

CATALOG CYMRU

An audit of uncatalogued collections in the Record Repositories of Wales

together with a survey of cataloguing and indexing resources

Archives and Records Council Wales

2008

Project Manager: Martin Locock
Report authored by: Gareth Haulfryn Williams

© Archives and Records Council Wales, 2008

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1 INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT	5
1. ARCHIVES IN WALES	5
2. ARCHIVE LISTING IN WALES	6
3. UNLISTED RECORDS	7
4. THE WAY FORWARD	8
5. THE CATALOG CYMRU PROJECT	8
6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS	9
7. EXPECTED OUTCOMES	9
2 METHODOLOGY OF THE AUDIT	11
2.1 LOGJAM	11
2.2 CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	11
2.3 PROJECT GROUP	11
2.4 AUDIT DESIGN	11
2.5 PARTICIPATING REPOSITORIES	12
2.6 PROJECT PARAMETERS	13
2.7 AUDIT STAFF	13
2.8 SELECTION OF RECORDS FOR AUDIT	14
2.9 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	14
2.10 CALCULATING CATALOGUING RESOURCES	15
2.11 PRIORITY ASSESSMENT	17
2.12 SAMPLING COLLECTIONS	18
2.13 MANAGEMENT GROUPS AND COLLECTION SUB-GROUPS	18
3 FINDINGS	19
3.1 BASIS OF CALCULATION	19
3.2 TOTAL EXTENT OF BACKLOG (ALL WALES)	19
3.3 SIZE OF BACKLOG BY REPOSITORY TYPE	19
3.4 TOTAL EXTENT OF MATERIAL BY COLLECTION TYPE	21
3.5 MATERIAL NEEDING LISTING WITH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION PRIORITISATION	25
3.6 CATALOGUING PRIORITY SCORES	25
3.7 CATALOGUING STATUS	26
3.8 CATALOGUING COMPLEXITY	27
3.9 WELSH-LANGUAGE RECORDS	27
3.10 CATALOGUING RESOURCES REQUIRED	28

4 THE NATURE OF THE COLLECTIONS	30
4.1 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	30
4.2 SIGNIFICANCE	30
4.3 SUBJECT MATTER	31
5 CATALOGUING METHODS AND RESOURCES	32
5.1 RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY	32
5.2 THE QUESTIONNAIRE FINDINGS	33
5.3 GENERAL SURVEY CONCLUSIONS	40
6 RECOMMENDATIONS	43
6.1 LOCAL REQUIREMENTS	43
6.2 NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS	43
6.3 GRANTS AND TOPICS	45
6.4 EXAMPLES OF PROJECT OPPORTUNITIES	45
6.5 RESOURCES REQUIRED	48
APPENDICES	49
Appendix 1 Participating Repositories	49
Appendix 2 Criteria for assessment of collections	50
Appendix 3 Collection sub-groups	52
Appendix 4 Cataloguing standards questionnaire	54
Appendix 5 Examples of typical types of catalogue entry	57

Acknowledgments

This project was funded by the Welsh Assembly Government by way of a grant from CyMAL: Museums, Archives and Libraries, which is gratefully acknowledged by Archives and Records Council Wales (ARCW) and all 22 project partners.

The Catalog Cymru project has been guided and monitored on behalf of ARCW by the members of the Project Management Board, whose advice and experience have proved invaluable:

Elisabeth Bennett (Chair), University of Swansea
Kim Collis, West Glamorgan Archive Service
Eluned Jones, CyMAL
Kevin Matthias, Denbighshire Record Office
Helen Palmer, Ceredigion Archives
Glyn Parry, National Library of Wales

The Secretariat for the Project Management Board was provided by Elizabeth Bennett, CyMAL, financial management was provided by courtesy of Ceredigion County Council, and the project had the benefit of physical accommodation, administration and technical services provided by the National Library of Wales.

The project partners also wish to thank staff members of the various institutions who welcomed the project surveyors and extended every help and facility. Their knowledge and cooperation has greatly enriched the quality of the survey data.

Thanks are also extended to the members of Archives and Records Council Wales and staff of CyMAL, especially Mary Ellis as monitor, for their continued interest and advice.

The advice of Janice Tullock, former Archive Development Officer, MLA North West, and one of the authors of the original Logjam report, both in the preparation of the application for funding and in final scoring, is gratefully acknowledged. MLA's permission for quoting substantially from their Logjam report is also gratefully acknowledged here.

The author is extremely grateful to Peter Keelan of Cardiff University for providing information not otherwise made available to the project team from data assembled for his MSc Econ. thesis.

The permission of Gwynedd Council, through the co-operation of Ann Rhydderch, Principal Archivist and Heritage Officer, to extract cataloguing entries from on-line catalogues for Appendix 5 is also gratefully acknowledged.

The Project Management Board wishes to record its appreciation of the continued input of Martin Locock, Project Manager, to the report after he left the project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This project was funded by the Welsh Assembly Government by way of a grant from CyMAL: Museums, Archives and Libraries, and managed by a Project Management Group on behalf of Archives and Records Council Wales. There were 22 project partners (record repositories in local government, Assembly Government Sponsored Bodies and higher education).

Archive keeping in Wales dates back over 100 years but has matured in particular since the 1974 local government reorganisation. Increasing volumes of material coupled with greater public usage have brought about a serious listing backlog. Concerns over this backlog have been a live issue to the archive community in Wales. Listing issues have also been highlighted by various web-based initiatives of individual archive services in more recent years. Archive services are typically only able to catalogue 60%-70% of their collections.

New funding opportunities have however become available. Taking advantage of these in a co-ordinated way, at local or strategic levels, calls for a better knowledge of the deficiencies in listing and the facilities for producing modern lists to a common standard.

A methodology had been devised in northwest England by the 'Logjam' project for surveying archive backlogs. The *Catalog Cymru* project was devised to research the backlog in Wales by conducting "a mapping exercise of uncatalogued archival collections and establish[ing] priorities for action by application of logjam methodology to Wales". Outputs were to include a Wales-wide database and report, and individual databases and reports for each participating repository. The present report is one of the said outputs. Outcomes were to include defining future priorities for cataloguing projects and improving the number, quality and standardisation of archive catalogues in Wales.

Methodology

The Logjam method of working was adopted so that the *Catalog Cymru* report could produce data comparable with that for other parts of the British Isles while sparing the work of developing a new methodology. A full exposition of this is laid out in the Logjam report.

22 Welsh partners with records to survey were identified, a project management group was established, and Logjam procedures were examined and modified where necessary to fit the Welsh context. Parameters were set, whereby unlisted or partially listed collections of <1 linear metre were generally disregarded; staff were engaged; and repositories submitted lists of records for survey.

Collections were identified and surveyed to establish subject area, extent, volume, dates, cataloguing complexity and level of cataloguing required, Welsh language content and any specific priority issues. The relative priority for listing the material and the time needed to catalogue it was then computed by means of a predetermined scoring system. Large collections were sampled.

Findings

1442 collections were finally included, these extending to **14.86km** of shelf run, or **1234.14 cu.m.** out of a total national archive holding estimated at 6331.8 cu.m. (or

19.49%). This gave an average of 65.5 collections, totalling 675 linear metres of records (56.10 cu. metres) per repository. Holdings in fact varied widely, from 1 collection to several hundred. Approximately 20% by volume of holdings of all three categories of repository (local authority, AGSB, HE) were uncatalogued.

121 collections of public records and 389 collections of "official" or other governmental records were identified, along with 932 of other (mainly private and business) provenance. These were further broken down for analysis into 71 sub-groups. Of the 1442 collections, 461 were identified of being of medium priority and 46 of high priority. 162 collections has had some initial listing work (such as box lists) and a further 313 had been listed to series level or had totally inadequate lists that needed replacing before records could be accessed. A third (487) were of moderate complexity and few (23) were very complex to catalogue. 239 had some or all of their content in Welsh.

Using Logjam methodology (based on time and practice research) the survey revealed that the **total** professional and para-professional time required to eliminate backlog was **297 years**, with a further 139 years required to bring catalogues fully up to standards for supra-repository use. **38 years'** work time would be required to eliminate the high-priority backlog.

The nature of the collections

Many of the collections surveyed were recent accessions, accruals or had early inadequate lists. It was clear that listing of collections is generally performed strategically, the most important collections normally being given precedence. Many collections of generally lesser importance, however, contain nuggets of extreme value. Collection titles and bulk are no indicators of relative importance. Some of the smallest collections revealed both a wealth of important content and a need for detailed or specialist work to effect listing to an acceptable standard.

The range of content is considerable. Apart from title deeds, however, there is little early material; most is 19th–20th century in date, and this is generally intelligible in character and content and relates more closely to contemporary concerns. It therefore needs to be available for use.

The survey has also highlighted a number of subject areas where a number of repositories hold material on the same subject. Coal mining, iron and steel and slate industries and railways are prominent examples. There is also a huge wealth of solicitors' material, which desperately needs opening up and exploring. Collections of artistic works also feature in a number of repositories and, if brought together, could make a major contribution to the access to cultural and creative heritage. It is also clear that there is a large corpus of local government records at present inaccessible,

Cataloguing methods and resources

The Catalog Cymru project as funded included an element of research into Cataloguing, Indexing and access points, Software and standards, and Appraisal as practiced by archive repositories in Wales. To this end, a survey of practices was undertaken by the project staff, through a questionnaire to partners, followed up by semi-structured interviews.

It appears, understandably, that the local authority repositories share a common culture in their approach as do university repositories. The three AGSB institutions are

all so different in nature that major differences in approach are evident and were to be expected. A striking unanimity of approach was however discernible in many fields.

Hierarchical listing methods are generally in operation. There is a legacy of catalogues of disparate standards and quality, but also a general move to the adoption of the CALM software and ISAD(G) listing standards, especially within local authorities. The other sectors are moving towards a greater consistency either between repositories or by utilising institution-wide information management systems. Physical indexing is largely being abandoned in favour (or in the hope) of electronic retrieval by free text searching as lists are increasingly available in digital formats.

The survey also considered appraisal methods and policies. This is done almost universally by intuition and professional judgement when material is accessioned. There is scope for the development and adoption of robust and explicit policies to inform future practice in this area.

Recommendations

The report makes nine detailed recommendations including the following:

- reducing the national backlog by strategic planning and prioritisation of cataloguing work by individual repositories;
- identification of possible subjects for co-operative projects and funding applications;
- considering the training of staff to create an adequate skills base as part of projects;
- strengthening projects by identifying and including added-value aspects, such as opportunities for community involvement or remote access.

A national strategy to deliver on these recommendations and others in the report is required, and this should have three streams:

- identification of 'quick wins' to create momentum;
- identification of single-repository schemes not suitable for multi-repository partnership bids;
- identification of suitable areas for multi-repository projects based on geography, subject matter or required skills.

Various exemplars for co-operative work potentially attractive to funders are given.

Resources required

Based on the Logjam formula for calculating time required and on updated rough costings, it would appear that tackling all the work uncovered by the survey would require an estimated £14m to achieve in full. Production of catalogues for the highest priority collections would cost up to £1.3m, while cataloguing all collections of medium and high priority would require some £6m.

1 INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

1.1 ARCHIVES IN WALES

The collection and study of manuscripts has a long and distinguished history in Wales, although it must be admitted that until the late 19th century this had a literary bias, as antiquarians strived to preserve the Welsh literary and genealogical tradition in private libraries. Other collections found their way to British-level institutions, notably the British Museum (now British Library).

In the later 19th century and increasingly into the 20th century with the activities of Cardiff Library and the establishment of the National Museum and libraries in the new University Colleges, culminating in the foundation of the National Library of Wales, the momentum for collecting and securing collections in Welsh public institutions gathered pace. An increasing emphasis on historical source material was also discernible.

County record offices (outside south east Wales) were generally slow to appear and various institutions continued to provide a *de facto* local archive service until well into the second half of the 20th century. Only after the 1974 local government reorganisation did the network of local record offices cover the whole of Wales, with the new counties of Conwy and Wrexham establishing archive services after the 1996 reorganisation. A pattern has now emerged of single-authority repositories in the more rural north, mid and west Wales, and of joint services in the old counties of Glamorgan and Monmouthshire. 13 archives services, providing a total of 14 repositories and a number of archive service points, now ensure an archival presence at local government level throughout the country.

Wales has also been a land of heavy industry in the control of large companies or, later, nationalised conglomerates. There are no specialist business archives in Wales maintained outside public collections - many National Coal Board and British Steel records, to give two examples, have been noted during the survey, having been transferred out of their respective corporate records systems.

Wales has a number of regimental museums that hold archives, and are recognised places of deposit for relevant public records; their other collections are specialised and normally integrated within museum-style listing systems and as such were not suited to inclusion in the *Catalog Cymru* survey.

The lack of a local government archive service in some parts of Wales and the wide geographical remit of some repositories have led, over the years, to a number of other institutions such as public libraries and local government and independent museums actively collecting (or more passively accepting) document collections to safeguard them. These accumulations have by now, in some instances, been transferred into professional archive custody, and this is a process that is likely to continue. These *ad hoc* keepers of archives have often done sterling work but none employ professional archive staff, and because of the relative smallness of the collections and the changing situation they were not included in the remit of the *Catalog Cymru* project.

It should also be noted that while the provisions of the Public Records Acts have led to a number of gifts or deposits in approved repositories in Wales, the legislation to create defined Welsh public records has not been activated, and very many

public records emanating from – or related to – Wales remain at the National Archives in London, although these generally speaking will be listed in detail.

Other records relating to Wales may well be found in specialist or academic repositories or in the record offices on the English side of Offa's Dyke. These records housed outside Wales have not been included in the survey's remit.

As the Welsh archival network has matured and collecting policies have become defined, there have been a number of adjustments to holdings, either by way of 'repatriation' from the original custodians (often national bodies) or as new repositories have followed local government boundary changes, and a significant number of collections transferred in such a way have been noted by the survey.

