



**INVESTMENT REVIEW**

**ARCHAEOLOGY FUNDING PROGRAMMES**

**FIRST STAGE REPORT: CONSULTATION RESPONSES**  
**- ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY**

Inspectorate  
Historic Scotland  
10 January 2008

## **CONTENTS**

### Acknowledgements

1 Introduction

2 Structure and methodology of this report

3 Summary of responses

4 Key themes

5 Next steps

Annex A The consultation document

Annex B List of respondents

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Historic Scotland wishes to thank all those who responded to the consultation document, and especially the members of Scottish Archaeological Link who held a special meeting, convened under the auspices of Council for Scottish Archaeology, to discuss the issues and the most effective way of presenting recommendations. We would also like to record that several respondents have offered assistance in taking forward the outcomes of the review in the form of practical actions, assistance which we have already begun to call upon.

## INTRODUCTION

1.1 Historic Scotland made a Corporate Plan commitment to undertake a consultative review of all strands of investment in the historic environment over the period 2004-7. The objective was to ensure that Historic Scotland had policies, priorities and procedures that were fit for purpose.

1.2 The Review of Historic Environment Grants conducted in 2004-5 dealt with the majority of this activity, but identified a strand of Ancient Monuments funding which was set apart for subsequent review, due to the different characteristics of this investment stream and the distinctive needs of stakeholders.

1.3 Restructuring and staff changes forced a year's delay, but also allowed an opportunity to expand the scope of the review from the original intention – to deal solely with Grants and Management Agreements for Ancient Monuments – to allow the inclusion of the rather larger Archaeology rescue and research programme.

1.4 The consultation document was finally launched in late March 2007 and responses requested by 30th June 2007. The text is reproduced at Annex A. The consultation was Web-based, with an introductory letter sent to approximately 350 established contacts, inviting them to visit the Historic Scotland Website and read or download the consultation document. A small supply of printed versions was set up, with copies sent to those with limited Internet access or a preference for working on paper.

1.5 One potential disadvantage of this approach is that there was no system in place to monitor “hits” on specific areas of the Historic Scotland Website. However, response rates compared quite favourably with other recent Historic Scotland consultations conducted on paper, such as the Scottish Historic Environment Policy series (SHEP).

1.6 Following an extension to the deadline at the request of two significant potential respondents, responses representing 27 individuals or bodies were received. There were 16 individual responses plus one group response from Scottish Archaeological Link, presenting the agreed views of a further 18 bodies, some of whom also submitted individual responses. Two formal “nil” responses were also received. The list of respondents is at Annex B.

1.7 Only one respondent requested that their response and its contents be treated in confidence. With this one exception, the text of all responses is now available on the Historic Scotland website, Consultations section, alongside this report, where they will remain for approximately one year from the date of this report.

### *Responses by type of interest group*

Individuals	2
Local authorities	5
Institutions/Societies	6
Commercial companies	1
Academic institutions	0
Other groupings	1 (representing 18 participants)
Advisory body	1
Nil responses	2 (both local authorities)

## **STRUCTURE AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS REPORT**

2.1 This consultation deliberately posed open questions, rather than seeking agreement or disagreement on specific proposals for change. This course of action was felt to be appropriate because the absence of any recent formal consultation meant that it was necessary to gauge whether wholesale structural change or relatively minor procedural adjustment was more likely to best meet the aspirations of respondents.

2.2 In consequence, it is not possible to present a statistical analysis for/against specific proposals. Instead, responses for each question were collated in “cut and paste” style, then ordered by similarity of change proposed, problem identified or positive comment. This mechanical gathering of comments was then reduced to a qualitative summary, still question by question, with positive comments first, criticisms second and suggestions for change third. This essentially uncritical synthesis of comments forms Section 3 below. Some comments arched across several questions, and these have been brought into consideration wherever appropriate. Additionally, some respondents made general observations outwith the question-led structure. Points made in this way have been added to the responses on specific questions where appropriate, but several general themes are also summarised at 3.12 below.

2.3 Some thematic common threads can be drawn together from each group of questions, and this is done in Section 4 below. This section, together with the point-by-summary in Section 3, will provide the structure by which Historic Scotland will consider its response and structure reporting in actions to be taken.

2.4 Section 5 closes this report by providing some detail about how further consideration will be taken forward and offering a timetable for progress reporting.

## RESPONSES

3.0 The consultation document contained short passages of text describing each of the three funding streams and then posed 11 specific questions, three each for the three funding streams and two questions about balance and overall resource allocation. These 11 questions form the structure followed below – the sub-paragraph numbering relates directly to the question, i.e. 3.7 contains responses to question 7. Comments which were volunteered over and above the 11-question structure are summarised at the end of this section in 3.12, but have also been imported to specific questions where appropriate. The full text of the consultation document can be found at Annex A and a list of respondents at Annex B.

