ul>	all	
Monitoring the scale of the challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through projects such as 'Seeing the Light of Day' and SMA/HE surveys continue to model skills capacity and storage capacity and demand.</li> </ul>	1	
Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider 'advocacy statement' or 'good practice statement' from ACE/HE on the value of archaeological archives – linked to implementing outcome of the Museums Review?</li> </ul>	2	
Strategic archive storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion with ACE and others (HLF, DCMS) in the context of the Museums Review</li> <li>Feasibility study for national (or regional) archive stores/resource centres, followed by preparation of business case for funding</li> </ul>	10	
Project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review standards and guidance better to embed archive creation and assessment into all life cycle stages of projects. Include evaluating the significance of archives, for example at PX assessment stage (see eg <i>Significance 2.0</i>: <a href="http://collectionstrust.org.uk/resource/reviewing-significance-2-0/">http://collectionstrust.org.uk/resource/reviewing-significance-2-0/</a>)</li> </ul>	3, 8	
Planning process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review implementation of NPPF policy on archives and develop best practice examples of policy, planning conditions, and WSIs.</li> <li>Consider whether current policy/guidance is adequate, and what requires amendment should an opportunity arise.</li> </ul>	7	
Ownership of archives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek legal opinion to test current/new views on title to artefacts.</li> </ul>	9	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review implications with sector partners</li> </ul>		
Rationalisation of existing collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted funding stream (? challenge funding) to allow museums to rationalise 'historic' archives in order to create some short-medium term storage headroom.</li> </ul>	3, 12	
Costs of archive curation, and storage (capital and revenue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an understanding of whole life (? but time limited) storage costs (which covers both archive store/resource centres and deep-store type alternatives) with the aim of producing a transparent national costing model.</li> <li>Consider how costs might be apportioned: developer/public funds</li> </ul>	11	
Leadership/liaison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review current structure to enable clearer leadership and better collaboration</li> </ul>	4, 6	
Archive usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a better understanding of the professional and public usage (and potential usage) of archives in order to inform retention strategies. Include both museums and contractor stores.</li> <li>Consider whether archives are 'findable' through existing systems, or whether there is a need for new or enhanced routes (national index, HERs, HIAS, Oasis)</li> </ul>	5, 15	
Selection and deposition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce unified core guidance, endorsed by ClfA, SMA, HE, ALGAO, FAME etc, on archive selection and deposition (as an alternative to fragmented or 'competing' guidance).</li> <li>Encourage academic studies on approaches to selection or digital alternatives to physical retention across a range of material types</li> </ul>	12, 14	
Implications for professional standards of selection/discard policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review changes to recording practices/standards that might enable less physical retention</li> </ul>	13	

## **Summary of main issues discussed**

### **1. The archives 'crisis'**

The profession has been discussing problems with archive deposition and storage for many years without finding solutions, although there is now a greater degree of awareness of the issues and progress has been made on specific topics. Surveys of collecting museums and of the holdings of archaeological contractors have been undertaken, and national/international guidelines have been produced. A number of current projects are addressing selection and retention in existing museum collections, and (within the southwest region) a wide range of museum, planning and liaison issues. It is notable that many of the eight recommendations of the SMA report of 2012 were designed to address questions that were, once again, central to the discussions in this workshop.

### **2. Valuing archives**

In theory we understand the public benefit of archaeological archives but we have not articulated this well, either within the profession or to government or to the public. Archives are more often spoken of as a problem or a burden rather than a valued resource, and the focus is on the amount of space required for their storage rather than their potential for use by researchers and the public. There is a need for advocacy of the value of our archives but advocacy needs to be grounded in the realities of current and future public expenditure.

### **3. Can we keep everything forever?**

The general consensus was no. Clear policies and guidance should steer the creation of valued archives with assessed research and display potential. Curation should be dynamic, and archives periodically reviewed for their comparative significance in order to guide retention decisions.

### **4. Working together**

Many individuals and organisations are involved in the creation, deposition and curation of archaeological archives: developers, consultants, contractors and their specialist advisers, local authority planning advisers, museum curators. Understanding and liaison can be patchy across these individuals/organisations: developers may not understand their responsibilities; there is a particular disconnect between those creating the archive and museums, often with little contact until the point of deposition; planning advisers may not have the capacity to monitor the archive element of a project. Cuts in local authority funding and staff mean that there is less capacity for liaison.