1.2 ARCHIVE LISTING IN WALES

In the early years of Welsh archive development, an understandable emphasis was placed on collecting the vanishing archive heritage as estates, law firms and traditional industries disappeared or were taken over. Listing science was also in its infancy and many of the archive lists that were produced were inadequate, discursive or otherwise unsuited to present-day demands. Retroconversion to digital format has proved particularly difficult in some cases, while accruals and a new appreciation of what is of significance has meant that many additional items remain uncatalogued or unincorporated into previous lists.

The pioneering work however bred a new and enthusiastic band of local historians eager to use the material available in their localities and equally keen to explore the resources of the national and university repositories that had previously been the preserve of the academic.

A growing database, initially in hard copy, at the National Register of Archives in London and on the shelves of the Manuscript Reading Room at the National Library of Wales showed the progress of listing work in Wales' repositories, both national and local.

As listing techniques became more sophisticated with a new generation of professionally-trained custodians and increasing resources for the running of archive services, particularly after 1974, so also did the pressures on staff time as searcher numbers increased dramatically. This led to an inability to tackle all the backlog of listing work that remained from the initial 'collecting' phase, while success and a higher profile themselves generated further accessions. An increased awareness of the true research interests of their clients also stimulated archivists to seek out and accession more industrial and cultural archives and archives in alternative formats such as sound and images.

Archivists in Wales, as their colleagues elsewhere, have therefore been very aware of the need to tackle the listing backlog. Funding opportunities, such as the Job Creation schemes of the 1980s and the later Lottery grants, have facilitated this but an awareness remained that much useful material was not accessible to the public and, as such, remained moribund.

These concerns have been a live issue to the archive community in Wales. Listing issues have also been highlighted by various web-based initiatives of individual archive services, and by Archives Network Wales (ANW), which provides the public

with access to a high-level description to *fonds* (or archival groupings) in all the repositories of Wales. A prerequisite for the inclusion of archives in ANW naturally has to be a list of some sort, detailed and final or provisional and perhaps only to series or bundle level.

Greater funding opportunities for the archive domain, together with a Wales-wide agenda stemming particularly from the formation of CyMAL in 2003, have been major stimuli for the present project.

1.3 UNLISTED RECORDS

A culture in which a lack of access to archives is increasingly unacceptable has been nurtured by:

- the increasing maturity of archive services, not only in Wales but also elsewhere in Britain;
- an environment of culture of efficiency and performance targets;
- the development of freedom of information legislation;
- a higher profile for archives engendered by factors such as popular television series and increased leisure;
- the emergence of strategic archive bodies furthering archives' role in nationwide social and cultural agendas; and
- new opportunities in web technology.

In 2001 the 'Archival Mapping Project for Wales' noted that almost all Welsh archive services had serious and growing arrears of cataloguing. It stated that, in general, archive services were only able to catalogue 60%-70% of their collections, leaving 30%-40% without catalogues. In addition, less than half of the uncatalogued material had even the simplest box-list summary, rendering it completely inaccessible. The report concludes that Welsh archive services were in dire need of cataloguing these collections in order to open up their collections to their users.¹

Subsequent to this, the Historical Manuscripts Commission compiled a 'Survey of archive cataloguing problems (England and Wales)'. Of the Welsh archive services surveyed, one stated that up to 10% of its collections were uncatalogued, three stated that between 10% and 25% of their collections were uncatalogued and two stated that between 25% and 50% of their collections were uncatalogued. Estimates of the extent of the backlogs ranged from 9 to 425 cubic metres. The main reason given for the cataloguing backlogs was a lack of capacity.²

In addition, new funding opportunities have become available, to which knowledge of the current situation is key.

Management of the situation, at local or strategic levels, called for a better knowledge of the deficiencies in listing and the facilities for producing modern lists to a common standard.

¹ Archival Mapping Project for Wales, *A survey of archival provision in Wales*, Archives Council Wales, (2001), pp 8 and 21-22

² HMC, *Survey of archive cataloguing problems (England and Wales)*, (2002), pp. 8-9

1.4 THE WAY FORWARD

Unless the situation in Wales were to be improved by piecemeal local action alone, the existing state of affairs needed mapping in order to allow for more strategic solutions. Once the requirements were known across a number of repositories, cooperative or partnership initiatives would become practical, opening up equitable access to collections, encourage the learning society, improve security and exploitation, allow the most efficient use of resources and comply with recent legislation and expectations in the field of information.

While this was being discussed on a Wales level, an innovative and pioneering audit of uncatalogued collections by the North West Regional Archives Council (NWRAC) in England funded by the North West Museums, Libraries & Archives Council was under way. This commenced in 2002, as part of the north west of England's Regional Archive Strategy, and was given the name *Logjam*. The aim of the *Logjam* project was to:

"identify, quantify and prioritise uncatalogued archival collections in the North West. Specifically it aimed to:

- produce a detailed picture of the archival collections which are uncatalogued in each repository and the region as a whole
- identify the resources required to catalogue these collections
- prioritise these collections and in particular identify specific priorities for future collaborative projects within the region."³

Logjam in fact drew on the principles and aspirations of the cross-domain *Full Disclosure* initiative, which aimed to open up access to collections across museums, libraries and archives and noted one of its prime recommendations as being to "identify and prioritise those collections that remain entirely uncatalogued as a basis for possible collaborative dialogue with other institutions or regional coordination of priorities."⁴

1.5 THE CATALOG CYMRU PROJECT

Meanwhile in Wales, the *Full Disclosure* report was similarly being considered as a way forward and after funding from the Welsh Assembly Government became available through its new sectoral body, CyMAL, and moves commenced to deliver a similar audit as a first stage for action in a Welsh context. This was driven by ARCW's revised Strategy document adopted in 2004, which noted as a high priority in its action plan the need to:

"conduct a mapping exercise of uncatalogued archival collections and establish priorities for action by application of logjam methodology to Wales"

with the following outcomes:

- "- to identify uncatalogued collections
- to provide a Wales-wide overview of cataloguing backlogs
- to provide individual repositories with an indication of the scope and extent of their cataloguing backlogs

³ North West Museums Libraries & Archives Council, *Logjam: An audit of uncatalogued collections in the North West*, Warrington, , (n.d.), p.3

⁴ Cultural Heritage Consortium, *Full Disclosure Prioritisation Study*. Final Report, London, (2002) p.48

- to determine the timescale and resources required to address the situation
- to gather evidence to formulate a strategy for action and to support a joint bid for funding to address the situation".⁵

The preparation of a bid for funding was approved by a meeting of ARCW in March 2005. The minutes of that meeting outline the organisational arrangements:

"The question arose as to who should take the initiative for Logjam (a project to quantify and prioritise the cataloguing backlog across Wales). It was felt that both ARCW and CyMAL should shoulder the responsibility. The suggestion had been made that the work could be undertaken by some of the ANW team under the control of ARCW, with the project commencing in January 2006 and completed in June of that year by two archivists and one project manager..... A centrally managed project, such as the one proposed, would produce evidence to justify the extra resources needed to reduce the cataloguing backlogs throughout Wales."⁶

Funding was duly secured. In the event, however, while the project commenced in January 2006 and progressed without a break, it proved problematic to attract qualified archivists to short-term posts. A Project Manager was however appointed and given a wider remit with regard to the survey work. Remaining survey work, including that of Welsh language archives, was carried out by a freelance archive consultant. The work therefore spread over a longer period than initially expected, survey work for the audit being completed in April 2007.

1.6 EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The project was designed to deliver the following outputs:

1. A Wales-wide database of uncatalogued collections;
2. A Wales-wide report that sets out the nature and extent of uncatalogued collections, summarises the situation regarding cataloguing, indexing and appraisal practices and making recommendations for future action;
3. Individualised reports indicating the nature and extent of uncatalogued collections for each participating archive service and the resources and timescale required to catalogue these collections; and
4. Individualised databases of uncatalogued collections for each participating archive service.

The first of these has been delivered and this report marks the delivery of the second. Outputs 3 and 4 have been delivered to each participating service, and these will furnish them with management tools for their further development work if they so wish.

1.7 EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Expected outcomes were that the project would:

- Recommend future priorities for cataloguing projects on a local and national level;

⁵ Archives and Records Council Wales, *The Foundation of Our Future: a National Archives and Records Strategy for Wales (2004)*, p.26

⁶ Archives and Records Council Wales, *Minutes*, 11 March 2005.

- Enable the formulation of a collaborative strategy to address cataloguing backlogs;
- Identify those collections that are held by a number of different archive services;
- Enable archive services to work towards improving access to archival collections through making finding aids and collections more widely available;
- Encourage the production of ISAD(G) compliant catalogues;
- In the long term, enable archive services to work towards complying with the Freedom of Information Act;
- Enable and inform the future development of Archives Network Wales.

2 METHODOLOGY OF THE AUDIT

2.1 LOGJAM

As noted above, a pioneering study of this sort had already been carried out in the north west of England. There seemed no merit in establishing a separate methodology and indeed, by remaining close to the Logjam method of working, the Catalog Cymru report might produce data which could be compared with that for other parts of the British Isles.

While the project methodology is outlined below, readers may wish to refer to the full exposition of the methodology as laid out in the Logjam report.⁷

2.2 CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

As a project sponsored by Archives and Records Council Wales, the stakeholders were readily definable as the 22 repositories /archive-holding bodies represented by that body. All 22 agreed to become *de facto* partners in the project, their input being their cooperation in preparing survey lists, etc. and providing on-site facilities for the audit to be carried out.

2.3 PROJECT GROUP

Following consultation with participating archival institutions, a small project group was formed, comprising officers of ARCW together with representatives of the National Library of Wales (who were to be titular employers of project staff) and of CyMAL as the funding body.

The group provided steer for the project and proved invaluable during the process of adopting – and subsequently adjusting – the audit methodology. The group met several times and the minutes and reports of the Project Manager formed a record of progress. Other regular contact was maintained via email.

In May 2007, responsibility for the project was transferred to the Archives Wales Management Group as Catalog Cymru is one the streams feeding in to the wider work on a digital virtual archive for Wales.

2.4 AUDIT DESIGN

Since the Logjam audit of uncatalogued archival collections had recently been undertaken on a similar scale and a recognised methodology was therefore in existence, it was decided to keep as close as possible to this way of working.

Factors examined while deciding whether the Logjam procedures needed modifying in any way included the following:

- the identity of the institutions taking part
- how the audit was to be organised and carried out
- any limits of time, size or content with regard to the material to be audited

⁷ North West Museums Libraries & Archives Council, *Logjam: An audit of uncatalogued collections in the North West*, Warrington, (n.d.), pp.6-10, accessible at: <http://www.northwestarchives.org.uk/logjam.htm>

- the data to be collected
- whether the cataloguing resource implications as calculated under Logjam were appropriate
- methods of prioritising collections
- any special requirements because of the Welsh context or because the audit was to be of a whole country rather than a region.

2.5 PARTICIPATING REPOSITORIES

It was decided early on that the remit should be to audit the collections of all repositories represented by ARCW, a total of 22 in all, and all repositories agreed to this. They are listed at Appendix 1. As noted earlier, there are no large business or specialist archive institutions such as the Unilever archives, the Wellcome Institute archives or BT archives in Wales. The sector therefore fell neatly into three categories:

- 14 local authority repositories, of which 3 are run by joint services serving two or more authorities
- 5 university archive services
- 3 Assembly sponsored public bodies (ASPBs) – now Assembly Government Sponsored Bodies (AGSBs).⁸

This is substantially different from the makeup of Logjam participants (6 County Record Offices, 14 metropolitan archives services and 10 specialist repositories).⁹

The Catalog Cymru participants nevertheless differed greatly in size and institutional management status from small university services to a national repository of long standing with extensive staff resources.

The audit was limited to ARCW repositories to keep the work within reasonable time limits. An attempt has not been made therefore to survey archives in non-ARCW institutions such as public libraries (where it is believed that some collections remain) nor in the extensive museum sector (other than in the case of Amgueddfa Cymru – National Museum Wales which has maintained long-term archival activity and is an ARCW member). A recent study has noted that the university archive sector is divided between those institutions that adopt a ‘research’ approach to archives and those that limit their activities more specifically to the archives of the institution; the 5 services that are included in the survey were proponents of the former approach.¹⁰ It has long been the case that regimental museums are significant holders of records and are often designated places of deposit for public records relating to military matters, although they fall outside the scope of this report.

A recent survey of Welsh museums¹¹ showed that some 39 museums in Wales claimed to hold a total of over 120000 archive items in 2006; it may be that few of

⁸ Amgueddfa Cymru – National Museum Wales, while operating over several sites, and possessing two separate ARCHON reference numbers (one for the general institution and one for the National History Museum at St Fagan’s), has a centralised records service and opted to be treated as a single institution. All departments/sites reporting unlisted record holdings were surveyed.

⁹ While local materials might be expected to be similar to those in the Logjam survey, specialist archives collections could be expected to be less likely to feature, while groups of national-level Government and cultural records might be expected to be far more prevalent.

¹⁰ Peter Keelan, *University Archives: Institutional Memory or Intellectual Memory* (unpublished MSc Econ thesis, Aberystwyth, 2007), p.5. It includes discussions which serve to amplify and extend consideration of university archives beyond that which is possible here.

¹¹ CyMAL, *Spotlight on Museums*, (2007).

these are listed to current archival standards despite being well cared for. The present audit however noted a number of collections which had been deposited in archive repositories by museums both public and voluntary.

This issue offers an important opportunity for ARCW, i.e. to engage with museums, libraries and other archive holding institutions across Wales, to work with them to raise awareness of their archival collections and to bring these collections together through Archifau Cymru - Archives Wales: the Virtual National Archive for Wales.