### Archaeology programme

#### 3.1 Question: **Which aspects of the Archaeology programme work well, and which less well, under the current arrangements? (9 responses)**

3.1.1 The following aspects of the current programme arrangements were generally felt to work well (although the question of how to measure “well” was raised, contrasting one definition, ease of operation, against another, value of results). The characteristics listed below were felt by some or many respondents to be features which should be retained in any future system:

- Expectation that projects address specified strategic or research themes
- Concentration on relatively small, tightly-specified projects
- Increased possibility of commitments lasting more than one financial year
- Commitment to projects – once funded, they have priority over new entrants
- Looking beyond narrow site boundaries to wider context
- Multiple partnership working – if kept un-bureaucratic
- Breadth of eligibility
- Ability to support strategic framework-setting
- Multiplier value of grants, especially to universities
- Provisional notification of bid outcomes in January rather than April

There was a general sentiment that the programme buys good value for money but was oversubscribed.

3.1.2 The following aspects were felt to be less than satisfactory:

- Survey projects disadvantaged over excavations
- Inconsistency in date of notification of bid success or failure
- Poor feedback to failed applicants
- Annuality in bids and allocations
- Use of Archaeology programme money for capacity building in the sector
- Too little emphasis on post-excavation and publication
- Archaeology of historic buildings poorly represented among funded projects
- Projects on islands unfairly advantaged
- Significant gaps exist in research responsibilities between different divisions of HS
- Estimates process takes too long
- Single closing date for project bids
- Priorities revisited insufficiently frequently

- HS' own Historic Buildings Repair Grant programme does not support best practice in respect of buildings archaeology.

There was one rather puzzling comment to the effect that the programme now funded projects of a type which 5 years previously it had ruled ineligible – this sat rather oddly with general sentiment in favour of more frequent priority revision.

### 3.2 Question: **What are the key current and future challenges that the Archaeology programme should address? (11 responses, some very detailed)**

3.2.1 The following were identified as key challenges – they have been grouped into related clusters:

#### *Structural and capacity issues:*

- National research agendas – looking beyond HS' own needs
- Local capacity-building
- Support for local SMRs – but doubt expressed over whether this should come from Archaeology programme or elsewhere
- Available funding levels, especially for new projects
- Developing the archaeological skills base
- Public engagement
- Backlog – innovative approaches to publishing old projects
- Funding powers if new heritage legislation is introduced

#### *Knowledge gaps and cross-cutting approaches:*

- Historic Landuse Assessment – especially delivering for end-users
- Environmental history
- Past sea-level change (adaptation theme)
- Dating more sites by C14 and other methods – keyhole projects

#### *Physical threat-led challenges:*

- Upland archaeology (especially in face of windfarms)
- Coastal erosion (two respondents saw this as the over-riding priority)
- Animal burrowing
- Agricultural damage
- Wetland archaeology
- Surveys of buildings and landscapes faced with significant change or neglect (proposed as a joint initiative with RCAHMS)

### 3.3 Question: **What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures? (8 responses)**

3.3.1 A wide and varied range of suggestions was received. These have been grouped into the three headings of policies, priorities and procedures. Inevitably there is some overlap between these groupings, and also with the areas of concern listed at 3.2.1 above.

#### 3.3.2 Policies

- Support for major themes of Understanding, Caring, Communicating and Involving
- 5-year rolling programme?

- Set up an advisory group to assist in setting strategic priorities
- Stimulate and adopt national research framework and national and regional research agendas
- Support local project facilitators
- Move away from annuality to multi-year commitments
- Consider staff capacity at HS as well as financial aspects
- Establish a simple bursary or challenge fund
- Less focus on specific sites, more on context

### 3.3.3 Priorities

- Educate and engage non-archaeologists and non-professional archaeologists
- Prioritise return visits to localities to present results of funded work
- Clearer, firmer guidance needs to be published
- More sophisticated prioritisation, taking account of significance of asset(s), level and urgency of need, specialist or public interest, general equity of effort
- Reduce priorities and link to these research agendas
- Fewer priorities (but no advice on what to give up)
- SMRs to be supported to reach benchmarked standards
- Act on the information gathered by recent surveys, especially coastal erosion
- Spend less in the islands compared with mainland Scotland

### 3.3.4 Procedures

- More transparency in decision-making
- Simplify estimates process, especially for ongoing projects
- Publication of lists of funded projects
- Simplify budgeting process
- Later bidding dates *and*
- Earlier outcome notification dates (the paradox was recognised by respondent)

## **Ancient Monuments Grants programme**

### 3.4 Question: **Which aspects of the Ancient Monuments Grants system work well, and which less well, under the current arrangements? (6 responses)**

3.4.1 The following aspects of the current programme arrangements were generally felt to work well. The characteristics listed below were felt by some or many respondents to be features which should be retained in any future system:

