

CREATING A BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD SCOPING REPORT



COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE
September 2007



HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD SCOPING REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to scope the resource implications of the Government's proposed Heritage Protection Act imposing a statutory duty on local authorities to maintain or have access to an HER, requiring the transformation of the county SMR into a fully developed HER and to explore a range of different operational models for data sharing and joint working with the District Councils.

Archaeological Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs) began life in response to the loss of the archaeological resource through urban and rural development. From the original aim of recording archaeological sites and finds, they are now developing to encompass a wide range of information about the historic environment which has been reflected in the change of name from SMR to Historic Environment Record (HER). Today they provide a unique information resource, forming the basis for sustainable conservation and playing an important role in informing public understanding and enjoyment of the local historic environment.

The historic environment includes all aspects of our surroundings that have been built, formed or influenced by human activities from earliest to most recent times. An Historic Environment Record stores and provides access to systematically organised information about these surroundings. It is maintained and updated for public benefit in accordance with national and international standards and guidance. An HER makes information accessible to all in order to advance knowledge and understanding of the historic environment, inform its care and conservation, inform public policies and decision-making on land-use planning and management, contribute to environmental improvement and economic regeneration, and to contribute to education and social inclusion and encourage participation in the exploration, appreciation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

Recommendations to be completed

1. BACKGROUND:

1.1 Current state of the Buckinghamshire SMR

The Buckinghamshire Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) is a public environmental record which is used for the purposes of land use planning, conservation, research, education and general interest. It covers the current administrative area of Buckinghamshire County Council including the four districts councils of Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe. The SMR is located within the County Archaeological Service at the County Hall complex at Aylesbury and is maintained by 1 full time officer with occasional assistance from volunteers, students, clerical support and staff on short-term contracts. The SMR comprises a computerised database linked to GIS mapping with additional paper records, maps, a collection of aerial photographs and slides and a library. The database contains over 68,000 records of which 18,729 relate to specific sites, monuments, buildings and landscapes. In 2006/7 the SMR staff dealt with 143 enquiries, comprising 66 commercial planning-related enquiries, 77 non-commercial conservation-related, academic and general local interest enquiries and generated income of £4,718. Users' satisfaction with the service provided by the SMR staff was 100%. In the same period 242 new reports were received and 312 were inputted into the database, the reports backlog was reduced from 28 to 18 items and the collections backlog was reduced from 3,546 to 3,447 items. The SMR database is available online through the Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website, with additional educational, community interest and visitor resources and is one of only 13 in England to be publicly available online. Appendix 6 provides comparisons with a sample of 10 other county SMRs/HERs. Whilst the variety of practice around the country makes direct comparisons extremely difficult, it appears that the resourcing of the Buckinghamshire SMR is below that of other counties, however performance is at least as good and in some cases better.

1.2 Heritage Protection Reform

In March 2007 the Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) published the White Paper 'Heritage Protection for the 21st Century'. It sets out the Government's intention to reform the system of heritage protection in England and Wales through primary legislation, for which parliamentary time is being sought in 2008/9 to put the new system into place for 2010/11. The White Paper represents the latest step arising from a consultation process initiated by the Government in 2000.

The White Paper opens with a positive statement from Ministers on the importance and public value of the historic environment. It goes on to say that people want reform of the heritage protection system and to see the historic environment at the heart of planning, regeneration, environmental stewardship and building sustainable communities. These broad aims are to be addressed through three core principles: a unified approach to the historic environment; maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement and supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. The main specific recommendations can be summarised as: A single unified Register of Historic Buildings and Sites in England and Wales to replace existing lists and schedules with designation devolved to English Heritage; accompanied by a faster designation process and simpler, clearer and more easily accessible designation records.

All national designations will be made on the basis of special architectural, historic or archaeological interest, with new detailed selection criteria for national and local designation. A heritage asset consent regime administered by local authorities will be created by merging listed building consent and scheduled monument consent with provision for statutory management agreements. It is also suggested that conservation area consent may be merged with planning consent. New measures will be brought in to enable local planning authorities to protect locally listed buildings from demolition and to remove the automatic "class consent" for cultivation of archaeological monuments on arable land. **Local authorities will have a statutory duty to maintain or have access to an Historic Environment Record (HER).** Local authorities will administer the heritage asset consent regime. New legislation will be underpinned with new guidance and supported by English

Heritage through a new programme of training, support and capacity-building for local authorities and local heritage organisations.

1.3 Statutory Status For HERs & HER Benchmarks

A consultation by DCMS in July 2003 on the future of Historic Environment Records, sought responses on draft benchmarks for good practice, statutory status, location and accessibility and the crucial role of information technology. It suggested broadening the scope of records from recording archaeological "sites and monuments" to cover historic buildings and landscapes and also broadening their use from planning to encompass outreach and education. In the past SMRs have concentrated on recording traditional archaeology such as excavated sites, ancient monuments and findspots, often with a period cut-off point at the end of World War II. The use of SMR information was often restricted to monument management and conservation and to informing planning decisions affecting archaeological sites. In recent years there has been a move towards increasing the scope and uses of the records, with more emphasis on developing integrated information systems that are inclusive of subject and period for all aspects of the historic environment, including landscapes, buildings and areas and historical ecology, from the earliest human habitation to most recent times. There has also been a widening of the uses made of the information with more emphasis on education, strategic planning, contributing to social inclusion and encouraging appreciation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The term "Historic Environment Record" is seen as a more accurate and useful description for such developed records.

The draft Benchmarks for Good Practice set out a checklist of measures for User Services and Access, Information Coverage and Content, Information Management and Organisation Management. Measures were divided into two tiers. Stage 1 is described as "essential good practice" whilst stage 2 is for "developed" HERs that "form part of integrated information systems for the historic environment". Currently the County SMR meets or is near completion of 21 of the 23 Stage 1 Benchmarks and 9 of the 15 Stage 2 Benchmarks. The main unresolved issues relate to system documentation, extended data content (especially building records), networked data sharing and collaborative projects, particularly the relationship of the SMR to the work of the district conservation officers. It is not yet clear how the Benchmarks for Good Practice will be incorporated into English Heritage guidance to Local Authorities and into future statutory obligations.

