

OPTIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARCHIVES

Part Two - Appendices

Report prepared for
Arts Council England and Historic England

March 2021

Quinton Carroll

Sally Croft

Manda Forster

Samantha Paul

Justin Wiles

Table of Contents

APPENDIX 1	DESKTOP REVIEW	3
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Theme 1 – A National storage strategy	4
1.3	Theme 2 – A National Archive Compilation Strategy	10
1.4	Theme 3 – Understanding use / users of archaeological archives	12
1.5	Conclusions	13
1.6	Gaps in our understanding – next steps	14
APPENDIX 2	DATA COLLECTION SURVEY	16
2.1	The survey	16
2.2	Headline results	16
2.3	Results of the survey	17
APPENDIX 3	EXISTING SOLUTIONS	26
3.1	Methodology	26
3.2	The Case Studies	26
3.3	Existing Regional / County solutions	27
3.4	Existing National Solutions	31
3.5	Case Study Questionnaire	32
APPENDIX 4	RETHINKING USER NEEDS WORKSHOPS	35
4.1	Introduction	35
4.2	Methodology	35
4.3	Findings	36
4.4	Individual Sessions (Workshops 1-3)	37
APPENDIX 5	STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION	6
5.1	Introduction	6
5.2	Methodology	6
5.3	Outcomes	6
5.4	Individual Sessions	7
BIBLIOGRAPHY		18

Tables

Table 1. Comparison of suggested costs for storing 1m3 of archaeological archives over 10 years	6
Table 2. Size of organisations that responded to the survey.	17
Table 3. Total current/active projects per size of organisation.	18
Table 4. Completed projects awaiting deposition per size of organisation.	19
Table 5. Completed projects undepositable per size of organisation.	20
Table 6. Percentage of completed projects held by contracting units that are undepositable	21
Table 7. Responses to Data collection survey, question 9: Use of addition facilities	24
Table 8. Annual accrual rate of archaeological archives by size of contracting organisation.	25

Figures

Figure 1. User Needs Workshop, Session 1 Jamboard (composite)	1
Figure 2. User Needs Workshop, Session 2 Jamboard (composite)	1
Figure 3. User Needs workshop, Session 3 Jamboard (composite)	3
Figure 4. User Needs Workshops, Session 4 Jamboard (composite)	5
Figure 5. Stakeholder workshops, Session 1, Proposition #1 Jamboard summary	8
Figure 6. Stakeholder workshops, Session 1, Proposition #1 Jamboard (composite)	9
Figure 7. Stakeholder workshops, Session 2, Proposition #2 Jamboard summary	10
Figure 8. Stakeholder workshops, Session 2, Proposition #2 Jamboard (composite)	11
Figure 9. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #3 summary	12
Figure 10. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #3 Jamboard (composite)	13
Figure 11. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, proposition #4 summary	14
Figure 12. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, proposition #4 Jamboard (composite)	14
Figure 13. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #5 summary	15
Figure 14. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #5 Jamboard (composite)	16
Figure 15. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, Proposition #6 summary	17
Figure 16. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, Proposition #6 Jamboard (composite)	17

APPENDIX 1 DESKTOP REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The *Options for Sustainable Archaeological Archives Project 2020* is the latest in a series of research and consultation projects looking at archaeological archives, commencing with the Society of Museum Archaeologists *Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012* project (Edwards 2013). Each of these reports has provided results and made recommendations that are relevant to this project, which are summarised here.

This section offers a review of the relevant projects, highlighting recommendations and collating relevant evidence, as well as identifying gaps in the available research. The reports consulted are:

- SMA / Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 (Edwards 2013)
- ACE / Wiltshire Museum / Seeing the Light of Day (Ferne, McNulty and Dawson 2017)
- HE / *Gathering Information on Deep Storage Archive Facilities in England* (Tsang 2017)
- HE / ClfA / *21st Century Challenges for Archaeology* (Wills 2018)
- HE / SMA / *Museums Collecting Archaeology (England) Report Year 3* (Boyle, Booth and Rawden 2018)
- SMA / HE / *Guidance on the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections* (Baxter, Boyle and Creighton 2018)
- ALGAO / HE / *Planning for Archives: Opportunities and Omissions* (Donnelly-Symes 2019)
- HE / *A Survey of Fees for the Transfer of Archaeological Archives in England* (Vincent 2019)
- MA / *Empowering Collections* (Museum Association 2019)

This review draws out the relevant recommendations and briefly summarises the supporting evidence that led to those recommendations being made, highlighting where further research was called for. The review will not consider discussions or recommendations around 'selection' or 'digital archiving'. While both issues are relevant to the current project, they have or are being addressed through the *ClfA Selection Toolkit* project (ClfA 2019) and the *Dig Digital* project (Forster 2020).

In addition to the above reports, this review also considers the recommendations made by Dr Samantha Paul in her doctoral thesis:

- *Why do we have this? A study of museum approaches to retention and disposal of archaeological archives* (Paul 2020).

This review does not include data from the following two reports as they either do not make relevant recommendations relevant to this project or the project is in progress: *Dig Digital* (HE project 7796, Forster 2020) and the DCMS consultation, *Revising the definition of treasure in the Treasure Act 1996 and revising the related codes of practice*.

The recommendations and supporting evidence from the reports listed above are discussed under the following themes:

- Theme 1 - National storage strategy
- Theme 2 - National archive compilation strategy
- Theme 3 - Use and users of Archaeological Archives

1.2 Theme 1 – A National storage strategy

Project: Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 (2013)

Recommendation 4 of the *Archaeological Archives and Museums Report 2012*:

“Develop a national strategy for the storage and curation of archaeological archives. For the national resource represented by archives to be accessible, attention needs to be paid to how and where material is stored; what is selected for retention as archives are prepared; what can be discarded from older archives.” (Edwards 2013, p9)

The completion of Recommendation 4 would fulfil Recommendation 6:

“Seek solutions for archive material that currently cannot be transferred to a repository.” (Edwards 2013, p10)

The Archaeological Archives and Museums survey aimed to identify areas of the country where an archaeological resource centre might provide an acceptable solution for the continued provision of access to archaeological collections and consider issues relevant to the establishment of archaeological resource centres (p14).

The report detailed the gaps in collecting areas across England in 2012 (p18) as well as highlighting that the situation was fluid. Some of the issues identified by the Society of Museum Archaeology’s 2002 and 2006 surveys into museum collecting areas (Bott 2003, Edwards 2006) had been resolved by 2012, while others had arisen (Edwards 2013, p17 and p19). In a significant number of cases there were discrepancies between a unit claiming they were unable to deposit, and curators reporting that museums were open to archaeological archives (p43).

Museums were asked to quantify the volume of their stored archaeological archives by cubic meters or by number of boxes, as well as to provide details on total storage capacity in cubic or square meters. Responses from 21 museums suggested the volume of stored archaeological archives ranged of 8m³ to 2,759m³, with an average volume of 314.81m³ (p24). Responses from 22 museums suggested the total storage space in museums ranged from 7m³ to 6,923m³, with an average volume of 1,247m³ (p24). This suggests that on average, 25% of museums stores are taken up by archaeological collections. These figures were provided with the caveat they represent a small number of museums and that most responders to the 2012 survey were unable to provide this data. In the report, the museum reporting a volume of 2,750m³ stored archaeological collections was considered to be an exception, and it was recommended that the number be excluded from the average volume calculations (Edwards 2013, p25). However following discussion with the author, it has been confirmed that the responder represented a county museum service and therefore were representative of that type of museum and should not be excluded from the count.

Three quarters of museums were funded by local authorities. As museum services are not a statutory requirement of local authorities, spending cuts by local authorities would have an impact on a museum’s continued ability to store and curate archaeological archives (p20). At the same time, many existing archaeological archives are homeless, remaining in the care of contracting organisations (p40). The FAME survey did not identify quantities of un-depositable archives by area nor data from some areas where gaps in collecting are known to exist so while the overall size of the issue was identified, the scale of the problem for specific areas was unknown (p43).

Therefore, at a national level it was possible to identify general trends in reduction or archaeological archive collecting but at a local level these were influenced by the local history and development of museums in their towns, districts, or counties, and subject to local pressures and political agendas (p47). However, the report did conclude that ‘local is important’; for many museums, it is important that they continue to collect and retain local material relevant to local populations (p45) and that where issues relating to archaeological archives had been addressed most effectively, this was through local collaboration (p47).

The Archaeological Archives and Museums Report 2012 therefore did not identify any specific areas of the country where an archaeological resource centre might provide an acceptable solution for the continued provision of access

to archaeological collections, but instead recommended a national strategy for the storage and curation of archaeological archives.

Project: Seeing the Light of Day (2017)

Recommendation 2 of the Seeing the Light of Day report:

"The storage and access crisis can be solved at a regional and national level." (Ferne, McNulty and Dawson 2017)

The report found that museum stores in the South West of England are full and archaeological contractors are holding large backlogs of archives that they are unable to deposit (p2). Over 1,300 cubic metres of archaeological finds and documentary archives are being held by archaeological contractors in temporary storage presenting a risk to their business viability (p4).

Barrier to deposition from the contractor's point of view included museums' lack of storage or inability to accept archaeological archives due to lack of resources including lack of experienced or knowledgeable staff (p5). The museums felt that where the existing backlogs to be deposited, they would take much of the available space in museums (p6).

The report concludes that NPPF requirement to provide public access to archaeological archives can be met at a regional and national level (p9). However, the report does not suggest any solutions or recommend any specific forms of regional or national storage.

The report suggested that understanding the costs of storing, managing and providing access to archaeology collections required further study (p7). The use of Deep Store was mooted though it was felt that realistic, long-term funding formulas needed to be created (p5). A few museums in the region have secured funding through Section 106 agreements (S106) for new storage facilities, but non through Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) (p6-7).

Therefore, Recommendation 2 states that sectors must come together to establish the delivery body that will implement a large-scale storage strategy. This will enable units to deposit the backlog of archives with a publicly accessible repository, support future development, and prevent the situation from worsening (p8).

The sector should also develop funding, charging and business models to ensure sustainable curation of archaeological archives in a regional/ national repository based on the robust cost model provided by the Seeing the Light of Day project (p8). The model details the costs of Wiltshire Museum setting up a new rented store, archive ingest, and their annual running costs. This figure is compared to the costs of DeepStore and Re-store as detailed in the 'Gathering Information on Deep Storage Archive Facilities in England' report (Tsang 2017) and a cost per m³ for each facility is summarised. The costs for 10 years of storage per m³ are given in Table 1.

During a workshop on 14/11/2017, Lorraine Mepham of Wessex Archaeology provided a series of costs per m³ of storage at DeepStore, Wiltshire Museum and Wessex Archaeology over a 10-year period (it is unclear how the £1 additional box access cost is calculated). The costs for 10 years of storage per m³ are given in Table 1.

Table 1 details the comparison of suggested costs for storing 1m³ of archaeological archives over 10 years from the 'Gathering information on Deep Storage' report, 'Seeing the Light of Day' project and Lorraine Mepham's presentation 'The True Cost of Collecting'. A true comparison is not possible as the costs have been reached through different methodologies, some include staff time to compile and curate, some include access retrieval costs, while others do not.

Table 1. Comparison of suggested costs for storing 1m³ of archaeological archives over 10 years

	Gathering information on deep storage facilities (Tsang 2017)	Seeing Light of Day: Wiltshire Museum Cost Model	Lorraine Mephram: The True Cost of Collecting cost model
DeepStore	£762.80 (does not include retrieval/ access costs)	£889 (includes access costs based on Wiltshire museum cost model)	£736 OR £1,353 (includes additional access cost @ £1 per box- not clear how this is calculated)
Restore	£1,565.50 (does not include retrieval/ access costs)	£1,692 (includes access costs based on Wiltshire museum cost model)	
Museum X	£522.90 (£52.29pa in 2015/16)		
Undeposited archives (Edwards 2013)	£2484.80 (£248.48pa)		
Wiltshire Museum		£1,320 (includes access costs)	£1,320 (includes access costs)
Wessex Archaeology			£1,040 OR £1,356 (with addition of WA staff costs)

Project: Gathering information on deep storage archive facilities in England

The *Gathering Information on Deep Storage Archive Facilities in England* report defined Deep Storage as off-site storage outsourced to a commercial facility, often based a long way from the originating museum or repository (p3). The report therefore discussed the benefits and drawbacks of deep storage in terms of supporting existing museum storage, rather than as an alternative means of archive curation.

The report suggested that off-site storage is more suitable for less frequently accessed and physically robust material, and that a dual strategy that also maintains a local store for material regularly accessed, or in need of regular monitoring in-house may be required (p6).

Use of deep storage facilities requires detailed recording of the contents of each box to run their own databases and for retrieval, therefore museums would need to decide how this would work with their own inhouse recording systems (p5). The costs of recovering material from deep storage mean there are greater benefits to those closer to, or on the fastest access routes to the facilities (p6). The costs for 10 years of storage per m³ are given in Table 1.

The project had had limited success in establishing the real costs of museum-based archaeological storage (only one museum, Museum X, provided the information required), yet the report concluded there are clear benefits to holding archaeological archives in a curatorial institution in terms of accessibility and cost, except where storage issues cannot be resolved. Deep storage could provide a 'stop gap' for museums that require additional or temporary storage (p8). However, the costs of deep storage are significantly lower than some museum deposition fees, and the amount archaeological contractors are paying to store 'un-depositable' archives, therefore it may become financially beneficial for contractors to use those facilities instead of depositing with a museum (p8). The

cost of storing 1m³ of un-depositable archives was established from the Edwards 2012 report and is detailed in Table 1 along with the suggested costs for DeepStore, Restore and Museum X.