- Availability of Architects Advisory Reports
- Possibility of relatively high grant percentage in proportion to costs
- Rolling programme with no fixed annual submission dates

3.4.2 The following aspects were felt to be less than satisfactory:

- Total level of available funds
- Waiting times for decisions
- Very high HS expectations of recipients
- 50% cap on grants for council-owned sites
- Paucity and small scale of field monument conservation projects
- Delays before funds become available – waits of up to 4 years
- Complicated procedures for relatively small grants
- Lack of widespread publicity for programme

- Concentration of spend on roofless ruins

**3.5 Question: What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures? (6 responses)**

3.5.1 The following suggestions were made:

- No changes needed
- Prioritise community-led projects
- Relax HS standards – accept adequacy rather than seeking perfection
- Increase funding totals
- Publish information of policies, priorities and procedures
- Simplify procedures
- Allow larger percentage grants because no profit for owners
- Empower Monument Wardens to assist in applications, finding matching or alternative funding and/or project supervision

Although not within the scope of this consultation, the question of VAT on repairs was raised.

**3.6 Question: Do potential applicants and their professional advisers find the Architects' Advisory Reports and other advice provided by Historic Scotland of value? (6 responses)**

3.6.1 This question produced a unanimously positive response, and more than one respondent expressed the view that this service could not be sourced anywhere else.

3.6.2 The following observations were made for fine-tuning of present arrangements:

- Vital service which must be maintained
- Split recommended works between essential and desirable
- More attention to ongoing maintenance needs post-conservation
- Reduce long waiting time for reports

### **Management Agreements Programme**

**3.7 Question: What works well about Management Agreements, and what less well, under the current arrangements? (5 responses)**

3.7.1 The following positive comments were made:

- Deliver clear benefits (especially for forestry sites)
- Welcome availability (but concern over low take-up)
- Effective but require commitment on all sides

3.7.2 The following areas of concern were identified:

- Total size of budget (too small)
- HS spends too much looking after its own estate and not enough on the rest of the archaeological resource
- Onerous and bureaucratic paperwork
- Huge potential, so why are there so few?
- Lack of incentives or advertising

One respondent linked these aspects, suggesting that because such agreements were rare, they were unfamiliar territory for land managers and for HS staff, so proceeded slowly; the argument being that increased volume would bring improved handling.

### 3.8 Question: **What are the key current and future challenges in the area of monument management? (6 responses)**

3.8.1 The key messages from respondents were:

- There is a need for new means of encouraging management of “landscape-sized” areas, often in multiple ownership and subject to pervasive small-scale attrition rather than dramatic damage
- HS is the only source of support for addressing natural threats to monuments
- It is important to remember that, especially for masonry structure, inaction does not equate to stability, but to continuing decay
- There is a need to consider climate change and think ahead of present problems
- There is a need to expand capacity at HS in staff terms as well as in financial terms

### 3.9 Question: [for management agreements] **What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures? (6 responses)**

3.9.1 The following were proposed:

- More staff time at HS devoted to monument management in general
- Simple enabling/planning grants
- Target owners who cannot access other funding streams, e.g. non-farmers
- More advertising/encouragement of Management Agreements by HS
- Simplified procedures and de-legalised wording
- Link Management Agreements to Ancient Monuments Grants and wider government-funded schemes such as Rural Development Contracts.

## **Balance between programmes**

### 3.10 Question: **Is the current distribution of funds among the three programmes equitable, and if not, how would you prefer to see funds distributed – and why? (6 responses)**

3.10.1 Responses to this question tended to be quite generalised but presented some coherent suggestions for change.

3.10.2 *Structure and operation of programmes*

- Operate 2 funds only: one for archaeology and one for all kinds of conservation
- Create a new stakeholder group to assist in allocating funding
- Concentrate spending on nationally-agreed priorities
- Make decision-making more transparent

3.10.3 *Scale and balance of budgets*

- If budget must be constrained, move some funding from archaeology to conservation

**3.11 Question: Is total expenditure on these activities, as a share of Historic Scotland's overall budget, at an appropriate level? If not, which areas of our operations should be afforded a lower priority, so as to free up more funds for archaeology and monument management? (9 responses)**

3.11.1 Several responses to this question noted that there was a shortage of financial data presented in the consultation paper itself. However, some respondents had clearly undertaken considerable research into HS on-line and published reports prior to framing their closing suggestions.