The requirement to maintain, or have access to, an Historic Environment Record will have major implications – at present the County maintains the SMR which has traditionally focussed on archaeology but is developing its coverage of historic landscapes and buildings. There would be significant costs involved in creating and maintaining a fully-fledged Historic Environment Record and in making it easily accessible to all local authorities in Buckinghamshire. It is unlikely that additional obligations could be absorbed within existing budgets and this report sets out the potential resource implications of expanding the SMR content of buildings records, meeting the Stage 2 HER benchmarks and developing closer relationships and data sharing with the District Councils. Developing new ways of working and closer working with the districts will also feature more prominently following Buckinghamshire County Council's successful bid to become one of the government's 'Pathfinder' councils.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT:

2.1 Aims

Produce a report establishing the resource implications for a fully developed HER and costings for a range of options for database/data sharing and joint working.

2.2 Objectives

- Scope the implications of transforming the SMR into a fully developed HER
- Scope the possible implications of the Heritage Protection Reform for the SMR

- Produce a costed project plan for the creation of a developed HER
- Explore different operational models for data sharing and joint working with the District Councils and produce a range of IT options

2.3 Methodology

- Initial discussion with District Councils to establish numbers of outstanding building recording reports for SMR, numbers of locally listed buildings in each District Council and existing information systems used.
- Assess numbers of recent additions to Listed Buildings in each District Council area.
- Assess resource implications of enhancing SMR recording of buildings with information from reports in academic journals, thematic and individual building reports in National Monuments Record, reports held by local or regional groups.
- Assess resource implications for data capture/inputting above categories onto SMR database.
- Discuss data sharing options with District Council staff, including a demonstration of the SMR database especially the designations and consultations modules, a demonstration of online searches via the Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website, networked access to the SMR database, and remote data supply from the SMR.
- Establish if District Councils have any specific requirements for recording buildings in SMR eg Buildings at Risk datasets, rapid appraisal surveys etc.
- Review and update 2001/2-2004/5 SMR Action Plan, including the SMR Backlog Management Plan.
- Assess other resource implications of achieving the HER Benchmarks and completing key outcomes identified in the SMR Action Plan.
- Assess additional expertise and training required for SMR staff to deal effectively with increased holdings of buildings records (not an existing specialism) and review job descriptions. Assess database training required for Conservation/Historic Buildings Officers.

3. WHAT WOULD A DEVELOPED STAGE 2 HER LOOK LIKE?

3.1 Information Content

At present the Buckinghamshire SMR records conventional above and below-ground archaeology, listed historic buildings, a small number of non-listed historic buildings, historic designed landscapes, ridge and furrow, Historic Landscape Characterisation data (in a separate database), has limited records for palaeoenvironmental and archaeological science data and has only partial recording of modern industrial, civil and military sites. National designations are recorded (Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens) and land-use planning consultations.

A developed HER would additionally include records for local designations, urban areas including Historic Towns Survey data and Conservations Areas, wider and more in-depth coverage of non-listed historic buildings and of modern complexes including industrial, civil and military sites, and more detailed records of palaeoenvironmental and archaeological science data. It would also be reasonable to expect that Historic Landscape Characterisation and Historic Towns Urban Survey data would be fully integrated into the HER database. This effectively means that there would be information recorded on the HER for every piece of land in the county, reflecting the seamless nature of the historic environment.

3.2 Functionality

As well as its existing role in informing advice on land-use planning, conservation, and management and its educational role, a fully-developed HER would:

- have an important role in recording national and local designation registers and in providing the baseline information required on which to make decisions as part of an integrated historic asset consent regime
- enable data sharing with District Councils
- be central in developing closer working relationships between the County Archaeological Service and Districts Councils, enabling a more 'joined-up' approach to the Historic Environment
- continue to deliver education, community and public access benefits via the 'Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past' internet website
- work through the Buckinghamshire Environmental Character System project to achieve closer working with colleagues maintaining Environmental and Landscape Records

4. RESULTS OF SCOPING PROJECT:

4.1 Consultation with District Council staff

The SMR Officer spent a day visiting each of the Districts Councils in January and February 2006 to discuss data sharing, joint working and any specific requirements they might have. As a result of the meetings a strong consensus emerged both in terms of existing practices and of future developments. All the District Councils' historic buildings and conservation officers are still using the original BCC paper record cards (none have access to digital databases of historic buildings) and all are using shapefiles on their corporate GIS mapping (although many expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of the digitising). All want to have access to the *full* range of information available on the SMR database, want to be able to link and access their own photos and digital documents to the SMR database and want to be able to access and edit the Designations and Consultations modules. All would be happy for the SMR to record locally important buildings and all appreciate the benefits of a closer working relationship with the County Archaeological Service and the SMR.

A number of District Council staff expressed the desire to develop and issue briefs for building recording, as is currently the County Archaeological Service practice, but felt that they lacked the experience to do this or that there was insufficient support from their planning departments. There were also some concerns about the standards of building recording and analysis being undertaken by certain contractors, consultants and specialists, as indicated by the completed reports.

4.2 Management Structures (Options)

The County Archaeological Service currently manages and maintains the SMR and provides archaeological planning advice to all five Local Planning Authorities in the county, whilst advice on listed buildings and conservation areas is provided to each district council by their own in-house staff. The new statutory responsibility set out in the Heritage Protection White Paper for a unified heritage consent regime administered locally by planning authorities, coupled with the emphasis on new methods of working and of delivering services that will result from Pathfinder initiatives suggest that a review of the management structures relating to the provision of advice on the historic environment would be timely. The following options set out a number of possible management configurations.