2.6 PROJECT PARAMETERS

Within the finite resources available, certain parameters had to be defined before work commenced:

- **Minimum size of collection:** the project could not aim to survey every uncatalogued archival item in 22 offices. A decision was therefore taken to accept the Logjam criterion of a minimum 1 linear shelf metre for inclusion. In fact, this was modified in practice to include collections which were contained in at least three average sized archive boxes, or a shelf-run of 0.8 metres or so, where this seemed appropriate, since a very large proportion of collections fell into this category and, where they contain material such as diaries, letters or deeds they can be of substantial worth and call for significant processing time. Other factors, such as ineligible material or piling rather than storing boxes one high on shelves also affected the shelf run count but frustrated rather than defined the criteria at times, especially in the case of small but significant collections. Unlisted collections have frequently to be assigned to a final storage location and so are often not on conventional shelving.
- **Definition of an uncatalogued collection:** as with Logjam, it was noted that a number of collections held in archive offices have collections that have basic box lists or poor quality catalogues. This project covered collections where the catalogues are not easily useable by the public and do not meet the standards outlined below, as well as totally unsorted and unlisted accumulations. Fully listed collections to item level where access is possible although lists are not compliant with modern ISAD(G) standards were however excluded.
- **Time window:** Archive repositories regularly add to their holdings and collections regularly move through the stages of sorting and listing to being fully available to the public. Any audit therefore has to be snapshot on the day it is made, although opportunities were available for later revision of inaccurate or misleading data. The Project Board determined that the date of its final meeting (26 April 2007) would be the cut-off date for recording any new alterations or additions to the data.

2.7 AUDIT STAFF

All audit work was done by one of the two staff engaged, who took care to work to the same standards, thus ensuring consistency of approach. All collections audited were inspected on site.

2.8 SELECTION OF RECORDS FOR AUDIT

Following the appointment of the project manager, each repository was asked to provide a preliminary list of uncatalogued collections. A trial audit of one repository with substantial collections was held as a pilot, and these repository lists were then used to estimate how long each audit would take to complete and played a critical part in the design of the project schedule.

2.9 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Each uncatalogued collection was individually examined by one of the project workers and the data was gathered (if available). The categories were varied a little from those of the Logjam project to suit Welsh circumstances:

- Collection Title
- Collection Reference
- Accession Number
- Location (shelf/bay/room)
- Collection Management Group (Public Records, Official Records, Others)
- Collection sub group (as defined by the project)
- Extent of boxes items/maps/plans (linear metres)
- Volume in cubic meters
- Extent of unboxed volumes (linear metres). This was included in the general linear metrage but provided a useful means of downscaling time requirements as volumes routinely take less time to list. As sampling was generally in operation, it was decided that volumes in boxes would not be included in this measurement
- Potential cataloguing complexity
- Predominate date range (to the nearest century)
- Level of cataloguing required
- Proportion of Welsh language content, disregarding incidental and bilingual material (none/some/majority/all)
- Any restrictions imposed on free access (condition or confidentiality)
- Freedom of Information or public demand needs, where these were felt to be exceptional.

A summary of content, any special features, availability of lists etc. was also made and, where it was of particular relevance for future evaluation of collections, noted in a free text box in the database.

Once the audit had been completed, the data was inputted into a Microsoft Access database modified from that originated for the Logjam project and analysed using its query and report functions. Data was checked with repository staff and modified where appropriate, along with initial assessments of priority (see below).

Each participating repository has received a copy of their individualised database and a set of instructions outlining how to use and update the database.

2.10 CALCULATING CATALOGUING RESOURCES

Logjam calculated the cataloguing resources required to process collections by using a formula designed specifically for the project. Catalog Cymru adopted this formula which, in order to take the complexity of each collection into consideration, was based on the following factors:

- Size of the collection
- Potential cataloguing complexity
- Main covering dates of the collection
- Level of cataloguing required.

Each factor is given a weighting and a total resources score is generated automatically for each collection. The score is then matched against a table of cataloguing resources and the database automatically provides a cataloguing time for archivists and paraprofessionals, as e.g.

9-12 months archivist time and 2 months paraprofessional time

It must be stressed that this can only be a rough estimate based on the general impact of bulk and the work needed to impose intellectual control on archives in general. Where substantial factors seemed to project staff to suggest that the generated time requirements were seriously inappropriate, a note has been added to the database in a freetext box.

Any projects conceived on the basis of this audit work will need to revisit and recalculate resource implications before formal budgets and time schedules can be agreed.

2.10.1 Size of the collection

The weighting for the size of each collection was determined by its actual size in linear metres. However, while this is suitable for boxed or rolled items, volumes tend to be much quicker to list. Where significant volume runs have been noted they have been entered in a box provided on the database input form; however, a preponderance of volumes has implications for a collection's complexity, and Catalog Cymru therefore decided to reflect the relative time demands for listing volumes by adjusting the complexity rating to give a similar effect. Logjam used a different methodology.¹²

2.10.2 Potential cataloguing complexity

The weighting for the potential cataloguing complexity was based upon 5 complexity categories:

¹² The Logjam database as created has a facility to note linear shelf runs of volumes and generates a listing time for these although it does not directly affect the weighted resources score. A separate formula was used by Logjam to calculate the time needed for listing volumes based upon an archivist or paraprofessional cataloguing 2 linear metres of volumes per day.

- Very Complex
- Complex
- Moderate
- Moderately Straightforward
- Straightforward

Definitions for the categories can be found at Appendix 2.

2.10.3 Main covering dates

The covering dates for the collection were aggregated into date ranges:

- 20th - 21st century
- 19th - 20th century
- 18th - 19th century
- 17th - 18th century
- 16th - 17th century
- 11th -15th century

Inevitably, collections did not fall precisely within these specific date ranges. The solution was to take the date range for the bulk of archival material within the collection.

2.10.4 Level of cataloguing required

The amount of work that has already been undertaken on a collection impacts greatly on the potential cataloguing time. The cataloguing resources formula distinguished between those collections that remained completely uncatalogued, and those that had been box-listed or listed to series level:

- High – Uncatalogued
- Medium – Box-listed
- Low – Listed to series level or with a totally inadequate item-level list.

2.10.5 Cataloguing Resources Table

Logjam carried out research by questionnaire before arriving at the method of calculation of cataloguing resources needed based on bulk, complexity and date. While the Logjam report notes that this is at best a rough calculation and further work remains to be done to arrive at a more reliable formula for correlating these factors with required resources, it is the best methodology based on practical experience available to date, and Catalog Cymru has adopted it.

The Logjam report noted that "repositories were recommended to undertake more detailed research on potential cataloguing resources before seeking funding to catalogue specific collections"¹³ and this is equally true for Catalog Cymru findings. Overall time estimates for the national backlog and those of individual repositories

¹³ North West Museums Libraries & Archives Council, *Logjam: An audit of uncatalogued collections in the North West*, Warrington, (n.d.), p.9

are more likely to be more accurate as over- and under-estimates will cancel each other out to some degree. ¹⁴

2.11 PRIORITY ASSESSMENT

Based upon guidelines from the national Full Disclosure Project, an assessment matrix adapted from that devised by Logjam was used to establish the cataloguing priority of each collection. The cataloguing priorities were based upon whether the collection was:

- in need of access to facilitate anticipated Freedom of Information Act enquiries (rather than 'covered by Fol' in Logjam)
- expected to be the subject of exceptional public demand (not used by Logjam)
- of high/medium/low local significance
- of high/medium/low regional significance (in Welsh terms, 'regional' was taken to mean county or wider)
- of high/medium/low national significance (Welsh or British, or of international significance)
- inaccessible because of condition or with restricted access (either type of restriction reducing the priority score by 10; where both are relevant, the reduction remains at 10).

The first two of these were only utilised where repositories, having been given the opportunity to ask for a priority score to be weighted, opted to do so. They responded to this in a subjective way and many opted not to nominate collections, despite it being suggested that some 10% of collections might be relevant. It must be borne in mind however, when comparing with Logjam results, that the Logjam methodology pre-dated Fol implementation and all collections that were felt came under the Fol remit were scored. In Wales, and in hindsight, use of Fol legislation to secure access to archives has been limited, while case law is still developing on what is caught by the legislation; advice is that most collections, even if deposited, are in theory potentially liable to Fol requests. However, Fol enquiries seem to have proved initially only marginal to repositories' activities in many cases. They were therefore asked to note collections where Fol searches were likely to be an issue, and the number noted was low.

Logjam also scored priority on the basis of eligibility for inclusion in past or present A2A or Archives Hub initiatives. While academic archives in Wales contribute to the Archives Hub, all Welsh repositories are covered by ANW, and all collections are eligible for inclusion, and so this criterion for priority was therefore irrelevant in a Welsh context and has not been used.

National significance was not scored until all collections had been scored. The Project Management Group discussed the criteria for deciding this in the context of Wales; the criteria are somewhat different to those more appropriate to Logjam as a regional survey in a larger national context. All collections identified by Catalog Cymru as scoring for regional significance were regarded as candidates for medium or high national importance.

In the light of the above assessments, a priority score was awarded to each collection and this established its cataloguing priority.

¹⁴ For a fuller description of the research and rationale for this calculation, see *ibid.*, p.9

The draft assessments, once made, were sent to the professional contact at each repository for their comments and their comments incorporated. Definitions were provided to ensure that consistent data could be gathered across Wales (see Appendix 2).

2.12 SAMPLING COLLECTIONS

The bulk of many collections meant that they could not be examined in their entirety in the time available, and project staff investigated a sample of boxes, ranging from 5% for some very large and consistent collections (e.g. single filing systems, such as quarter session rolls) to 50% or higher where the collection was complex and varied. Small collections (6 boxes or less) were often examined in their entirety.

It was noticeable that relatively few collections were completely unsorted. Box labels were very frequently available noting broad categories (e.g. financial records, personal letters, photographs, or functions) or the references of the original creators remained as an aid to identification. Rough box lists or summaries were also of frequent occurrence.

While this does not materially affect the fact that large numbers of archive holdings remain inaccessible to the public, it shows that professional custodians carry out some initial processing of records upon their accession. The documents may be unproduceable to the potential user for lack of the substantial time resources needed to prepare the required item-level lists, but it is far from the case that these collections are totally unknown to their custodians who endeavour to preserve original order and/or secure the information necessary for high-level description.

2.13 MANAGEMENT GROUPS AND COLLECTION SUB-GROUPS

The audit collected information on types and general provenance of records by noting their management group and the sub-group of records within that group into which they fell. Logjam used four management group headings: Public, Official, Deposited and Religious records. After consideration, it was decided that the Welsh context was better served by division into three categories:

- Public Records, as defined by the Public Records Acts.
- Official Records, defined in this context as those of public bodies such as local government, health authorities, state education establishments and other bodies in the public sector.
- Other Records, including all those from business, private or non-statutory sources, whether deposited, donated or purchased, and artificial collections.

Logjam used the term 'Deposited records' for Other Records but this could be taken to define the nature of the terms of accession. It was also felt that there was no logic in having a separate 'Religious records' category, since there is no difference in status between religious and other bodies in Wales, where there is no established church. The basic list of Collection Sub-groups was also modified and somewhat increased from that of Logjam by a process of sub-division. The list of collection sub-groups used (and those available but unused) are to be found at Appendix 3.

3 FINDINGS

3.1 BASIS OF CALCULATIONS

A total of **1502** collections were identified and proposed for audit by the partners and were surveyed during the life of the project.

By the time that the audit was carried out on site, some collections were already listed or listing to adequate level was reported before the cut off date of 25 April 2007. These collections, **27** in number, were removed from the database.

Further examination of the remaining collections led to the amalgamation of some data records where separate accruals had been surveyed separately. Others were excluded as they did not fall within the remit of the audit. This led to a decrease of a further **32** in the total number of collections.

The final number of collections identified as falling within the audit's criteria and awaiting listing in Wales's 22 repositories in 2006-07 was therefore **1442**.

3.2 TOTAL EXTENT OF BACKLOG (ALL WALES)

1442 collections were identified as being in need of cataloguing work to make them accessible to the user, extending to **14.86km** of shelf run, or **1234.14 cu.m.** out of a total national archive holding estimated at 6331.8 cu.m. (or **19.49%**).

If divided equally between all 22 repositories, this would give an average of 65.5 collections, totalling 675 linear metres of records (56.10 cu. metres) per repository. Holdings in fact varied widely:

Number of uncatalogued collections	Number of repositories
1-4	3
5-10	0
11-20	5
21-30	5
31-50	4
51-100	1
<101	4

Table 1

Collection counts above 50 were 74, 163, 209, 223 and 411.

3.3 SIZE OF BACKLOG BY REPOSITORY TYPE

3.3.1 Size of backlog in Local Authority repositories (including joint services)

	Number of collections		Linear Metres of uncatalogued material		Extent of volumes (li.m) uncatalogued		Cubic Metres of uncatalogued material	
	No	% total*	li.m	% total*	li.m	% total*	Cu.m	% total*
Public	109	7.59%	1041.94	7.01%	57.71	13.89%	82.284	6.67%

Records								
Official Records	384	26.63%	3419.68	23.01%	106.09	25.53%	261.912	21.22%
Others	561	38.90%	4767.88	32.08%	242.76	58.42%	392.438	31.80%
ALL	1054	73.09%	9229.50	62.09%	406.56	97.83%	736.634	59.68%

Table 2

*: percentages refer to the percentage of the whole national backlog for that category and/or metreage of records held by all repositories of the type under consideration

	Average holdings	
	Average Number of collections per repository (14) (to nearest)	Average size of collection (li.m)
Public Records	4.95	9.56
Official Records	17.45	8.91
Others	25.50	8.50
ALL	47.91	8.76

Table 3

Total repositories: 14

Total of all holdings: 3925.4 cu. metres¹⁵

Percentage of holdings uncatalogued: 18.77%¹⁶

3.3.2 Size of backlog in University repositories

	Number of collections		Linear Metres of uncatalogued material		Extent of volumes (li.m) uncatalogued		Cubic Metres of uncatalogued material	
	No	% total*	li.m	% total*	li.m	% total*	Cu.m	% total*
Public Records	1	0.07%	9.00	0.06%	0.00	---	0.720	0.06%
Official Records	2	0.14%	7.50	0.05%	0.00	---	0.510	0.04%
Others	89	6.17%	1269.76	8.54%	2.64	0.64%	99.807	8.09%
ALL	92	6.38%	1286.26	8.65%	2.64	0.64%	101.037	8.19%

Table 4

*: percentages refer to the percentage of the whole national backlog for that category and/or metreage of records held by all repositories of the type under consideration

	Average holdings	
	Average Number of collections per repository (5) (to nearest)	Average size of collection (li.m)
Public Records	0	9.00
Official Records	0	3.75
Others	18	14.27

¹⁵ CIPFA Archive Services Statistics 2006-07 Estimates, London, 2007, p.30, modified by later information from one repository.