3.11.2 Not surprisingly perhaps, there was a call for increased budgets for all three programmes, with the following being advanced in justification:

- Real value has fallen due to inflation
- Archaeology's "share" of HS overall budgets has fallen
- Archaeology budget is low compared with HS spend on "presentation" costs of £4.5m and advertising directed to HS' own estate.
- HS annual expenditure on "other costs" of £7m cited from Annual Report
- Allocations are more akin to those for a region (English Heritage spending in Yorkshire was cited) than to a nation
- Funding levels should at least be doubled (no basis given for figure)
- Promote archaeological spending to (nearer) parity with historic buildings spending

**3.12 Comments made over and above responses to specific questions (7 respondents)**

3.12.1 Several respondents took the opportunity to make more general comments. In broad terms, general comments welcomed the Investment Review, confirmed that existing programmes worked well (subject to detailed proposals for change) and emphasised that HS is the only provider in certain areas.

3.12.2 General comments ranged from short single points to quite detailed discussions of one or more aspects of the programmes and their context. Where possible, specific points have been incorporated above, under the question-led responses.

3.12.2 More than one respondent drew attention to the fact that these HS programmes provide what is often the only source of funding where problems of site loss or deterioration are not attributable to a "developer" who can be encouraged to act through planning policy or enlightened self-interest. Coastal erosion was cited as the most obvious example. It was also noted that the scale of such demands far outstrips HS ability to respond.

3.12.3 The actual and potential role of the voluntary sector was a recurrent theme, with both the value of relatively modest HS investment and the potential for the voluntary sector to assist in delivering HS policy objectives particularly emphasised.

3.12.4 Several general comments included "wish lists" identifying multiple examples of areas where action was deemed necessary, while recognising that such action

would in most instances have to be collaborative within the whole sector, rather than being the sole responsibility of HS. Nonetheless, and a suitable point on which to end this detailed summary of responses, there was a sense in which respondents were consistently looking to HS to act, to lead sector-wide action, or at least initiate the process of debate leading to action.

3.12.5 A comment was also made about the balance of funding responsibilities between HS and the rest of Scottish Government. It was suggested that the rest of SG tended always to look to HS to deal with archaeology, rather than making appropriate provision for it in programmes or initiatives, even when it could be demonstrated that archaeology could make a real contribution to achieving overall government targets.

## **KEY THEMES**

4.0 Working through the many points set out above, for each group of questions a small number of over-arching themes emerged from the recommendations received. These serve to unite and link more detailed comments into a smaller number of generic issues. These are presented here, in bullet point format, in the hope that they will help to structure further consideration.

### **4.1 Archaeology programme**

Upstreaming: support was expressed for longer-term planning based on agreed research frameworks and agendas, with firm commitment of resources to multi-year projects once agreed.

Openness: more transparency was sought in decision-making along with increased receptiveness to stakeholder inputs, more consistent engagement and feedback.

Capacity: support was expressed for the use of Historic Scotland funding to build institutional and voluntary capacity at local and national level, but some doubt as to whether this should be funded from the Archaeology programme or from some other source.

Clarity: clearer, simpler operational procedures were advocated, backed by improved guidance setting out refined priorities.

### **4.2 Ancient Monuments Grants programme**

Funding: concern was expressed over the level of programme funding, in absolute terms and relative to other Historic Scotland funding programmes and operational budgets.

Expertise: expert advice from HS Architects and other staff was ascribed a high value, but seen as offset to some extent by stringent standards set for work specifications.

Capacity: community-based conservation projects were favoured, with a feeling that these might take precedence over larger “set-piece” monument consolidation exercises.

Clarity: clearer, simpler operational procedures were advocated, backed by improved guidance setting out refined (and reduced) priorities.

### **4.3 Management agreements**

Advertise: the scheme was seen as poorly publicised and little understood.

Simplify: the procedures were seen as being unduly onerous for the relatively small payments involved.

Resource: the scheme was seen as being under-resourced, although it was recognised that this is a question of staff time as much as money.

Link: there was a feeling that the scheme needs to be restructured to work effectively alongside other sources of funding, notably the schemes operated by the Rural Directorate (although one comment suggested that the HS scheme should specifically target those who are not eligible for other grants).

#### **4.4 Balance**

Combine: it was suggested that all 3 programmes, or at least AM Grants and Management Agreements, could be combined to improve financial flexibility and reduce paperwork.

Concentrate: HS support, it was suggested, should focus on agreed priorities once these have been established – in all 3 funding streams – whereas at present too wide a range of projects qualify for funding.

Transfer: although increased levels of overall funding were strongly advocated, there was also a sense that some funds should move from archaeological research and investigation to monument management.

#### **4.5 Resources in general**

Increase: respondents advocated increased overall budgets across the board if possible, but certainly for AM Grants and Management Agreements, with staff time devoted to make these work more effectively.

Real value: the level of resources in these 3 programmes, it was suggested, appears to have fallen behind in real value due to inflation, and is now well below that needed.

Redistribute: other areas of HS activity appeared to respondents to be over-generously resourced, given the urgent needs of archaeology and ancient monuments.