The low level of engagement of the academic community with this workshop, and archives from development-led archaeology in general, was noted. However, the potential for involvement of academics and researchers in many aspects of archive management and potential was identified.

The split of responsibilities between government departments (DCLG and DCMS), and between ACE, Historic England, and HLF is also a factor but unlikely to change, so we must make the existing arrangements work more effectively.

## **5. Archives usage**

Although we have collected information on museum storage and staffing, volumes of archives awaiting deposition and other issues, we do not have good information on which components of archives are used, how they are used, whether in a museum or with contractors. Opinions and anecdotal evidence suggest everything from little use of the majority of archives through to frequent use, including of those held by contractors. Some museums will have information on use of their own collections but there is no overall assessment. Although it is felt that, increasingly, we have undertaken much of the data collection we need, this is an area that would benefit from survey and could include looking at public knowledge of and attitudes to archives.

## **6. Leadership**

Many organisations are involved in developing archives policy and practice: ACE, HE, ALGAO, FAME, ClfA, SMA, and groups have been created to improve co-ordination of effort eg AAF, ClfA archives group. There is a perception that the sector is fragmented and that this is a barrier to action.

The first recommendation of the SMA 2012 report – that ACE, Historic England and AAF should produce a national policy statement on the significance of archives – has not been implemented.

## **7. The planning system**

At the introduction of PPG16 in 1990, and the rapid increase in developer funding for archaeological investigation, provision for the consequent archives was not properly thought through, specified or integrated into the planning system.

The NPPF has a good policy, and there is supporting guidance but additional guidance is required. The NPPF does not include a requirement for museums to accept archives, neither is there any specific funding mechanism to support archives or any guidance on situations where there is no collecting museum.

There is scope within national and local guidance and Local Plan policies to articulate better the responsibilities and the process of archiving, specifying this more clearly and fully in planning conditions and WSIs. There is some good practice in these areas that could be disseminated. Ideally more detailed phased planning conditions are needed, although more detailed model conditions drafted for the Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 in 2015 were not acceptable to government. Archive deposition is rarely monitored by local authority planning advisers, nor is enforcement of planning conditions often used to expedite archive deposition.

There is some use of Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 agreements to fund archives but there are competing needs for resources for (for example) education, libraries and roads; some existing good practice in this area needs to be disseminated.

There is a need for clearer overall guidance on archives in the planning process, with model/good practice examples.

## **8. Project designs and project management**

The archive needs to be considered as one of the principal products through the life cycle of a project, as part of mainstream project management rather than as an end of project activity undertaken only by archives staff. Project documentation should set out how the archive will be

created, managed and deposited with the costs (including specialist advice on selection, retention and discard) built into the overall project costs.

All projects should start with research questions, and the research potential of the archive should be considered as part of this. Research potential and significance can be reviewed as part of the post excavation assessment process and before deposition, so that the potential of an archive is known to the receiving museum (who should also have been involved in the assessment process).

## **9. Transfer of title**

Artefacts are understood generally to be the property of the landowner from whose land they derive. However, difficulties in establishing ownership and obtaining a transfer of title to the receiving museum leaves many archives in limbo. Linear projects and very large projects are a particular problem. Current research discussed in this workshop presents an alternative view of ownership; this needs to be explored and tested with further legal opinion. A simplification of this issue could assist with the movement of archives through the system.

## **10. Storage**

The storage problems have been and are being well documented by previous and current surveys. They are not replicated for other museum collections because of the 'pipeline' of developer-funded archaeology that continues to produce new archives. Many of these have no collecting museum to go to and many other museums are nearing capacity. Where there is no museum home for archives they are held by the archaeological contractor that produced them; there is a consequent and significant on-going cost to the businesses concerned.

The appropriateness of storage of archaeological archives in museums was questioned; some archives may have very little potential for display, education and engagement but high potential for specialist research.

New repositories for archaeological archives, linked to museums, are needed, on a national or a regional scale. The capital costs might come from ACE and/or HLF. There would be an issue of who would own and administer the new facility(ies).

## **11. Funding**

The full cost of creating and curating archives is not understood, although at least one local authority has calculated the cost based on using deep storage. We need an agreed costing model.