Project: 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology Report

Proposed action 4 of Workshop 1, Archaeological archives, 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report:

"Strategic archive storage: Feasibility study for national (or regional) archive stores/resource centres, followed by preparation of business case for funding." (Wills 2018, p6)

Proposed action 9 of Workshop 1, Archaeological archives, 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report:

"Costs of archive curation, and storage (capital and revenue): 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. Consider how costs might be apportioned: developer/public funds." (Wills 2018, p9)

The 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report highlighted many of the same issues as discussed by the Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 report (Edwards 2013), suggesting that the circumstances (the 'storage crisis') leading to recommendations for a national archiving strategy had not improved in the intervening 6 years. The report stated that the 'storage crisis' around archaeological archives is not replicated for other museum collections because of the 'pipeline' of developer-funded archaeology that continues to produce new archives (Wills 2018, p12). Workshop participants also questioned the appropriateness of storing research archives in museums, some having little potential for display, education and engagement (p13).

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 report concluded that new repositories for archaeological archives, linked to museums, are needed, on a national or a regional scale (p13). The capital costs might come from ACE and/or HLF augmented by the use of Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 agreements. However, the report did suggest there would be an issue of who would own and administer the new facility(ies).

Project: Museums Collecting Archaeology (England) Report Year 3 (2018)

Year three of the Museums Collecting Archaeology report (Boyle, Booth and Rawden 2018) detailed the results of the 2018 survey as well as summarised the previous two years results. Relevant data regarding the continued threat the provision for curating archaeological archives includes the following:

59.4% of responding museums described themselves as continuing to actively collect archaeological archives in 2018, up from 2017 (52%) but roughly equal to the 2016 result (59.5%) (p3). As in 2016 and 2017, the most cited reason for ceasing to collect, was lack of space (76.9%) followed by shortage of staff resource and then staff expertise (p18).

The regions with the highest percentages of museums ceasing to collect were recorded as the North West (20%), London & East England areas (20%) and West Midlands (18.1%) regions (p 19).

"This is a crisis!!"

"Shelving is full, and archives are now stacking up on the floor due to a lack of storage space."

"We are at the brink of completely running out of space."

(quotes from responders)

Similar to the data provided in 2016 and 2017, 66.6% of responding museums in 2018 (and which are actively continuing to collect) reported that they will run out of space within 5 years or less (p46). 48% of responding

museums have specialist museum archaeological expertise as per the ClfA Specialist Competence Matrix in 2018 (p47)

Project: Guidance on the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections (2018)

Guidance on the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections document (Baxter, Boyle and Creighton 2018) is informed by the results of five detailed scoping studies which demonstrated that rationalisation is unlikely to release large amounts of space in store.

All five participating institutions conclusively demonstrated that rationalisation is not a cost-effective way to increase storage capacity. The costs and resources required to undertake rationalisation and disposal to its conclusion were high, whilst the amount of space it released was relatively small.

Project: Planning for Archives - Opportunities and Omissions (2019)

No recommendations regarding regional or national storage were made in the Planning for Archives: Opportunities and Omissions report (Donnelly-Symes 2019). However, the report did highlight National Planning Policy Framework Footnote (2018) 64 which states that archives should be deposited with a local museum or other public repository (p7). This requirement was not being met across England as archaeological archives were unable to be deposited in over 25% of the country, with many more museums expecting to be unable to accept archive within the next five years (p16). The report also raised concerns over the declining numbers of staff and level of expertise within museums to fulfil the requirement for accessibility (p16).

The potential to acquire funding to explicitly assist with the facilitation of archaeological archiving through section 106 agreements or the Community Infrastructure Levy was also highlighted (p17).

The report also discussed one further proposal of attaching archaeological archiving to Arts Council museum accreditation but did question how non-museum archive repositories would be factored into this scenario. The report suggested that this would be worth further investigation as a means to ensuring that all archive repositories are working to an acceptable standard and that archives are ultimately lodged with those repositories that have publicly committed to curating them (p17-18).

Project: A Survey of Fees for the Transfer of Archaeological Archives in England 2019

The Survey of Fees for the Transfer of Archaeological Archives in England project aimed to understand the charges and fee structures imposed by collecting organisations in England for the deposition of archaeological archives (Vincent 2019). The report concluded that the vast variation in the fees charged by collecting organisations for the deposition of archaeological archives (ranging from £0 to £1200 for one document box plus 3 bulk finds boxes), was the result of confusion on how to calculate costs, the HE box grant scheme and what those costs should cover (p8).

The methods used by collecting institutions to calculate costs are not transparent and many institutions simply base their fees on those of others under the assumption that someone established that fees are reasonable (p7). This has resulted in deposition fees remaining artificially low, and no collecting organisation is currently covering its storage costs (p8).

The report recommendations are based around existing storage within museums and other repositories; however, some provide guidance when thinking about establishing charging structures:

*"Current fees should not be considered a useful benchmark against which to set fees in the future."
(Vincent 2019, p9)*

Setting a single fee across organisations is unrealistic due to the variation in the type, size and make up of collecting organisations. However, clearer guidance on what factors which should be considered when setting fees would be helpful (p8).

"Discussion around shared, regional or national storage solutions should acknowledge the variable nature of income from archaeological archive depositions."

"Any discussions around future storage solutions should take into account the financial impact of archaeological archives which collecting organisations have agreed to accept, but which have not yet been deposited." (Vincent 2019, p9)

The income currently generated through charging for archaeological archive deposition is variable across institutions and is influenced by the time between project inception and deposition of the archive.

Project: Empowering Collections (2019)

Recommendation 11 of the Empowering Collections report:

"Explore shared storage solutions. Many collections are held in unsuitable stores. Efficient storage solutions in which multiple museums share the same up-to-date storage facility can help to solve this problem, while also ensuring that collections are well documented." (Museum Association 2019, p23)

The Museum Association feel that overflowing storage combined with limited staffing and resources, mean that many museum collections are in a state of stasis or even decay. Funding cuts over the past decade have resulted in a loss of collections resources and skilled museum staff meaning museums are unable to provide adequate care for the items that they hold, undertake rigorous collections reviews, or transfer unwanted and duplicate items out of their collections. Therefore, new storage solutions and more effective collections reviews and rationalisation are required (p5).

Note: The 'Rehousing the collection of the Science Museum Group' case study provides insight on how 300,000 objects can be recorded and transported utilising barcode scanning technology alongside an app and automated image ingest pipeline, directly linked to the museum's collection management system.

Doctoral thesis: Why do we have this? A study of museum approaches to retention and disposal of archaeological archives (2020)

Recommendation 4 of the thesis:

"Develop a National Archaeological Archive Resource as an alternative to museum-based curation" (Paul 2020, p251).

The thesis demonstrated a need for new repositories for archaeological archives at a regional or national scale in order to remove the burden of commercially derived archives from the museums who feel unable to appropriately curate them. The research suggested that organisation at a regional level would prove difficult due to the variations in complex overarching political, economic and financial pressures, coupled with cross local-authority funding arrangements. The thesis therefore recommended that that storage of archaeological archives should be at a national level, either in one location, or through central organisation of satellite stores.

The author stipulated that the physical storage environment should meet the SMA definition of a publicly accessible repository as fair, inclusive, equitable, flexible and responsive (Society for Museum Archaeologists, 2019), and that the ideal situation would be a large, publicly accessible resource centre, staffed by qualified curators and professional archaeologists that supported access to the archaeological resource for any purpose such as research, exhibition, learning and general interest as defined by the Archaeological Archives Forum (Archaeological Archives Forum, 2010). However, it was also noted in the thesis that public interest is best served when the archives are located where they will be best understood, valued and made accessible, and that a remote location was not necessarily a barrier to use if the systems are in place to access and retrieve that material when necessary.

The thesis also recommended that the creation of a national storage solution could remove the emotional and ethical burden on some curators to look after material that is rarely accessed or used within their museum, as well as neutralise some of the mistrust between commercial archaeologists and museum curators around box fees, selection

criteria and financial incentives to deposit, not deposit, or how much to deposit. However, it was also noted that this may well not suit those museums fully engaged with the archaeological archiving process, and the loss of an important revenue stream for some may mean they would be unwilling to move to a national system of curation. The thesis demonstrated that many museums do not want to lose control of their archaeological collections, and for some, involvement in the planning process supports local authority funding of the museum and its staff. It was therefore suggested that where museum provision for archaeological archive storage is considered to be adequately resourced and accessible, this could be retained alongside a national solution.

1.3 Theme 2 – A National Archive Compilation Strategy

Project: Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 Report

Recommendation 3 of the Archaeological Archives and Museums Report 2012:

“Establish a national strategy for archive completion as a means of providing easy access to the archaeological record. The Archaeological Archives Forum should investigate possible solutions such as a national index of archaeological archives and universal standards for archive creation.” (Edwards 2013, p9)

The increasing number of undepositable archives in store with archaeological organisations, creates an ethical dilemma for companies in terms of compilation and curation of the archives in their care. Additionally, commercial organisations reported that variations in museum deposition requirements (such as stringent requirements for selection and retention, some museums only accepting complete archives while others are separating documentary from material archives, or only accept the smaller archives) resulted in archives being rejected (p43). National standards on archive compilation would improve quality and efficiency, remove variations in the cost of archiving and deposition fees, and standardise the application of selection and retention (p40).

Project: Seeing the Light of Day report

Recommendation 4 of the Seeing the Light of Day report:

“A standard framework on archaeological archives to be required in all briefs and Written Schemes of Investigations.” (Ferne, McNulty and Dawson 2017)

The Seeing the Light of Day report advocates for a ‘Standard Framework’ that incorporates archiving procedures, data management processes, selection strategy, transfer of title, and recognised repositories. The standards should be endorsed by ClfA, FAME, ALGAO and SMA to ensure that they are adopted and implemented. They should be referenced and monitored by DM Archaeologists in their briefs and/or guidance for archaeological interventions. The introduction of such a framework would provide the added benefit of more effective consideration of archaeological archives at the beginning of the archaeological process (p9-10).

Project: 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology Report

While the 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report did not make any specific recommendations or suggest actions towards the creation of a national archive compilation strategy, workshop participants did discuss the concept. The potential for a new national index of archives was discussed, with some suggesting that more easily accessible information could help to increase the use of archives for research (Wills 2018, p14).

The report did question how a national index of archives would link to HERs and signpost the location of archives accurately. Proposed action 11.2 of Workshop 1, Archaeological archives, 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report:

“Consider whether archives are ‘findable’ through existing systems, or whether there is a need for new or enhanced routes (national index, HERs, HIAS, Oasis).” (Wills 2018, p7)

Project: Museums Collecting Archaeology (England) Report Year 3

Year Three of the Museums Collecting Archaeology report (Boyle, Booth and Rawden 2018) detailed the results of the 2018 survey as well as summarising results from the previous two years. Relevant data regarding the current provision of standards and guidance for archaeological archives deposition includes the following:

75% of responding museums said they had a collecting policy that specifically referred to British Archaeology (p27), and 70.3% reported that their institution has a set of standards or guidelines for the deposition of archaeological archives (p28). Interestingly, 24.5% were unwilling to share these documents (p29). The report concluded that this may be because museums are becoming less willing to share these documents with outside organisations and could reflect a lack of confidence with the collecting and curation of archaeological material. Additionally, it is possible the museums recognised a difference between stated collecting objectives in policy and procedural documents, and the reality on the ground given staffing and storage pressures (p30)

Project: Planning for Archives: Opportunities and Omissions

No specific recommendations regarding national standards on archaeological archiving practices were made in the Planning for Archives: Opportunities and Omissions report (Donnelly-Symes 2019). However, the report did identify that archive repositories within 7.8% of ALGAO: England authority areas had no archiving guidelines, raising the question as to whether the standards of archives produced in these areas, while for some other repositories there can be contradiction between the general requirements for an accessible archive and certain museum collection policies (p16).

Doctoral thesis: Why do we have this? A study of museum approaches to retention and disposal of archaeological archives (2020)

The thesis made two recommendations pertinent to the creation of a national archaeological archive strategy:

Recommendation 1 of the thesis:

"A National Archaeological Archives Registry linked to detailed archives contents databases (Paul 2020, p244).

Recommendation 2 of the thesis:

"National standards on archive compilation and recording" (Paul 2020, p247)

The thesis demonstrated that access and re-use of archaeological archives is greatly increased when information about an archive's location and contents is available digitally, preferably on-line. It was therefore proposed that archives need to be more 'findable', and that establishment of a National Archaeological Archives Registry would raise the profile of these un-used collections, promote their access and re-use, and stimulate research. It was proposed that a National Archaeological Archives Registry should not duplicate current knowledge but draw information from existing systems such as OASIS and either link directly to or provide details on where users can access the archive's contents database (the archive's metadata). The thesis reported that where detailed metadata about an archive's contents exists, that archive is more accessible and useable by curators, researchers and other interested parties. The author noted that archaeological archive and object data can be studied, manipulated and re-used in many different ways, and any standardised archives contents database would necessarily be detailed in nature in order to support a broad spectrum of users. The thesis concluded that the creation of a National Archaeological Archive Registry accompanied by detailed databases would increase the research undertaken on the results of commercial archaeological projects, as well as facilitating access for display and engagement activities. Detailed metadata has the potential to reduce the need or desire to access the physical archives, supporting remote storage as a viable solution to the 'storage crisis', therefore reducing the strain on museum resources as well as facilitating movement of archives between stores and users.