Option 1: BCC retains responsibility for HER and Archaeological Planning Advice; No SLAs with LPAs (status quo) (IT Options 1, 3, 4, 5, or 6)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
Existing responsibilities maintained; minimum disruption	Development of HER determined by BCC priorities and resources	BCC not able to bear full cost of shared statutory responsibility
	Possible lack of public clarity over division of responsibility for advice and heritage asset consent regime	No establishment costs involved

	Does not reflect shared statutory responsibility implied in Heritage Protection Reform	
--	--	--

Option 2: Responsibility for HER and Archaeological Planning Advice devolved from BCC to District Councils (IT Option 2)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
Integrated teams providing advice to LPA on all aspects of the historic environment	Insufficient numbers of existing BCC archaeology staff to maintain current levels of archaeological advice and HER expertise to each LPA; fragmentation of archaeological expertise held at County level	District Councils bear full cost of statutory responsibility
	Does not reflect shared statutory responsibility implied in Heritage Protection Reform	Establishment and maintenance costs involved
	Fragmentation of Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website and other HER resources	Increased staff and IT costs due to loss of economies of scale

Option 3: BCC retains responsibility for HER and Archaeological Planning Advice; SLAs with LPAs (IT Options 1, 3, 4, 5, or 6)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
Existing responsibilities maintained	Possible lack of public clarity over division of responsibility for advice and heritage asset consent regime	SLAs to include financial contribution
Income raised to support development of HER		No establishment costs involved
Development of HER linked to LPA performance indicators		
Reflects shared statutory responsibility		

Option 4: Responsibility for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas centralised from Districts to BCC (IT Option 6)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
Single integrated team providing advice to all LPAs on all aspects of the historic environment	Existing accommodation inadequate for an expanded team	SLAs required with Districts
'One-stop shop' for advice and heritage asset consent regime	Conservation officers separated from district planners	Would need overall historic environment services review to determine cost implications
Economies of scale		

Option 5: Responsibility for HER, Archaeological Planning Advice, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas devolved from Districts and BCC to a single lead District Council (IT Option 6)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
Single integrated team providing advice to all LPAs	Most conservation officers separated from district	SLAs required with other Districts and BCC

on all aspects of the historic environment	planners	
'One-stop shop' for advice and heritage asset consent regime	IT issues involved in transfer of HER database	Would need overall historic environment services review to determine cost implications
Economies of scale		

Option 6: HER and other historic environment services outsourced; LPAs buy-in services (IT Options: unknown)

Pros	Cons	Financial issues
None identified	Loss of expertise within LPAs	Cost of service & overheads
	Loss of 'informed client'	
	Commercial consultancies or trust likely to require a transfer cost with the HER	
	Services provided may not be sufficiently responsive to LPAs' needs.	
	National track-record of failed services	

4.3 IT Structures: Options for HER database/data sharing and joint working with District Councils

The County Archaeological Service and District Council staff wish to have access to each others' records and expertise and to work more closely in providing advice on the historic environment. The provision within the Heritage Protection White Paper for unified registers of national and local historic assets, the statutory requirement for planning authorities to have access to HERs, coupled with the emphasis on new methods of working and of delivering services that will result from Pathfinder initiatives also emphasise the benefits of data sharing. The following options for accessing SMR data were developed as a result of discussions with District Council staff and BCC ITU staff and set out a number of possible IT delivery mechanisms.

Option 1: Districts have partial access to data on Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website but no access to full HBSMR database, copies of digital HER information supplied on request under license (status quo)

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
No training required	Provides access to part of database only	Ongoing staff costs for data copying (BCC)
	Fails to satisfy statutory responsibility	£2,000 pa existing commitment to maintain UBP website (BCC)
	Limited GIS mapping (central points only)	
	Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website not used – not providing level of information required	

Option 2: Districts have disaggregated HBSMR database for district, no BCC centralised database.

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
Provides access to whole database for district	No existing HER expertise in districts	Establishment and maintenance costs (Districts)
Districts assume entire responsibility for maintenance of district HER		1-off staff costs for data transfer (Districts & BCC)

Option 3: BCC maintains HBSMR database; Districts have standalone copy of data for district only

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
	Requires regular (monthly?) updates from BCC	Software licences (Districts)
	Possible overwriting of data during updates	Training (Districts)
	Provides access to part of database only	Ongoing staff costs for data copying (Districts & BCC)

Option 4: Districts have dial-in read-only access to county HBSMR database

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
Provides access to whole county database	Access one-way only: no data sharing	Software licences (Districts)
Avoids potential data conflict/overwriting issues		Dial-in software licences? (Districts)
		Training (Districts)
		SQL server for HBSMR? (BCC)

Option 5: Districts have dial-in access to county HBSMR database with edit access to specific modules/fields

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
Provides level of access desired by DCs	Requires strict protocols for data editing to avoid overwriting or deletion of data	Software licences (Districts)
Enables closer working between BCC development control archaeologists and DC officers	May require DC's digital images, documents and files to be copied to HER	Dial-in software licences? (Terminal Services, Citrix, Intranet Browser) (Districts & ?BCC)
Database maintained by BCC HER Officer	Dial-in software may affect robustness of HBSMR database	Training (Districts)
Digital images and files archived centrally		SQL server for HBSMR? (BCC)
		Would need ITU technical appraisal and costings

Option 6: Districts have networked access to county HBSMR database with edit access to specific modules/fields

Pros	Cons	Additional costs
Provides level of access desired by DCs		Software licences (Districts)
Enables closer working between BCC development control archaeologists and DC officers		Training (Districts)
Database maintained by BCC HER Officer		Wide area network connections or Broadband access via IPstream? (Districts & BCC)
Digital images and files archived centrally		Would need ITU technical appraisal and costings

4.4 Resourcing (Options)

See Appendix 2 for existing and projected costs. There are a number of possible sources of additional funding for the HER, including financial contributions from the District Councils

linked to Service Level Agreements and/or linked to Best Value Performance Indicators; the use of part of the Planning Delivery Grant; the possibility of direct funding from DCMS or English Heritage as a result of the Heritage Protection legislation, and a possible BCC Medium Term Plan growth bid for funding for an HER Assistant.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

5.1 Management Options

The table below attempts to analyse the relative merits of the proposed management options set out in section 4.2 above. Scores expressed as positives, neutral and negative outcomes are applied to a number of relevant criteria, with ++ = major positive outcome, + = positive outcome, O = no change, +/- = mixed positive and negative, - = negative outcome and -- = major negative outcome. It should be pointed out that the scoring is applied from an HER perspective.