Costs may need to be explicitly shared between the developer – perhaps for a defined period of time such as 25yrs – and public funds for the longer term.

Developers are not paying the full cost of the archives arising from their developments - charges currently levied vary enormously and c 55% of responding museums in the 2016 SMA survey do not make any charge for deposition.

Local authorities are under extreme financial pressure, leading to a loss of specialist staff (in museums and as planning advisers), and capacity generally. There is unlikely to be any more resource from local authorities.

The proportion of the project costs for archiving may be diverted elsewhere before the end of the project, leaving little to create and deposit the archive; this is a project management issue although

it should also be seen in the context of a perceived under-costing of the archive component of projects generally.

The management of resources from developers was discussed: should this be paid into a central dedicated fund?

## **12. Guidance on selection and retention**

*'New archives'*: We have produced standards and guidance on creating archives but the standard is not always met and the guidelines are not widely followed. Many guidelines are too generic, not specific enough. Selection is seen as volume management, not as research archive creation and there can be pressure to reduce volume in order to reduce both deposition and storage costs.

Museums are often not involved in decision making when an archive is being prepared. In many cases expertise tends to lie with the archaeological contractor and commissioned specialist rather than the museum, although the relevant specialists may not be available at the optimum times on site and in archive preparation.

We could take some relatively simple decisions, such as not retaining archives from 'negative' sites – but guidance is needed even on this.

*'Historic archives'*: while there is scope for rationalisation of existing archive collections this process has a cost and many museums do not have the funding or the expertise to undertake it. Current pilot projects funded by Historic England may encourage more organisations to undertake this, thus freeing some space for new material by, for example, selective retention of bulk finds based on agreed criteria.

There could be an adverse public reaction to the discard of their local archives and we need to take account of this.

## **13. Standards**

Selection and retention needs to be considered along with standards in recording on site and in post excavation analysis – decisions to discard may result in a need for a higher level of prior recording.

## **14. Digital archives**

The potential of digital technology to transform archives was acknowledged but not discussed in detail. Suggestions included retaining a digital only archive for those projects which produced little or no significant material, the artefacts themselves being discarded. On site developments in digital recording are not being paralleled in archive creation. Guidance on digital archiving is needed.

## **15. Information about archives**

In order to improve use and accessibility is there a need for a new national index of archives? More easily accessible information could help to increase the use of archives for research. How would this link to HERs which should signpost where are local archives are?

## **16. Confidence**

As a sector we lack confidence in articulating the value of archives, determining what they should consist of, and advocating for the resources they need. We are risk-averse.

The pace of development of new types of scientific analysis means that we feel a need to keep everything, just in case. There are excellent examples of the re-use and research on older archives.

However, if we don't make choices others will do it for us since not everything can be retained forever.

## Workshop notes

### Morning session

#### Introduction - Hedley Swain

There's been an 'archives crisis' for more than 20 years, so is there really a crisis?

We've been discussing these issues for 20 + years without finding solutions

We've had lots of surveys – we don't need any more

Are there compelling arguments for the value of archaeological archives that capture the zeitgeist?

There will be no money or other resource from local authorities

There is money around but compelling arguments will have to be made in order to capture it - and the amount of money needed is not enormous

We shouldn't think about cubic meterage, it's about public value. So what is the public value of archives?

What has been the outcome of keeping archives as we do – has there been an explosion in knowledge?

Whose job is it to sort this out - we are fragmented as a profession - is that one of the problems that makes it difficult to address these issues?

Are we agreed about the philosophy of what we are doing; if so, have we got the tools in place to deliver? If we agree, and have the tools, have we got the capacity to deliver?

For whom is this a priority?

We need a two page solution with an identified cost in order to argue our case for resources.

#### Group session 1

**Do we know why we are creating and keeping archives, what their archaeological value is and how they are actually being used? What is their potential for future research, display, public access?**

What are the issues?

#### Table 1 Facilitator: Mike Heyworth

We have a theoretical answer: public benefit, but there is no collective, articulated, substantiated overview. We understand at a high level, but not at the level of detail to enable a case to be made, for example, to local authorities.

We don't know enough about usage of archives.

There has been no philosophical discussion about archives in the last 25 years.



