



The National Archives

Nick Barratt
Action 4 Archives
Flat 2
17 St James Road
Surbition
Surrey
KT6 4 QH

Natalie Ceeney
Chief Executive
The National Archives
Kew, Richmond
Surrey TW9 4DU
T +44 (0)20 8392 5220
F +44 (0)20 8487 9207
E natalie.ceeney@nationalarchives.gov.uk
nationalarchives.gov.uk

The National Archives, bringing together
the Public Record Office, the Historical Manuscripts
Commission and the Office
of Public Sector Information.

24 September 2009

Dear Nick.

Re: Counter proposals for making 10% budget cuts at TNA worth £4.2m

Thank you for your letter, which we received this Monday, 21st September. Despite the fact that it was received after the consultation period closed because of your other commitments, my team and I have been through your proposals closely.

I appreciate how much effort you have put into preparing these suggestions. We have therefore gone through them in detail, explaining either where we are already doing what you suggest, or why we don't believe the answer to be the right one for us at this time.

In order to make this clear, I've presented your proposals and our comments in a tabular form. We would of course be happy for you to publish our response in full on your website or in any other forum. As such, our intent is to share this letter in full at the User Forum later today.

As you are aware, we are announcing what we now plan to do, following all of the helpful feedback, at the user meeting today. The consultation is now complete. Thank for you for all your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely

Natalie Ceeney
Chief Executive

Your proposal	Comments and response
<p>Review of senior management: Reduction of management board to former size, with Directors responsible for Operations and Services; Finance and Performance; and Information Management. This would produce a saving of c.£260,000 per annum</p>	<p>The comment about reducing Management Board to its former size is a little unclear. As you are aware, I started as CEO at The National Archives in October 2005. At the time, we had a management board significantly larger than now – 14 members, rather than the 11 we do now. In fact, one of the first actions I took was to commission an independent review of our governance arrangements that led to a reduction in the number of executive members of the Board, and an increase in the number of non execs, to improve scrutiny.</p> <p>http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/annualreport0506.pdf</p> <p>I assume from your letter, therefore, that you mean the number of Directors, rather than number of Board members. It is certainly correct that I have changed some job titles, but this has not actually meant an increase in posts. For example, when I arrived, we had a Head of HR. I believe that people management is absolutely critical to the success of TNA, so when the postholder left, I changed the title of the post to that of HR Director, and I elevated the status to that of Director, sitting on the Board. This was not a new post, and was not a much higher salary either, but it demonstrated the importance I put on good people management in an organisation of over 600 people, and also freed up the Finance Director to focus on the financials. Similarly, the Customer & Business Development Director post directly replaced the old Head of Business Development post – again, no new post – and indeed your later recommendations actually specifically suggest that the post itself should be retained, all be it at a lower level. The only Board level post which didn't exist in some form when I joined was that of the Director of Information Policy and Services, that occupied by Carol Tullo. Carol was Director of OPSI when it merged with TNA in 2006. Carol was already at Board level, and joined the Board to oversee her areas of responsibility. The funding for her post was transferred with her, so there was no additional cost to adding Carol to the Board and, instead, it ensured that a key new area of work was given appropriate focus on the Board.</p> <p>I hope this explains the changes to our Board structure since I've joined. My main actions have actually been to reduce the size of the Board, but mainly through changing titles and status of roles to ensure that the right functions were represented on the Board. The total cost of the Board has actually declined in the four years I've been CEO at The National Archives.</p>