Management Option	Performance criteria				Positives	Negatives
	Cost (+ = saving - = cost)	Quality of Service	Practicality	Alignment with Heritage Protection Reform		
Option 1: Status quo	- HER cost to county	o	++	- Fails to fully address HPR joint working	2	2
Option 2: HER devolved to districts	-- Short and long term costs	+/- Creates historic environment services but fragments HER & Archaeology	-- Fragmentation of the HER	+ Creates integrated local HE services but county excluded	2	5
Option 3: BCC retains HER, SLAs with districts	- HER cost shared	+ Access to HER	+	+ Moves towards "virtual" historic environment service	3	1
Option 4: Single centralised service at BCC	o Might allow efficiencies to absorb HER costs?	+/- Creates HE service but separation of COs from Districts	- Staff movements/ accommodation issues	++ Creates "sub-regional" historic environment service	3	2
Option 5: Single centralised service at a lead district	- HER cost	+/- Creates HE service but separation of COs from Districts	- Transfer of HER – IT issues	++ Creates "sub-regional" historic environment service	3	3
Option 6: Outsourced Service	-- Consultancy externalises	-- Lack of proactive role	- Transfer of HER – IT	o/+ Could be integrated	0/1	5

(Commercial or Trust)	all costs	and local responsiveness	issues	HE service if COs included		
------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------	----------------------------	--	--

The analysis indicates that management options 3-5 have the most number of positive outcomes overall and option 3 has the least number of negative outcomes. The status quo option 1 does not really address the challenges of Heritage Protection Reform and the anticipated new statutory requirements whilst options 2 and 6 offer few benefits and have significant challenges attached to them. Option 3 for BCC to operate a county-wide HER managed and part-funded through SLAs with the district councils performs best against the criteria and is likely to provide the most practical and cost-effective outcome and is therefore the preferred management option. Further consideration could be given to exploring options 4 and 5, a centralised historic environment service based either at the County Council or a lead District Council as the direction of Pathfinder becomes clearer.

5.2 IT Options

IT option 1 (status quo) fails to meet the aspirations of both the Heritage Protection Reform and Pathfinder and doesn't provide the level of access to SMR information required by the Districts. This could be overcome by disaggregating the HER completely to the Districts (option 2), but there would also be a need to disaggregate the rest of the County Archaeological Service to avoid compounding the problems caused by lack of access to HER information. Option 3 (Districts holding standalone copies of the HER data) offers only limited benefits and would involve significant costs for District Councils. Option 4 (dial-in read-only access to centralised database) improves on the current situation but provides no added functionality to option 3 and may possibly involve greater costs. Options 5 and 6 offer different technical solutions but provide similar functionality and will need to undergo technical evaluation by BCC ITU. Option 5 (dial-in edit access to centralised database) would probably be more expensive than option 6 (networked edit -access to centralised database). Option 6 is therefore recommended as the preferred IT option, subject to the findings of the technical appraisal.

5.3 Resourcing *to be completed*

JW March 2006, updated 12th September 2007

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: KEY SOURCES

Background Reports

- Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum, September 2003 *Consultations on the Review of Heritage Protection and Historic Environment Records* (report paper)
- Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum, September 2005 *Heritage Protection Review* (report paper)
- County Archaeological Service, October 2000 *A Future for Our Past: Buckinghamshire Archaeological Management Plan*
- County Archaeological Service, December 2001 *Buckinghamshire SMR: Data Audit for the Year 1999-2000*
- County Archaeological Service, April 2002 *Buckinghamshire SMR: Action Plan 2001/2-2004/5*
- County Archaeological Service, forthcoming *County Archaeological Service Management and Medium Term Business Plan 2005 to 2007*
- DCMS, July 2003 *Historic Environment Records* (consultation document)
- DCMS, July 2003 *Protecting our historic environment: Making the system work better* (consultation document)
- DCMS, June 2004 *The historic environment: a force for our future* (government policy statement)
- DCMS, March 2007 *New Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings: an Analysis of Consultation Responses* (consultation report)
- DCMS & Welsh Assembly Government, March 2007 *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century* (White paper)
- DCMS & Welsh Assembly Government, March 2007 *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century: Regulatory Impact Assessment*
- DCMS & DCLG, March 2007 *Revisions to Principles of selection for Listed Buildings* (DCLG Circular 01/2007, DCMS Circular PP992 updates Section 6 of PPG 15)
- English Heritage & ALGAO, October 2002 *Historic Environment Records: Benchmarks for Good Practice*
- Historic Environment Conservation, April 2006 *Heritage Protection Review: Assessment of Eight Pilot Projects for DCMS*

Information Sources

- English Heritage National Monuments Record
- English Heritage HER Liaison Officers
- District Council Conservation and Historic Buildings Officers

APPENDIX 2: RESOURCING

Existing SMR Resourcing:

	Annual maintenance costs	SMR establishment costs
Staff costs (1 fte at scale 5)	£33,224	
Software licenses		£9,399
Hardware lease costs	£1,300	
Software technical support and maintenance contract	£4,915	
Staff training costs	£333	£1,320
Purchase of equipment	****	
Management costs	****	
Total:	£39,772 ++	£10,719

ESTIMATED COSTINGS: [Costs based on 2007/8 salary rates + 31% on-costs]

Existing and projected maintenance: *to be provided*

Complete 2000-2005 HER Action Plan and Upgrade SMR to HER Benchmarks:

Document recording practice	HERO	Approx 15 days
Complete digital data capture programme	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 20 days to complete existing programme
Develop digital data transfer standards	HERO	Approx 5 days
Resolve long-term digital data storage issues	HERO; BCC ITU	Approx 5 days
Written policy on content & data sharing	HERO	Approx 2 days
Formal agreement on coverage & SLAs	SAO; HERO; BCC Legal; District Councils	5 days to consult LPAs, BCC Legal Team & compile report
Migrate Historic Landscape Characterisation data into HBSMR	Consultants	3-4 days Exegesis consultancy
Migrate Historic Towns survey data into HBSMR	Consultants	?3-4 days Exegesis consultancy
Create local list buildings records (712 records)	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	36 days inputting at 20 per day
Create Designations records for Conservation Areas and link to DC's shapefiles (175 records)	HERO; Archaeological Assistant; BCC ITU	18 days inputting at 10 per day
Link designations records to EH SAM & Registered Park/Gardens shapefiles	HERO; BCC ITU	1 day
Link consultations records to separate shapefiles	HERO; BCC ITU	1 day
Enhance buildings records with information from specialist journals, publications & reports etc (327 NMR building records, estimated 239 articles in key journals)	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 35 days Plus 1 day annual visit to NMR library to update records.
Enhance monument records	HERO;	Approx 10 days