Since PPG16 was approved there has been no 'new' response from museums / no new revised philosophy/model, but now there is a different world. The PPG16 model was not thought though fully to include archives.

We are less brave – new scientific techniques are developing all the time so we are scared of making judgements which may come back to haunt us. We feel a need to keep everything just in case...

We need to work with the 'now' as well as thinking about future generations.

There is a danger of archaeology by numbers – no professional judgement is being applied.

The archive is a sample of a sample – not absolute truth.

Professional v public expectations – these are very different.

We need to start from the research questions – which can then lead to an assessment of the value of archives – there is not enough focus on research.

The archaeological contractor has a key responsibility – on behalf of the client – as they have the best understanding of context from which the archive derives.

We must avoid the 'deposit and run' option which seems to be practised by many contractors; instead the value of an archive could be assessed as part of the preparation for deposition process.

We need general principles for the approach to the assessment of the value of the archive.

A greater use of standards and national reference collections is needed.

We have a collective responsibility to tackle these issues – the crisis is our responsibility.

Title remains a key issue to resolve.

Current standards and guidance are too generic – we need more practical guidance to support professional confidence. Not all of those that are in place are being followed. Insufficient confidence in decision making and we leave the decisions to others further down the line.

Great to have reference to archives in the NPPF, but we are missing detailed guidance.

Museum skill set more important than museum context when thinking about archives.

We must exercise more choice throughout projects (*cf* MAP2 process of regular team meetings a good one, but unsustainable unless we undertake fewer interventions, or record and don't keep material from less significant interventions).

If we don't make the choices there is a danger that others will make the decisions for us eg cash starved local authorities. We haven't articulated properly the value of archives that they hold.

Is there a crisis? Not a visible public concern – but might become one if it became clear we were throwing away their history ... we must avoid judgements being made by others using non-archaeological criteria.

Best case examples must be promoted (LAARC, Chester Farm, etc).

Potential for digital access – we can divorce keeping physical and documentary archives together. We're not making best use of digital technology.

There is a long time lag in rewriting history for public audiences.

Archiving should be considered at the start of the project: do we need to do the work in the first place, say why we are collecting the material and for what purpose.

Why are we keeping archives: for future generations... to gain knowledge ... tell stories, and make ourselves better human beings.

**Is the existing legal and policy framework sufficient to enable the archaeological archive to be created, deposited and curated?**

What are the issues?

**Table 2 Facilitator: David Dawson**

There is a disconnect in the planning process – it doesn't 'require' archives to be accepted by museums or funding allocated.

Repositories have no direct line to funding as system is not joined up.

Legal issues regarding title: artefacts are owned by the landowner which leads to transfer of title issues: it is a voluntary system. The onus is on the developer to ensure this happens.

Haggai Mor has identified a possible different legal approach to Transfer of Title. This needs to be followed up to produce new clear legal guidance that has been tested (HE + ? DCLG).

We haven't exploited the potential of the NPPF 'public access' test – is it being met?

Wiltshire Museum – appeal decision by Secretary of State has some potential to help – this needs a legal view.

Phased planning conditions are needed instead of the current model condition:

- Need to set out the steps to publication / archive
- There are other conditions in use.
- DM archaeologists are advising planning committees
- DM archaeologists need 'backing'
- Government was going to review all planning conditions 3 years ago – not done (action needed by DCLG)
- Issues include – ignorance, embedded practices, advice from DM archaeologists may be ignored by planning officers and/or committees

Funding is not allocated for the cost of archives

- CIL / Section 106 – but lack of ability to get high enough on planning policy agenda, competing need for resources eg for education, roads
- Contractors – finds archives are not their responsibility – landowners are owners
- Better joint action needed by DCLG / DCMS on policy front
  - What advocacy is happening?

- DCLG focus is elsewhere ... removing roadblocks to development
- Perception that HLF won't fund storage
  - Have we failed to advocate access?
  - Lots of HLF-funded 'History Centres'

Should contractors be costing projects for **them** to store the material where there is no museum capacity?

How are contractors costing archiving?

- Museums don't know the costs themselves / aren't acting as "businesses"
- Need an accepted costing model
- Perhaps use a standard % across developers

Which museums **should** be taking archives?