Responsibility: respondents expressed concern that HS may be carrying a burden created by the impacts of the policies or operations of other bodies within or funded by Scottish Government, and which would more properly be borne by them.

#### **4.6 General comments**

More money: in general, the programmes reviewed were felt to be essential, and while improvements could be made, the key desire was for additional funding.

Last resort: Historic Scotland performs an irreplaceable function in funding and directing actions to respond to loss and damage arising from “developer-less threats”, especially coastal erosion, and this burden will not reduce.

Partnership: the increasing desire to work in partnership came over very strongly, especially in respect of the voluntary sector, and the important multiplier effect of HS funding, as seed-corn or matching funding for multi-resourced projects, was highlighted.

Leadership: despite the appetite for increased stakeholder engagement, there is clearly a desire for HS to continue its established role as a leader in the archaeological sector at a variety of scales from developing policy and guidance to supporting the development of sector-wide research frameworks and agendas.

## NEXT STEPS

5.1 This report, and pdf copies of all comments received (where we have permission to make these public) are now lodged on the HS website and will remain there for approximately one year. Copies of this report will also be sent to all who responded, and an opportunity offered to correct any misapprehensions or accidental distortions emphasis which may have arisen in summarising comments received.

5.2 This report will be used within Historic Scotland as a basis for two strands of action: official response and action planning. The intention is to produce a Second Stage report which combines these two strands, providing a point by point commentary on Section 3 and whether or not HS accepts the validity of each comment in whole or in part. Where a need for change is accepted, the actions which might ensue are identified, with where appropriate an indication of timescale and priority.

5.3 At a first and indeed second reading, few of the issues raised in this consultation appear to be matters of Ministerial, as opposed to operational, policy, but this will be carefully reviewed as part of the next stage of analysis, and appropriate consultations will take place as necessary. But the initial expectation is that the Second Stage report will be able to address almost all of the points made by respondents.

5.4 Indeed, several of the issues raised have already seen action: for example progress has been made in setting up a working group to create a sector-wide research framework, with HS offering sponsorship for secretariat activity to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, who have indicated a willingness to lead this activity. On a much more mundane level, progress on simplifying and updating Archaeology grant and contract conditions is well advanced with a view to implementation from 1 April 2008, as part of an internal exercise to which HS was already committed. Further areas of achievement will be identified in more detail in the Second Stage report, alongside areas where there is still work to be done.

5.5 Subject to the usual caveats about operational resources and the absence of major problems, it is Historic Scotland's intention to prepare a full Second Stage report no later than 31 March 2008, by which time we confidently expect to be able to report on significant progress on many of the main issues.

5.6 Subject to any necessary consultations within Historic Scotland and with wider interests, the intention is to publish this second stage report at the end of April 2008, with all proposals for change which are accepted being effected by September 2008 or earlier.

## **Annex A**

### **INVESTMENT REVIEW: ARCHAEOLOGY FUNDING PROGRAMMES: improving systems, setting priorities**

#### **Consultation paper**

If you value Scotland's rich past as represented by its archaeological sites and ancient monuments, and believe society should care for the physical evidence of that past and seek to understand it better, we seek your views. We need feedback from those who have received – or been refused – funding from the programmes reviewed here. If your interest is for one special site or topic, we need to hear from you too, because your special case may cast light on a wider issue. This a chance for you to help Historic Scotland – and the whole historic environment sector – make better use of the public funds we invest in studying and protecting Scotland's historic environment.

**Archaeology programme (grants and commissions)**  
**Ancient Monuments Grants programme**  
**Management Agreements programme**

**Historic Scotland**  
**28 March 2007**

## **Introduction**

1.1 This consultation paper invites views on the priorities and operation of Historic Scotland's investment programmes for the archaeological sector, covering archaeological operations, grants for conservation work on ancient monuments and agreements for the management of ancient monuments. It completes the process begun in 2004 with the review of Historic Environment Grants.

## **Responding to this consultation paper**

1.2 We invite written responses to this consultation paper by 30 June 2007. Please send your response, marked "Investment Review" to:

[hs.inspectorate@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hs.inspectorate@scotland.gsi.gov.uk)

or

Investment Review  
Inspectorate APAGA Team  
Historic Scotland  
Room G55D  
Longmore House  
Salisbury Place  
Edinburgh  
EH9 1SH

or

By fax to: 0131 668 8765

If you have any queries contact Noel Fojut on 0131 668 8650.

1.3 The consultation is available on the consultation web pages of the Historic Scotland website at [www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/consultations). This consultation, and all other Scottish Executive consultation exercises, can also be accessed on line from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations>. Printed copies of the consultation can be obtained from Historic Scotland's head office at the address given above. You can telephone Freephone 0800 77 1234 to find out where your nearest public internet access point is.