for complexes with information from EH thematic recording	Archaeological Assistant	
Create GIS polygons for key events records (estimated 209 records)	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 7 days inputting at 30 per day
Clear existing collections backlog	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 180 days
Create GIS polygons for monument records with multiple points (estimated 2,161 records)	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 36 days inputting at 60 per day
Complete cataloguing of supporting reference collections	HERO; Archaeological Assistant	Approx 5 days
Document GIS recording practice & comply with metadata standards & data exchange protocols	HERO	Approx 10 days
Comply with Dublin Core & other data standards	HERO	1 day to assess compliance
Formal adoption of documented recording procedures	HERO; Senior Archaeological Officer; District Councils	5 days to consult LPAs & compile report to cabinet members
Review SLAs annually	HERO; Senior Archaeological Officer; District Councils	4 days to consult LPAs
Total: Approx 230 days	Breakdown: Consultants 8 days; HERO 86 days; Archaeological Assistant 312 days; Senior Archaeological Officer 5 days; BCC ITU 8 days; BCC Legal 1 day; District Councils 3 days	Cost: Approx £38,019 £3,600 £7,829 £25,678 £668 5 days uncertain charge, 3 days not chargeable £511 -

JW March 2006; Updated 7th September 2007

APPENDIX 3: COUNTY HER COMPLIANCE WITH HER BENCHMARKS

	<u>Stage 1 Benchmark</u>	<u>SMR compliance</u>	<u>Stage 2 Benchmark</u>	<u>SMR compliance</u>
1.1 Information Services Policy	1.1a Written policy for information services	Yes	1.1b Developed information services policy based on User needs & satisfaction	Yes
1.2 Access to Services	1.2a Publication of details of public access & search facilities including opening hours & charging policy	Yes	1.2b Dedicated, supervised search area. Developed provision for remote access	Yes
1.3 Satisfying User Needs	1.3a Maintained records of users and types of enquiries	Yes	1.3b Systematically collected information on user satisfaction. Market research into needs of user groups & potential new users groups	Yes
1.4 Researching New Audiences	1.4a Programme of outreach activities or outline proposals	Yes	1.4b Developed programme of outreach activities based on user responses & market research	Yes
<u>User Services & Access</u>	<u>Stage 1 Benchmarks</u>	<u>4/4</u>	<u>Stage 2 Benchmarks</u>	<u>4/4</u>
2.1 Information Policy	2.1a Written policy on scope, coverage & content. Record inclusive of subject & period for all archaeology. Statement of existing arrangements for data sharing etc	Yes, though needs a bit more work...	2.1b Written policy on extended scope, coverage & content, including historic buildings & areas, developed through consultation & agreements with partner authorities. Coverage inclusive of subject & period for all archaeology & aspects of historic environment.	No
2.2 Information Coverage & Content	2.2a Coverage in accordance with information policy. Comprehensive coverage for statutory and non-statutory designated historic places. Record MIDAS compliant.	Yes	2.2b Enhanced coverage based on consultation & agreements about shared data holdings typically including additional heritage datasets, pan-authority GIS, networked arrangements for	No

			shared access & collaborative projects.	
2.3 Primary or Unique Archives	2.3a Primary archive deposited with appropriate repository. Disposals policy for staged transfers & security copying/scanning as appropriate.	Yes	-	
Information Coverage & Content	Stage 1 Benchmarks	3/3 (or thereabouts)	Stage 2 Benchmarks	0/2
3.1 Formally Adopted Documentation Procedures	3.1a Written manual or recording guidelines	No	3.1b Extended written manual for procedures covering range of information systems with which record shares data or has links. Adoption of full procedural standard.	No
3.2 Databases Compiled to National standards	3.2a Data MIDAS compliant, with Mon/Event/source scheme & using national thesauri	Yes	3.2b Compliance with developing standards including Dublin Core scheme, hierarchical data models & info scheme for buildings & landscape management records.	No
3.3 GIS Linked to Record Databases	3.3a Compliance with national GIS standards & guidance	Yes, though metadata recording needs a bit more work...	3.3b Extended procedural manual for GIS. Compliance with standards for GIS content & protocols for sharing/exchanging GIS data.	No
3.4 Supporting Reference Collections	3.4a Written guide & index to collections held by record. Collections housed & maintained to environmental & storage standards.	Yes	3.4b Catalogue of reference collections, cross-indexed to database. Forward plan programme for enhancing & digitising reference collections.	Yes, though needs a bit more work...
3.5 Data Security	System security policy including storage & handling, security	Yes, though probably needs a bit more work...	-	

	procedures, long-term archiving & security copying			
3.6 5-yearly Information Audit	3.6a Report of Information Audit	Yes	3.6b Repeat audits on 5-yearly cycle	Underway
3.7 Data Validation & Currency	3.7a Assessment of backlog, update & enhancement requirements. Prioritised programme as part of Forward Plan.	Yes	3.7b Cleared backlog of validation & data entry. Implementation of programme for new information capture. Phased programme of enhancements as part of Forward Plan.	Yes
3.8 Safeguards Against Risks & Disaster	3.8a Risk assessment & disaster plan	Yes	-	
Information Management	Stage 1 Benchmarks	7/8 (or thereabouts)	Stage 2 Benchmarks	3/6 (or thereabouts)
4.1 Formal Adoption as Historic Environment Information Resource	4.1a Resolution of governing body to adopt record formally. Formal recognition desirable from LPAs served by record	Yes	-	
4.2 Formal Agreement on Geographical Coverage & Service Levels	4.2a Resolution of governing body. Service Level Agreements or contracts	No	4.2b Annual review of Service Level Agreements	No
4.3 Statement of Purpose, Policies & Key Aims	4.3a Formally adopted policies & strategic plan	Yes	-	
4.4 Forward Plan with Appropriate Budget	4.4a Forward Plan for implementation of programmes & projects, indicating resources secured & required for plan period	Yes	4.4b Annual review of Forward Plan	Yes
4.5 Professional Officer with Primary Responsibility for Record	4.5a Appropriate staffing provision & structure. At least 1 full-time experienced & qualified member of staff.	Yes	4.5b Appropriate staffing provision & structure. Personnel with qualifications, experience etc for managing extended range of Historic Environment information resources.	Yes
4.6 Internal Management	4.6a Management tree with	Yes	-	