¹⁶ While this is a significant bulk of inaccessible material, it compares favourably with the uncatalogued holdings of county record offices in north west England, according to the Logjam report (*op.cit.*, p.13) which stood at 26%.

ALL	18	13.98
-----	----	-------

Table 5

Total repositories: 5
Total of all holdings: 516.3 cu. metres¹⁷
Percentage of holdings uncatalogued: 19.57%

3.3.3 Size of backlog in AGSB repositories

	Number of collections		Linear Metres of uncatalogued material		Extent of volumes (li.m) uncatalogued		Cubic Metres of uncatalogued material	
	No	% total*	li.m	% total*	li.m	% total*	Cu.m	% total*
Public Records	11	0.76%	24.94	2.27%	0.00	---	1.76	0.16%
Official Records	3	0.21%	16.28	0.11%	0.00	---	0.704	0.23%
Others	282	19.56%	4306.77	15.27%	6.37	0.02%	394.103	31.93%
ALL	296	20.52%	4347.99	29.25%	6.37	0.02%	396.567	32.13%

Table 6

*: percentages refer to the percentage of the whole national backlog for that category and/or metreage of records held by all repositories of the type under consideration

	Average holdings	
	Average Number of collections per repository (3) (to nearest)	Average size of collection (li.m)
Public Records	4	2.27
Official Records	1	5.43
Others	94	15.27
ALL	99	14.69

Table 7

Total repositories: 3
Total of all holdings: 1890.1 cu. metres¹⁸
Percentage of holdings uncatalogued: 20.98%

3.4 TOTAL EXTENT OF MATERIAL BY COLLECTION TYPE

Definitions:

Public Records – Archives covered by the Public Records Acts, such as hospital and health records, court records and prison records

Official Records – Archives of local authorities and all of their predecessor bodies and other statutory bodies

¹⁷ Linear metreage supplied by individual correspondents or extrapolated from Peter Keelan, *University Archives: Institutional Memory or Intellectual Memory* (unpublished MSc Econ thesis, Aberystwyth, 2007), *passim* and subject to a multiplier of 0.079 to estimate cu. metres.

¹⁸ Linear metreage supplied by individual correspondents

Others – Archives emanating from private businesses, religious establishments, universities, individuals and organisations.

3.4.1 Extent of uncatalogued material by management group

	Number of collections		Linear Metres of uncatalogued material		Extent of volumes (li.m) uncatalogued		Cubic Metres of uncatalogued material	
	No	% total	li.m	% total	li.m	% total	Cu.m	% total
Public Records	121	8.39%	1075.88	7.24%	57.71	13.89%	84.76	6.87%
Official Records	389	26.98%	3443.46	23.17%	106.09	25.53%	263.13	21.32%
Others	932	64.63%	10344.41	69.59%	251.77	60.58%	886.25	71.81%
ALL	1442	100.00%	14863.75	100.00%	415.57	100.00%	1234.14	100.00%

Table 8

	Average size of collection and quartiles						
	by li.m	by cu.m	Lowest (li.m)	25th percentile (li.m)	Median (li.m)	75th percentile (li.m)	Highest (li.m)
Public Records	8.891	0.70	0.50	1.60	3.50	9.00	106.65
Official Records	8.852	0.68	0.30	1.62	3.28	8.00	263.44
Others	11.099	0.95	0.23	1.50	2.97	7.20	400.00
ALL	10.308	0.86	0.23	1.60	3.00	7.50	400.00

Table 9

The formal criterion for inclusion in the survey was 1 linear metre shelf run, but a number of factors explained at 2.6 above led to this criterion being disregarded where it was felt appropriate. 136 collections fell below the official survey parameters but have been included.

More generally, it will be observed that smaller collections are in the majority, half being 3 li.m. or less. There is a trend for more public and official records collections to be slightly larger than other collections, and rather more very large collections affect the 'others' figure.

There were 1165 collections of 10 li.m. or less, only 49 of over 50 li.m. and only 14 of 130 li.m. or more. Most collections therefore are relatively small and individually pose little challenge; it is the number of them that is both exciting in its potential and challenging in its size.

3.4.2 Extent of uncatalogued public record material by collection sub-group

SUB-GROUP	LA		Univ		AGSB		All Wales	
	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m
Assizes and Crown Court Records	1	1.20					1	1.20
Charity Commission	3	6.42					3	6.42

Coroner's Records	8	178.50					8	178.50
County Court Records	2	13.15					2	13.15
Hospital and Health Records ¹⁹	19	176.05	1	9.00			20	185.05
Insurance and Pension Committees	2	16.79					2	16.79
Land Tax Commissioners	3	23.17					3	23.17
National Coal Board	13	93.84					13	93.84
Petty Sessions	4	78.31					4	78.31
Prisons	1	4.20					1	4.20
Quarter Sessions	30	325.28					30	325.28
Registrar of Shipping and Seamen	5	31.60					5	31.60
Tithe and Manorial Records ¹⁴					1	1.98	1	1.98
Valuation Office	2	20.24					2	20.24
Other public records	16	73.19			10	22.96	26	96.15
TOTALS	109	1041.94	1	9.00	11	24.94	121	1075.88

Table 10

The categories of Board of Trade; Court of Great Session; Customs and Excise; Lord Chancellor's Advisory Committee; Probate Records; and Vehicle Licensing were available for use but no relevant records were recorded.

3.4.3 Extent of uncatalogued official record material by collection sub-group

SUB-GROUP	LA		Univ		AGSB		All Wales	
	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m
Boards of Guardians of the Poor	4	18.18					4	18.18
Borough/City Council (pre-1974)	50	687.73					50	687.73
Civil Parish / Community Council	51	161.48			1	2.32	52	163.80
County Council (1888 -1996)	95	1027.93	1	6.00			96	1033.93
District Council (1974-1996)	18	251.19					18	251.19
Drainage and River Boards	4	23.80					4	23.80
Electricity Boards	2	20.50					2	20.50
Gas and Water Records	15	69.32			1	3.96	16	73.28
Highway and Bridge Boards	2	2.52					2	2.52
Hospital and Health Records ¹⁴	3	4.90					3	4.90
Other local gov't	19	136.59					19	136.59
Police Records	12	126.01					12	126.01
Rural District Council	24	185.34					24	185.34
School Boards	2	7.68					2	7.68
School Records	15	158.37					15	158.37
Shrievalty and Lieutenancy	2	1.75					2	1.75
Tithe and Manorial Records ¹⁴	3	6.20					3	6.20
Turnpike Trusts	1	5.37					1	5.37
UA	8	85.94					8	85.94
Urban District Council	52	436.33					52	436.33
Other Official	2	3.05			1	10.00	3	13.05
TOTALS	384	3419.68	1	7.50	3	16.28	388	3443.46

Table 11

The categories of Joint Boards; and Sanitary Authorities were available for use but no relevant records were recorded.

¹⁹ These categories were used for both public records and official records, depending on provenance and status.

3.4.4 Extent of uncatalogued other archive material by collection sub-group

SUB-GROUP	LA		Univ		AGSB		All Wales	
	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m
Antiquarian Collections					1	2.31	1	2.31
Business: Architects/Building/Civil Engineering	10	28.37			1	2.64	11	31.01
Business: Brewing	5	49.63					5	49.63
Business: Chemical	2	13.35					2	13.35
Business: Engineering	2	20.42			1	0.90	3	21.32
Business: Gas and Water	1	4.51					1	4.51
Business: Manufacturing	16	85.60	1	8.12	3	5.07	20	98.79
Business: Mining/Extractive industry	21	129.00			6	11.58	27	140.58
Business: other	28	203.69	2	23.40	13	290.10	43	517.19
Business: Railways	13	61.59	1	21.75	3	3.70	17	87.04
Business: Retailing	8	28.25			1	2.16	9	30.41
Business: Shipbuilding/Repairing	2	5.00					2	5.00
Business: Shipping/trade	7	21.86					7	21.86
Business: Solicitors	70	1278.22	1	6.50	7	260.30	78	1,545.02
Business: Textiles	1	1.89			4	63.35	5	65.24
Business: Waterways	1	1.23					1	1.23
Campaign groups	2	2.70	1	3.68			3	6.38
Charity	7	14.11			1	1.00	8	15.11
Christian: Anglican	6	11.90	1	1.00	7	709.79	14	722.69
Christian: Baptist	16	29.91			1	3.30	17	33.21
Christian: Congregational and United Reformed	6	12.09					6	12.09
Christian: Methodist Church	23	50.16					23	50.16
Christian: Other					1	4.70	1	4.70
Christian: Presbyterian and Calvinistic Methodist	1	1.20			7	61.70	8	62.90
Christian: Roman Catholic					1	28.20	1	28.20
Christian: Society of Friends	1	0.23					1	0.23
Employees'/Employers' Associations	11	41.51	7	68.20	2	7.92	20	117.63
Estate/Family	124	1618.17	3	42.15	38	449.61	165	2,109.93
Miscellaneous accumulations	9	50.11			4	6.10	13	68.55
Multi-provenance collections	54	556.95	3	12.34	27	1524.83	84	2,099.48
Party Political Papers	5	29.34	5	17.70	1	7.31	11	36.65
Personal Papers	42	188.69	39	212.70	103	608.72	184	1,010.11
Research Collections	9	32.87	2	17.50	32	121.57	43	171.94
University and college	4	25.38	14	789.15	4	15.96	22	830.49
Voluntary sector	54	169.95	9	45.57	13	113.95	76	329.47
TOTALS	561	4767.88	89	1269.76	296	4306.77	932	10344.41

Table 12

The categories of Christian: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; Christian: Pentecostal; Christian: Unitarian; Christian: other; and Religion – other were available for use but no relevant records were recorded.

3.5 MATERIAL NEEDING LISTING WITH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION PRIORITISATION

This table considers the collections which repositories noted as having FoI implications

TYPE	NUMBER OF COLLECTIONS	LINEAR METREAGE
Public Records	5	100.35
Official Records	7	53.08
Others	1	0.81
ALL	13	154.24

Table 13

Only three repositories recorded collections that they felt merited special prioritisation on FoI grounds, despite all repositories surveyed being given the opportunity to do so. The table, while therefore of little significance, is included in order to facilitate comparisons with Logjam.

3.6 CATALOGUING PRIORITY SCORES

This section includes local, regional and national significance scores, FoI and public demand implications and any restrictions for reasons of condition or confidentiality.²⁰

3.6.1 Priority scores by management groups

TYPE	LOWER PRIORITY (Score 0-20)	MEDIUM PRIORITY (Score 30-50)	HIGH PRIORITY (Score 60 +)
Public Records	89	27	4
Official Records	291	95	3
Others	554	339	39
ALL	934	461	46

Table 14

3.6.2 Priority scores by type of repository

TYPE	LOWER PRIORITY (Score 0-20)	MEDIUM PRIORITY (Score 30-50)	HIGH PRIORITY (Score 60 +)
------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------

²⁰ The score bands are pitched at 10 less than in the corresponding Logjam report table (*op.cit.*, p.17) as Logjam scored for eligibility to various regional schemes available in England at that time and there was major scoring for FoI with different criteria applied..

Local Authority	745	289	20
University	51	39	2
AGSB	138	134	24
ALL	934	462	46

Table 15

3.7 CATALOGUING STATUS

This section records scores based on the availability of any initial lists, inadequate finding aids etc. as follows:

Uncatalogued – No cataloguing work has been undertaken on the documents [Score = 100].

Box-listed – A basic list of the contents of each box of documents has been produced [Score = 60].

Series level list – Catalogued to series level is the next level of detail in cataloguing but is not classified as fully catalogued in this project [Score = 20].

3.7.1 Cataloguing status by management groups

TYPE	UNCATALOGUED		BOX-LISTED OR OTHER LISTING DONE		SERIES LEVEL LIST OR OTHER INADEQUATE FINDING AID	
	No.	li.m	No.	li.m.	No.	li.m
Public Records	75	650.41	30	344.59	16	80.88
Official Records	253	2190.83	32	446.01	104	806.62
Others	639	6524.10	100	1886.44	193	1933.87
ALL	967	9365.34	162	2677.04	313	2821.37

Table 16

3.7.2 Cataloguing status by type of repository

TYPE	UNCATALOGUED		BOX-LISTED OR OTHER LISTING DONE		SERIES LEVEL LIST OR OTHER INADEQUATE FINDING AID	
	No.	li.m	No.	li.m	No.	li.m
Local Authority	664	5552.44	103	1253.69	187	2423.37
University	63	621.63	11	303.98	18	360.65
AGSB	240	3191.27	48	1119.37	8	37.35
ALL	967	9365.34	162	2677.04	313	2821.37

Table 17

3.8 CATALOGUING COMPLEXITY

3.8.1 Cataloguing complexity by management groups

TYPE	Very complex		Complex		Moderate		Mod. straight-forward		Straight-forward	
	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m
Public Records	0	---	13	232.58	29	281.58	41	364.77	38	196.95
Official Records	0	---	13	87.46	85	1134.29	162	1407.45	129	814.26
Others	23	1449.35	169	2728.58	373	2939.45	263	2453.87	104	773.16
ALL	23	1449.35	195	3048.62	487	4355.32	466	4226.09	271	1784.37

Table 18

3.8.2 Cataloguing complexity by type of repository

TYPE	Very complex		Complex		Moderate		Mod. straight-forward		Straight-forward	
	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m	No	li.m
Local Authority	14	956.33	140	1908.90	321	2685.29	341	2355.37	238	1356.61
University	0	---	11	156.63	32	205.06	33	799.04	16	125.53
AGSB	9	493.02	44	983.09	134	1464.97	92	1104.68	17	302.23
ALL	23	1449.35	195	3048.62	487	4355.32	466	4226.09	271	1784.37

Table 19

3.9 WELSH-LANGUAGE RECORDS

This section records the number of collections with significant amounts of Welsh content. Welsh-language content which was in a bilingual context, or was incidental or insignificant was not included, as the intention was to identify collections where Welsh language fluency would be required to catalogue the collection.