- Possibly a smaller number of centres of excellence
- Do museum development programmes / MD Officers have expertise / knowledge to do anything about this?
- How do we create centres of excellence -> policy eg qualified archaeologist / place of deposit
- HLF fund could fund 50% of capital cost if good public access
- Government has to do something for major infrastructure projects – eg HS2
- Need for dynamic management of archives

Written Schemes of Investigation

- No – we don't make use of opportunities that we have already
- Model + review of conditions – ALGAO
- Seeing the Light of Day project outputs
- Post Excavation Assessment should also be specifying retention / deposition

Monitoring of archives

- Not at all
- Briefs are monitored to report stage and **not** further
- Enforcement much harder at this stage
- Applicant needs to know what's required
- How can enforcement happen [ie once development has started then the 'lever' has gone] ?

Ownership / Transfer of Title

- Problem can be solved (Haggai Mor research)
- Needs to be mandated – HE
- To be accepted need Local Authority Counsel opinion and ideally Judicial Review (not cheap)

Do key partners work together?

- No
- Place-shaping not enabled
- Need for better / pro-active briefs [POLICY] ->
  - Public access
  - Community archaeology
  - Deposition

Impact of loss of staff

- Will result in lowest common denominator

- Needs to be quick and simple – staff are time poor

**Are there fieldwork and analysis practices we could improve that would refine our approach to selection?**

What are the issues?

**Table 3 Facilitator: Duncan Brown**

Standards and good practice guidance exists for selection for archive but is rarely implemented, museums are not involved, and it is seen as the responsibility of archives specialists. A model selection procedure is in draft.

We need to build selection into the project design.

Need to identify research objectives.

Museums are not involved in projects at an early enough stage, and in the decision making on selection.

Responsibility is given to an archives officers, not shared through the project management.

Selection processes are seen as for volume management, not as for maximising the research potential of archives.

Selection already takes place but experts are often not available on site or during archive preparation.

Skills issues – we need to understand the research potential of finds and archives in general.

Ignorance of good practice in creating and managing digital data.

Time and money are driving decision-making but we are not investing in good quality decision-making

We are not clear on who uses archives and for what purpose.

Universities are not involved in the process.

If you throw things away you may need more recording on site and during post-excavation.

We are a risk averse sector, without confidence in the decisions we are making.

Fieldwork processes are there but not being used.

**Should we keep everything forever, irrespective of the significance of the sites that the archives represent?**

What are the issues?

**Table 4 facilitator Stephen Reed**

No, don't keep negative sites

Museums/LA advisers/contractors need to talk to each other - but there may not be capacity to do this. We need to increase communication between museums and contractors over archive creation.

Increased analysis of material that may be discarded may be needed.

Seeking funding from developers for digital archive creation/deposition may put too much financial pressure on developers.

Are museums the right place for archives?

Possible technological alternatives to keeping everything - digital proxies? Seed bank approach to sampling of bulk finds?

Developers are not paying the full cost of archives. Archaeologists don't value their own work and cost accordingly.

Existing archives in museums need to be assessed and this will inform future collection policies.

Who is deciding what is kept - mainly contractors, and little liaison with museums.

---

## Afternoon

**All groups tackled solutions to all questions, apart from Table 2 which concentrated on legal and policy issues:**

**HS:** so we know what the value of archives is? Yes, but not the value of individual archives. They are a part of the whole archaeological resource. We know what we should be doing but we're not talking. How do we make this happen?

### Table 1

A national overview of archive usage needed (however harsh the results).

We need to define what we mean by looking at an archive – does this include display objects, education, research? Multiple ways in which it can be defined and we need to be consistent.

There are 493 museums in Britain with archaeological material – surveys are challenging and we may need to consider sampling and on the ground investigative interviewing.

More engagement from academics needed, especially to define the academic value of archives – can we use impact studies as part of the REF?

Need research into public attitudes to archives – this might help to calculate contingent value.

Archive model is rather out of date and unclear to the public – more immediacy for public engagement at time of fieldwork via social media and access to the excavations which will generate more understanding of the site and the desire to access material in the archive in due course.

Make archives more visible online – link HERs to archives and feed into initiatives like Know Your Place.

Use planning gain from developer funding towards engagement and positive PR re archives.

More discussions needed on sharing of skill sets – how and where? Refer back to national standards and reference collections. Sharing approach needed to build confidence and share decision making.