Arrangements Appropriate	arrangements for admin & clerical support.			
4.7 Access to Technical & Specialist Advice & Support	4.7a Provision for IT support. Professional advice available on management of archive & primary records.	Yes	-	
4.8 Staff Training & Development Programme & Resources	4.8a Organisation training plan with formal review process for staff training & development. Budget provision for relevant training courses. Training plans for student & volunteer placements.	Yes	-	
Organisation Management	Stage 1 Benchmarks	7/8	Stage 2 Benchmarks	2/3
Total:	Stage 1 Benchmarks	21/23 (or thereabouts)	Stage 2 Benchmarks	9/15 (or thereabouts)

JW 12th September 2005; updated 1st March 2007

DRAFT

APPENDIX 4: REVIEW OF 2001-2005 SMR ACTION PLAN

SMR Action Plan Key Outcomes	Achieved?	Notes	Relationship to HER Project Plan
1. Review and update SMR Action Plan on an annual basis	Yes		Benchmark 3.6a (Level 1) Benchmark 3.6b (Level 2)
2. Disaster Recovery Plan completed by April 2002	Yes		Benchmark 3.8a (Level 1)
3. Local recording practice & procedures documentation completed by April 2003.	No	Postponed to concentrate on other issues	Benchmark 3.1a (Level 1) Benchmark 3.1b (Level 2)
4. Resources obtained to implement the backlog management plan according to programme.	Yes		Benchmark 3.7a (Level 1) Benchmark 3.7b (Level 2)
5. Complete post-migration editing of specific record fields to ensure data integrity maintained for priority datasets to be completed by April 2003.	Yes		Benchmark 2.2a (Level 1)
6. Implement a programme of digital data capture.	Partly		Benchmark 3.4b (Level 2)
7. Appoint a full-time SMR Officer and maintain/develop student, volunteer and clerical assistance	Yes		Benchmark 4.5a (Level 1) Benchmark 4.5b (Level 2) Benchmark 4.6a (Level 1)
8. SMR added to BCC critical databases by October 2001.	NA	Superseded by ITU procedures.	
9. SMR data available to consultees in appropriate paper & digital formats by April 2002.	Yes		Benchmark 1.2b (Level 2)
10. SMR data available over the Internet by April 2005.	Yes		Benchmark 1.2b (Level 2)
11. Digital data transfer standards defined & implemented by April 2003.	No	Postponed to concentrate on other issues	
12. Long-term digital data storage & maintenance issues resolved by April 2003.	Partly		Benchmark 3.5 (Level 1)
13. Digital archiving issues addressed by April 2004.	Yes	Postponed to concentrate on other issues.	Benchmark 3.5 (Level 1)
14. Existing high/medium priority collections secured by digital data capture by April 2005.	Yes		Benchmark 3.4b (Level 2)
15. Submit project bid for "Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past" Project by June 2002.	Yes		Benchmark 1.4a (Level 1)
16. Complete the "Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past" Project by September 2006.	Ongoing	Expected completion by end October 2007.	Benchmark 1.4b (Level 2) Benchmark 1.2b (Level 2)

JW 26th February 2007

APPENDIX 5: 2007/8-2012/13 HER ACTION PLAN

The HER Action Plan set out below comprises a five-year action plan for the financial years 2007/8-2012/13 and forms part of the County Archaeological Service's Business Plan set out in "A Future for Our Past 2". Routine HER maintenance tasks such as editing existing record fields, adding new material to the HER backlog and the active conservation of the collections are allowed for but not specified in the Action Plan. The table identifies key tasks and outlines a prioritised programme for implementation, including resource requirements, performance measures and key partners involved. Individual tasks are cross-referenced to corresponding aims and actions identified in "A Future for Our Past 2".

The priority categories follow the terminology used in the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Service Business Plan:-

- High Priority (including tasks essential to meet statutory requirements). In order to achieve this action as specified we would, if necessary, seek additional resources or shift existing resources away from other lower priority tasks.
- Medium Priority (including Best Practice tasks). Where there is difficulty in achieving this action to the specified standard or timescale we would consider carrying it out over a longer timescale, in a different way, or to a more utilitarian standard.
- Low Priority. If difficulty is experienced we would shift resources and staff time away from these aspects of the action plan to achieve higher priority tasks.

Action Plan: Key Outcomes

HER Policy and Planning

1. Review and update this HER Action Plan on an annual basis.
2. Local recording practice & procedures documentation completed by April 2008.
3. Service Level Agreements with District Councils negotiated and in place by ****

HER Content

4. Develop the HER into a fully-developed on-line HER by ****.
5. Recording of national and local designations meet requirements of proposed new heritage protection regime by 2010.

Staff Resources

6. Secure resources for HER Assistant post by April 2011.
7. Maintain/develop student, volunteer and clerical assistance.

Information Technology

8. Migrate HLC and EUS datasets into HER database by ****
9. Long-term digital data storage & maintenance issues resolved by ****

HER Access

10. Complete the "Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past" Project by December 2007.
11. Continue programme of outreach activities.

Note:

The following table indicates the Detailed Breakdown of Tasks required for the Action Plan. Under responsibility, SAO refers to the Senior Archaeological Officer, HERO refers to the Historic Environment Record Officer and AA refers to Archaeological Assistants. The Archaeological Assistants will comprise available student, volunteer, short-term clerical/admin support or a full-time Historic Environment Record Assistant (subject to availability of funding).