In order to support a National Archaeological Archives Registry linked to detailed archives contents databases, standardised systems on archive compilation and recording were recommended. The thesis discussed that while standards on archive creation and compilation already exist (Brown, 2011), it is the specifics of how materials are

stored, how bag and boxes are labelled, and how the 'metadata' (the data about the archive) is presented, that can either support or hinder archive access and re-use. Current variations in museums' deposition requirements increase the time and resources required to compile and transfer archives from planning-led archaeology. The research indicated that a standardised system of archive compilation and transfer would be welcomed by commercial archaeologists and streamline curation and accessibility for the majority of curators and researchers wishing to re-use the material. National standards could be followed by units in areas where no repository exists or where a museum has temporarily closed its doors to new acquisitions, expediting their eventual transfer to permanent storage. A single methodology of archive compilation would facilitate access to anyone wishing to work with an archive regardless of its location, and ease the issues around dealing with archives when a commercial unit goes out of business.

1.4 Theme 3 - Understanding use / users of archaeological archives

Project: Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 Report

Objective 8 of the Archaeological Archives and Museums Report was to characterise the users of archaeological archives, while Objective 5 was to investigate the potential for archaeological resource centres to attract new audiences for archaeological collections (Edwards 2013, p14). The report concluded that archaeological archives were used by museums with an archaeological curator for loans, teaching collections, and handling packs in museums. In museums with no archaeological expertise it is unlikely that archaeological archives will reach much of an audience at all (Edwards 2013, p45).

Museums were asked to quantify research (external) visits to their museums over the previous twelve years (2000-2011). However, due to a lack of data compiled by museums, the report did not manage to fully characterise end users of archaeological archives following deposition. Nineteen of the responding museums were able to provide data on who was accessing their stored archaeology collections:

Volunteers by far represented the largest user group (45%) followed by the public (20%), private researchers (14%), universities (10%), community groups (6%), schools (3%) and commercial archaeologists constituted only 1% of the visits (p71). Data from 40 responding museums, suggested around 2000 visits are made each year to stored archaeological archives, that's about 50 visits per museum per year, or roughly one visit per week (p72).

The report therefore found that "archaeological archives have been used by responders to reach a very wide and diverse range of audiences" (Edwards 2013 p8). However, the '50 visits per year' were not achieved by the majority of the responding museums. In fact, only 3 reported a number over this 'average' with the majority reporting numbers well under 15 per year. The skew seems to result from the response of one museum/repository that reported over 900 visits that year, but they did stipulate the collection had recently moved to a new location allowing numbers to increase (p73). If this number is removed, the average number of external visitors to archaeological collections per year for the 40 responding museums is closer to 26, or 2 visits per month with several reporting as few as one visit per year. Visitor numbers for the remaining 121 museums was not established, though as stated previously, access is unlikely for museums without an archaeological curator (p45).

The Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 project did not fully characterise the users of archaeological archives. While the report concluded that archaeological archives had a wide range of uses and could reach a variety of audiences, this was only possible where specialist staff were present in the museum. In 2012 it was reported that only 30% of responding museums had an archaeological curator on staff (Edwards 2013 p8). Potential archaeological archive 'end users' were not identified by the 2012 survey, neither was the form that use might take, how different end users would/could access or use archives, or how access/use may differ for individual archive components.

Project: Seeing the Light of Day report

The Seeing the Light of Day report concluded that Archaeology archives are among the most-used museum collections, for use in exhibitions, handling sessions, education, volunteer projects and by researchers (Ferne, McNulty and Dawson 2017, p6). Contractors reported using the archives in their care for a range of public engagement activities, such as lectures and workshops, educational and community activities and open days (p5). However, more work is required to properly fund public repositories where researchers, communities and the wider public can access archaeological archives, no specifics on the how access could be provided, and use facilitated were given.

Project: 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology Report

Proposed action 11.1 of Workshop 1, Archaeological archives, 21st Century Challenges for Archaeology report:

“Archive usage: 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.” (Wills 2018, p10)

The report concluded that we do not have good information on which components of archives are used, how they are used, whether in a museum or with contractors, and that this is an area that would benefit from survey (p11).

The report also highlighted the low level of engagement of the academic community with archives from development-led archaeology in general, although the potential for involvement of academics and researchers in many aspects of archive management was not discussed further (p11).

Project: Empowering Collections

Recommendation 4 of the Empowering Collections report:

“Research to understand public expectations of collections. It is clear from our research that there is a substantial gap between museums’ collections activity and the public understanding of collections. Museums need to understand better what their communities – visitors and non-visitors – want from collections if they are to diversify their audiences and remain relevant in the long term. Sector bodies should fund UK-wide deliberative public opinion research to enable museums to expand their knowledge of their communities and respond to these expectations.” (Museum Association 2019, p16)

The Museum Association states that museums should consult regularly with audiences on how collections are researched, presented and used, and should encourage public participation alongside professional knowledge and expertise when using collections (p10).

1.5 Conclusions

A number of reports reviewed, including the Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 (Edwards 2013), Seeing the Light of Day (Ferne, McNulty and Dawson 2017), 21st Century Challenges (Wills 2018) and Dr Pauls PhD thesis (Paul 2020), recommended that national or regional stores would provide an acceptable solution for the continued provision of access to archaeological collections. Therefore, in general, research undertaken consistently recommends that the strategy should be national, although none go so far as to suggest the nature and organisation of such a facility, or series of facilities. None of the reports identify any specific areas of the country where an archaeological resource centre would be best placed, the Edwards report (2013) specifically highlighting the fluid nature of the ‘storage crisis’.

Edwards (2013) suggested that locality may be important in relation to archaeological archives, while Dr Paul’ doctoral thesis concluded that location does not have to be a barrier to use if the systems are in place to support access. The 21st Century Challenges report (Wills 2018) concluded that new repositories for archaeological archives should be linked to museums, and the Empowering Collections report (Museum Association 2019) recommends the

use of shared museum storage. The Gathering Information on Deep Storage Archive Facilities report (Tsang 2017) suggested that off-site storage is more suitable for less frequently accessed and physically robust material, but that maintenance of a local store for material regularly accessed, or in need of regular monitoring in-house may be required. Tsang (2017) also states that those closer to, or on the fastest access routes to the storage felt the greater benefits due to the costs of recovering material from deep storage.

While the 21st Century Challenges report (Wills 2018) called for consideration of a transparent national costing model for archaeological archives, the Survey of Fees for the Transfer of Archaeological Archives in England report (Vincent 2019) concluded that setting a single fee across organisations is unrealistic due to the variation in the type, size and make up of collecting organisations. Additionally, the variable nature of income from archaeological archive deposition, should be taken into account, especially regarding potential loss of income by museums.

A national strategy for archive completion was recommended by the Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 report (Edwards 2013) and the doctoral thesis 'Why do we have this? A study of museum approaches to retention and disposal of archaeological archives' (Paul 2020), while the Seeing the Light of Day report (Fernie, McNulty and Dawson 2017) advocates for a 'Standard Framework' for archaeological archiving procedures. Both the Edwards report (2013), 21st Century Challenges report (Wills 2018) and Dr Paul's PhD thesis (Paul 2020) suggest the creation of a national index of archaeological archives.

Key recommendations which have been highlighted through the desk-based review, can therefore be summarised as:

- Development and adoption of a National strategy for archaeological archives.
- Development of a National index of archaeological archives.
- Creation of a standardised framework for archives management.
- Provision of a blended solution should involve museums and off-site storage.
- Consideration of archive deposition fees in terms of both of consistency and impact of proposed solutions.

1.6 Gaps in our understanding - next steps

Updating the data (Appendix 2)

Although previous projects undertaken have produced comprehensive datasets, there is a significant amount of time since the last data collection exercise which collected information from archaeological organisations that create and deposit archives was delivered. A simple survey based around the questions included in the Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012 (Edwards 2013) project will be developed and circulated to provide a current dataset which can be compared with that gathered in 2012 (results presented in Appendix 2).

Understanding existing solutions (Appendix 3)

A key element of the OSAA project will be identifying practical options which can be considered in terms of how they might address the challenges and issues identified during the desk-based review. A key element missing from the previous project data in relation to the experience of archives management in England is the presentation of the different approaches to archives storage which are already in use across the UK and further afield. An in-depth consideration of the various solutions currently in use will provide the perspective from archive managers of the advantages / disadvantages of different options as well as informing a review of resources which will be required to meet the challenges (case studies are presented in Appendix 3).

Users of archaeological archives (Appendix 4)

A significant gap in current knowledge identified by the desk-based research is how archives are used. While the reports discussed above provide evidence linked to the storage crisis, archive deposition backlog and reductions in museums specialist staff, they do not outline which components of archives are used, how they are used and by whom, and levels of public engagement. In addition, previous reports have not considered research access requirements or how archives could be better promoted to researchers.

The identification of archaeological archive 'end users', and the potential access requirements that would be required to support that use is an area that would benefit from surveying and could include looking at public knowledge of, and attitudes to archives.

The 2008 report 'Discovering physical objects: Meeting researchers' needs' (Research Information Network 2008) may provide a starting point on establishing how archaeological archives may be made more findable and accessible to researchers and other end users. The main findings of the report were that:

- researchers want online finding aids that enable them to plan their visits to museums and collections and to see and, where possible, to handle objects for themselves
- researchers use a variety of methods to find out about objects that might be relevant to their research, but contact with curatorial staff is crucial
- most researchers are unaware of the online catalogues that have been, and are being, developed by museums and other organisations
- researchers believe that there is a lack of consistency in the arrangements that different museums make for direct access to objects.

(Research Information Network 2008, p5)

To address this knowledge gap, a series of workshops will be held with different user groups to identify the concerns and opportunities that different archive solutions might provide (results presented in Appendix 4).

APPENDIX 2 DATA COLLECTION SURVEY

2.1 The survey

The short data collection survey was devised to provide an update to the information collected during previous projects (Appendix 1). The aim was to ensure that any options considered as part of the OSAA project were balanced against a realistic understanding of future capacity needs.

The survey was sent out to all ClfA Registered Organisations and FAME members via each organisation's mailing list, and members of the project team personally approached individuals in order to maximise the number of responses. Unfortunately, as a result of the Covid19 pandemic the survey went live during a period of significant upheaval in UK archaeology. Many archaeological staff were either furloughed or working from home and therefore were unable to access the data required to fully respond to the survey.

"These are as accurate as we can be, however, our archives are spread across four separate offices. We also have personnel on furlough who may have archives at home."

Despite this, responders represent approximately 45% of the contracting organisations responsible for the creation and compilation of archaeological archives in England (see below). Responding organisations ranged from sole traders to multi-office organisations with over 400 members of staff. The results of the survey are presented below, and where applicable, directly compared to the 2012 FAME survey (in Edwards 2013).

During analysis of the survey data, it was recognised that the volume of archaeological archives accrued annually could not be established through any of the existing surveys or reports. A further survey asking commercial units to estimate their average annual accrual rate was therefore sent to all ClfA Registered Organisations and FAME members via each organisation's mailing list, and responders to the Data Collection Survey were contacted directly. The results of this short survey are presented at the end of this report.

2.2 Headline results

The following headline results are discussed in more detail within the main body of the report. The figures quoted are based on the scaled-up survey results to provide a broad estimate for the totals in England.

- At the time of the survey, there were **27,288** active archaeological projects in England.
- There are **26,131** completed projects awaiting deposition in England.
- Contracting units hold an estimated **7,339** undepositable project archives England (likely an underestimation).
- On average, **23%** of all completed archaeological projects are undepositable (likely an underestimation).
- Archaeological archive holdings within contracting units are estimated at **4,957m³**, of which **1140m³** (23%) could be considered undepositable.
- An estimated **492m³** of archaeological archival material is compiled each year, of which **113.24m³** (23%) could be considered undepositable. (NOTE: Manipulation of these figures due to a potential overestimation by one organisation would see these numbers reduce to an annual accrual of **404.5m³** nationally, **93m³** of which cannot be deposited.)

2.3 Results of the survey

Who were the respondents?

In total, 20 organisations responded to the survey. All 20 organisations responded to Questions 1 (Organisation) and 2 (Organisation Type), of which 18 were contracting organisations involved in the creation and compilation of archaeological archives (answered as Archaeological contractor or Local Authority based contractor).

Of the responders not currently involved in the active creation and compilation of archaeological archives, one represented an archaeological consultancy (answered as Consultancy based curator) and another an archive repository (answered as Local Authority based Contractor- the archive repository had previously responded to the 2012 survey as an archaeological contractor but is no longer involved in the generation of archives). These responses from non-contracting organisations have been excluded from the statistical analysis.

The 18 responses included in the statistical analysis represent approximately 45% of the contracting organisations (40) in England involved in the creation and compilation of archaeological archives (identified through comparison with the FAME members and ClfA Registered Organisation scheme). This indicates a 40% reduction in the responses compared to the 2012 FAME Survey which received 31 responses, or 75% of contracting organisations nationally at the time.

The responses have therefore been scaled up by a factor of 120% where there have been 18 responses to provide a broad estimate for the totals in England (where there have been less than 18 responses to specific questions, the number of responses has been stated and the estimates scaled up accordingly).