<p>Appointment of independent Chair for Management Board to ensure CIPFA good practice guidelines are met</p>	<p>The Civil Service has a different accounting structure to many other bodies, in that it requires that every government department has a single Accounting Officer, and not a Chair and CEO split. One of the reasons for this is that we work to Ministers, and so we already have a split in responsibilities, in that the Minister oversees the direction of the organisation, and our role is to deliver against an agreed direction. Although the CIPFA guidance is well respected, it is not guidance which the Civil Service deems appropriate to government Departments. That is a decision not made by me, but by the leadership of the Civil Service.</p> <p>In order to improve scrutiny, as mentioned above, one of the first reviews I commissioned when joining TNA was a governance review. We now have some very strong non executive Directors, all with a huge amount of governance and management experience. As we are not permitted to adopt the Chair/ CEO split in The National Archives, I felt that increasing the quantity of non executives at TNA would allow us to similarly improve governance. I am pleased that we have a well running Board with a high degree of scrutiny of the executive.</p>
<p>Full review of senior management pay scales, with immediate removal of market supplements and no further appointments to mid or high band. Strict code of conduct to be introduced for pay assessment</p>	<p>There are two forms of 'senior manager' within TNA. There are senior civil servants (SCS) - small numbers – just myself and the Directors- and other senior managers who are not senior civil servants. The distinction is important, as the different groups are governed by different pay agreements.</p> <p>The SCS pay terms and conditions are set nationally, in a pan-civil service pay agreement. My own pay and conditions are set by the Ministry of Justice; I have an annual review where I am compared with people doing similar roles in the wider MoJ group, and no-one in TNA, including myself, has any say at all in my pay (or in my starting salary). For the Directors' pay and reward, we get a directive every year from the Cabinet Office which tells us the terms under which we should pay the Directors, according to performance. This is then delegated to the TNA Remuneration Committee, which is chaired by one of our non executive Directors and consists of all of the non execs (and I am not a member, I just present my view to the non execs). There is, therefore, a full review of the Directors' salaries each and every year. We are not permitted to deviate from the SCS pay structure. No Director is paid a 'market supplement' – all of the TNA Directors, and I myself, are roughly mid point through their respective SCS scale.</p> <p>Below SCS level, TNA has full delegated pay authority for its staff. This delegation is outlined in our framework agreement (http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/executive-</p>

	<p>agency-framework-agreement.pdf) which was last updated at the time of the TNA/OPSI merger. It might help if I explained how we set pay rates. Every pay negotiation round, we prepare a draft pay agreement for staff, which we clear with Cabinet Office, Treasury, our Ministers – and then negotiate with the Trade Unions (which usually changes elements, but within the mandate agreed by Treasury and Cabinet Office). We all know that the public sector generally pays less than the private sector rate, but we also all know that if we don't pay a decent salary for the job, we either can't attract people, or they leave as soon as they can get a better paid job. We see this happen all the time, particularly in areas like IT where well qualified people can command high salaries, and the cost to us of recruiting someone who joins for a year, learning a lot, then leaving, along with their knowledge, is far higher than that of paying the right rate and keeping them for a few more years. Our pay system is therefore designed both to be fair, but to also ensure that we can attract and retain good people at all levels. We work closely with the Trade Unions to conduct equal pay audits to ensure that our system is fair. I am sure you would want us to ensure that all of our staff are paid fairly, and command something approximating to the rate for the job.</p> <p>We do, of course, have lots of checks and balances built in. Every single time a vacancy arises, HR and the manager check the job description to see if anything has changed. If anything has changed, it goes before a panel of HR, Managers and Trade Unions to re-grade the job. This sets the salary band for the job. Under our rules, jobs have to be advertised at the bottom of the band <i>unless</i> the manager can prove that this will not allow them to attract and retain the right person, and HR need to verify any such cases (and the Trade Unions get details of any appointments made above the band minimum, to enable openness and scrutiny). It is therefore true that we do have staff on market supplements, both at senior, but also at junior grades, determined on a case by case basis after this analysis, in order to be able to get someone suitably qualified for all roles. We consider this a pragmatic, sensible way of ensuring that we can attract and retain the right staff. These market supplements are reviewed each time someone leaves. Removing them from someone in post would be changing their contractual terms and conditions, and hence illegal. We do not pay people more than we need to, but we also try and pay our staff fairly.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative staff structure to be introduced with clear senior management roles in accordance 	<p>I suspect that we have a different view of what TNA's core remit is. Reading the Action4Archives site, it appears that you want us to go back to the remit of the Public Record Office (pre the merger with the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 2003). There is a problem with this, in that we are statutorily now a different body</p>