Expertise re archaeological archives mostly lies in local authority museums.

Is the solution regional to build critical mass? More commercial approach to build skills and capacity with developer funding to reduce the burden on local authorities. Needs funding ring-fenced from developer.

Storage costs are variable across the UK and not always charged. Must be done everywhere and more consistently. More guidance needed on appropriate storage costs. SMA can do this and then HE can increase its standard box rate. Costs of storage depreciate over time, but not with all models.

Do we have to keep everything in perpetuity? Move from developer funded to public collection after 25 years (say) following review based on use and value? Still an incentive to client to deposit lean, mean archive in the first place.

Must resolve issues around transfer of title.

Better use of phased planning conditions – title transfer linked to sign off of conditions.

Selection and guidance documentation mostly written in 1990s and needs to be reviewed, perhaps in modular way as capacity of key organisations/individuals limited. Link to ClfA standards.

Must be more selective in choosing whether to undertake fieldwork – only when it will add value. Have to overcome peer group pressure and fear of unknown value.

Build expertise into contractors – better sampling strategies / mobilise PhD/MA students to look at linked topics – provides added headspace. Set up recognised programme with AHRC funding?

Keep everything forever? Guidelines from 5 museums being collected together (HE funded).

Museums or repositories? Can be mixed model with SLAs in place to expand LA capacity.

Compare paper archives and National Archive. How is this handled?

Regional solutions? Level of granularity is crucial – political v administrative v public perspectives.

No one-size fits all model.

Revisit governance models for 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## **Table 2**

Embed archives policy in local plans, HE to provide advice to LPAs.

Improve archaeological content in all planning documentation.

Agree repositories to hold archives: space/location/numbers/standards.

Advocacy: champion the issues.

Use accurate costing for a % levy on all developments. Cambridge has already calculated the real cost.

Making it happen – need best practice guidance from ClfA.

Training and mentoring.

No-one is suggesting that we get rid of social history collections but the problem in archaeology is the pipeline from development-funded archaeology.

We’ve made it a problem for archives people, it’s a problem for all of us. Need to mainstream the archives issue.

Where are the academics?

Why doesn’t the planning system work better? Its is there, but not well enough developed.

Create centres of excellence.

Public value and engagement needs to be demonstrated.

Minimum standards – who sets them?

National policy making – need lead from ACE

Need for advocacy of public benefit.

Need for a statement from ACE and HE on the value of archives, as recommended by the Edwards report

Identify a champion and organisations to act

Many archives still with contractors

Big issue of standards

**Implementation:**

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clearer guidance on all stages from pre-planning to discharge</li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explicit articulation of archives in Local Development Plans and Policies – as compliance with NPPF policies</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Historic England – review guidance to local authorities on Local Development Plans</li> <li>○ Local Planning Authorities</li> </ul>

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion of archive preparation, deposition, use / access in <b>all</b> stages of planning documentation - ie             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pre-application discussions – recognition</li> <li>○ Brief – LPA + depository requirement including outreach</li> <li>○ WSI – methodology for above</li> <li>○ PXA – outcomes, challenge and solutions - proposal</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clearer standards and guidance</li> <li>○ Model paperwork / clauses</li> <li>○ Circulation of case studies</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy-makers             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ HE, Government, LGA, ALGAO, FAME, ACE</li> <li>○ Contractors / consultants</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Museums / depositories</li> </ul>
--	--

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Repositories that will hold, promote and enable access to archaeological archives</li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ National / regional / local solutions – ‘museum’ type services</li> <li>○ Needs space / location, curation</li> <li>○ Minimum standards -&gt; ‘place of deposit’ / centre of excellence – with outreach</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ACE – partner with HE. Society of Museum Archaeologists, Museums Association</li> </ul>

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advocacy – public benefit / education / awareness</li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Delivered by sector-wide plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Time Team / Detectives TV programmes using archives</li> <li>○ Strong policy statements</li> <li>○ Identify a champion</li> <li>○ Re-invigorate APPAG</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Following recommendations of 2012 report by Rachel Edwards</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ACE, National Museum Director’s Conference, CIFA, MA, SMA, HE, Historic Environment Forum</li> <li>○ Government – including National Infrastructure Commission</li> <li>○ Infrastructure projects – HS2, Hinkley, A303</li> </ul>