This follows the same methodology to the used in 2012 and allows the clearest comparison to the 2012 FAME survey data and analysis.

Responding Organisations

The responding organisations ranged in size from sole traders to a large organisation employing 400 individuals. The size of responding organisations have been quantified by the number of staff as defined by the 2012/2013 Profiling the Profession report (Aitchison and Rocks-Macqueen 2013). The below table details the number of responders per size of organisation.

The responders per size of organisation is also expressed as a percentage for comparison with the 2012/2013 profiling the Profession data. However, it is important to note that Profiling the Profession included Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, as well as the types of organisations that do not create and complete archaeological archives and therefore have not been included in this data analysis. A direct comparison of the size of responding organisations is therefore not possible.

No. archaeological staff	No. responders to 2020 survey	% responders to 2020 survey	% employing organisations represented in 'Profiling the Profession' (2012-2013)
1	1	5.5%	29%
2 to 10	1	5.5%	49%
11 to 49	10	56%	18%
50 to 99	2	11%	1%
100 to 249	2	11%	2%
250+	2	11%	0%
total responding	18	100%	

Table 2. Size of organisations that responded to the survey.

In 2012/2012 small organisations (up to 10 employees) was the norm, however by far the largest responder to this survey were organisations with 11-49 employees (56%). The trend towards responders from medium/large contracting organisations may be the result of several unit mergers in recent years, or that larger organisations create and compile a larger number of archaeological archives and are therefore more engaged with the issues and likely to respond.

Question 3: Can you confirm that your answers to this survey are a formal organisational response?

All 18 contracting organisations responded to the question, of which 17 confirmed a formal response.

Question 4: How many archaeological project archives do you hold (including both active ongoing projects and those ready for long term storage)?

Question 4a: Total current / active projects

All 18 contracting organisations responded to the question. The number of active projects ranged from 6 to 3719.

The total number of current/active projects between all 18 contracting organisations is 12,280. This gives an average of 682 per contracting organisation and suggests a total of around **27,288** active archaeological projects in England.

By type of responding organisation

- Small contracting organisations (1-10 employees, 11% of the responders) reported 86 current/active projects (1% of reported projects). That equates to roughly 29 current/active projects per employee.
- Medium contracting organisations (11-99 employees, 67% of the responders) reported 6587 current/active projects (53% of reported projects). That equates to roughly 15 current/active projects per employee.
- Large contracting organisations (100-250+ employees, 22% of the responders) reported 5670 current/active projects (46% of reported projects). That equates to roughly 5.5 current/active projects per employee.

Size of organization/ No. of employees	% of the responders	No. of current/ active projects	Projects per employees
1-10	11%	86	29
11-99	67%	6587	15
100-250+	22%	5670	5.5

Table 3. Total current/active projects per size of organisation.

Alternatively, this can be calculated as an average number of 8 current/active projects per employee for the responding organisations.

Question 4b: Completed projects awaiting deposition (e.g. which can be deposited)

All 18 contracting organisation responded to the question. The number of completed projects awaiting deposition (e.g. which can be deposited) ranged from 2 to 6000 (at a multi office organisation).

The total number of completed projects awaiting deposition across all 18 contracting organisations is 11,759. This gives an average of 653 per contracting organisation and suggests a total of around **26,131** projects awaiting deposition in England.

By type of responding organisation

- Small contracting organisations (1-10 employees, 11% of the responders) reported 22 completed projects awaiting deposition (<1% of reported completed projects awaiting deposition). That equates to roughly 7 completed projects awaiting deposition per employee.
- Medium contracting organisations (11-99 employees, 67% of the responders) reported 4347 completed projects awaiting deposition (37% of reported completed projects awaiting deposition). That equates to roughly 10 completed projects awaiting deposition per employee.
- Large contracting organisations (100-250+ employees, 22% of the responders) reported 7390 completed projects awaiting deposition (63% of reported completed projects awaiting deposition). That equates to roughly 7 completed projects awaiting deposition per employee.

Size of organization/ No. of employees	% of the responders	No. of completed projects awaiting deposition	Projects per employees
1-10	11%	22	7
11-99	67%	4347	10
100-250+	22%	7390	7

Table 4. Completed projects awaiting deposition per size of organisation.

Alternatively, this can be calculated as an average number of 8 completed projects awaiting deposition per employee for the responding organisations.

Question 4c: Completed projects undepositable (e.g. no receiving repository)

Of the 18 contracting organisations, 17 responded to the question. The number of completed projects undepositable (e.g. no receiving repository) ranged from 8 to 988.

The total number of undepositable projects from all 17 contracting organisations is 3119. This gives an average of 183 per contracting organisation and suggests a total of around **7,339** undepositable project archives England. However, it is likely that this figure is an underestimation as some of the responders suggested the figures they provided did not tell the whole story:

"Our database records which museums archives are destined for, and I know which are currently closed, but that is far from the whole picture."

By type of responding organisation

- Small contracting organisations (1-10 employees, 11% of the responders) reported no completed projects undepositable (0% of reported undepositable projects). That equates to roughly 0 completed projects undepositable per employee.
- Medium contracting organisations (11-99 employees, 67% of the responders) reported 1510 completed projects undepositable (48% of reported undepositable projects). That equates to roughly 3.5 completed projects undepositable per employee.
- Large contracting organisations (100-250+ employees, 22% of the responders) reported 1609 completed projects undepositable (52% of reported undepositable projects). That equates to roughly 1.6 completed projects undepositable per employee.

Size of organization/ No. of employees	% of the responders	No. completed projects undepositable	Projects per employees
1-10	11%	0	0
11-99	67%	1510	3.5
100-250+	22%	1609	1.6

Table 5. Completed projects undepositable per size of organisation.

Alternatively, this can be calculated as an average number of 2.1 completed projects undepositable per employee for the responding organisations.

Comments by responders suggest that there are many factors other than a lack of receiving repository that affects their ability to deposit archives:

"Some have repositories, but actually getting them to accept an archive seems to be impossible."

"The above contains projects where we have been unable to obtain the TOT and the museum will not accept the archive even after three proven attempts of contact"

"We have been in business since the 1960s and have a lot of old backlog material that has no further funding available."

"Archives with no receiving museum are often not prepared, hence the low number for completed projects undepositable."

Comparison with 2012 FAME survey

The estimated **7339** undepositable project archives in England (see above) appears to represent a significant reduction (18%) from the figure of 9,000 undepositable archaeological archives quoted in 2012. There may be several explanations for this reduction:

- One of the 2020 survey responders previously quoted 1,781 undepositable project archives in 2012, but has since transformed into an archive repository, therefore they no longer have any undepositable archaeological archives.
- The opening of Northamptonshire Archaeological Resource Centre and Cambridge County Councils adoption of DeepStore for archive deposition will have also significantly reduced the number of undepositable archives held by contracting units.

"Recently museums that had been closed for large-haul renovation have reopened (just prior to Covid closures) i.e. Northampton, MOL and Luton and that has reduced undepositable archives considerably."

- It was also acknowledged that adoption of new best practice policies has reduced the number of undepositable archaeological archives:

"It would be about 50 more awaiting deposition and another 20 at no receiving repository but we now archive negative projects on oasis/ADS only in agreement with museums and that helps."

- One of the responding organisations detailed that the number given for 'undepositable archives' was not representative of their true 'undepositable archive holdings' as the number stated (400) only represented those with no receiving museum. For many more deposition is affected by other factors:

"Deposition is affected by many factors other than museum closure e.g. current deposition fees have outstripped the original funding or been spent on temporary storage whilst museums were closed. Transfer of title affects many projects especially where third-party consultants manage correspondence, or older legacy projects where rapid ownership changes are involved and original owners are impossible to locate. New museum preparation guideline changes, including,

rationalisation requirements, whilst worthwhile were not funded into the original project costings and so cannot be met etc.”

It therefore appears that there are significantly more than 7,399 undepositable archaeological archive currently being held by contracting organisations in England, and that the figure of 7,339 represents a significant real-world increase in the number of undeposited archives estimated in 2012.

Combined responses to question 4.

The combined responses from question 4 for active projects (24,560), completed projects awaiting deposition (23,518) and completed projects undepositable (7,339) suggest that **60,759** archaeological project archives are currently held with contracting organisations in England.

The combined responses for questions 4b and 4c (completed projects awaiting deposition 23,518 and completed projects undepositable 7,339) suggest a total of **33, 471** completed projects currently held by contracting units in England, **22%** of which are deemed undepositable.

By type of responding organisation

- Small contracting organisations reported that 0% of their completed projects were undepositable.
- Medium contracting organisations (67% of the responders) reported 26% of their completed projects were undepositable.
- Large contracting organisations (22% of the responders) reported 22% of their completed projects were undepositable.

The data provided from only the large and medium contracting organisations suggests that an average of **24%** of completed archaeological project archives are deemed undepositable.

Overall, an average of **23%** of all completed archaeological projects are considered undepositable. However, it is likely that these figures do not represent the full percentage of completed projects held by contracting organisations that are undepositable (see above).

Size of organization/ No. of employees	% of the responders	No. completed projects awaiting deposition	No. completed projects undepositable	Total completed projects	Percentage of completed projects held by contracting organisations that are undepositable
1-10	11%	22	0	22	0%
11-99	67%	4347	1510	5857	26%
100-250+	22%	7390	1609	8999	18%
Suggested for England		23,518	7339	33471	22%

Table 6. Percentage of completed projects held by contracting units that are undepositable

Question 5: What is the current estimated volume of your physical archaeological project archive?

Question 5a: The material archive / by volume (metres cubed) and shelf length

Of the 18 contracting organisations, 13 provided the estimated volume, and 9 provided the estimated shelf length of their physical material archaeological project archives.

The estimated volume ranged from 1m³ to 260m³, amounting to 1442.7m³. This gives an average of 111m³ per contracting unit and suggests a total material project archive volume of around **4439m³** held nationally by contracting organisations.

The estimated shelf length ranged from 7m to 4091m, amounting to 6174m for the 9 responders. This gives an average of 686m and suggests that the contracting units in England currently hold **27,440m** shelving of material archives.

5b: The documentary archive / by volume (metres cubed) and shelf length

Of the 18 contracting organisations, 11 provided the estimated volume, and 12 provided the estimated shelf length of their physical documentary archaeological project archives.

The estimated volume ranged from 0.86m³ to 15m³, totalling 129.5m³ for the 11 responding contracting organisations. This gives an average of 13m³ and suggests a total volume for documentary archives nationally of **518m³**.

The estimated shelf length ranged from 0.1m to 365 m, amounting to 915.8m for the 12 responders. This gives an average of 83.3m and an estimated national total documentary archive shelf length of **3,330m**.

Combined responses to question 5

The combined totals for question 5 suggest the national archaeological archive holdings within contracting units to be estimated at **4,957m³** or 30,770m of shelf space.

If on average, 23% of all archaeological projects are considered undepositable, this implies that **contracting units currently hold 1140m³ of undepositable archaeological archives**.

Comparison with 2012 FAME survey

In 2012 the estimated volume of temporary archives being held by contracting organisations in England was 5,860m³, of which 1,160m³ (20%) were undepositable archives.

The 2020 survey results therefore indicate a 15% decrease in the total volume of archaeological archives being held by contracting organisations from 2012 to 2020. However, the volume of undepositable archives has only decreased by 2% (from 1,160 m³ to 1,140m³), a figure that should be considered in light of the opening of Suffolk, Northants and Cambridge stores for deposition of previously undepositable archaeological archives (see above).

Question 6: We know the cost of archive deposition, especially for legacy archives, can be problematic. What % of your undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets?

- 17 contracting organisations responded to the question which allowed for an open-ended response.
- 5 organisations reported 100% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 1 organisation reported 90% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 3 organisations reported 50% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 1 organisation reported 35% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 2 organisations reported 5% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 3 organisations reported 0% of their undeposited archives have ring-fenced archive budgets.
- 2 organisations responded that they were unable to answer the question.

Question 7. How confident are you in the numbers provided above?

All 18 contracting organisations responded to the question.

2 responders believed they were very confident in the numbers provided, 11 responders believed they are fairly confident in the numbers provided, and one responder was not confident at all. 4 contracting organisations chose to respond using the free text box.

"Archive deposition is prioritised to archives with funding, transfer of title and willing receiving museum. During archive preparation recommendations from the museum, specialists etc, are used to carry out archive rationalisation so the volume held at OA is the working archive and not necessarily the volume for deposition."

"This is an estimate only: we have checked our database and measured our shelving, but as our system is currently being overhauled it is unlikely to be completely accurate."

"These are broad estimates - office access to get more accurate figures limited at present."

Question 8. Do you have any comments you wish to make regarding the specific issue of long-term archive storage?

All 18 responding contracting organisations chose to provide additional comments around long-term archive storage.

"Part of the problem with this is we have no way of budgeting for archiving costs for new projects for these museums as they themselves do not know if they will ever open up again or what costs they will charge for deposition."

"Difficulties of lack of coherent policy r.e. archaeological archives disposal/deposition policy etc.- every repository has different guidelines making it hard to easily prepare archives for deposition."

"We are finding more instances where archaeological monitors are saying the project should be deposited with a specific museum, but the museum is either no longer accepting archives, no longer collecting in that area/parish, or is only accepting 'archaeologically significant' archives."

"Some museums are accepting archives 'in principle' but cannot physically take them as they have no space left in their stores."