Action Plan: Detailed Breakdown of Tasks

TASK	<i>A Future for our Past 2</i> ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY Lead: Others:		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
HER Policy & Planning									
Review and update Disaster Recovery Plan	SMR 3		HERO		Annual Review	-		Disaster Plan reviewed	Ongoing
Recording & collection policy and procedure documentation			HERO		17 days (HERO)	£2,856	See Note 1	Updated collecting policy & recording documentation completed	2007-8
Formal agreement on HER coverage, recording policies and Service Level Agreements with District Councils		H	SAO	HERO; District Councils; BCC Legal Team	10 days	£1,680 + £73 per hour Legal fees		Formal adoption of HER by District Councils and SLAs in place.	
Review Access & Charging Policy	SMR 3		SAO	HERO	Annual Review	-	See Note 2	Policy reviewed	Ongoing
Document recording practice for GIS data and comply with standards for metadata			HERO	BCC GIS Officer; HLC Project Officer	10 days	£1,680	Link to Historic Landscape Characterisation Project. See Note 3	Spatial data recording system developed System developed 2002: Needs formalising!	2007-8
Review Business/Action Plan	SMR 1		SAO	HERO	Annual Review 1 day	-	See Note 4	Business/ Action Plan targets met	Ongoing
Establish SLAs with District Councils and review annually.		H	SAO	HERO; District	Annual Review	£672	Subject to agreements with	SLAs reviewed	Ongoing

TASK	<i>A Future for our Past 2</i> ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY Lead: Others:		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
				Councils	4 days		Districts		
HER Content									
Enhance buildings records with additional information from specialist publications	SMR 5 & Link to PS 10	H	HERO	AA	35 days	£5,980			
Enhance monument records for complexes with additional information from thematic surveys	SMR 5 & Link to PS 10	H	HERO	AA	10 days?	£1,680			
Create Local List buildings records	SMR 1 & SMR 5	H	HERO	DC Listed Buildings/ Conservation Officers	36 days (HERO)	£6,048	See Note 5		
Create designations records for DC Conservation Areas and link to GIS shapefiles	SMR 1 & SMR 5	H	HERO	DC Listed Buildings/ Conservation Officers; BCC GIS Officer	18 days	£3,024	See Note 5		
Complete GIS data capture of existing HER material			HERO	BCC ITU; BCC GIS Officer; AA	5 days (HERO)	-	See Note 6	Prioritised existing HER datasets captured on GIS	
Complete acquisition of key digital datasets from external sources	SMR 2		SAO	HERO; BCC ITU; BCC GIS Officer	5 days	-	Other agencies involved. See Note 7	Datasets obtained & installed	Ongoing
Complete existing HER collections: Records of Bucks			HERO	AA	2 days		Photocopy/scan missing volumes of Recs of Bucks?	Collections completed	

TASK	A Future for our Past 2 ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
			Lead:	Others:					
Data exchange/sharing with English Heritage, National Trust, neighbouring HERs, Bucks County Museum, Portable Antiquities Scheme, Diocesan Archaeological Advisor	SMR 2		HERO	BCC ITU	?		Other agencies involved. See Note 8	Procedures agreed and implemented	
Pro-actively establish & maintain contacts for HER information	SMR 2		SAO	HERO; AA; BCC Museum	Unquantified	-	Link to HER Access Project. Largely dependent on outside bodies & individuals. See Note 9	Increased HER reporting from non-commercial sources	Ongoing
Data sharing with districts	SMR 1	H	SAO	HERO; BCC ITU	?	-	Largely dependent upon DC's Officers. See Note 10	IT solutions scoped out. Procedures agreed and implemented	
"Event" data			HERO	AA			See Note 11	Prioritised data edited and mapped on GIS	Ongoing
Complete catalogue of HER collections: Slides Maps & Drawings	SMR 2		HERO	AA	5 days	£840	Clerical /volunteer /student task?	Collections catalogued within HER database	Ongoing
"Sources & Archives" data			HERO	AA	Unquantified		Related to catalogue of HER collections. To be reviewed during	Prioritised data edited	Ongoing

TASK	<i>A Future for our Past 2</i> ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY Lead: Others:		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
							cataloguing process. See Note 12		
Clear existing collections backlog			HERO	AA	180 days	£14,971		Existing backlog cleared	
Staff Resources									
Secure resources to employ a full-time HER Assistant	SMR 2 & MAN 1?		SAO	HERO				Achieve backlog targets set as annual performance indicators	2008/9
Maintain and develop student, volunteer and clerical assistance	SMR 2 & MAN 1?		SAO	HERO			See Note 13	Achieve backlog targets set as annual performance indicators	Ongoing
Information Technology									
Digitising key events in GIS	SMR 2		HERO	AA	7 days		See Note 14	Key events mapped	
HER database conforming to national data standards	SMR 3	H	HERO		5-yearly Review	£168	See Note 15	HER fully MIDAS compliant	Ongoing
Digitising monuments in GIS as polygons	SMR 2		HERO	AA	36 days	£6,048	Data integrity issue. See Note 16	Monuments adequately mapped	
Digital data transfer standards			HERO	BCC ITU, Exegesis, FISH	5 days	£840	See Note 17	Data transfer documentation in place and implemented	

TASK	A Future for our Past 2 ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
			Lead:	Others:					
Resolve long-term digital data storage requirements			HERO	BCC ITU	5 days	£840		Storage needs assessed and provision planned	
Migrate HLC data to HBSMR	SMR 5 & Link to PS 5-8	H	HERO	HLC Officer, Exegetis	4 days	Approx £1,800			
Migrate EUS data to HBSMR	SMR 5 & Link to PS 10	H	HERO	HLC Officer, HLC Assistant, Exegetis	4 days?	Approx £1,800?			
Link HBSMR designations records to GIS shapefiles			HERO	BCC GIS Officer	1 day	£168			
Link HBSMR consultations records to GIS shapefile			HERO	BCC GIS Officer	1 day	£168			
Review HBSMR license number requirements	SMR 3		HERO		Annual review	£168			Ongoing
HER Access									
Complete "Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past" project	SMR 4 & OCA 2	H	SAO	HERO; UBP Project Officer		NA		Project completed	2007-8
Maintain UBP website	OCA 2 & OCA 4	M	HERO	AA	12 days	£2,016	Requirement of HLF grant funding	Monthly uploads; new images & reports linked	Ongoing
Review public facilities including disabled access	SMR 3	M	HERO		Annual review		Monitor user surveys and website feedback	User satisfaction levels maintained	Ongoing
Continue programme of	OCA 3 &	M	HERO				No resources	2007/8 PI target	Ongoing

TASK	<i>A Future for our Past 2</i> ACTION REF	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY Lead: Others:		TIME	COST	COMMENTS	OUTCOME PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	TIMETABLE (Financial year beginning April)
outreach activities	OCA 6						available after March 2008	of 15 events, with 300 participants and 150 young people	

DRAFT

NOTES:

HER Policy and Planning

1. Produce version-controlled HER recording and documentation manual including a protocol for recording Period data to ensure data consistency. Review record structure of monument records, particularly for complexes and linear monuments. Revise HER collecting policy to include statements on coverage, content and data sharing.
2. Maintain the HER Access and Charging Policies consistent with legal requirements, County Council policy and national guidelines. Review policy and charging rates annually.
3. Develop HER recording standards, policy and methodology for recording historic landscape data and spatial data on GIS as part of Historic Landscape Characterisation Project.
4. Review, and if necessary, update the HER Business/Action Plan on an annual basis.