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Accurate costings</li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Channel tunnel link – boxes per mile</li> <li>○ HS2 estimate / forward demand</li> <li>○ Seeing the Light of Day</li> <li>○ Propose a % levy on all projects</li> <li>○ Business planning</li> <li>○ HE own research</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SMA, Seeing the Light of Day, HE – own research on infrastructure requirements (have estimated workforce, why not archives?)</li> </ul>

What	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implementation                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clear consistent best practice guidance</li> <li>○ Advocacy within local authorities – planning officers</li> <li>○ Establish ‘legal’ status of archaeological archives alongside financial / HR records (preservation by record principle)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Designate archaeological archives as heritage assets</li> <li>○ CIFA standards &amp; guidance</li> <li>○ NPPF guidance</li> <li>○ Feasibility studies – eg legal issues, capital funding, revenue funding, looking abroad</li> <li>○ Training and mentoring programme</li> </ul>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Guidance – HE, CIFA</li> <li>○ Advocacy within LAs – ALGAO, HE, LGA, CBA, POS</li> <li>○ Training – CIFA, HE, RICS, RIBA, RTPI</li> <li>○ Note: Valletta Convention requires an ‘authorised person’</li> </ul>



**Table 3**

Should we be ring-fencing money at the start of a project to keep for archiving so that the sum costed for archiving isn't spent on other things?

Resourcing of projects is not adequate (not total agreement on this), and there is usually insufficient money left for the archive. A % of the project budget could go to a national fund to support archives.

Projects are driven by time and money, not quality

Things have improved somewhat but standards are not implemented properly.

The archive is not properly a part of the project, not valued, spoken of as a burden, need re-conceptualising as an asset. Mainstream archiving.

Need for a national index of archives, also need proper links to HERs.

Refine fieldwork processes to improve archiving.

But we will still be creating archives and we must be selective.

Material doesn't have to be in a museum for ever – after 25 years maybe we should reassess the value. Developer pays for the first 25yrs?

Use research agendas to re-examine and re-evaluate material.

A selection strategy should be in place before starting work, reflecting the research design, and it can be modified as the project develops.

Recording and discard should be linked.

Time pressure leads to poor decisions.

**Table 4**

We need to take collective responsibility in deciding whether to keep or not.

Active management of archives is needed - review and rationalise periodically, discard based on review and rationalisation. Box fees could cover 20 years of deposition, then review.

Assess significance of archives - locally /nationally significant.

Deposition should be of the material we want to retain for future research and the museums should then periodically review their collections.

There is scope for some rationalisation of existing collections, but rationalisation is expensive.

Keeping everything can lead to the neglect of the most important archives.

The actual space occupied by archaeological archives is very small.

You can use volunteers to catalogue archives but this can be expensive because of the costs of supervision and teaching.

Create a national catalogue as part of the rationalisation – stand-alone? How would this link to HERs, Oasis? National consistency is needed. Once the national catalogue has been created with national funding new archives could be added by the curator. ACE could create the national record, and HLF could fund individual museums to populate it.

De-accessioning and throwing away could cause an adverse public reaction.

Sort out title issues.

Use post excavation assessment process for archive assessment.

Funding sources: ACE, HLF - but sustainability issues after initial capital investment.

Who to act? SMA - but many museums don't have archaeological curators, national museums council, FAME, ClfA.

Need to join up local authority archaeological advisors and museums - but staff shortages impede this.

Importance of WSI content covering the creation and deposition of the archive.

### **Discussion of storage at end of day:**

Where should the material be stored? A single national store? Deep stores, other options?

- Probably regional stores – need feasibility study – that can be used by museums. HS2 undertaking an options survey for deposition – results in the summer
- Doesn't matter where it housed as long as it's accessible
- Ring fence money for storage
- Can you estimate the % cost of a project that should be allocated to the archive?
- Can't be one size fits all but a national repository could be a solution

Funding:

- developers to fund initial costs, HLF might fund capital.
- Need a feasibility study.
- Where do you cut from developer funding to state funding?

Who would own the new repository:

- An existing national or regional museum
- ACE?
- Historic England?
- a new organisation?
- English Heritage – as part of the national collection?

Advocacy:

- we need a road map for influencing decision makers and funders.