	No Welsh content	Some Welsh content	50% or more Welsh content	All Welsh content
Local Authority	947	87	14	6
University	55	22	12	3
AGSB	201	65	27	3
ALL	1203	174	53	12

Table 20

3.10 CATALOGUING RESOURCES REQUIRED

The number of staff time estimated to eliminate the backlog is recorded here, based on the Logjam scoring system which scores for cataloguing complexity, predominant date range, cataloguing status (i.e. taking into account any listing already performed), and extent weighting. A score is generated which then is converted into an estimated time figure. Higher-scoring collections are also given a figure for the para-professional input required. Further time requirements for detailed work are also calculated (see 3.10.2 below).

Scores are generated in the form of an estimated time range (e.g. 2 weeks to 1 month, 24 to 28 months). The tables in this section are based on the middle point of each range, so that 2 collections needing 4 to 6 months work would be counted as 5 months x 2 = 10 months required.

The calculation was based on a survey of the average time taken to catalogue collections in the north west of England immediately prior to the Logjam project.

3.10.1 Cataloguing resources required by type of repository and management group

TYPE	Number of months of Public records		Number of months of Official records		Number of months of Others		Number of months of TOTAL	
	Prof	Para-prof /clerical	Prof	Para-prof /clerical	Prof	Para-prof /clerical	Prof	Para-prof /clerical
Local Authority	178.5	15.5	479.5	60.0	1239.75	150.5	1879.75	226.0
University	0.75	---	3.75	---	173.5	22.5	178.0	22.5
AGSB	3.75	---	4.25	---	1058.0	178.5 ²¹	1066.0	178.5
ALL	183.0	15.5	487.5	60.0	2471.25	351.5	3141.75	427.0

Table 21

Total professional and para-professional **years** required to eliminate backlog: **297 years.**

3.10.2 Further resources required for detailed work:

The Logjam software also generates an estimate of the requirement for additional time where detailed item level descriptions with access points are required as an output beyond the basic standard of cataloguing.

²¹ This figure is higher than that for the more extensive local authority holdings. This is accounted for by the fact that the AGSB sector has proportionally more very large collections which require proportionally more para-professional input.

TYPE	Number of months Public records	Number of months Official records	Number of months Others	Number of months TOTAL
Local Authority	105.5	263.0	724.25	1092.75
University	0.75	2.25	95.5	98.5
AGSB	3.0	2.0	473.5	478.5
ALL	109.25	267.25	1293.25	1669.75

Table 22

Total additional years if additional detailed work is required for backlog: **139 years**

3.10.3 Cataloguing resources required to eliminate backlog of higher-priority collections

Additional time requirements (see 3.10.2) are not included.

TYPE	Number of high priority collections scoring 60+	Number of months of	
		Prof	Para-prof
Local Authority ²²	20	267.5	58.5
University	2	22.0	5.0
AGSB	24	70.25	35.0
ALL	46	359.75	98.5

Table 23

Total professional and para-professional years required to eliminate high-priority backlog: **38 years**

The dynamics of the situation change substantially however if a lower priority threshold is invoked. Any collections scoring for one high and one medium significance rating (local, regional or national) and not being unavailable would be captured at a score of 40+. These would in effect be those collections that are likely to be in demand by a more than purely local constituency of users.

TYPE	Number of high priority collections scoring 40+	Number of months of	
		Prof	Para-prof
Local Authority	128	658.5	118.5
University	16	127.75	25.0
AGSB	95	377.5	64.5
ALL	239	1163.75	208.0

Table 24

Total professional and para-professional years required to eliminate high-priority backlog: **114 years**

²² 5 collections in a single repository account for 234 professional and 57 para-professional months of these totals, out of a total of 20 prioritised collections held by local authorities.

4 THE NATURE OF THE COLLECTIONS

4.1 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

It was not within the remit of the project to compare those collections which were in need of cataloguing with those already accessible through adequate catalogues. The project staff however observed when carrying out survey work that a good number of unlisted collections were either:

- recent accessions,
- accruals to listed collections of lesser worth than the initial deposit, or
- of comparatively minor significance.

There were also many collections proposed for the audit which had lists of some sort prepared many years previously but which did not conform to modern standards and were not of sufficient detail to allow access to users.

It is fair to say also that a subjective impression was gained that in general the collections that were most immediately apparent as being important are given priority by repositories and were listed or in the process of being listed.

Often therefore the collections most in need of cataloguing attention may not be totally unlisted accumulations; rather they may be archives which have been listed early in a repository's life to standards acceptable in an earlier age when thorough browsing of an archive catalogue was the user's accepted way of working. These catalogues are by now, however, inadequate to afford access in a modern context and are usually impossible to adapt easily for retro-conversion work. They will certainly not be of practical use when Freedom of Information considerations are in play.

4.2 SIGNIFICANCE

It also became apparent during the audit survey work that many collections of generally lesser importance contain nuggets of extreme value such as very early accounts or correspondence from important figures. Other collections relating to small geographical areas can remain uncatalogued as they have lacked a high priority in a wider context, but these may nevertheless be of the utmost importance for local historians of that parish or village. In other cases again, a collection's significance lies in the existence elsewhere of material of a similar nature or relating to the same subject.

The title of a collection is not always indicative of its importance. For example, examination of two seemingly very similar collections of papers of leading academics showed that one contained only routine administrative material which in theory would be available elsewhere (minutes of examination boards, faculty meetings, etc and some secondary research material) while the other contained a very large archive of correspondence with major cultural and literary figures and an almost disappointing amount of material on his distinguished administrative career.

Bulk is also no indicator of significance. The collections surveyed in fact ranged in bulk from 0.012 cu.m to 55 cu.m. (the lowest quartiles extending from 0.012 cu.m to 0.1 cu.m, and the highest quartile from 0.725 to 55cu.m, although only 32

collections exceeded 5cu.m). Many of the larger collections in fact revealed a lack of weeding on the part of the originator or the present custodian, while others were very large series which were of particular instance files which were not always appropriate for sampling.

In fact some of the smallest collections revealed both a wealth of important content and a need for detailed or specialist work to produce listing to an acceptable standard.

4.3 SUBJECT MATTER

The range of content is apparent from a consideration of the collection sub-groups noted in the table at paragraph 3.4 above and the free text descriptions associated with these in the central database. Apart from title deeds, however, there is little early material; most is 19th – 20th century in date, and thus relates to that period which most exercises historians, genealogists and educational users alike: it is accessible and intelligible in character and content and relates more closely to contemporary concerns. It therefore needs to be available for use.

The survey has also highlighted a number of subject areas where a number of repositories hold material on the same subject. Coal mining, iron and steel and slate industries and railways are prominent examples. There is also a huge wealth of solicitors' material, much emanating from a huge number of individual clients, which desperately needs opening up and exploring.

Collections of artistic works also feature in a number of repositories and, if brought together, could make a major contribution to the access to cultural and creative heritage; this is particularly true of the remarkable number of composers' manuscripts preserved but unlisted. Such subject concentrations as may be appropriate for composite bids for funding will be identified in the recommendation section (Chapter 6 of this report).

It is also clear that there is a large corpus of local government records at present inaccessible, despite the fact that local repositories are usually an organic part of the local government organisation. Relating to all aspects of local social and institutional life, these are archives that are much neglected but easily accessible by all users once catalogued. It could be argued that it is the prime responsibility of an authority to ensure that its records are available, and these are indeed the records that in future will be the focus of Freedom of Information enquiries; they have been neglected for lack of demand and thus have received low cataloguing priority in the face of more pressing public demands. It would be wrong to ignore the need for these records now to be catalogued and made available, and funding needs to be found to bring them into full use.

While joint subject-based bids or projects to open up a particular archive are desirable, there will also be room for the single collection to gain high priority where it is unique in its subject matter or has particular significance.

5 CATALOGUING METHODS AND RESOURCES

5.1 RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY

The Catalog Cymru project as funded included an element of research into Cataloguing, Indexing and access points, Software and standards, and Appraisal as practiced by archive repositories in Wales. To this end, a survey of practices was undertaken by the project staff, through a questionnaire to partners, followed up by semi-structured interviews.

As with the cataloguing audit reported above, to keep within time restraints the survey was limited to the 22 local authority, university and AGSB project partners (i.e. repositories that are represented directly or indirectly on ARCW).

There are 55 other bodies in Wales listed on the NRA ARCHON directory which hold archives, mainly museums and libraries. No formal survey was undertaken of their systems and practices; it is understood that in most cases archival holdings are covered by the main cataloguing system for the organisation, rather than a specialist archival system. Archival data standards are not employed; in some cases other documentation schemes are used.

In conjunction with the outcome of the audit of uncatalogued collections, the survey of archive services will hopefully inform the strategy for ensuring that all archival collections in Wales are catalogued to a high standard and that users are able to explore the catalogues through appropriate access points, by identifying common approaches across Wales.

An awareness of cataloguing methods, levels and depths and the technical listing and indexing systems in use is a prerequisite for any strategy hoping to promote supra-repository collation of archival data. Such information should also be of use to any repositories seeking to update, upgrade or modify their present procedures and conventions.

In particular, working to common standards such as ISAD(G) is essential if maximum benefit is to be had from cataloguing work in future. It is likely that prospective funders will need to be reassured as to adherence to recognised professional standards and systems.

In an era governed by Freedom of Information requirements, robust appraisal practices are essential to enable archive services to fulfil their legal responsibilities, and to protect them from accusations of unwarranted destruction of records and archives; it was to facilitate this that questions were asked about appraisal criteria currently in use. This will also identify areas of overlap in institutional collection policies and holdings.

The results of the survey could also inform future initiatives relating to archives held by bodies which are not currently members of ARCW, and ensure that they adopt common standards.

The survey was designed to collect four forms of data:

- Summary information about current policies and practices

- Documentation of these policies and practices
- Quantitative estimates of the amount of catalogue data held in various formats²³
- Brief summary of previous cataloguing practices.

A 100% response rate was achieved.

The questionnaires were completed over a period from mid 2006 to early 2007; in most cases they were completed following a structured interview allowing a textured understanding of practices and their rationale. Early responders may in fact have progressed with the adoption of software and standards before later responders were given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire (which was normally done at the time of the on-site audit of uncatalogued collections). Since there is a gap of some 18 months between the completion of the first questionnaires and the publication of this report, some progression towards greater use of electronic formats and standards may be assumed.

5.2 THE QUESTIONNAIRE FINDINGS

The 27 questions were divided into sections on Cataloguing, Indexing, Software/data standards and Appraisal. The questionnaire is at Appendix 5.

Cataloguing

5.2.1 Treatment of multiple deposits

Local authority offices reported an historic ambivalence towards the treatment of new accessions which formed *de facto* accruals to previously accessioned collections, but with a majority stating that they were increasingly uniting accruals with the original deposit. Repositories in the other sectors (university and AGSBs) were more varied in their approach, although only one stated that accruals were always regarded as a stand-alone unit.

The consensus would appear to be to integrate later accruals or at least treat them as additional sections to the original accession. The practice of separation had derived from the wish to manage accessions as entities; this is now handled by other means.

5.2.2 Reference code structure

Only four repositories reported arbitrary (i.e. non-meaningful) reference codes, most seemingly having schemes that identify the collection by name or its type of content and/or provenance. Apart from an initial collection identifier, most offices did not use a reference code structure beyond an item or production unit identifier. About a third reported regular or occasional use of an intermediate identifier to denote a series level. It would appear that the automatic reference code generation facility in commercial cataloguing packages such as CALM²⁴ is not yet being utilised or is being over-ridden to maintain pre-existing coding schemes.

²³ As an overall survey, partners were not expected to invest substantial effort in the production of precise quantifications and categorisation. Approximations to the nearest 5-10% were deemed sufficient. It was suggested that information compiled by partners for the TNA Questionnaire on Catalogue Retroconversion (October 2005) could be used.

²⁴ CALM for Archives is one the CALM cataloguing software packages produced commercially by DS Ltd. A description is available at: <http://www.ds.co.uk/page.asp?id=57>

The norm therefore is a two-part reference code (apart from any repository prefix), namely fonds/accession level and lowest listing level (file, item or piece).

5.2.3 Levels adopted

Offices typically adopted a pragmatic approach to the number of levels used, depending on the complexity of the archival structure. One repository uses 8 levels when required, and one only used a flat item description technique. The norm would appear to be three or four levels, consisting of fonds, series and item, with sub-levels employed when appropriate; nearly all repositories suggested a flexible approach at the discretion of the archivist cataloguing the collection, depending on complexity of the material's structure.

The norm was to catalogue to item level, although one repository reported changing to file-level listing from 1999 on while another 3 repositories noted a regular practice of listing to file level unless item level listing was required.

There was some variation in the approach to document production: 4 of the local authority repositories noted a frequent difference between description or record units and the entities produced for searchers. This was not a practice adopted by any university or AGSB repositories.

Most repositories reported that their lists reflected hierarchical archival relationships, and few used sorting or artificial grouping (e.g. listing letters from a single correspondent or deeds for a parish) to assist access at the expense of the hierarchical approach. There was some suggestion however that this was a former widespread practice.

One repository that used non-archive specific software did not reflect multiple levels, but some repositories utilising archive-specific software reported taking full advantage of the hierarchical level facility available and thus developing a fuller hierarchical type of catalogue.