<p>with TNA's core remit</p>	<p>than the Public Record Office (PRO), with a wide ranging remit. If we fail to act according to our full remit, we would be acting illegally. In addition, when we undertook these mergers, our budgets grew accordingly (when I joined, this was a £35m organisation, and it's now a £55m organisation). If we demerged any of our responsibilities, aside from our view that it would be the wrong move, we'd need to give the additional funding back.</p> <p>The details of our remit are in our Framework Agreement (http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/executive-agency-framework-agreement.pdf). However, it might be easier if I explain the background to the mergers, and the rationale for the change, and why we believe it significantly strengthens this organisation.</p> <p>The PRO was concerned with the management of government's records, and with government record keeping. It merged with the HMC in 2003, to create The National Archives. This merger was really significant, but not just because of the name change. It took the statutory remit of the combined body from just being about records created by central government, to being concerned with the archival heritage of the whole nation. This gives us an obligation, as well as a right, to lead, advise and also support the wider archive sector. Money came with the merger to support this extra work.</p> <p>In 2006, The National Archives merged with OPSI and HMSO, again acquiring both the statutory remits and the money to enable these remits to be performed effectively. This effectively gives the combined organisation a remit to oversee government's records and information production from creation to reuse. We believed, and still believe that this is the right strategy for the organisation, because it a) gives us far more clout as a body, b) because we believe that government information needs managing throughout its lifecycle, and c) it makes sense for the 'PRO element' by safeguarding its future. The reality of e-records and information is that unless they are captured at the point of creation, and managed appropriately (e.g. kept readable) they will simply not exist 30 years later to become a record of The National Archives. But in addition, increasingly, history does not start at 30 years, and our wider 'reuse' remit means that we can, and do achieve the release of information before it reaches the 30 year point, which is to the benefit of the public and researchers alike. The investment (all funded through the merger) we make into improving government information has both an immediate benefit now to government, but also helps ensure that there is no black hole in</p>
------------------------------	---

	<p>history.</p> <p>The final part of the merger story is our acquisition of the Statute Law Database service in 2008. This brought the updating of the statute book into TNA (we already publish legislation). Because of overlaps with existing work, this means that we have been able to both do a better job of publishing and updating legislation, and have made savings to reinvest in our overall activities.</p> <p>It is worth also noting that we are a government department, reporting to Ministers. Whatever our statutory responsibilities, we work to the direction of the government of the day. We are obliged, under our Framework Agreement, to agree a strategy with our Minister which guides our work. We have done so – our 5 year Vision is on our website, along with annual business plans. These set out, in addition to our statutory remit, what we are obliged to focus on. We cannot change this strategy without Ministerial approval.</p> <p>http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/operate/plans.htm</p> <p>I do believe, therefore, that we have the right senior management structure to cover this full remit of the organisation. We have support Directors in Finance and HR, both of which are critical areas worthy of a dedicated focus (Caroline and Terry). We have a Director overseeing the government work we do, and also the wider advisory work (Carol). We have a Director overseeing our technology strategy and delivery (David), which, given much of our content now arrives and is disseminated electronically, this is a critical post. We have a Director managing our public service delivery, onsite and online (Jeff). And we have a Director responsible for the commercial negotiations necessary both to raise us income and to deliver our content through third parties (Oliver). I do not believe we have any superfluous posts at Director level.</p>
<p>Monday closure</p> <p>Review of opening hours with proposals to be put forward to preserve 6 day opening week that include:</p> <p>MODEL A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no specialist records advice before 11 but general records advice only; OR 	<p>When working through the options before 29th June, we did consider alternatives along the lines you have suggested. However, they do not generate sufficient savings, as staff are still required to be in the building if we open 6 days a week. This is because, even if we open later, our staff work 7-8 hour days, and so a later opening just means more staff time at desks, but does not generate savings in staff costs. Our staff don't generally work 'hours' spread over 6 days, but work their 36 hours week over 5 days. Our staff are pretty flexible (so will work some long days and some short) but we would be talking about a very major change in staff terms and conditions if we asked staff to work their hours over 6, not 5 day</p>