1.4 SEconsult is an e-mail system set up by the Scottish Executive to alert you of new consultations. SEconsult is available at [www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/seconsult](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/seconsult). The system allows stakeholder individuals and organisations to register and receive a weekly e-mail containing details of all new consultations (including web links). SEconsult complements, but in no way replaces SE distribution lists, and is designed to allow stakeholders to keep up to date with all SE consultation activity, and therefore be alerted at the earliest opportunity to those of most interest. We would encourage you to register.

## **Handling your response**

1.5 We need to know how you wish your response to be handled and, in particular, whether you are happy for your response to be made public. Please complete and return the **Respondent Information Form** which can be downloaded from the place you obtained this document to ensure that we treat your response appropriately. If you ask for your response not to be published we will regard it as confidential, and we will treat it accordingly.

1.6 You should be aware that Historic Scotland, as an agency of the Scottish Executive, is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 and would therefore have to consider any request made to it under the Act for information relating to responses made to this consultation exercise.

### **Next steps in the process**

1.7 If you have given permission for their response to be made public (see the attached Respondent Information Form), it will be made available to the public in the Scottish Executive Library by 31 July 2007 and on the [Scottish Executive consultation](#) web pages by the same date. We will check all responses where agreement to publish has been given for any potentially defamatory material before logging them in the library or placing them on the website. You can make arrangements to view responses by contacting the Scottish Executive Library on 0131 244 4556. Responses can be copied and sent to you, but a charge may be made for this service.

1.8 Following the closing date, all responses will be analysed and considered along with any other available evidence. We aim to issue a report on this consultation process by 31 August 2007. This report will outline any significant proposals for change arising from this review, and the timetable for action.

### **Comments and complaints**

1.9 If you have any comments about how this consultation exercise has been conducted, please send them to Noel Fojut as detailed above.

### **Scottish Executive consultations – some general information**

1.10 Consultation is an essential and important aspect of Scottish Executive working methods. Given the wide-ranging areas of work of the Scottish Executive, there are many varied types of consultation. However, in general, Scottish Executive consultation exercises aim to provide opportunities for all those who wish to express their opinions on a proposed area of work to do so in ways which will inform and enhance that work.

1.11 The Scottish Executive encourages consultation that is thorough, effective and appropriate to the issue under consideration and the nature of the target audience. Consultation exercises take account of a wide range of factors, and no two exercises are likely to be the same.

1.12 Typically, Scottish Executive consultations involve a written paper inviting answers to specific questions or more general views about the material presented. Written papers are distributed to organisations and individuals with an interest in the

issue, and they are also placed on the Scottish Executive web site enabling a wider audience to access the paper and submit their responses ([www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations)).

1.13 Consultation exercises may also involve seeking views in a number of different ways, such as through public meetings, focus groups or questionnaire exercises. Copies of all the written responses received to a consultation exercise (except those where the individual or organisation requested confidentiality) are placed in the Scottish Executive library at Saughton House, Edinburgh (K Spur, Saughton House, Broomhouse Drive, Edinburgh, EH11 3XD, telephone 0131 244 4556).

1.14 All Scottish Executive consultation papers and related publications (eg, analysis of response reports) can be accessed at: [Scottish Executive consultations](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations) ([www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations))

1.15 The views and suggestions detailed in consultation responses are analysed and used as part of the decision-making process, along with a range of other available information and evidence. Depending on the nature of the consultation exercise the responses received may:

- indicate the need for policy development or review;
- inform the development of a particular policy;
- help decisions to be made between alternative policy proposals;
- be used to finalise legislation before it is implemented.

1.16 Final decisions on the issues under consideration will also take account of a range of other factors, including other available information and research evidence.

**While details of particular circumstances described in a response to a consultation exercise may usefully inform the policy process, consultation exercises cannot address individual concerns and comments, which should be directed to the relevant public body.**

## Context of this review

2.1 Ancient sites and monuments decay steadily under the influence of gravity, weather and general wear and tear. Seeking to preserve every vestige of the past without regard to cost or lost development opportunities is not an option. Important as our historic environment may be, funding is not limitless. Therefore all efforts towards management and investigation of the historic environment must be carefully targeted.

2.2 This consultation seeks the views of interested and experienced stakeholders as the first stage of a review aimed at refreshing the priorities and systems used by Historic Scotland to determine where we invest the public funds made available to us to support the management and investigation of Scotland's archaeology and ancient monuments.

2.3 Historic Scotland is by no means the only funder of archaeological investigations and site management activities. We seek to deepen our understanding of the interests, objectives and capabilities of other stakeholders and to work with them, placing our investment collaboratively rather than competitively.

2.4 Our investment in these areas – currently about £1.85 million per year – complements other strands of work entrusted to Historic Scotland, such as the direct management and presentation to the public of over 300 key sites, the protection of sites and monuments through legislation, setting of national policies and standards and the publication of advice and guidance.