"The reality is a large research project on a scheduled ancient monument is very different to a 2hr monitoring project in a back garden where three pieces of peg-tile, a sherd of pottery and an iron nail were found in topsoil. Archaeological contractors should be allowed to make judgements on the significance of these small archives and not be made to fill up a store with relatively unimportant material no one will ever want to study or research."

"The perennial issues of museum inflexibility with regards lack of TOTs. This is becoming a much bigger issue with the increasing use of consultants."

"Archaeological archives are a national treasure that are being failed due to lack of appropriate national repository. Research is being affected by lack of a coherent single strategy for deposition that secures the resource accessibly. Archaeological archives differ in nature and content to other collections held by museums and should be thought of less as display objects, though they may contain these, and more as evidence archives. Whilst the public, and the museums that serve them, are set up to display, research and conserve objects we urgently need a storage option for the large but necessary evidence material held in archaeological archives which is literally the stuff from which our history, and so heritage, is deduced."

"While many of these could potentially be deposited with open repositories, we simply cannot afford to pay £300 per box to deposit them. While we are happy to include the archiving costs within tenders

for new projects and, therefore, can deposit these, being charged sometimes upwards of £10000 to deposit larger, older archives is unworkable and we will have to keep them in storage within our warehouse."

Question 9. We will be considering a range of options for the long-term storage of archives including using mixed-use premises. Do you think any of the facilities below might be of interest to your organisation?

Renting storage space for live project archives

Of the 13 contracting organisations that answered the question, 1 responded positively, 7 negatively and 5 said they would possibly be interested in renting storage space for live project archives depending on cost and location.

Hire of co-working spaces

Of the 12 contracting organisations that answered the question, 1 responded positively, 9 negatively and 2 said they would possibly be interested in the hire of co-working spaces.

Hire of bench / lab space with access to specialist equipment

Of the 12 contracting organisations that answered the question, none responded positively, 10 responded negatively and 2 said they would possibly be interested in hiring bench/lab space with access to specialist equipment.

Hire of meeting spaces

Of the 13 contracting organisations that answered the question, 3 responded positively, 6 negatively and 4 said that they would be interested in hiring meeting spaces.

Option	Responders	Yes	No	Possibly
Renting storage space for live project archives	13	1	8%	7
Hire of co-working spaces	12	1	8%	9
Hire of bench / lab space with access to specialist equipment	12	0	0%	10
Hire of meeting spaces	13	3	23%	6

Table 7. Responses to Data collection survey, question 9: Use of addition facilities

Additional Survey Question. What is the average estimated volume of Archaeological Archive material generated during one year of your organisation's archaeological projects? (average over the last 5 to 10yrs). Ideally, please provide your response in volume rather than box numbers.

In late October 2020, a supplementary question was sent to all ClfA Registered Organisations and FAME members via each organisation's mailing list. In addition, all original responders to the Data Collection Survey were contacted directly.

Responders were given the option of providing their average annual volume as meters cubed, or by number of boxes. Where number of boxes only was provided, responders were re-contacted to establish their average box size to establish an approximate volume in cubic meters.

23 organisations responded to the questions, of which 19 were contracting organisations involved in the creation and compilation of archaeological archives (answered as Archaeological contractor or Local Authority based contractor). The responses from non-contracting organisations (museums, consultancies etc) have been excluded from the statistical analysis.

The average reported estimated volume of archaeological archive material generated during one year ranged from 0.04m³ to 84.7m³, with an average of 12.31m³ per contracting unit. This suggests approximately 492m³ of archaeological archives are accrued every year nationally (scaled up to represent the 40 contracting organisations identified through comparison with the FAME members and ClfA RO scheme).

By combining the potential annual accrual rate of archaeological archives in England (492m³), with the percentage of completed projects deemed undepositable (23%), it is possible to suggest that **113.24m³** of archaeological archives are produced each year that cannot be deposited.

NOTE: One responder reported an exceptionally large annual archive accrual rate of 84.7m³. The response was from one of the larger commercial units working in England. It was suggested the figure may be an overestimation on their part, but it was not possible to be more specific due time and resource constraints. The nearest response was from a similar sized organisation and was for an annual accrual rate of 43m³. If the exceptionally large response is replaced with this lower figure, the average annual accrual rate of archaeological archives per organisation reduces to 10.11m³. This would suggest approximately 404.5m³ of archaeological archives are accrued every year nationally (scaled up to represent the 40 contracting organisations identified through comparison with the FAME members and ClfA RO scheme), **93m³** of which cannot be deposited.

By type of responding organisation

- Small contracting organisations (3 responders) reported an average volume of 2.13m³ of archaeological archives were accrued annually per contracting organisation, of which 0.49m³ (23%) can be considered undepositable.
- Medium contracting organisations (10 responders) reported an average volume of 6.2m³ of archaeological archives were accrued annually per contracting organisation, of which 1.86m³ (23%) can be considered undepositable.
- Large contracting organisations (6 responders) reported an average volume of 27.64m³ of archaeological archives were accrued annually per contracting organisation, of which 6.36m³ (23%) can be considered undepositable.

Size of organization/ No. of employees	No. of responders	Total average annual A.A. accrual volume in m ³	Average m ³ accrued annually per contracting organisation	Average m ³ of undepositable archival material accrued annually per contracting organisation (23%).
1-10	3	6.04	2.13	0.49
11-99	10	61.99	6.2	1.86
100-250+	6	165.83 124.13	27.64 20.69	6.36 4.76
All responders	19	233.86	12.31	2.83

Table 8. Annual accrual rate of archaeological archives by size of contracting organisation.

NOTE: Figures in grey demonstrate the annual accrual of archaeological archives if the exceptionally large rate reported by one organisation is replaced with the next response down.

APPENDIX 3 EXISTING SOLUTIONS

Between March and September 2020, the OSAA team undertook a series of thirteen case studies looking into existing solutions for the management and storage of archaeological archives within England and the United Kingdom more widely. Each case study represented either a single institution, collection of institutions or national body dependant on their approach to archaeological archiving. A questionnaire was sent to each case study participant as a launching point for data collection and follow-up telephone interviews were conducted as necessary with one or more representatives. The case studies and their representatives are listed below, along with a blank version of the questionnaire.

Analysis of the case study data has fed into the report recommendations (see Part One), and examples / supporting evidence discussed where relevant. A summary of key themes, approaches and pitfalls discussed with case studies are detailed below. These are not intended as a full analysis of each case study, simply to highlight some of the common issues, or areas of success.

An additional interview was conducted with Matt Moor (head of site) and follow-up site visit to the Science Museum's new facility at Wroughton was made as part of the solutions research in May 2021. The details from this interview and site visit are included in the main body of the report (Part 1, Section 5.3 Option 3, A Single National Solution).

3.1 Methodology

A standard questionnaire was circulated to all the case studies included in the study, which was completed (in most cases) and then followed up with one-to-one interviews. In some cases, an interview was conducted without a completed questionnaire being received. A copy of the initial questionnaire circulated can be found at the end of this appendix.

3.2 The Case Studies

- Cambridgeshire: Quinton Carroll, Historic Environment Team Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council.
- English Heritage: Matt Thompson, Head Collection Curator.
- Gloucestershire Museums: Alexia Clark, Document and Collections Officer at Museum In the Park, on behalf of all six museum in Gloucestershire.
- Herefordshire Museums: Patrick McNulty, Independent Museum Consultant working for Hertfordshire Museum Development and the Hertfordshire Archaeological Network.
- Humber Bone Store: Kevin Booth, Senior Curator.
- Ireland: Judith Finlay, Registrar and Collections Resource Centre Manager, National Museum of Ireland.
- Museum of London: Michol Stocco, Archaeological Archives Manager, London Archaeological Archives Resource Centre.
- Northamptonshire Archaeological Resource Centre (NARC): Ben Donnelly-Syms, Archaeological Archives Curator.
- Northern Ireland: Rhonda Robinson, Assistant Director, Historic Environment Division.
- Paisley, The Secret Collection: Ewan Imrie, Collective Architecture.
- Science Museum Group: Jack Kirby, Group Head of Collections Service and Matt Moor, Head of Site, Wroughton. NB – This case study is included in the main text (see Part One, Section 5.3).

- Scotland: Chanté St Clair, Head of Collections Services, Fraser Hunter, Principle Curator, Iron Age and Roman Collections, Liz Mylod, project Assistant Registrar and Emily Freeman, Treasure Trove Scotland.
- Wiltshire: Megan Berrisford, Collections Manager, The Salisbury Museum and David Dawson, Director, Wiltshire Museum.
- Wales: Dr. Elizabeth Walker, Principal Curator, National Museums Wales.

3.3 Existing Regional / County solutions

There is only one example close to a regional solution involving archaeological archives currently employed within England: English Heritage operate four 'hub' stores and a number of smaller satellite stores all of which are managed centrally through HOMS (Heritage Object Management System) on a centralised server. Any member of English Heritage staff with access to the data management system can access the entire collection and establish an object or archives location. When objects are moved within stores, between stores, loaned out or moved for conservation requirements, the details are tracked on HOMS providing real-time location data and conservation updates for the entire collection. Each hub site is run by curators, conservators and support staff assisted by volunteers. The management of HOMS is currently provided by one registrar, one assistant registrar and two documentation officers, but this is not considered enough to deal with the structural backlog that exists.

The level of detail recorded on HOMS varies between objects and archives, with five to six hundred thousand entries potentially representing hundreds of thousands (possibly millions) of individual objects. There are also differences in granularity, some archaeological archives are documented at box level, some at components of those boxes, or context bags etc. While the metadata does exist for almost everything in the EH collections, this is sometimes just in card format and therefore cannot be searched and accessed via HOMS. There exists a massive documentation backlog which varies from site to site. Whether or not material is recorded in HOMS, and the detail within the record affects accessibility at both a site and institution level.

Existing County solutions

Archaeological archive storage and management at a County level exists for Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire. In both cases the archaeological archive storage is owned, managed and curated by a single entity - the county council.

Northamptonshire

The Northamptonshire Archaeological Resource Centre (NARC) was established as part of a larger Heritage project at Chester Farm to restore a 17th century farm and adjacent 34-hectare site into a sustainable heritage attraction, educational and commercial space. The NARC is not currently open to the public due to delays in the build program. It is anticipated that it will be completed in early 2021, and able to open to the public along with the wider Chester Farm Heritage Park site in late 2021. The current NLHF funding will end once the site is completed. The Chester Farm Heritage Park's business plan forecasts that the site will be self-sustainable without the need for contributions from the local authority after being open for 5 years. The charge for deposition is factored in as part of reaching this sustainability for the site. NARC will not charge for access to archives and it is hoped that commercial activity (weddings, commercial lets etc.) at the site will offset the cost for the archive resource centre and educational elements.

As of 2020 there are an estimated 16,000 boxes of archaeological bulk finds held across 40+ organisations in Northamptonshire including the 3 main temporary stores and Historic England who hold over 4,100 boxes of archive. Once complete the NARC will be able to accept all these archives. The NARC building has a research room based on the county record office model with the capacity for up to 10 researchers at a single time (pre social distancing). It is expected once open that the research room will have Wi-Fi, a computer with a catalogue accessible and research equipment such as a microfiche reader and potentially a digital microscope. The building has a

designated kitchen/break space, and the wider Chester Farm site has an on-site café for visitors. The building is fully DDA compliant with a wheelchair lift that goes across all floors (including plant room in the roof). It is envisioned that volunteers will be crucial to the running of the NARC, primarily to assist with the re-boxing and cataloguing the poor condition legacy archives. The ownership of the site is due to change in 2021 when Northamptonshire County Council becomes two unitary authorities.

"The overall authority will change as part of the Local Government changes in Northamptonshire as the county becomes two Unitary Authorities from 1st April 2021. It has not been determined which authority (North Northamptonshire or West Northamptonshire) the NARC will be a part of but there has been confirmation that it will collect archaeological archives for both authorities."

Cambridgeshire

Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team manage their archaeological archives through a combination of remote storage at DeepStore (a commercial storage facility within the salt mines in Cheshire) and a converted bunker beneath the County Council offices in Cambridge. The decision to manage archaeological archives in this manner was based solely on the business case established by the Historic Environment Team (CHET). The tendering process (for storage provision) was weighted towards quality of care, though the financial cost of the re-archiving project and subsequent long-term care was also a consideration. DeepStore provided the most economically advantageous solution to the local authority and delivered the storage and access standards required by CHET. DeepStore however was only suitable for the storage of stable (bulk) finds and documentary archives, the unstable or fragile finds are housed at the council's converted bunker beneath the County Council offices in Cambridge. The on-going storage costs are covered by the box deposition fee which is applicable to archives stored at both DeepStore and the council offices.

Cambridgeshire County Council implemented new deposition standards requiring all archives produced within Cambridgeshire to be conserved, sorted, packaged and documented in the same way. This process is supported by the completion of a detailed database linked to the barcode system already employed by DeepStore. Prior to the rollout of the new system, the existing archives in CHET's care were assessed and re-archived against the new standards so that all archives can be searched, retrieved and used in the same way. All new depositions of archives are delivered to Cambridgeshire County Council for checking and eventual transfer to DeepStore, or in the case of larger archives, a direct 'uplift' with DeepStore personnel from the commercial unit's offices can be arranged. In these cases, the archives are checked by the CHET staff at the commercial unit's offices prior to deposition. Access to the archives can be requested at the DeepStore facility or at the council offices by applying to CHET, or the boxes can be recalled and loaned out to researchers or museums using the DeepStore barcode tracking system.