- 'browse only' access to Open Reading Room and online services before 11am, with only directional advice via Information Point
- invigilation service only for Document Reading room 9am-11am for TNA ticket holders with documents held overnight, no new productions or Document Delivery staff on public duty, only Security presence required
- clear 'Duty Rota' system for specialists to be on call but not necessarily on duty, freeing up more time for staff with general enquiry knowledge to be public facing whilst permitting specialist staff to undertake development or cataloguing work
- SAVING: reduction in staffing hours for Specialist / General Advice and Document Delivery to 42 hours per week, from 50.5 hours

MODEL B

- site to be fully closed, with no public access, according to

weeks (which is the only way that either Model A or B would work and manage to save us money).

We also have a lot of feedback that users want document ordering to start earlier, not later. In fact, we routinely have requests to this effect. We have therefore tried to extend document ordering, rather than restrict it.

On this specific point, you'll be pleased to note that we already operate under the system you suggest. The majority of advice services are delivered by general enquiry staff. Our specialists only work a limited number of shifts on duty per week (typically half that of generalists), allowing them to spend the majority of their time on knowledge development, cataloguing, etc. We also have an 'on call' system allowing our specialists to be called when needed, but allowing them to free up time for more specialist work.

<p>the following opening hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday 11 – 5 ordering 11 - 4 Tuesday 10 – 7 ordering 10 – 4.45 Wednesday 11 – 5 ordering 11 - 4 Thursday 10 – 7 ordering 10 – 4.45 Friday 11 – 5 ordering 11 – 4 Saturday 10 – 5 ordering 11 – 3 SAVING: reduction in opening hours to 43 hours per week, from 50.5 hours; reduction in ordering hours to 33.5 hours 	
<p>Review of Open Reading Room</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate return of Library to a closed area, with Librarians on duty at all times. Librarians who wish to answer general enquiries to receive specific records training Introduction of periodical headcounts; or alternative means of assessing user numbers in Open Reading Room. Periodical surveys of surrogate material use, with no 	<p>As you are aware, we opened up the Library area under the Kew 2008 changes, in response to reader demand. Although it has not been universally popular, we have had a lot of positive feedback to the changes. We do not feel that there is any benefit in reversing this change. All reader advisers (whether they have a library, history, or archival background) receive full training to assist the public. This proposal would not save us any money, and would cost us money we don't have to make the change. It is also important to remember that Library staff have a range of duties, like specialists, and more time spent on desks in the Reading Rooms would mean less time to maintaining and developing the library content and catalogue. Library staff are also available on call, when needed.</p> <p>You should be pleased to know that we already have an automatic counting system in place to monitor reading room numbers. We also conduct 'ad hoc' counts of the Open Reading Room, as and when required.</p> <p>You should be pleased to know that we have been conducting</p>