2.5 It should be noted that Historic Scotland funds similar work on the 300-plus properties in its direct care separately. This review is concerned solely with the funding of archaeological activities outside our own estate.

2.6 Historic Scotland currently operates 3 external funding programmes under the terms of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (“the 1979 Act”). This review looks at each programme in turn. There are also important questions about balance between the funding streams, addressed at the end of this paper.

### Funding streams reviewed (anticipate 2007-8 funding levels):

- Archaeology programme £1,555,000 per year
- Ancient Monuments Grants programme £250,000 per year
- Management Agreement programme £45,000 per year

## The Archaeology Programme

3.1 The Archaeology Programme operates under section 45 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Its main purpose is to mitigate destruction of archaeological sites (including buildings) and landscapes through projects involving survey, excavation, advice, training and education and to make accounts of the work available for general and specialist audiences. Work is commissioned on a commercial basis or (wherever possible) by grants to bodies such as universities or heritage trusts. There is a single annual bidding cycle, with bids submitted during September and decisions announced in January. Urgent projects can, however, be

considered at any time of year. Investment per project can range from over £250,000 (phased over several years) to sums of a few hundred pounds.

3.2 The strategic objectives of the programme are to:

- achieve a better understanding of our past;
- improve techniques for preserving and interpreting surviving evidence;
- ensure that important sites which cannot be preserved are recorded;
- develop the knowledge base for owners of sites and monuments and for all with an interest in land management;
- encourage community participation and build capacity, and
- publish information relating to all of the above.

3.3 Within that framework, Historic Scotland sets operational priorities which are continuously reviewed. The last comprehensive published statement on priorities was published in 1997 as “State Funded ‘Rescue’ Archaeology in Scotland”. This identified a series of priorities centred on archaeological periods and topics. While there is no doubt that such period and thematic research agendas remain important, recent years have seen a growing realisation of the importance of understanding and managing the archaeological resource, without which future research will be impossible.

3.4 Historic Scotland’s current Corporate Plan (2005-8) reflects these new priorities in the key areas of endeavour it sets for the archaeology programme:

- completing necessary survey work to inform management of the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site;
- progressing, in partnership with the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, national coverage of the interactive Historic Land Use Assessment;
- analysing the patterns of loss arising from coastal erosion and developing a coherent response;
- continuing to publish surveys of Scotland’s Historic Burghs, and
- investigating archaeological loss within ploughlands and methods of mitigation.

3.5 Historic Scotland expects the projects it funds to do more than just explore individual sites, however interesting. They must also contribute towards a broader understanding of key issues, progressing two broad and overlapping groups of agendas:

- Archaeological research/knowledge agendas which target particular periods, themes or regions, and aim to identify key gaps in knowledge, thus directing future research. Important within this group are scientific agendas such as the refinement of dating techniques or the identification of raw material sources.
- Historic environment management/interpretation agendas which focus on how best to understand and manage the resource as well as increasing public access and other benefits. Generally there is consensus on objectives but less agreement about the most effective methods.

Historic Scotland may seek to stimulate the development of specific agendas where there is consensus on need but lack of action within the archaeological sector at large – for example our long-term support of improvements in radiocarbon dating or our recent efforts to stimulate co-ordinated research into Scotland’s rich wetland archaeology.

3.6 Historic Scotland will continue to fund a wide variety of projects, ranging from site-specific investigations to research into processes of change. The potential of newly proposed projects to contribute to existing and developing agendas will increasingly be a primary consideration for funding decisions. However, it remains our aim to complete and publish existing projects at a rate which balances new starts. In practice, this means that the amount of funding available for new projects in any year will continue to be intimately related to our progress in bringing existing projects to a successful conclusion.

### **Archaeology Programme Questions:**

Q1. Which aspects of the Archaeology programme work well, and which less well, under the current arrangements?

Q2. What are the key current and future challenges that the Archaeology programme should address?

Q3. What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures?

### **The Ancient Monuments Grants programme**

4.1 The Ancient Monuments Grants programme, under section 24 of the 1979 Act 1979, makes grants available to the owners of ancient monuments. Grants are intended to assist owners (or those authorised by them) to preserve, maintain and manage monuments in their possession and, where appropriate, to open and present them to the public.

4.2 The guiding principle is to preserve sites as they have come down to our day, without radical structural interventions or rebuilding. Work is funded only if it halts, or significantly slows down, structural deterioration for at least 10 years – and ideally for a generation or more. Typical projects include masonry consolidation and the removal of damaging vegetation, often with a modest element of interpretation. Individual grants may be as large as £200,000 (phased over several years) although most are smaller, from £5,000 to £30,000 per annum. Because conservation work to ancient monuments seldom provides future financial benefits to owners, grant levels may be generous, typically from 50% to 75% of qualifying costs. Small and urgent works may be grant aided at full cost, especially when undertaken in collaboration with conservation charities.