Lack of constant on-site access to the majority of the archives is not considered as an issue by the CHE team who have reported an immediate increase in the number of requests to access the material. In the six years since the completion of the project requests have risen steadily, with around 500 boxes on-loan in 2019. The archives have been used as part of temporary exhibitions by local groups and museums, and also as part of larger exhibitions such as the 'Hide and Seek: Looking for Children in the Past' exhibition at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Cambridge that ran for twelve months in 2016. Several large-scale research projects have been undertaken using material retrieved from DeepStore; the 'After the Plague Project' where Cambridge University is looking at over 200 skeletons from three early medieval sites in Cambridge, and the 'Feeding Anglo-Saxon England Project' is studying environmental samples stored by CCC since early 2000.

"Within 18 months during 2017 and 2018, 8% of our total holdings had been accessed by researchers, students, community archaeology groups, professional archaeological companies, museums and educational institutions."

Problems encountered with the County-wide approach

Several other counties have either attempted or would like to explore shared museum storage or a county-wide solution to the issues surrounding archaeological archives. However, various problems have been encountered when more than one local authority is involved in the process and these have yet to be overcome. Three of the case studies (Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire and Wiltshire) highlighted some of the issues that can be encountered when

attempting a county-wide approach to the storage and curation of archaeological archives. The majority of problems arose when trying to establish how a shared store would be owned, managed and maintained across several institutions and local authorities. An additional Case Study from Scotland, the Secret Collection, Paisley, offers a slightly different perspective. The archive store for Renfrewshire Museums is located in a refurbished high street department store basement and offers an interesting example of a high street location and associated costs for renovation.

Gloucestershire

In Gloucestershire the idea of a county store had been discussed since the early 2000's and the concept was seriously revisited in 2016 when the six museums in the county joined forces to create county-wide deposition standards for archaeological archives. Despite a positive approach by each museum and the efforts of the Gloucestershire Museums Development Officer, there were a range of problems that could not be resolved:

- Timing - the museums struggled to be able to work on it at once due to differing organisational priorities.
- Different needs of the individual museums - e.g., capacity for archaeology vs social history collections etc.
- Capital required - where come from and division of investment? No identifiable lead partner.
- Location - the county is large, and inevitably the store would be closer to some museums than others - this would make it easier/harder for some to use than others, and the 'fairness' of the issue was never resolved.
- Legal set up - if a store was to be rented, who would be the 'head tenant' and how would rent, running costs etc. be divided between the museums. If a site was bought, who would manage it in the long-term, who would take ultimate responsibility for it?

One of the museums in Gloucestershire ran out of space in their archaeology store and ceased accepting new depositions several years ago. Two further museums are at capacity and will either need to acquire additional storage space or cease collecting very soon. One museum is volunteer run and very new to taking archaeological archives, while the remaining two museums currently do not have a storage capacity problem. Moving forward, at least two of the Local Authorities involved are now entirely against contributing funding to an 'owned' shared store as the legal considerations are contrary to their policies.

"Discussions across Gloucestershire today indicate that most of the museums consider that the idea of shared storage creates a major headache and that none of the old issues have not gone away."

The Gloucestershire museum group provided a list of considerations that they feel currently preclude progress on the idea of county-wide storage:

- How can a space be fairly shared out to meet the needs of each museum?
- Would collections types from all museums be combined - i.e., all archaeology together, if so, how is it clear what belongs to who? How is cross-contamination managed, how is entry of new depositions managed and distributed across the available space?
- If collections types are not combined, then the store would need 6x archaeology rooms, 6x natural history rooms etc - this seems excessive.
- Who is responsible for IPM, visitor management on site etc.?
- How are the costs of the building fairly shared and how is the building resourced, staffed etc.?
- How do you manage access to the building - how is security managed with staff from 6 different museums all needing keys and access at different times?
- What would the National Security Advisor (Museums) think about this - we are certain they will have an opinion and that it wouldn't necessarily be favourable!
- Who would take the ultimate responsibility for:
 - Energy costs? Insurance? Health and Safety?
 - Liability in the event of an accident or disaster? Security and responding to alarm call outs?

Hertfordshire

Within Hertfordshire, most museums do not have sufficient land to expand and will run out of storage space in around 2 years. There has been a long-term desire to develop a County Archaeological Store to alleviate pressure on the museums though this has not progressed past the scoping and consultation stages. Previous projects and joint bids to the National Lottery Heritage Fund did not come to fruition. Hertfordshire Archive and Library Service (HALS) is due to move to a new site, which provided a catalyst for discussions around a county store. However, at present the HALS site development plans do not include an archaeological archive store.

DeepStore was considered but was not a popular option by the museums as it would take the archives out of the County. Planning and discussions around a county store are at a very early stage and while the idea has been agreed by the museums and is broadly supported at County level, no agreement has been made at District level. The COVID19 pandemic had put all discussions on hold.

Wiltshire

Salisbury and Wiltshire museums both fall under Wiltshire County Council jurisdiction and therefore did not encounter many of the issues that other museums have come up against when attempting to create a county storage solution involving several local authorities. Wiltshire County Council agreed the county store in principle and provided capital of £200,000 for a store which the two museums would share. A site was found, but various legal issues (the district council solicitors raised concerns) slowed down the process until the site owners pulled out. Salisbury museum were at risk of losing £50,000 they had secured from another funder, and therefore drew £75,000 from the £200,000 and have bought a storage unit for their own use. Wiltshire museum are now planning to use the remaining £125,000 to buy their own storage unit.

Therefore, while the legal and site management issues around county-wide storage were resolved by involvement of the county council, the museums were still affected by institutional priorities and pressures, leading to a separate approach to the storage of archaeological archives. While the planned joint storage did not come to fruition, both Wiltshire and Salisbury have a commitment from the council that if they sell the individual buildings in the future, the money can only be used for archaeology storage. It is also hoped that earnings generated through deposition fees (potential £85,000 projected by Wiltshire) will be available for the joint venture, and that other projects such as the A303 may provide opportunities to campaign for county-wide storage of archaeological archives.

Creating spaces – The Secret Collection, Paisley Museum

This case study was included as an example of a regional archive which is housed in a redeveloped high street department store. The Case Study was conducted as an interview with the architects who designed the development, Collective Architecture. The refurbishment project created a 2,100m² storage facility housing the collections of Renfrewshire Council Arts and Museums service. Delivered for £2.58 million, including racking fit out, the site is located strategically on Paisley High Street within the basement of a former Littlewoods department store, providing easy access and contributing to the revitalisation of the town centre. The space was purpose built by Littlewoods in the 1970s and occupied by the department store until 2005. The empty site provided a large, open environment within which a secure, climate-controlled store has been created. The new facility also has spaces for school groups, interested parties and researchers, as well as good access for large items via a ramp. The location provided a large facility for storage but had some issues for the staff – a small street frontage and limited daylight.

Details about the project can be found online here: <https://www.collectivearchitecture.com/projects/paisley-the-secret-collection>

Collective Architecture have also provided access to some project boards they produced as part of an exhibition panel: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/inji1v63bhrzfri/CollectiveArchitecture-SecretCollection-Panels.pdf?dl=0>

The renovation works cost:

- Main renovation works costs (Project Management and Construction) - £2,233,000
- Storage racking costs (Rackline) - £345,000
- Cost per m² - £1230

3.4 Existing National Solutions

Outside of England, archaeological archives are administered at a National Level. While the approaches, level of oversight, decision making procedures and storage solutions vary between Scotland, Ireland, Wales and Northern Ireland, they reported that many of the same problems encountered within England exist such as lack of storage, huge backlogs, ownership considerations, lack of use and insufficient data to support full engagement.

Science Museum Group (National Collection Centre)

Due to the relevance of this case study to the Options presented in the main text, more detail on this facility is provided in the main body of the report (see Part One, Section 5.3).

Ireland

The approach in Ireland presents both the benefits and potential pitfalls of a National single storage solution. The National Museum of Ireland (NMI) has a statutory requirement to collect archaeological archives from Ireland, alongside a requirement to support the local museums. The NMI manages many of its collections, including archaeological archives at Swords, a national collection centre located at an industrial area outside of Dublin. The central location and good travel connections is seen as paramount, facilitating researcher visits, depositions and collections of material loaned out to approved museums.

The importance on databases and online access for researchers, local museum curators and other users can not be underestimated. However, there has been some push back from local museums to the 'top down' approach, though some of this is being overcome through engagement and the perceived success of the project (currently around 5% of the collections are on loan to approved museums across Ireland). Early engagement with all stakeholders is recommended, alongside active, on-going outreach to maintain relationships and engagement. Remote, backup storage is advised to ensure sustainability.

Northern Ireland

While commercial units in Northern Ireland are required to apply for a licence to undertake excavations, until recently the licence did not include responsibility for deposition of the subsequent archive. In January 2019 the excavation licence was revised to include the production of archives to deposition ready standards, but there is no specific Northern Ireland in place as yet, but these are intended to be developed. In the meantime, standard requirements refer to the EU Standard (ARCHES) and ClfA standards.

Currently the existing National Museum/ Historic Environment Division storage is considered unfit for purpose and therefore units are holding large quantities of undepositable archaeological archives. The issue came to a head following the closure of a major commercial archaeology unit, and a large industrial building located just outside Ballymena has been purchased to be repurposed for archive storage. It is envisaged that the contents of several small, poor condition stores across Northern Ireland will be brought together at Ballymena but the total volume, contents and current state of those archives is not fully understood. The existing records are not considered accurate, and no digital inventory currently exists. As of September 2020, the costs for refitting the store and making it ready to accept archives have almost doubled from the original expected estimate.

The Ballymena store is considered a temporary solution, and it is hoped that museums will take the archives in the future; although at present they seem unenthusiastic it is hoped this will change when everything is brought up to a consistent standard.

Scotland

NOTE: the archaeological archiving process in Scotland is currently under review and is likely to change to some extent.

With the exception of ecofacts-only assemblages, all archaeological assemblages in Scotland are subject to the Treasure Trove process. Under this system, anything recovered from Scottish soil is considered crown property regardless of the age or material type (documentary archives are not included in this process). The Scottish Archaeological Finds Allocation Panel (SAFAP) meet three times a year to assess applications by accredited

museums to accession objects and material archives material into their collections. The SAFAP will allocate the material at the meetings, and bar a conflict, the process is complete. With regard to contested material, the panel make a recommendation to the Crown Agent on what the outcome should be, but this is not common occurrence with generally only one or two instances a year. Conflicts can be encountered at a local or regional level where two or museums have overlapping collecting areas, or at a national level where museums may have specialist collections or curators. However, there can also be instances when no museum applies for an object or archive (also not very common occurrence) and the material therefore becomes the property of the finder, resulting in contracting units holding undepositable archives.

In general, there are considered to be storage issues across Scotland which may affect museums willingness to apply to accession new material. Selection of archaeological archives is not common practice, potentially due to an unease about discarding material considered to be Crown Property.

In Scotland National Museums Scotland is one of a group of museums considered 'last resort' hosts for any archaeological material not claimed by museums through the first round of the Treasure Trove process. At the second round, museums of last resort can bid for allocation in the usual way. Where no museum, including those of last resort, wishes to acquire the object, it reverts to being the ownership of the finder (and can be sold on the open market).

Wales

The National Panel for Archaeological Archives in Wales (a subgroup of the Historic Environment Group) was established after the need for national policies and guidelines for collection, selection and deposition of archaeological archives was recognised at government level. The group established national standards and guidance on the compilation and deposition of archaeological archives (linked to existing ClfA standards), alongside standardised deposition charges across Wales and guidelines for the selection and retention of archaeological material.

While standards and policy are set at national level, selection and deposition decisions are made at a local level by the local Trust and regional curators. It is the intention that archaeological material should stay local, but only registered museums with archaeology within their collection policy can accept archaeological archives; the National Museum will only step in where there is no local collecting museum.

Currently, there are storage issues across Wales, with some museums unable to collect archaeological archives due to limited resources and space. There is also a significant legacy issue with many archives being stored by the Welsh Trusts, alongside controversy over collecting areas and where the material from specific sites should be stored. Regional stores/ resources centres have been proposed as a potential solution, but the idea has met significant resistance and is considered quite a politicised issue.

A discussion of the Welsh Strategy for archives and access was published in 2004 (Henderson and Parkes 2004) and a review of the situation regarding storage and access to archaeological archives in Wales was undertaken in 2013 (Edwards 2014).

3.5 Case Study Questionnaire

Options for Sustainable Archaeological Archives – Case Study Review

Arts Council England (ACE) and Historic England (HE) are jointly funding a new project to assess strategic options for the ongoing issue of storing archaeological archives. The options appraisal will review existing and future capacity for archaeological archives within England, considering a full range of archive solutions and evaluating the potential of each to meet the needs of archive creators, managers and users.

The project delivery team is led by Quinton Carroll, Cambridgeshire County Council, current chair of the Archaeological Archives Forum and of ALGAO: England, with Sally Croft (Cambridgeshire County Council), Samantha Paul (Independent consultant) and Manda Forster (DigVentures).

As part of the project, we are collating information from existing archive solutions to include as Case Studies and would like to include your repository in the study. This questionnaire is intended to be a launching point for data collection and will help us begin to compare the range of current solutions across the UK and Europe.