It was clear that there is a difference between repositories as to what is treated as a fonds where certain common classes of record are concerned, e.g. all records of a local authority responsible for an archive, or individual departments' records thereof. This is a pragmatic decision and different standpoints can be defended but it poses some issues at a supra-repository compatibility level.

In general, while a hierarchical approach is all but universal, this is subject to local practice and interpretation. The adoption of standards and archive-specific software is reducing this variance.

5.2.4 Cataloguing standards

The use of the ISAD(G) standard (sometimes imposed by software) is common to most Welsh repositories, apart from one institution that uses a flat item listing approach dictated by institutional software and three long-established repositories that use in-house standards that were established forty or so years ago (two of which are declared to be 'near' ISAD(G) standard). The university sector tends also to use standards as dictated by the archive hub and EAD which are compatible with ISAD(G). The increasing penetration of CALM and other archival software can

be expected increasingly to bring cataloguing into ISAD(G) conformance.

All but 4 repositories had adopted a standard for cataloguing after 1995 (the date when ISAD(G) was launched in its present form), suggesting a determination to produce catalogues that conform to a supra-repository standard. There is no adoption of an established data content standard, but ARCW has proposed the use of the ANW Fonds-Level Description Guidelines as the content standard for Wales.

Only 2 repositories have serious issues to contend with before moving to full compliance with the professional standard in Wales.

5.2.5 Formats of catalogue

Typically 80% - 95% of lists are held in paper format, but it was significant that the younger record offices had a greater proportion of lists in electronic format, and one repository holds all its lists in "born digital" electronic format only. This suggests a general trend of recent years towards creating and holding catalogues in electronic form. This impression is confirmed by the number of record offices that have or are in the process of retroconverting paper lists to digital and even web-compatible format. 5 local authority repositories held more than 60% of lists digitally. University sector respondents all had substantial numbers of electronic or digitised lists, although the percentages varied widely. The lists available in the AGSB sector were very largely digital, with one institution having invested heavily in retroconversion. Generally speaking, formats (including those used for retroconversion) permitted searching across different catalogues, rather than only within a single file (e.g. as may be the case with pdf-format files) even where these had been digitised from hard-copy originals. All repositories (apart from one which failed to respond to the question at all) evidently have access to appropriate information technology.

While paper-based lists still predominate, retroconversion and "born digital" lists are increasing electronic (including remote) access to catalogues over the whole sector in Wales.²⁵

5.2.6 Remote availability of catalogues

Despite the availability of information technology, the actual availability of remote access provision varied widely. Virtually all repositories in the local authority sector reported 80-100% of collections being mounted on Archives Network Wales (ANW) at fonds level. The picture with university and AGSB repositories is more mixed, with 5 reporting a high percentage of collections on ANW and/or the Archives Hub, but 2 reporting no ANW presence (bodies which were not members of ARCW at the time of the ANW project).

Locally developed provision is however patchy, and lower level descriptions to series or item level are available only as a result of individual initiatives. Some 8 repositories noted the availability of catalogue material on the web, but normally only for a low percentage (1-20%) of lists; one repository claimed 85% of lists on the website and another 90%. Website material was normally in HTML format rather than in the form of pdf files (apart from one prominent repository). Half the

²⁵ See the Digital Preservation Coalition's taxonomy for a definition and discussion of the terms used in this paragraph: <http://www.dpconline.org/graphics/intro/definitions.html>

repositories were able to offer some digital remote access provided by the institution or its parent body; and all parent authorities maintain websites so in theory remote access is technically feasible.

This situation is expected to change to the extent that the National Archives public records initiative on Access to Archives (A2A) offers repositories an alternative route to web dissemination for one category of catalogues. The questionnaire threw up some evidence of this emerging facility.

While ANW provides initial high level access, other remote access is patchy but appears to be developing, and technological facilities appear to be available in many repositories.

5.2.7 Catalogue content

The data elements common to all respondents were title and reference code, dates, scope and content. Four repositories regularly omit an introduction or administrative details, biography or history and two omit details of the listing process. Nine do not include details of depositor or source, and a further two only do so with permission.

With regard to the depth of detail included in catalogues, respondents were asked to estimate percentages for transcripts, calendars, long and short summaries, and basic listing by item or by series. These descriptions were not universally understood, and examples of the various types of summary and list were prepared for those that requested further clarification [see Appendix 5 for this set of examples]. It is clear however that repositories vary their depth of cataloguing detail to correspond with the needs of the user and the accessibility of the material as well as, possibly, being dictated by available cataloguing resources.

No repositories had more than an insignificant percentage (<5%) of transcripts. One repository reported that 35% of their lists were calendars and another reported 10%, but the other 7 that did so reported only <5% of their catalogues to be calendars.

There was a certain confusion evident over the distinctions to be drawn between long and short summaries and basic lists by item, as the distinction can only be subjective. 5 local authority repositories considered that 70% or more of their catalogues fell within the 'long summary' category, while the other local authority offices tended to divide their catalogues between short summaries and basic item lists. All 4 of the university archives responding to this question returned high levels of short summary catalogues (80-100%); the AGSB sector all noted a majority (60-100%) of short summary/basic item lists.

7 repositories across all three categories noted that they had only basic series lists for some proportion of their holdings; this was mainly of 5-10% but in one office the figure rose to 18% and in another to 30%. These lists are in effect series level descriptions or, in older terminology, the equivalent of series headnotes and do not facilitate access as a rule to the records. It is likely that many of these collections were in fact surveyed as being inaccessible but with some listing work already done.

Summary descriptions at item level make up the bulk of available catalogues and as such provide some access to the records concerned. Since repositories

universally reported inclusion of the crucial data items of title, date, scope and content, this access would appear to be adequate although data may not be compatible to allow co-ordinated supra-repository access to a range of germane material.

Indexing

5.2.8 Former indexing standards

The local authority and AGSB sector repositories that have traditionally indexed their collections (12 out of 17) all used in-house standards. One AGSB and three of the 5 university repositories utilised the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH).

5.2.9 Current indexing standards

There appears to have been little movement from local in-house methods and term-lists towards adopting common standards. References to free text searching on web-based catalogues suggest a move away from traditional indexing or searching by defined keywords. Surprisingly only one institution noted adoption of the ISAAR(CPF) standard. One institution that previously had no indexing regime noted adoption of Social History and Industrial Classification (SHIC) and subject discipline-specific standards.

A general lack of movement towards sector-wide standards may suggest a low level of indexing activity, especially as free text searching of electronic material is increasingly an option. Only the university and AGSB sectors appear to have adopted a common standard, that of the Library of Congress.

5.2.10 Percentage of holdings indexed

There was a clear division here between those repositories that reported a high percentage of material indexed (typically 70% or more) and those (6 in total) that reported little or no indexes. It was evident that record repositories that had been more recently established were more likely not to have substantial indexes.

Taken together with the lack of development towards common standards noted in the previous paragraph, this suggests that indexing is not a priority activity at present.

5.2.11 Types of collection indexed

Little consistency of approach was observed, and most offices index all lists; two repositories noted an emphasis on people/place name rich collections (in one instance done by a family historian organisation), while conversely two noted that they excluded parish registers and suchlike from indexing.

5.2.12 Thesauri

It would appear that respondents confused this with the question on standards; in-house 'standards' that were inspected were often little more than short directions with a thesaurus of authorised terms.

Thesauri noted were Library of Congress and in-house thesauri.

5.2.13 Use of authority files

This is apparently a largely unadopted practice. The creation of new authority files is time-consuming and demanding of specialist reference facilities, and may be a major problem where local material is involved, as suitable externally derived authority files may rarely be available.²⁶

Only two repositories, both from the AGSB sector, reported their widespread use, although one other repository noted that it drew on ANW content where available.

5.2.14 Physical format of indexes

Nearly all the repositories reporting the existence of indexes noted that all or >85% were in card format.

One repository had also transferred 80% of card records to an electronic database and two non-local authority repositories reported 90% coverage in digital format alone. Four others noted some indexes being prepared in word processed format.

Most indexes are in older hard copy format, but there is some evidence of the development of digital facilities in this area.

5.2.15 Availability of indexes to remote users

Apart from a few web-accessible databases and the potential for free text word searches where catalogues are available remotely, remote access to indexes was not available.

Software/data standards

5.2.16 Database software available

9 local authority and one university office reported use of CALM, with 3 others evaluating it. 5 repositories reported different proprietary or bespoke systems which do not seem to be inter-compatible. 4 repositories had none and did not report any evaluation exercises in progress.²⁷

5.2.17 Use made of database software

Those repositories with software typically reported using it for current cataloguing and 6 also for accessioning. 5 noted that it was also being employed in retro-conversion work. There was evidence that this is an evolving process.

5.2.18 Proportion of currently-catalogued material held on databases

Most of those reporting catalogues held within their systems (15) had only a small

²⁶ For a discussion of the contents of a suitable archive authority file see: Gillman, Peter *National Name Authority File: Report To The National Council On Archives* Boston Spa, British Library, 1998, pp. 21-2, available at <http://www.ncaonline.org.uk/materials/nationalnameauthorityfile.pdf>

²⁷ There has been progress, in the local authority field, since the compilation of the questionnaires, to regard CALM as the *de facto* standard software in Wales.

percentage of all their catalogues available on archive software (as opposed to HTML or pdf-format catalogues available on the web). Apart from 2 AGSBs, which reported 100% of catalogues accessible through the software, only 5 had as much as 15-25% available.

5.2.19 Indexing thesauri employed

Apart from two that noted Library of Congress Subject Headings (in one case as dictated by ANW), and 4 that indicated that they had in-house thesauri, thesauri were not used with this software.

5.2.20 Usage of EAD

Two universities noted use of this via the Archives Hub, and one had been using EAD but was transferring to bespoke software away from the EAD standard. No local authority repository used EAD.

5.2.21 Conformity with ISAD(G)

5 repositories claimed not to use software that was ISAD(G) compatible. One however was using CALM. The others had no software or, in one case, used software designed for use in fields other than archives.

5.2.22 Conformity with ISAAR(CPF)

One local authority and 2 university repositories had adopted ISAAR(CPF). All the other 19 confirmed that they had not adopted it.

Appraisal

5.2.23 Appraisal policies

No local authority repositories had a specific appraisal policy; two university and one AGSB repository had specific policies. All those noting that they had no policy noted however that appraisal was based on their collection policy.

It would appear therefore that repositories in general rely on their collection policy to act as a 'gatekeeper' against keeping irrelevant or unimportant items.

5.2.24 Timing of appraisal

In the case of all 22 repositories appraisal was performed on accession of the material, whether or not an appraisal (as opposed to collection) policy was in existence. Later appraisal or deaccessioning was not reported except by one AGSB which has a regime of 3 yearly collection reviews, when any material deemed no longer relevant could be deaccessioned.

5.2.25 Criteria for retention or disposal

Repositories were asked for any criteria, with no suggestions being offered to them.

One university repository reported appraisal in accord with JISC retention guidelines and HEI Archival Selection criteria (but was developing in-house appraisal criteria).

One noted that internal Records Management criteria were considered. It is also clear from answers to the next question that depositors' wishes are respected as to whether appraisal can be carried out.

There did not appear to be significant variations in emphasis between different categories of repository, and all but six offered at least two separate grounds for any decision.

The criteria noted were: relevance (13 times); duplication of other material (9); professional judgement (6); importance or historical value (6); condition (4); uniqueness or type of material (4); user interest (2); financial or legal requirements for retention (2); pre-determined guidelines (2); institutional needs (2); and space (1).

The criteria were, in the main, subjective, and in essence depended on professional opinion at the point of appraisal.

5.2.26 Treatment of varying types of collection

18 repositories claimed that all collections were treated in the same way. Two of the remaining local authority repositories however noted that they used more drastic and less intuitive methods for categories such as rate books that could be sampled, and another used an individual approach dependant upon the depositor's wishes; the final respondent did not specify why the treatment varies or in what way.

A number of comments noted that pre-weeds in a record management context led to a greater destruction rate; one quoted 90%.

Generally speaking, however, all collections within a single repository are appraised according to common standards, even if these are intuitive or based on judgement.

5.2.27 Appraisal practices for collections held on deposit

19 repositories appraise and weed deposited collections (often with specific approval from depositors). The other three did not accept deposits.

5.3 GENERAL SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

It appears, understandably, that the local authority repositories share a common culture in their approach which differs somewhat from that of university repositories, which themselves share a generally common approach perhaps based on the more corporate nature of their line management. The three AGSB institutions are all so different in nature that major differences in approach are evident and were to be expected. A striking unanimity of approach was however discernible in many fields.

This is a substantially different finding to that of the much more comprehensive if sectorally more limited and geographically much more diverse survey recently published of 18 Research Library Group partners in the UK and USA which 'had "multiple metadata creation centers" on campus that included libraries, archives, and museums and had some interaction among them'. In this survey, little co-

ordination of metadata techniques was found across domains and institutions, despite a common research culture, because of the employment of a wide variety of metadata tools many of which were then customised to answer local needs.²⁸ While Wales may have a range of traditional and electronic metadata practices and tools, there is less work to do to arrive at more compatible standards within the Welsh archive domain, whatever the differences, than is evident elsewhere. Only one institution was identified in the Catalog Cymru survey where, leaving any legacy incompatibilities aside, the RLG scenario was reflected, with archives subject to a number of different cataloguing and metadata systems.

Cataloguing

Hierarchical listing methods are generally in operation, producing lists that are generally to item level and giving a fair amount of detail, although supra-repository access may be difficult because of the bulk of legacy or pre-standard catalogues. The increasing adoption of ISAD(G), CALM and the comprehensive nature of ANW fonds-level descriptions across much of the archive domain over the past 5 years or more has resulted in a new bulk of compatible material prepared to international standards, and able to be expanded.

Legacy catalogues are very largely paper based but several repositories evidenced a significant amount of retro-conversion and web availability.