<p>immediate withdrawal of surrogates from Open Reading Room</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of statistics on use of online content viewed onsite, and displayed as a proportion of total downloads • Clearer identification of staff whilst on public duty through use of badges, showing specialist records advisor; general records advisor; orientation and new reader services; and librarians • Review of space in Open Reading Room (eg seminar rooms, currently unused) 	<p>annual microfilm/fiche usage surveys for more than a decade. The latest one took place in May 2009. As we have stated in previous responses though, we do believe that removing surrogates from open access in the reading room, when (and only when) our experts tell us that they believe that the digital surrogate is of appropriate quality and represents good customer service. Anyone who wants to use surrogates can still do so, for free. They will still be housed in Kew.</p> <p>We do not collect this data, as we are not clear about the benefit in doing so. It costs money to collect any data. We will keep revisiting, on an annual basis, which data we need to collect in order to help run our services more effectively. For the coming round we will feed this suggestion into our planning process. However, we do not understand how this proposal would save us money!</p> <p>The issue of name badges and staff descriptions has been fully debated in previous user forum meetings. It remains our view that implementing your suggestion would not be helpful. Readers do not always know what level of assistance they require, and having 'senior' or 'junior' on badges can actually mean that readers direct a higher proportion of enquiries to the 'senior' staff, removing our most senior experts from having the time to focus on the specialist work we need them for. We find that our staff are good at assessing whether they have the expertise to answer enquiries directed at them, and can either provide the appropriate answer, or find the right person who can. Again, this proposal would not save us money.</p> <p>By 'seminar room', we assume you mean our Talks Room. This room has been highly successful, allowing us to offer talks on a wide range of topics of interest to researchers. The room is in use every day. And having this talks room allows us to also offer 'new to Kew' sessions each day, to orientate new users of our services to The National Archives, which generally helps reduce the number of similar enquiries directed at our staff. If we stopped these sessions, the number of enquiries that we field would almost certainly increase.</p>
<p>Review of staffing structure and job descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As part of a full review of TNA 	<p>I hope my earlier comments explain that our statutory remit is not just the 'PRO remit' but includes the remit of all four bodies which form part of The National Archives. If we 'shifted back' our focus in the way you suggest, there would be some immediate consequences:</p>

<p>staffing, core roles will be defined and focus shifted back onto key archival functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Directorate for Information Management, including the acquisition, management and preservation of new material; digital record access and preservation; consultancy services to sector professionals and Government (to be charged for as SLA) <p>○</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would be acting in breach of Statute, and hence be acting illegally • If we started to charge for our oversight work for government, the government departments who we are pressurising to do work for us would simply stop using us. This would inevitably lead to a future black hole in history. • We are prohibited from simply charging other parts of government for their services (as it shifts a burden from one part of government to another), so could not technically move to this model anyway.
<p>Review of staffing structure and job descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Directorate for Operations and Services to undertake full career progression exercise, skills and expertise audit, and creation of accurate job descriptions based on peer reviews; work plan for subject teams that incorporate cataloguing, generation of new interpretive content, contributions to funding bids, external recognition and representation <p>○</p>	<p>An exercise akin to what you are proposing was conducted two years ago, with every member of the team in our public facing area having their job re-evaluated. All job descriptions for the ARK team have effectively been through the sort of Peer Review process you are proposing – all were posted for comments from staff, and reviewed by the Trade Unions as well as by the managers in the area. Work is underway to develop clear career progression scales based on professional expertise. This is a recommendation I am confident we are already implementing.</p>

<p>Review of staffing structure and job descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Directorate of Finance and Performance to incorporate Business Development Unit, with tighter financial controls over commercial policy linked to profit margins and risk assessment 	<p>This is an activity which I employed Oliver Morley to lead - a commercial negotiator with a wealth of commercial experience.. I have been extremely impressed by how Oliver has grown our commercial income more than 23% in a recession. Oliver's income generation activity is more than paying for his salary.</p> <p>In most commercial organisations, it is standard practice for the 'sales' or commercial function to be run by someone separate from the Finance Director. The skill-set is different, and the separation of roles important for accountability and scrutiny. Given we want to generate commercial income and, more importantly, commercial profit to reinvest, I am keen to follow best practice.</p>
<p>Review of running costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation for new energy contracts to obtain cheaper fuel bills • Urgent review of cooling plant facilities, to ensure proper public safety measures are in place and to obtain energy efficiency savings • Preparation of 'special interest' case, with offsetting proposals, for CO2 emissions given the potential conflict with BS5454 to ensure proper document storage 	<p>You'll be pleased to know that we are doing all of this, and more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our energy is bought through a government consortium which uses the purchasing power of the whole of government. • One of the key savings planned is to reduce not only our price per unit of energy, but also the number of units we consume. Our Estates team are actively reviewing how we do this through plant and mechanical changes as well as through initiatives such as the introduction of motion sensitive lights. • We started a review of not only our cooling plant, but our whole estate over a year ago – and that work is continuing. • We presented a case to Treasury a year ago on the need for capital investment, and are continuing discussions • We do not believe that there is any need for us to prepare a 'special interest' case since proposals to reduce CO2 emissions are not in conflict with the guidance set out in BS5454. We believe we can, and should, be aiming to achieve both targets. • TNA is taking a sector lead in developing sustainable environments for archive collections. We are actively supporting a project in collaboration with the UCL's Centre for Sustainable Heritage to model the performance of TNA's repositories that will enable us to optimise the performance potential of the buildings to reduce energy