HER Content

5. Consolidate local designations in HBSMR in advance of implementation of Heritage Protection legislation
6. Complete digitised data capture of HER enhancement/backlog data:
BCMAS reports **High Priority (possibly in partnership with NMR?)**
Slides & photographs **High Priority (links to HLF project) Ongoing**
APs Plots **High Priority**
APs **Medium Priority Ongoing**
Historic map copies/tracings **Low Priority (copies of CRO collections)**
7. Complete acquisition of digital HER datasets from external sources:
Historic Buildings (non-listed) **High Priority Digital data only available for WDC**
MPP assessment scores **Medium Priority Digital data not retrievable!**
Other EH datasets (SAM Documents, Field Monument Warden's Reports, Excavations Index, Buildings Index) **High Priority Buildings Index acquired March 2006, Excavations Index available via ADS**
The successful acquisition of these datasets will be largely dependent on external bodies, however the resulting data will go a long way in filling the thematic and period gaps within the existing HER coverage identified by the original SMR Data Audit.
8. Establish and maintain appropriate data exchange/data sharing agreements with:-
County Museum **Medium Priority**
Portable Antiquities Scheme **High Priority License Agreement signed October 2005**
Neighbouring HERs **Medium Priority**
National Trust **High Priority**

Diocesan Archaeological Advisor **Low Priority**

English Heritage and National Monuments Record **High Priority License Agreement signed March 2006**

9. Encourage and facilitate appropriate private, voluntary and academic research which feeds back reliable data to the HER by establishing regular contact with potential sources of HER information such as:
Local independent archaeologists (eg Paul and Charmian Woodfield).
Ashmolean Museum
British Museum
Oxfordshire Museum Service
Northamptonshire Museum Service
Active local archaeology/history groups and societies (eg Marlow Archaeological Society, CVAHS, Princes Risborough Countryside Group and Archaeology in Marlow)
NMR & Cambridge University AP collections
BCC Local Studies Library collection.
10. Review the potential for data sharing with District Councils' Conservation/Historic Buildings Officers. **HERO now BCC digital data 'custodian' for DC's Conservation Area, Listed Building and Local List datasets. Notification data regularly updated and provided to DC planners, HER data regularly provided to DC conservation officers.**
11. Editing pre-2000 "Event" data. A fair amount of editing required to minimise unnecessary duplicate records and to ensure that a minimum level of data is recorded (estimated 3,000 Event records).
12. "Sources and Archives" data requires a fair amount of editing to minimise unnecessary duplicate records (17176 Sources and Archives records currently).
Prioritise records for editing or retain existing records unedited?

Staff Resources

13. Obtain appropriate permanent/temporary/volunteer support with an annual target of **0.2 FTE** post contribution towards HER data inputting. Maintain a record of staff & volunteer time spent on HER tasks.

Information Technology

14. Digitise key pre-2000 events on GIS as polygons and points (approx 209 records for fieldwalking, trial trenching and excavations).
15. Ensure all future developments of the HER database conform to national data standards.
16. Digitise existing monuments on GIS as polygons (currently displayed as multiple points; approx 2,161 records).
17. Develop guidelines for digital transfer of data to the HER and its storage and access. XML routines being written by Exegesis for importing PAS data and OASIS data into HBSMR. FISH XML routine and guidelines available; XML import and export routines available following upgrade to Windows XP.

Julia Wise

21st March 2007; updated 7th September 2007

Appendix 6: Buckinghamshire SMR compared to 10 other county SMRs/HERs

SMR/HER	HER Staffing		HER Workload			HER Development	County comparisons		HER as Pathfinder Pilot?
	No of HER staff (fte)	Funding source	No of Mon records	No of reports per year	Inputting rates (No of reports per year)	Progress with Benchmarks	County area (ha)	County population	
Buckinghamshire *	1.4	1 Core, 0.4 Income	18,712	228	286	21/23 Stage 1 9/15 Stage 2	156,500	479,000	No
Shropshire	3	2 Core, 1 SLA with 2 DCs	20,322	42	82		319,736 (2 X Bucks)	287,900 (0.6 X Bucks)	-
Staffordshire	1.5	1 Core, 0.5 unpaid student. Exploring SLA with DCs to fund Assistant	12,826	84	Lot less than 84!	Not assessed. 9/23 Stage 1?? 3/15 Stage 2??	262,333 (1.5 X Bucks)	811,000 (1.6 X Bucks)	-
Cambridgeshire	2	2 Core; SLAs with 3/5 DCs funds Dev Control post.	15,100	150	300	18/23 Stage 1 9/15 Stage 2	305,400 (1.9 X Bucks)	570,200 (1.2 X Bucks)	-
Lincolnshire *	3.75	3.75 Core; SLAs with 3/5 DCs part fund Dev Control	23,322	308	308	Not assessed.	588,000 (3.75 X Bucks)	646,000 (1.3 X Bucks)	No

		posts.							
Dorset *	2	1 Core, 1 temporary secondment	22,506	52	52?	16/23 Stage 1 2/15 Stage 2	265,275 (1.7 X Bucks)	701,800 (1.5 X Bucks)	No
Suffolk *	1 +	1 Core, Occasional assistants external funding	25,251	250	123	13/23 Stage 1 Stage 2 not assessed	380,207 (2.4 X Bucks)	692,100 (1.4 X Bucks)	No
Bedfordshire						Awaiting information			
Hertfordshire *						Awaiting information			
Oxfordshire						Awaiting information			
Surrey						Awaiting information			

* Pathfinder councils

JW 9th August 2007