All this opens up the potential for inter-repository co-operative partnerships and funding applications. Differences identified in depth of detail and data elements included may need to be resolved, but a truly national cataloguing standard, based on a definition of those elements where there is discretion allowed in ISAD(G) and other standards and systems, should be achievable, given the will to do so.

Indexing

Physical indexing does not now appear to be practiced widely across the domain, and reliance is still placed on old card indexes, while thesauri have almost exclusively been created in-house. The lack of a commonly adopted thesaurus and the unavailability of appropriate authority files is a barrier to co-ordinated progress on this front. Until such matters are given attention at all Wales level, however, free text wordsearching of digitised legacy catalogues and indexing facilities within archival software will hopefully make up for this difficulty to some degree.

Software/data standards

Local authority archives in Wales are apparently standardising on CALM software and most other archive repositories are using some other form of software for cataloguing, bespoke or commercial. ISAD(G) is being adopted as a common standard, but direct use of EAD was not noted, although it lies behind ANW and Archive Hub data sets. It is surprising that the ISAAR(CPF) standard for names was

²⁸ Karen Smith-Yoshimura, *RLG Programs Descriptive Metadata Practices Survey Results* (Dublin [Ohio], 2007) pp.4-6, available at: <http://www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-03.pdf> The author, in a message distributed on the Forum for Information Standards in Heritage (FISH) listserv [FISH@JISCMAIL.AC.UK] stated that "although we saw some expected variations in practice across libraries, archives and museums, we were struck by the high levels of customization and local tool development, the limited extent to which tools and practices are, or can be, shared (both within and across institutions), the lack of confidence institutions have in the effectiveness of their tools, and the disconnect between their interest in creating metadata to serve their primary audiences and the inability to serve that audience within the most commonly used discovery systems."

not widely adopted, as this is a widely-available international standard. Its adoption should not, however, pose any great problems except in retro-conversion contexts.

Appraisal

This is done almost universally by intuition and professional judgement based on reference to collection policies when records are accessioned. Deposited as well as transferred or donated records are appraised. Specific appraisal policies are not maintained. Later review and possible deaccessioning is only practiced in one, specialist, institution. There is scope for the development and adoption of robust and explicit policies to inform future practice in this area; many of the respondents said they would welcome the creation of model policies.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 LOCAL REQUIREMENTS

The Catalog Cymru audit is non-judgemental and the terms of reference did not extend beyond surveying existing backlogs. Individual reports on each repository's holdings will be made available in confidence to that repository but these will not make any recommendations as to facilities or practice. The Logjam report went further than this and did make (although it did not publish) individual repository recommendations; its general comments are however worth noting in summary here as the issues involved as are as relevant in Wales as in north west England:

- Additional cataloguing staff are needed in record offices to catalogue large unlisted collections as archivists have to devote much of their time to public service delivery.
- Cataloguing staff should have a recognised qualification.
- The Freedom of Information Officer of a repository's parent organisation should be aware of the extent of uncatalogued material.
- Large collections need input from more than one archivist to catalogue large collections within a reasonable timescale.
- A secure cataloguing area with computer facilities and cataloguing software will assist efficiency.
- Additional paraprofessional staffing will reduce cataloguing time and can reduce staff costs by allowing archivists to concentrate on work that requires higher professional skills – often archivists have to do clerical tasks associated with cataloguing and this is uneconomic.

These are matters for the individual repository to consider. While any strategic approach to diminishing the national backlog will need to use partnership approaches to resourcing, these points are also relevant on the wider canvas as individual repositories will still need to be the focus for delivery of the work. Repositories and their parent authorities will also, hopefully, be keen to tackle those parts of the backlog for which they are responsible and for which they can find resources locally.

6.2 NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Catalog Cymru audit has revealed a mixed picture of backlogs throughout the country; three local authority repositories and two AGSBs have significantly large backlogs, but even where the backlog is smaller, it is often substantial in terms of available cataloguing resources in the repositories concerned. There are few or no repositories where the backlog could be solved within local resources. Users throughout Wales are therefore denied access to a large part of the country's archive heritage.

In the age of electronic communication, remote access is a second issue to be addressed, and supra-repository co-ordination and liaison is needed.

Thirdly, cataloguing cannot exist in a vacuum. It is a pointless activity unless it not only allows access but also leads to use of records, hopefully by new classes of user. By making archives available, however, new opportunities for this arise. A major

consideration in any grant funding applications should be added value outputs. Some examples of this are given at 6.3 below. This will facilitate the attraction of grants, raise the profile of archives and justify the cataloguing work, while giving funders a return that fits their agenda. This removes archive funding from the purely heritage context and gives it a more general social focus that is good for archives and assists the search for funds.

Finally, archivists' skills are in short supply. The difficulties in securing professional initially found by this project are only one manifestation of that. Projects may need to include capacity building (e.g. training phases) within their framework.

It is therefore recommended that:

- 1** Further work is undertaken to ensure that compatible standards, software and systems are available in all public archive repositories and service points throughout Wales in order to provide the maximum potential for partnership and co-operative working;
- 2** Endeavours are made to reduce the national backlog by strategic planning and prioritisation of cataloguing work by individual repositories;
- 3** Correlations, common themes and resonances are researched in the 'backlog' collections across repositories to identify possible subjects for co-operative projects and funding applications;
- 4** Topics of current interest or those germane to socio-political agendas (e.g. multiculturalism, promotion of the arts) or otherwise likely to attract non-archive specific funding should be identified from among collections across a range of repositories or a single repository as appropriate;
- 5** Mechanisms to drive forward and co-ordinate a concerted local and national initiative to reduce the backlog are established and progressed either by setting up a working group or by placing backlog issues as a regular agenda item for a body such as ARCW;
- 6** While it is important to attack the priority element in the backlog, virtually everything in the backlog is potentially of value and if it can be tackled, it should be when and as funding or resourcing opportunities allow;
- 7** Any projects should consider the need for initial training to professional standard of specially recruited staff, or employ other strategies, e.g. secondment, to ensure qualified staff input;
- 8** Any projects aimed at reducing the backlog should consider, at all stages from planning through funding applications to implementation, whether additional aspects (such as encouraging use of a newly catalogued collection) would be appropriate; and that
- 9** Opportunity funding should be considered of major potential to the delivery of any national strategy through individual projects.

The national strategy will aim to have three streams:

- 1** Identification of 'quick wins' to be progressed on a local or single-repository level to achieve momentum;
- 2** Identification of single-repository schemes which need resourcing but are not suitable for multi-repository partnership bids; and
- 3** Identification of suitable fields for multi-repository projects based on geography, subject matter or required skills (e.g. Welsh language competence).

6.3 GRANTS AND TOPICS

It is probably of limited value to suggest funding sources here. The more obvious ones will be familiar to readers of this report and opportunity funding can take the seeker after grants into unexpected places. The field is also in rapid flux as funding streams appear, change and disappear on an almost annual basis.²⁹

A number of topics have emerged during the audit as ones that are common to a number of repositories. It is suggested that a topic based scheme, covering a number of collections and preferably in a number of repositories will be more attractive to most funders than an application for funds to tackle a single collection (other than the most significant, of which few individual collections were found). An examination of the table in paragraph 3.4 will give an indication of the scope. Among topics which might appear to have grant attracting potential are records of:

- Coalmining (north-east, south-east and south-west Wales)
- Iron and steel manufacture (south-east and north-east Wales)
- Shipping (south Wales seaboard and one north Wales collection)
- Railways (mainly south Wales)
- Literary correspondence
- Baptist and Methodist denominations
- Theological colleges
- Broadcasting production and scripts
- Welsh composers.

There are also large numbers of title deed collections, solicitors' accumulations and personal papers which would repay some detailed examination to identify themes that could form the basis of cooperative bids.

It is clear that the quarter sessions records found in every county record office are catalogued to varying depths of detail (if at all) and this very rich if much underused historical source could benefit from a Wales-wide exercise to get lists to a consistent level of detail.

6.4 EXAMPLES OF PROJECT OPPORTUNITIES

Detailed work on the Catalog Cymru database and consideration of archive-specific and general funding sources will have to be performed in pursuit of the above strategy. The following examples merely suggest the sort of potential that can be detected from the database and the sort of funding that might be accessed. They are based on actual collections surveyed, but they have not been discussed with the repositories concerned as they are examples of what might be feasible and may not prove viable.

Strategy stream 1

²⁹ A good overview of the sort of funding available is to be found in Matthews Millman Ltd, *Semlac MLA British Library Funding Research*, Final Report, March 2004, and the rather more discursive but by now more outdated J. Lomax, et al, *A Guide to Additional Sources of Funding & Revenue for Libraries & Archives*, 2nd Edition, London, 2000, British Library. More recently published, the report by Jayne Austen, *Making the Case: The argument for funding documentation backlogs* (MDA, 2007) should be required reading for anyone considering backlog listing; it is available at: http://www.collectionslink.org.uk/raise_funds.

It is hoped that this project will have identified small collections in need of listing that repositories will be able to prioritise within normal cataloguing programmes. If any national programme to tackle backlog cataloguing is undertaken, it is important that such work is logged and costed so that it may be included as partnership in-kind funding if required to secure further resources from outside. In other cases, as below, small local funding initiatives may be appropriate. It is important, however, to utilise any external funding as a match to attract further grants wherever this is possible.

<p>Scenario</p> <p>A collection of brewery records, including old publicity material, is in need of a detailed catalogue. The record office is seeking to extend the number of its item-level catalogues available on the web.</p>
<p>Project description</p> <p>Listing 1.5 linear metres of records (not volumes) to item level, to take 4 weeks, suitable for pre-course experience for prospective archives student under supervision; and making available on RO website.</p>
<p>Non-archival benefits</p> <p>Brewery company uses items identified in publicity work.</p>
<p>Potential funding</p> <p>Sponsorship of student by Brewery: £1k in exchange for first access to catalogue and logo on web page where catalogue available. RO provides office and personnel services, sundries and professional supervision from core budgets.</p>

Strategy stream 2

<p>Scenario</p> <p>A county archives service has several discrete collections of deeds emanating from one area a good distance from the record office. Together they create an excellent picture of landholdings from 1700 to 1950.</p>
<p>Project description</p> <p>About 3.5 linear metres of deeds and allied estate records relating to small estates and farms require full listing. This is achieved with co-operation of a local Millennium history group who, after specific training (e.g. in reading period-specific handwriting and data entry), can support an archivist by performing para-professional tasks. After the listing is complete, the two local schools will be involved in visits to the record office and school-based project work, including remote access to catalogue via the internet.</p>
<p>Non-archival benefits</p> <p>Life long learning opportunities and multi-discipline teaching for primary children, together allowing cross-generational involvement in local heritage in an area with dispersed population and incomers.</p>
<p>Potential funding</p> <p><£5k from Big Lottery Fund Awards for All Wales, <£500 PTA/school, £100 local history group, £200 from RO outreach budget to pay transport costs for group, local computer access point, local event to conclude project, overtime for RO staff for evening visit, local material costs. RO in-kind contribution of professional time, computer access at RO, consumables.</p>

Strategy stream 3

<p>Scenario</p> <p>A total of 5 repositories from different sectors identify a group of collections relating</p>

to railways along a main east-west corridor. Together these provide a resource for railway history for which there is at present no alternative. The records testify to coalfield and industrial traffic and British-Irish main line working.

Project description

By opening these collections to the public and associating them with other collections already available, a critical mass of railway-based archives can be created providing a new resource both at item level and by way of a union guide to local sources. An exhibition could be created at a tourist focus in western Wales. A total of 12 collections are involved, extending to 60 linear metres; Logjam software has calculated 12 months professional time to catalogue these and a further 8 months to make them fully accessible digitally. Cleaning, boxing and some conservation work will be included and an allowance of £10k in the budget will be made for this. It is also estimated that a guide to regional railway records will take a further 6 months. Links with an Irish historical institution will be sought and shipping/railway records for the Irish Sea Crossing investigated by them on a joint basis, sharing professional techniques and experiences.³⁰ User groups will be identified or established to kick start exploitation of the material. These ancillary activities will be costed at £15k. A project management board will oversee the project and a project leader will be identified from among the partners' personnel; their time on the project is costed at £200/day for 2 days/month. The overall project is designed to instil confidence in prospective funders and provide a number of access routes into the material, while also taking advantage of the Interreg funding opportunity. Adjustments will be made to the value added elements after discussion with potential funders.

Non-archival benefits

Promotion of tourism and possible links with Ireland. Provision of academic research aid.

Potential funding

A total of £102k is sought for salaries, oncosts, travelling and sundries. A funding package might be made up as follows:

HLF 'Your Heritage' grant: £35k

Interreg IIIA Western Wales/Eastern Ireland: £30k (Welsh element)

Business sponsorship (railway operating company): £6k

Business charity trust contribution, etc: £6k

Friends' organisations: £2k

Archive Partner contributions (financial): £5k

Archive Partner contributions (in kind – conservation facilities): £6k

Archive Partner contributions (in kind – accounting/personnel/accommodation etc): £12k

NOTE: *a project of this size will require a lead partner to hold budgets, etc. It is important that the lead partner is chosen for maximum effect when applying for grants: e.g. HLF notes a preference for funding 'not for profit' bodies for their 'Your Heritage' scheme. AGSBs may not be eligible to apply for European (including Interreg) funding, but may be able to partake in a wider partnership in which other parties are eligible to receive such funds. Sponsors may be more comfortable giving grants to charities. Larger projects may benefit grant-wise by being run by an independent organisation formed for the purpose by the partners.*

³⁰ In fact, Interreg partners can be interested in very different subjects and can be from totally different sectors, provided they have a desire to exchange expertise or combine operations at some meaningful level. Thus a record office interested in scanning documents for sale on demand might hypothetically be able e.g. to form a partnership relationship with an internet sales company who wish to develop techniques in the not for profit/leisure field, and secure Interreg funding to share experiences and trial procedures.