	<p>costs in the repositories while ensuring the continued permanence of the collections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TNA has developed a comprehensive Sustainable Development Action plan includes specific measures to improve energy performance.
<p>Digitization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of revenue generated by existing licence deals required, with due diligence to be performed on means of access requirements • Funding of future in-house digitization projects to be dependent on funding from commercial deals • Clear accounts for net revenue generation for in-house projects required, so an assessment about future projects can be taken • Re-instatement of Grants Manager with remodeled remit to create a programme of grant-funded projects that recover costs of the role, whilst bringing a wide range of high-profile academic 	<p>Digitisation projects are already independent from funding on commercial deals. They are in separate cost centres, managed by different managers and are entirely trackable.</p> <p>On every single measure, The National Archives commercial digitisation programme is world-class. It generates more revenue than any other archive programme. It has digitised more content. It delivers more document downloads. Where quality is not what it should be, we have <i>always</i> taken steps to address it with our license partners.</p> <p>It is worth explaining our digitisation process. All funding for in-house projects comes from commercial deals – because they are funded by the profitable customer and business development directorate. When a set of documents is proposed for digitisation, it is reviewed at our digitisation forum, and then allocated to one of three funding routes, depending on the most sustainable approach. First, commercial licensing. Second, other funding bodies. And third, via our limited in-house funds. We stress that one of the main reasons for in-house funding is that we wish to ensure that documents are preserved, and digitisation is an important way of reducing physical handling for high use and popular material.</p> <p>On the Grants Manager post, we have a different view from you. The National Archives has been pretty successful in raising grants for many years. We added the Grants Manager post a few years ago (at a senior level) to try and boost this income. Unfortunately, this didn't work – we continued to get grants, but only at the previous levels. As the Grants Manager is well respected, I am not suggesting that this is a failure of the individual but an indication that we were already tapping into the grants funding available. We will continue to prioritise securing of grants.</p>

<p>digital publishing projects to a new audience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p>(b) Publications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of publication strategy to produce products that are saleable in a wider mass-market • Creation of new range of products for educational audience, for digital download, to supplement existing free to view content 	<p>We are in the process of starting to make digital content online from documents online. With samples from the UFO files, and Ancestors magazine, we will be moving to providing existing publications also, with reference of course to authors.</p> <p>These are arguably the toughest conditions in the publishing market for decades. Even large publishing houses, such as Penguin, are retrenching. We simply do not believe we have the scale to be able to compete profitably in this market – it is only by being able to launch many books, or attract blockbuster authors that successful houses have been able to remain viable. We do not have the capacity to launch more than around 15 books per year, and investment to build scale is simply too risky a financial decision to make with public money.</p>
<p>(c) Record copying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abandonment of existing strategy that makes a substantial loss, return to cost recovery copying with digital images created for future sale • Greater exploitation of image library contents 	<p>We can confirm that commercial reprographic is in fact profitable, generating significant margin for Customer & Business Directorate. We are now readying for launch our online image library.</p> <p>Public service copying is charged at cost recovery only.</p>
<p>(d) Events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of consumer-focused events that use TNA as an education 	<p>As you'll know, we already do a huge number of events. These are expensive, so we do not plan to do more. However, part of our vision is to 'bring history to life for everyone' and we see our programme of events as core to achieving this. While mass market events with regard to family history are important, our focus has been more on providing for government and the historical & academic community. For example, our very successful</p>