We appreciate that some information might be difficult to provide – especially under current working conditions. Our intention is to follow-up this initial form with a phone call and possible visit (subject to Government guidelines relating to the lockdown). This would enable more detail to be added to some of the questions and the opportunity to provide further clarification where appropriate.

Part 1 – Basic Information

What is the name of your organisation?

Is your organisation accredited? (Yes/No).

What is your name?

What is your role within your organisation and are you able to answer on behalf of your organisation?

What is your contact email address?

Part 2 – Your Review Process and Store

What are the main sources of income for your organisation?

Central government.

Local authority.

Charging for deposition.

Charging for research services (x-ray, XRF etc.).

Other (please specify).

What was the main reason for your organisation undertaking a review of your archaeological store?

To increase storage capacity.

To improve the environmental conditions within the store.

To improve access for visitors.

To reduce running costs.

Other (please specify).

Do you have a Development Plan in place for your store, and if you do have you secured funding?

Please list the various solutions you considered before making a final decision?

Expansion of your current store.

Outsourcing storage to a commercial company, for example DeepStore.

Construction of a new store.

Other (please specify).

Please describe any unforeseen problems you encountered during this process.

What environmental requirements did your new archaeological store require?

What security requirements did you consider?

What research/visitor facilities did you consider?

Were there any unexpected additional costs during the development of your new storage solution?

During the review process did you consider any alternative sources of funding for the running of your new store? Please give details below.

What storage solution did your organisation settle on and why?

How much does it cost annually to run your store?

How is your store funded?

How many staff does the store employ?

Are volunteers integral to running your store and, if so, what roles do they fill?

What is the total storage space within your store?

How much free space does your store have?

How many archive boxes do you receive annually?

Typically, how many requests for archive access do you get per year?

How many visitors if any, do you receive annually?

Are you currently accepting archives?

Are there any other issues regarding the review process that you would like to raise?

What if any additional facilities would your organisation benefit from?

Does your new store have the capacity to expand its storage capacity? (Y/N)

Any other comments or further information?

APPENDIX 4 RETHINKING USER NEEDS WORKSHOPS

4.1 Introduction

To support the aims of the options appraisal in reviewing existing and future capacity for archaeological archives within England, the OSAA project needed to consider the full range of archive solutions and evaluate the potential of each to meet the needs of archive creators, managers and users. In order to better understand the user perspective, a series of engagement workshops were undertaken; “Rethinking Archives” where colleagues from across the heritage and archaeology sectors were invited to take part to help rethink how we store and access archaeological archives.

This document reviews the feedback and collates recommendations generated by those workshops. Summaries of the comments left on the jam boards (digital flip charts) are included below, and copies of the actual boards are included.

4.2 Methodology

A pilot workshop was undertaken in July 2020 with two further workshops following in August and September 2020. Widely circulated through the networks of SMA, CIfA, ALGAO and FAME, the workshops were fully booked with 73

participants in total. Of those, 20 were from contracting archaeological organisations, 24 from museums, 21 represented local planning authorities and 7 were from research or national advisory bodies.

Each workshop was set up the same with breakout groups of participants. Each breakout group discussed a series of questions relating to the use of archives (see Section 8.4 for summarised comments for each breakout session across all three workshops). Jamboard was used to record comments as digital post-it notes during each discussion, images from which are included below. Sessions were recorded for the benefit of the project team to revisit and record exact comments.

4.3 Findings

Despite great variation in responses, there were common threads that came through:

- The requirement for a nationally co-ordinated process or 'brand' for the National Collection of Archaeological Archives.
- The option to create a physical, national repository location.
- The need for a digitally accessible national index or register (incorporating existing archives and a process for newly created archives) including archives contents details.
- a consistent, standardised approach to preparation, storage and access to archives.

The need to take into account the existing local needs and concerns of organisations storing and curating archives was also raised.

Digital and physical access

Currently digital access to archives information is extremely varied across the sector with some archive repositories being consistently updated with a remotely accessible front end, others have little or none.

Due to the varied quality and often extremely technical nature of digital archives available, they are generally unsuitable for members of the public without the required technical knowledge. It was also felt that they were often not consistent enough for researchers to utilise in comparative studies across regions.

It was felt that researchers and others were often unaware of digital archives and the type/nature of data held by repositories, it was also stated that not knowing who to contact was an issue. This resulted in physical archives either not being accessed or the wrong material being requested.

It was expressed that curators (where available) had to act as a bridge between the archive and the requestor, further adding to their often-heavy workloads.

It was frequently stated that easy access to physical archives was essential to facilitate research requests and also assisted in the deposition of other archives.

Improvement of access to physical archives would also result in a greater output of research with reduced costs and time. Again, the idea of large inter-region research projects was raised and it was felt that improved access would result in these becoming more common and requiring less resources to accomplish.

Greater access would also result in archaeological displays and research taking place with less time invested in logistics, this could mean exhibitions reflecting big topics of the day and current events to a greater extent.

4.4 Individual Sessions (Workshops 1-3)

Session 1 - Current Picture

How do you currently use archives in projects or work?

The main areas discussed covered research (which increased where there was on-line data or access), within a museum context (display, curation, public engagement etc) and by specialists as part of commercial projects. It was thought general re-use by commercial units was low. Jamboard comments included:

- PAS Research, if accessible online.
- Displays and research. X3
- Further analysis when a commercial project is in the same area.
- Provide displays of temporary loans.
- Commercial units.
- Collaborations with Universities.
- Students.

Existing issues.

The biggest issue was online access and availability, followed by the variation in documentation, lack of museum resources and knowledge of where the archives are located. Jamboard comments included:

- More information about the archives is needed online (including photos) to improve access.
- Some archives are only open part time. X2
- Where are the archives and how can access be gained.
- Units not depositing quickly enough.
- The public don't realise archives can be split (with specialists long term etc).
- Not as well documented in museums as other objects in their collection.
- Museum staff not as knowledgeable with archaeological archives as other objects in their collections.
- Not possible to capture all the research and info from a grey literature report.
- Time taken to access digital data.
- Lack of awareness outside of depository.
- Access to older material.
- Grey literature hiding archives?
- Universities teaching of how to approach research.

- Why should a lack of curator mean no access to archives?



Figure 1. User Needs Workshop, Session 1 Jamboard (composite)

Barriers.

The three main barriers were considered to be lack of on-line data, staffing and resources, and the promotion and visibility of archaeological archives. Jamboard comments included:

- Lack of online access, including photos. X2
- Lack of full-time permanent staff. X4
- Providing access is a small part of the job and can be low priority.
- Lack of promotion of access and deposition.
- Staff lacking an archaeological background.
- Not knowing where the archive is located and where it is physically (Which museum and then where in the museum). X3
- Disability access.
- Lack of social media presence.
- Need to look at how we define archives.
- Resourcing access.
- Lack of awareness of how to access digital archives.
- General lack of access.
- Lack of digital documentation.
- Not knowing what is in the archive.
- Making sure things go back in the right box. X2
- Lack of publication awareness.

Session 2- Rethinking use

If barriers were removed what would change how you use them.

Generally, it was thought that if the barriers to use were removed everything would be better, research would increase, and new stories could be told. Jamboard comments included:

- Everything would be better!
- Tell new stories.
- Greater sharing with researchers and community groups. X3
- Engagement with the public with up to date research and techniques.
- Being able to get access to all project information not just from the grey report.
- Greater understanding of artefact analysis and the importance of objects (some sites and objects have an overinflated importance as researchers are unaware of recently discovered parallels).
- Less delay for time sensitive research questions.
- Greater engagement in the big issues of the day (environmental change).
- Make it easier to use material for education etc.
- Increased use from researchers and local groups.
- Curators can do more with an archive the more they know about it.
- How many researchers want to access archives?
- Need a national archives register?



Figure 2. User Needs Workshop, Session 2 Jamboard (composite)

What changes would help get the most out of archaeological archives?

The main changes needed were the need for National standards (for archive compilation, data, curation and accessibility), an on-line catalogue, better facilitation of the archiving process and to a lesser extent physical accessibility. Jamboard comments included:

- More photographs.
- Standardisation of data.
- Standardised deposition guidelines across the country.
- Standardisation of digital data.
- Can we improve the language used in archives to make them more accessible. X2
- Archives becoming part of a museum collection give them greater protection.
- Online promotion of content.
- Research involvement in post-ex for mental health.
- Online catalogues. X2
- Improve disability access.
- Make the most of deselected material. X2
- Wifi, hearing loops, microscopes, scales, camera stands etc.
- Improve local engagement. X2
- Increase dialogue with academics and commercial units.
- Closer links to universities and early stage researchers.
- University and local authority as well as public library and HER all in one spot.

Is the physical location of an archive important?

The answers to this were less clearly defined. Location was deemed important from a local perspective, but it was less clear if this meant archives needed to be stored locally, or if access could be facilitated through different means. Dispersed storage was considered as positive, supporting local museums network, but less positive in terms of logistics and researchers having to travel to multiple locations. Jamboard comments included:

- Yes even if the data is available online.
- Physical access to the archive is very important to the public.
- Research space is very important.
- Local access important to the public.
- Local stores mean researchers may have to travel all over the country.
- Depends on the user group.
- Location is important when getting people to deposit.

Session 3 - Rethinking access

How would you like to access information about the archive?

The clear answer to this question was through an on-line searchable database, a live updatable central index or catalogue using standardised terminologies and data management systems. Possible homes for the catalogue included the ADS, OASIS/HERALD linked to HER's and museums. Jamboard comments included:

- Online and searchable by type, similar to HER access. X2
- In a publicly accessible format, front facing and less specialist in nature.
- National database.
- National database that links to regional museums or archives.
- Still needs local access.
- Improve terminology at the data entry stage.
- Through individual museum portals.
- So much event data it may need to be handled centrally (and then distributed locally?).
- Access for multiple types of users requires multiple entry points.
- HERALD.

"Central digital catalogue accessible by all. Central repository where access can be arranged centrally or locally as required. If archives are 'loaned' there needs to be a checking process for return."




Figure 3. User Needs workshop, Session 3 Jamboard (composite)

How would you like to access the material?

The answers to this were less specific though access to researcher space or lab/bench space was considered important. Several individuals suggested museums could still perform the function. Jamboard comments included:

- At the collecting museum.
- Regional resource centres, but what about material already in collections?
- Research space at the depository. X2
- Research space is essential. X2
- Look at the Scotland model?
- Increased use of digital recording to reduce the need to access physical archives (photogrammetry).
- Different users have different needs, some not able to access digital data.

Who should manage the physical storage of archives?

The general consensus (though by no means unanimous) was that archaeological archives should be managed at the national level, though it was pointed out that change is difficult and there may be resistance from existing providers. Jamboard comments included:

- National level, reflecting national importance
- Any change would be difficult.
- Difficult to answer.
- Ownership an issue, at regional level who, Historic England?
- In theory it doesn't matter but is a big change.
- Combination of national and regional.
- Regional stores could but local curators at risk.
- One store with multiple points of access?
- National Store may lose local engagement.
- Can other museums sign up or is it compulsory?

Session 4 - Rethinking space

Would you use a specialist facility?

Responses were mixed, though it was thought any facility would need visitor facilities. Jamboard comments included:

- Would need a visitor facility to get people inside.
- Tours of the stores. X2
- Café and shop needed.
- Record office in Suffolk have similar facility.
- Why can't it be joined up (record office and archives?).




Figure 4. User Needs Workshops, Session 4 Jamboard (composite)

Can you think of potential user groups?

It was though any facility could cater to community groups and schools etc. It was thought researchers and specialists would use bench spaces but that many of the larger commercial units already had those facilities. Jamboard comments included:

- Commercial Units.
- Researchers.
- Local groups.
- Hive - is that a model to follow?

Do you think people might pay to use or rent space?

The response was mixed. Jamboard comments included:

- Regional hubs bid to be a hub or archive?
- Charging for commercial research.
- Space for PhD students whose archive research is too big for university facilities.

APPENDIX 5 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

5.1 Introduction

To support the aims of the options appraisal in reviewing the impact of different potential options with stakeholder groups, the OSAA project needed to consider possible solutions with project stakeholders. A discussion workshop was held in October 2020 which invited stakeholder organisations to engage in a series of discussions which considered different options for archaeological archives storage.

This appendix reviews the feedback and collates recommendations generated by those workshops. Summaries of the comments left on the jam boards (digital flip charts) are included below, and copies of the actual boards are included.

5.2 Methodology

The October 2020 workshop involved 20 invited participants representing several key stakeholder organisations, including ClfA, ALGAO, CBA, HE, EAC, EH, HS2, NHSF, NT, FAME, SMG and SMA.

The format was based on the successful delivery of the user needs workshops discussed above. A series of propositions were presented to the participants, who then discussed each within breakout group sessions (see Section 9.4 for summarised comments for each break out session across all three workshops). Jamboard was used to record comments as digital post it notes during each discussion, images from which are included below. Sessions were recorded for the benefit of the project team to revisit and record exact comments.

5.3 Outcomes

The session provided an opportunity to test some ideas with stakeholder groups, and to reveal where the key opportunities and issues were perceived to be. The concept of a National collection was well received, with very few negative points. In particular, the idea of a national brand and identity was seen as a powerful narrative for those working with developers, clients and other organisations, to help underpin the value and significance of archaeological archives from developer funded excavations. Participants immediately saw the practical advantages of a national approach, especially when linked to indexing and signposting of archives and their contents. This would have the very positive impact of supporting discoverability and use, meaning archives were more accessible both for research and engagement purposes. Accessibility was a thread that ran through all the workshops discussions and should be seen as a key consideration for any storage solution.