6.5 RESOURCES REQUIRED

The highest priority collections would require 38 staff years to catalogue. The higher medium and high priority collections together would require 114 years and the full backlog would require 297 years or, including the time needed for additional cataloguing work, 436 years.³¹

A very rough costing for archivist input, including on-costs, of around £25000 per annum; para-professional input at around £18000 p.a.; and charges for line management, accommodation, computer hardware, software licences, and sundries, of around £5000 per staff year might be predicated. The latter might usually be provided as a contribution in kind but should be costed in at planning stage.

	High Priority		Medium-high/High Priority		All Backlog	
	Basic	Further work	Basic	Further work	Basic	Further work
Archivists	750000	350000	2425000	1025000	6550000	900000
Para-prof.	144000	324000	306000	963000	1944000	2502000
Other charges	190000	160000	570000	475000	1485000	695000
TOTAL COST	1084000	1244000	3301000	2463000	9979000	4097000

Table 25

Based on the Logjam formula for calculating time required and on the rough costs as above, it would appear that to produce catalogues of the highest priority collections would cost a little over £1m, or £1.3m if the additional work were to be done to make them fully accessible remotely and usable on a supra-repository level.

Similarly the backlog of Medium-high/High priority collections would cost £3.3m (or £6m) to tackle.

The cost of tackling the whole backlog of 15km linear shelf run so that catalogues were available for all Wales' archives would be around £10m, or a little over £14m if all additional cataloguing work was also to be done.

These figures do not include costs of added value activities such as the appointment of education or interpretation staff to engage the public with outreach activity, or capital costs of storage facilities for catalogued records, etc. These are items that should be included as required in any bid costings.

It cannot be overemphasised that costs vary depending on local conditions and rising prices, and no scheme should be costed on the above basis. The calculation is merely to give a rough calculation of the approximate global costs involved.

³¹ i.e. the requirement for additional work where detailed item level descriptions with access points are required as an output beyond the basic standard of cataloguing.

Appendix 1

Participating Repositories

ARCHON code	Repository	Type of service
GB 0208	Flintshire Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0209	Denbighshire Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0210	National Library of Wales	AGSB
GB 0211	Carmarthenshire Archives Service	Local government archive service
GB 0212	Ceredigion Archives	Local government archive service
GB 0213	Pembrokeshire Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0214	Glamorgan Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0216	West Glamorgan Archive Service	Local government archive service
GB 0217	University of Wales Swansea	University archive service
GB 0218	Gwent Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0219	Caernarfon Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0220	Meirionnydd Archives	Local government archive service
GB 0221	Anglesey County Record Office	Local government archive service
GB 0222	University of Wales Bangor	University archive service
GB 0223	Powys County Archives Service	Local government archive service
GB 0546	National Museums and Galleries of Wales	AGSB
GB 0982	University of Wales Aberystwyth	University archive service
GB 1239	Cardiff University Library, Special Collections and Archives	University archive service
GB 1775	Wrexham: A N Palmer Centre	Local government archive service
GB 1952	RCAHMW	AGSB
GB 1953	University of Wales Lampeter	University archive service

Appendix 2

Criteria for assessment of collections

For reasons of consistency it was decided to adopt the general definitions of complexity, cataloguing level required and local and regional significance criteria as used for the *LogJam* survey. It became evident however that the *LogJam* definition of national significance was unsuitable for adoption in a Welsh context where the word 'national' is open to differing interpretations.

Definitions of the Cataloguing Complexity of an uncatalogued collection

Very Complex – Typically a family and estate collection would merit a rating of 100. This is traditionally a very complex type of collection to catalogue and in most instances there is very little original order left. Personal papers may relate to a myriad of different family members and large bundles of title deeds add to the complexity. Parts of the collection may require expertise in medieval palaeography.

Complex – A collection of business records would usually be regarded as complex to catalogue and would warrant a rating of 80. Whilst one would expect to find a consistent series of records such as financial and administrative records, each business conducts itself uniquely. In many instances it may be difficult to recreate original order.

Moderate – A collection of Urban District Council records would merit a rating of 60. In most instances the records created are quite consistent and would contain a large run of minutes and rate books. In very few cases would there be any palaeographical difficulties.

Moderately Straightforward – Hospital records are usually moderately straightforward to catalogue. The records are usually consistent, mostly comprising of admission registers, patient and staff records and financial volumes.

Straightforward – A collection of council minutes.

Criteria to define the Cataloguing Level required for a collection

High: A catalogue useable by the public did not exist. Only the accession record or basic level description existed

Medium: Basic collection level description existed and/or the collection had been box listed

Low: Collection and series level descriptions completed to ISAD(G) basic level. Descriptions only required at file level

Criteria for determining the significance of records

Local - Geographically close community, for example a parish, town or city

- Records of local, political, social or historical importance
- Records of local significance for the study of humanities, arts, sciences and technology
- Records of evidential value for the local community

Regional –County level or region (e.g. north Wales, west Wales)

- Records of significance for regional communities
- Records of regional, political, social or historical importance
- Records of regional significance for the study of humanities, arts, sciences and technology
- Records of evidential value for the regional community

National Significance

Importance

A full representation of an aspect of the activities of an organisation which has made a contribution to:

- Social, economic, political or cultural life
- Developments in science, technology, agriculture or industry
- The natural environment
- The life and works of a person who has made a contribution to the social, economic, political or cultural life; or has
- Association with other collections

Quality

- *Comprehensiveness*: of a sufficient size and richness of relevant material to enable it to be regarded as representative
- *Uniqueness and authenticity*: demonstrating rarity, intactness or integrity of individual items or groups of items
- *Informational value*: an acknowledged key source for study of a given subject, an acknowledged source of public enjoyment

For a collection to be deemed significant some of the criteria from both the 'importance' and 'quality' areas must be met. Collections allocated a national significance score can be significant at Welsh or British levels, or have international or non-territorial relevance.

All collections assessed as having medium or high *regional* significance qualify for consideration under *national* significance.

Appendix 3

Collection sub-groups

These were modified somewhat from the Logjam sub-groups to take Welsh circumstances into consideration. Those used are listed in the table below:

Public Records	Official Records	Others
Assizes and Crown Court Records	Boards of Guardians of the Poor	Antiquarian Collections
Charity Commission	Borough/City Council (pre-1974)	Business: Architects/Building/Civil Engineering
Coroner's Records	Charity	Business: Brewing
County Court Records	Civil Parish / Community Council	Business: Chemical
Hospital and Health Records	County Council (1881-1996)	Business: Engineering
Insurance and Pension Committees	District Council (1974-1996)	Business: Gas
Land Tax Commissioners	Drainage and River Boards	Business: Manufacturing
National Coal Board	Electricity Boards	Business: Mining/Extractive industry
Other public records	Gas and Water Records	Business: other
Petty Sessions	Highway and Bridge Boards	Business: Railways
Prisons	Hospital and Health Records	Business: Retailing
Quarter Sessions	Other local govt	Business: Shipbuilding/Repairing
Registrar of Shipping and Seamen	Other Official	Business: Shipping/trade
Tithe and Manorial Records	Police Records	Business: Solicitors
Valuation Office	Rural District Council	Business: Textiles
	School Boards	Business: Waterways
	School Records	Campaign groups
	Shrievalty and Lieutenancy	Charity
	Tithe and Manorial Records	Christian: Anglican
	Turnpike Trusts	Christian: Baptist
	UA	Christian: Congregational and United Reformed
	Urban District Council	Christian: Methodist Church
		Christian: Other
		Christian: Presbyterian and Calvinistic Methodist
		Christian: Roman Catholic
		Christian: Society of Friends
		Employees'/Employers' Associations
		Estate/Family
		Miscellaneous accumulations
		Multi-provenance collections
		Party Political Papers
		Personal Papers
		Research Collections
		University and college
		Voluntary sector

These were subsequently further divided by use of a free text description.

Provision was made for the following categories of sub-group but in the event no relevant collections were identified:

Public Records	Official Records	Others
Board of Trade	Joint Boards	Business: Banking/Finance
Court of Great Sessions	Sanitary Authorities	Christian: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
Customs and Excise		Christian: Pentecostal
Lord Chancellor's Advisory Committee		Christian: Unitarians
Probate Records		Religion: Other
Vehicle Licensing		

Appendix 4

Cataloguing standards questionnaire

Cataloguing

1 Treatment of multiple deposits

Is every accession considered a separate collection, or are multiple accruals considered to be part of a single collection?

Always separate Depends Always single

Comments:

2 Reference code structure

2a Are reference codes for collections arbitrary (e.g. A1087) or meaningful (e.g. B/DBC)?

Arbitrary Depends Meaningful

Comments:

2b How are hierarchical relationships within collections assigned and displayed? (ie classed by material, series, box)

Comments:

3 Levels adopted

How many levels of cataloguing are used (maximum)?

What is the smallest unit of subdivision? (e.g. file, single item, bundle)

Is there any difference between units of record and units of production?

Are the catalogues arranged to reflect multiple levels? Are they arranged in special order (correspondence alphabetically by recipient; by catalogue number not date)

Comments:

4 Cataloguing standards

What guidelines or standards are used to formulate catalogues e.g. ISAD(G), MAD, in house templates? When were your current guidelines adopted?

5 Formats of catalogue

Can you provide estimates of % material or collections covered by cataloguing in different formats:

card index only

paper catalogue only

digital: text file/ Word document

digital: database

digital: web text

other (specify)

Note that this excludes separate indexes: see Indexing.

6 Remote availability of catalogues

What % of catalogues are available to remote users, in which formats:

ANW (fonds level only)

ANW (full)

repository website: HTML

repository website: PDF
repository website: text file
repository website: CALM web interface
Other (specify)

7 Catalogue content

7a What data elements are included within the descriptions – historically & currently?

Title and ref code
Introduction/ admin biog history
Accession/source
Dates
Scope and content
Archivist's note / date of cataloguing
Other

7b What % of your catalogues are of the following level of detail:

transcript [word for word]
calendar [all essentials abstracted]
long summary [narrative giving details of content]
short summary [content described not given]
basic listing by item [title/ date]
basic listing by file or series

Indexing

8 What indexing standards have been used historically (with approx % for each)?

9 What indexing standards are currently used (if applicable, with % for each)?

10 Percentage of holdings that are indexed

11 Are specific types of collection indexed/not indexed?

12 What thesauri are used?

13 Are authority files used/created?

14 Physical format of indexes (e.g. card, hard copy, word processed, database (specify)), with % for each)

15 Are indexes available to remote users?

Software/data standards

16 Does the archive service have a database (CALM / other)?

17 What use is made of it?

18 What proportion of currently-catalogued material is held in it?

19 What thesauri are used for indexing? Which are local thesauri? (maintained by the RO)

20 Is EAD used? If so, how?

21 At what date was ISADG adopted? What proportion of existing cataloguing conforms?

22 At what date was ISAARCPF adopted? What proportion of existing cataloguing conforms?

Appraisal

- 23 Do you have a written appraisal policy? If not, what practice is followed?
- 24 Does your policy specify when appraisal should occur? If so, when
- 25 What criteria for retention or disposal are applied?
- 26 Are all types of collection treated in the same way?
- 27 Do you apply appraisal practices to collections held on deposit?

Appendix 5

Examples of typical types of catalogue entry

To demonstrate the nature of the various types of catalogue for which details were sought in the Survey of Cataloguing Standards, the following list of examples was prepared. They were taken at random from lists available on the internet and were deliberately selected as being typical pre-ISAD(G) catalogue entries of the sort that might be found in most repositories. They are not intended as exemplars of best practice, but as a way of demonstrating the categories listed at question 7 of the Cataloguing Methods and Resources Questionnaire.

CALENDAR

XD2/7357 1576 Oct.11 COPY NUNCUPATIVE WILL of John Wynne ap Hughe of Bodwell, Esq.. Bequests comprise chest to son and heir Hughe Wynne, and all household stuff and plate and all takings of benefice of Llannor to his son and heir Thomas Wyn; 3/4d to repair Bangor Cathedral; all money on mortgage to Hughe Wynne on condition that he keeps his illegitimate bro., William ap John Wynne, at school; all rents and arrears for farms due last Michaelmas to Elyn, dau. of Hugh Wynne; double wages to all household servants; half sheep in Boddell Kuwarche to Morris Griffith; 8 head of 2-year-old cattle to Hughe David ap Hughe, 4 to Hugh ap Robert ap Howell, and 2 to Hughe ap Richarde ap David; tenement rent free for two years to Elin verch Rees ap Howell and Eignion [sic]; £5.6.8d to poor of parishes Aberdaron and Llannor. Lists debts due to him. Executor: son Thomas Gwynne. Appended: COPY GRANT of Probate (3 November 1576) Copy [of c.1908] from P.C.C. 30 Carew. [N.L.W. Bodfean 15]

LONG SUMMARY

XD2/15033 1764 Dec. 22 LETTER: Dr. James Grant, Edinburgh to [?Mr. Grant] asking the recipient to ask for a loan of the sum of £15 from Mr. Colquhn Grant, and sending his regards to Mrs. Grant. [N.L.W. Glynllivon 2496]

SHORT SUMMARY

XG1/32 1837 May 8 ORDER setting up Pwllheli Poor Law Union and setting out conditions for the Workhouse of the Board of Guardians

BASIC LISTING BY ITEM

XG1/1 1837-1839 Minute Book

BASIC LISTING BY FILE/BUNDLE

XPEN/759/2 1931-1937 CORRESPONDENCE between the Penmaenmawr and Welsh Granite Company and the National Union of Sett Makers. Also bills of prices agreed between the company and the union

BASIC LISTING BY SERIES

XD2A/1-1712 GLYNLLIFON: ESTATE PLANS

These plans relate mainly to the fabric of estate properties, although there are some surveys and maps of lands and plans of machinery and installations. The bulk were found together in the estate office, although a few which have been found among the rest of the estate's large archive have been listed here. Miscellaneous documents which had no apparent connection with the plans listed here but which were found with them have been listed in the main catalogue of documents. However, letters, specifications etc. linked to plans listed here have been retained in this part of the Newborough Archive.