4.3 Each case is assessed on its own merits. Success depends upon the significance of the monument, the urgency of its needs and the availability of funds at the time the case comes forward. The existence of a committed owner or local group to press forward a proposal and to supply or identify additional funding, or help in kind, is a key consideration.

4.4 Owners who have expressed interest in applying for AM Grant are entitled to receive an Architect's Advisory Report from Historic Scotland. This is a scoping document which identifies the needs of a monument and sets them into context. One of

its main purposes is to ensure that the superficially urgent is not addressed at the expense of less obvious but more serious issues.

4.5 The Ancient Monuments Grants programme is managed on a rolling basis without fixed application deadlines, although once approved for funding, a costed timetable of works is developed and agreed for each project.

### **Ancient Monuments Grants Questions**

Q4. Which aspects of the Ancient Monuments Grants system work well, and which less well, under the current arrangements?

Q5. What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures?

Q6. Do potential applicants and their professional advisers find the Architects' Advisory Reports and other advice provided by Historic Scotland of value?

### **The Management Agreement programme**

5.1 The programme operates under Section 17 of the 1979 Act. Management Agreements can cover a very wide variety of works of preservation, and also presentation and public access. Agreements are voluntary but legally binding. They can include payments for capital or current expenditure, but are not intended to provide any profit element.

5.2 The difference between work suitable for Management Agreements and that suitable for Ancient Monuments Grants is the need to secure a management regime for a period of several years. Typical actions include control of vegetation and burrowing animals, exclusion of livestock or removing sites from cultivation. Ideally, the change of use supported by an Agreement goes on to become embedded in the owner's routine land management, so that the value of the monument comes to be appreciated and good management continues without further payment.

5.3 Historic Scotland currently funds 15 Agreements, with annual payments ranging from as little as £80 to more than £5,000. In addition, over 300 scheduled monuments on Forestry Commission Scotland land benefit from Management Plans between FCS and Historic Scotland. These use the Management Agreement formula, with FCS meeting its own costs, as is established policy for the management of historic environment assets owned by government bodies.

5.4 As is the case with archaeology and ancient monuments grants, there are other potential sources of funding for site management. In recent years, schemes operating in the agriculture and forestry sectors have included payments for maintaining or enhancing the environmental value of land (where environment includes the archaeological dimension). It is envisaged that future Land Management Contract arrangements, currently being finalised, will also provide opportunities for beneficial site management. Some conservation charities also support historic environment management aims, often alongside nature conservation. Historic Scotland seeks to work

in collaboration with all other funders, providing expertise and advice on best practice as well as money.

### **Management Agreement Questions**

Q7. What works well about Management Agreements, and what less well, under the current arrangements?

Q8. What are the key current and future challenges in the area of monument management?

Q9. What changes would you like to see made to policies, priorities or procedures?

### **Balance between programmes**

6.1 Taking the three “archaeological programmes” together as 100%, Historic Scotland spends approximately 85% on archaeological rescue and research, 12.5% on grants for capital works to slow or arrest the physical decay of ancient monuments, and 2.5% on agreements to manage ancient monuments in ways which reduce their rate of decay.

### **Questions of Balance**

Q10. Is the current distribution of funds among the three programmes equitable, and if not, how would you prefer to see funds distributed – and why?

Q11. Is total expenditure on these activities, as a share of Historic Scotland’s overall budget, at an appropriate level? If not, which areas of our operations should be afforded a lower priority, so as to free up more funds for archaeology and monument management?

## **ANNEX B**

### **RESPONSES RECEIVED**

#### **Individuals**

Caroline Wickham-Jones  
John Wood

#### **Local authorities**

City of Edinburgh Council  
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar  
Dumfries & Galloway Council  
East Ayrshire Council  
Highland Council

#### **Institutions/societies**

Caithness Archaeological Trust  
Council for Scottish Archaeology  
Edinburgh Archaeological Field Society  
National Trust for Scotland  
Scotland's Coastline and the Problem of Erosion (SCAPE Trust)  
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland\*\*

#### **Companies**

Name withheld by request

#### **Other groupings**

Scottish Archaeological Link \* (see note)

#### **Advisory body**

Historic Environment Advisory Council for Scotland\*\*

#### **Formal nil responses**

North Lanarkshire Council  
Visitscotland

\* Note 1: including CSA; HS; HEACS; SCHR Ltd; SUAT; AOC; EAFS; SCAPE; ALGAO; CAT; Glasgow University; CFA Archaeology; Headland Archaeology; NTS; NMS; SAS; RCAHMS; GUARD. (Bodies underlined also submitted individual responses, ranging from detailed additional comments to merely affirming support for the SAL response.)

\*\* Note 2: deadline extension agreed.