In terms of potential issues for all solutions, the need to provide a balance between regional and local ownership and access, against provision of national catalogues and indexing was raised in more than one workshop. Concerns that a national approach to storage would erode income and therefore resources within local museums was raised as a likely if unintended consequence of centralisation. Feasibility was also brought up – a move to a National collection brand, supported

with an online accessible index, was very welcome, but is the level of data aggregation and incorporation of existing museum collections possible, and how would it be funded? If it were possible, the research benefits of an accessible index were seen as a major positive, opening up a significant opportunity of national and internally significant research.

With regards to storage solutions and the options available, no single option was felt to be more supported than another. Rather, a blended approach which involves existing museums, local access to any archive with a guaranteed storage option would seem to combine all options. This would need the buy-in from multiple partners but provides the local and regional connection which is supported by a nationally supported infrastructure. For museums where storage is an issue, being able to access national managed facility provides the back-up needed to relieve pressure and reduce the strain on capacity. For access, the idea of national infrastructure provides an additional advantage of an 'inter library loan' approach, where collections can be accessed at a location local to them.

Apart for the recognition that a sustainable funding option needed to be developed, there was a not agreement on a particular funding model. A degree of start-up funding would be needed, and as a national collection, the idea that some support from national or public funding would be needed. The one thing participants did find agreement on was boxes – a move away from box charges would be a positive move. How income could then be generated was not clear – with suggestions including a levy which frontloaded archive costs or subscription paid by contractors or projects to a storage facility.

5.4 Individual Sessions

Session ONE, The National Archaeological Archive

Participants were presented with the following proposition and asked to discuss its pros and cons, as well as make a yes/no decision on the proposition.

Proposition # 1 – We need to recognise archaeological archives as a significant National collection which needs to be protected and cared for. Yes / No?

Overwhelmingly, our breakout session participants supported the proposal that archaeological archives should be recognised as a significant National collection (Figures 7 and 8). A key positive is seen as branding and identity, providing a useful vehicle to communicate significance and value of archaeological archives on a regional and national level.

"If we generated material that fitted into national vision/ collection would be easier to explain to developers."

"If had that identity- would be easier to argue its importance"

Creating a National collection could also provide the opportunity to centralise information, reduce duplication of effort and standardise collections management, which was also seen as a positive. Information management and centralisation was seen as a necessary part of a National collection being created, which would support accessibility and findability of archives.

"Give focus to developing national standards"

"Help with signposting to archives location"

"Managing as a national collection has potential to improve discoverability. Otherwise it has to be through linked open data - but most local museums don't even have online catalogues"

"Potential for efficiencies - avoids duplication of inessential material in multiple places"

The proposition is not without its drawbacks and would need strong leadership and lots of buy-in from stakeholder groups. Participants cautioned against alienation of regional museums, the costs associated with establishing a National collection, and issues of collaboration or interoperability with existing museum catalogues.

"Experience suggests that the local museums feel that archives should be local. Often questions from councillors mean museum's having to adhere to local politics"

"May be challenging on a local level. Difficult to get a strategic vision."

"If we created a single NAC catalogue how would we deal with existing museum listings?"

"What if people don't want to be part of it?"




Figure 5. Stakeholder workshops, Session 1, Proposition #1 Jamboard summary

Proposition #1 - We need to recognise archaeological archives as a significant National collection, which needs to be protected and cared for. Yes or No?



"Two-tier system?- what about the archives that have already been deposited?"

"Feasibility and getting people to use it consistently"

"Lack of ownership at a local level"

"How much could you aggregate existing data into a new single catalogue?"

We also discussed how a single National archive might be funded, and a range of options were proposed. Of these, the common threads of the discussion included:

- A centrally funded start-up, perhaps with support from public infrastructure or research infrastructure funds.
- As a National collection, a degree of public funding would be appropriate and perhaps moving to a statutory requirement.
- Movement away from a box charge, perhaps through the use of levy to front-load costs for archive deposition in projects.
- A subscription model for archaeological contractors, or for larger projects.
- A need for sustainability.




Figure 7. Stakeholder workshops, Session 2, Proposition #2 Jamboard summary



Figure 8. Stakeholder workshops, Session 2, Proposition #2 Jamboard (composite)

Session Three, Storing the collection

Participants were presented with three propositions based around how archives should be stored (nationally, regionally or utilising the museums network) and asked to discuss the pros and cons of each, as well as make a yes/no decision.

Proposition #3 – Guaranteed storage for all appropriately prepared archives should be provided by a single physical and National Store. Yes / No?

The idea of one single National Store produced mixed feelings from the participants with only a few clear 'yes' or 'no' responses and most needing some clarification about how it might operate before a decision was made. Whilst there were positive angles, there were some real concerns. As with previous propositions, the single entity idea provides a simplified accessible route to information, and some felt that if archives can be accessed then it shouldn't matter where they are held. A large National Store could provide opportunities for specialist storage spaces and would need research areas to ensure they are usable as a resource and not simply a store facility. Some felt that a national solution could take advantage of existing facilities, such as DeepStore, supported by connections with regional locations such as museums to facilitate access. In this case, the National Store would not prove to be a barrier to collaboration but could act as an 'overflow' for museums which have reached capacity, or as a network connector, taking the idea of inter-library loan systems with museums acting as places where researchers can view collections.

"Need to move archives between off site & local store - perhaps a 'booking' system to national index by appointment. Box index should include digital image of contents online to enhance index."

"As long as can access it when needed, location of storage possibly doesn't matter."

"System like inter-library loans"

"DeepStore advantages - only pay for what you use, stable environment, no O2 so no worry about fire"

"If museums are part of the solution the main store could be DeepStore but the user interface- where researchers can visit - is the local museum."

Concerns were mainly linked to the existing museums network, and the unintended consequences of developing a solution which does not include museums. Would the loss of archaeological archives as part of the collecting policy of museums threaten the income or resources of organisations, risk a reduction in skills and expertise in museums or lead to the loss of access to archives on a local level? In addition, concern of the viability of an ambitious programme, whether it is fundable or would lead to archives being split across locations, was also discussed.

"Museums might end up being priced out - if it costs us more to archive compared with the national archive people might try and avoid depositing with us."

"Culture dump, loss of regional/local connectivity etc etc store of last resort could be a possibility but I suspect this would end up as the default"

"Issues how to persuade people it is a good idea to move archives away from area"

"Too ambitious, it is not practically manageable. Loosing local connections is as well important issues."




Figure 9. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #3 summary




Figure 10. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #3 Jamboard (composite)

Proposition #4 – Guaranteed storage for all appropriately prepared archives should be supported via a network of regional storage centres. Yes / No?

The proposition to use regional storage centres provides some opportunity to reduce concerns over local access – however, the need to secure an operational model which works with several local authorities and the multiplication of capital costs were key issues. The advantages included support for regional resources, which might be beneficial to local people and public engagement. Pinon was certainly less emphatic with this option – participants recognised this model is used for some (English Heritage) but that as an option for a National collection, it might not solve any more issues that a Nationally held store might.

“At least material would be help more locally than a national repository and so access would be better”

“Yes, as part of a 'mixed provision”

“Yes, proposition 4 and 5 do not have to be contradictory. Network of storage facilities could be formed upon existing entities (with additional funding)”

“Possibly, but only if there is an option for existing large repositories to become part of this solution”

“Accessibility is key! Either a regional store or a national store (with or without remote back storage) that is networked with local museums”

did like the idea that this would support the experience of in-house museum archaeologists and that the system is already in place. The guarantee would need to come from off-site / last resort storage facility, which might create tensions between regional and national repositories. It would not support any standardisation or accessibility, apart from perhaps providing better connections to local public audiences.

"Capacity is still an issue - for this to work support and investment is still needed to ensure it can be a consistent and sustainable solution"

"Including existing archives in a network unites the sector"

"Would be good to re-engage museums in archives as some are losing interest"

"No statutory requirement for museums to collect archives - so unless that exists it is easy for provision to be withdrawn"

"That's the system we have now, and it doesn't work!"

"Yes- alongside backup solution that work and the 'national brand' and management"




Figure 13. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #5 summary



Figure 14. Stakeholder workshops, Session 3, Proposition #5 Jamboard (composite)

Session four, Standardising the store

The final session asked participants to discuss standardisation, within the working project archive and the deposited archive, and to outline any pros and cons as well as make a yes/no decision on the proposition.

Proposition #6 – The preparation and storage of both working and deposited archaeological archives should be standardised and meet industry wide benchmarks. Yes / No?

The proposition that an industry standard could be developed which was linked to both the working project archive (essentially ClfA Standards for Archives) with a standard for the management of archaeological archives once in store proved to be an interesting discussion. The proposition did get some clear agreement from most of the participants, although there were areas of concern. Issues discussed all related to the currently existing museum accreditation – would another raft of standards prove too much, would standards be in line with collecting policies, and would additional resource be required in museum to facilitate compliance. A key question was around regulation – who was setting the standards and who was checking them? On the positive side, standards were a way to reduce deposition delays and streamline costs, making it more of a level playing field for project design and budgeting. Standards were also viewed as a means to make archives more accessible and predictable, and better for both regional and national research projects.

"Yes - needs a working group to define"

"Makes archives more sustainable in a digital world"

"Incentivise holding organisations meeting standards for care and access"

"Reduce deposition delays and costs to contractors by streamlining processes"

"Does the existing accreditation process need revisiting for archives?"

"Who oversees the benchmarks? Who ensures they're being followed?"

"Relies on accreditation being enshrined in the planning process otherwise commercial units won't want to pay more to deposit with an accredited store"

"Lots of standards already exist. Will another be accepted?"




Figure 15. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, Proposition #6 summary




Figure 16. Stakeholder workshops, Session 4, Proposition #6 Jamboard (composite)

Bibliography

Aitchison, K. and Rocks-Macqueen, D. 2013. *Archaeology Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2012-13*. Landwood Research

Archaeological Archives Forum (AAF) 2010. *Developing an Archaeological Resource Centre Guidance for Sustainable Storage and Access to Museum Collections*. Archaeological Archives Forum.

Baxter, K. Boyle, G. and Creighton, L. 2018 *Guidance on the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections*. SMA for Historic England.
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1n2WfUjzeJhm4W5dmkTc0ycMI76ywF5PV/view> accesses 08.04.20

Boyle, G. Booth, N. & Rawden, A. 2018. *Museums Collecting Archaeology (England) Report Year 3*. Society for Museum Archaeology for Historic England
<http://socmusarch.org.uk/socmusarch/gailmark/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/HE-SURVEY-2018-TEMPLATE-FINAL.pdf> accesses:07.04.20

ClfA 2019. *Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives*. ClfA
<https://www.archaeologists.net/selection-toolkit> accessed: 06.04.20

DigVentures 2019. *Work Digital / Think Archive: A Guide to digital data generated from archaeological investigations*. DigVentures <https://digventures.com/projects/digital-archives/> accessed: 05.04.20

Donnelly-Symes, B. 2019. *Planning for Archives: Opportunities and Omissions*. ALGAO
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/planning-for-archives/planning-for-archives/> accessed: 06.04.20

Edwards, R. 2013. *Archaeological Archives and Museums 2012*. Society of Museum Archaeology
<http://socmusarch.org.uk/socmusarch/gailmark/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Archaeological-archives-and-museums-2012.pdf> accessed: 04.04.20

Fernie, K. McNulty, P and Dawson, D. 2017. *Seeing the Light of Day: securing a sustainable future for archaeological archives, Summery Report*. Wiltshire Museum Devises
<https://seeingthelightofday.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/summary-report-seeing-the-light-of-day-2017-10-26.pdf> accessed: 06.04.20

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government 2018. *National Planning Policy Framework*. APS Group on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf accessed 05.04.20 accessed: 08.04.20

Museum Association 2019. *Empowering Collections*. Museum Association
<https://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=1262818> accessed: 09.04.20

Paul, S. 2020. *Why do we have this? A study of museum approaches to retention and disposal of archaeological archives*. University of Birmingham Ph.D.

Research Information Network, 2008. *Discovering physical objects: Meeting researchers' needs*. Research Information Network. <http://www.rin.ac.uk/system/files/attachments/Discovering-objects-report.pdf> accessed: 27.04.20

Society for Museum Archaeologists (SMA), 2019. *Publicly accessible repositories & archaeological archives* [Online]. Available: <http://socmusarch.org.uk/socmusarch/gailmark/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Publically-accessible-repositories.pdf> accessed 12.05.2019

Tsang, C. 2017. *Gathering Information on Deep Storage Archive Facilities in England*. Historic England
<https://research.historicengland.org.uk/Report.aspx?i=15626&ru=%2fResults.aspx%3fp%20%3d1%26n%3d10%26rn%3d40%26ry%3d2017%26ns%3d1> accessed: 06.04.20

Vincent, S. 2019. *A survey of Fees for the Transfer of Archaeological Archives in England*. Historic England Research Report series 003-2019
<https://research.historicengland.org.uk/Report.aspx?i=16220&ru=%2FResults.aspx%3Fp%3D1%26n%3D10%26rn%3D3%26ry%3D2019%26ns%3D1> accessed: 07.04.20

Wills, J. 2018. *The World after PPG16: 21st- century challenges for archaeology*. ClfA
<https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/21st-century%20Challenges%20for%20Archaeology%20project%20report%20October%202018.pdf>
accessed: 05.04.20