<p>resource for mass markets such as family history, local history</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day schools, workshops and online courses are several examples that can be developed commercially 	<p>conference on Tudor power, pageantry and propaganda in March, and our upcoming Information Opportunity conference. It is worth stressing that Kew as a site is not necessarily capable of hosting such events, especially if we were to follow the previous recommendation of closing the seminar rooms!</p> <p>In the last 1-2 years we have also hosted book launches, including Professor Peter Hennessy's 'Cabinets and the Bomb'. We regularly contribute to external events, such as 'Who Do you think you are live' and other key family/local history events, such as the recent Halsted Trust Conference, where a number of record specialists spoke on topics such as the 'Poor Law' project.</p> <p>We host many other archival and historical related events, covering areas such as cataloguing, conservation, research related talks, collection security and of course, our regular press events for new releases.</p> <p>We also have an active outreach and inclusion programme, which seeks to promote areas of our records to wider audiences. In support of this we contributed to the 'Lifetime on Tiptoes' project, a HLF funded initiative focusing on Panjabi experiences of partition by hosting an event at Kew. Similarly, we are one of the sites on the National Anglo-Jewish Heritage trail (Jtrails) which celebrates the 350th anniversary of the readmittance of Jews to England. We are also active participants in the. Recent events include collaborations with the Anglo-Sikh heritage group and the Kew Society.</p> <p>Full details of our events programme, including our free talks schedule, are published on our website at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/events/calendar.htm</p> <p>On the matter of school workshops and courses, you are correct that these 'could' be developed commercially. However, our view is that our Education department is there to support the school sector, many of whom are also under increasing financial pressures. Instead of charging for these services, we focus instead on reaching students from economically or socially deprived areas and utilising technologies, such as the web and videoconferencing, to deliver these services in a cost effective manner in support of the national curriculum. By doing so we help to educate future historians and researchers, whilst raising their awareness and understanding of The National Archives and our records holdings.</p>
<p>(e) Consultancy</p>	<p>As I explained earlier, providing advice, support and also scrutiny of government information and records management, and of the</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited cost recovery or profitable consultancy can be introduced, such as digital record keeping; specialist records advice; media requests for services.• Full cost recovery on all other outreach services.	<p>wider archive sector, is part of our statutory role. We would not be permitted to charge another part of government (whether central or local) for something covered in our core statutory remit.</p> <p>This activity is fully funded, as the budgets for HMC and OPSI were transferred to The National Archives with the merger. If we stopped the activity, we'd need to give the money back!</p>
---	---

<p>(f) Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of business case to establish proper academic status for TNA, with attendant budgets, for Postgraduate studies in academic and popular history fields (eg medieval history, family history) <p>Potential future development to acquire University status for separate Academic division, based on research into its holdings akin to 'Centre for Archival Studies' at Dundee University</p>	<p>I am sure that you are aware that the higher education sector is having just as many funding challenges as we are. I am not, therefore, confident that trying for academic status will be likely to secure us more funding. Also, as a government department, we are funded by Treasury, and we cannot secure funding from other parts of government other than on a one-off grant basis. Therefore, even if we were to set up an academic institution, we could not secure more money from HEFCE to support it, so this would actually just drain cost from other (core) activities.</p> <p>We are, however, already doing a lot in this regard. We secured AHRC 'analogue status' (i.e. status equivalent to a university status) in 2005, on the back of our research excellence. This is a status we want to maintain. It does mean we can secure funding from AHRC for digitisation projects, which we do.</p>
---	--