

Volume 1

Development of a best practice model for conservation and preservation assessment plans for cultural collections

**Final Project Report:
Methodology and Analysis**

A Heritage Collections Council project

undertaken by

Artlab Australia

in partnership with the

History Trust of South Australia

and the

State Library of New South Wales

February 1999

THANK YOU

Numerous people and organisations have contributed willingly to this project from within Australia and internationally.

The project partners on behalf of the Collections Management and Conservation Working Party of the Heritage Collection Council thank you for your enthusiasm, help and support.

May 1999

Table of contents

1. Summary	3
2. Project overview	6
3. Project methodology	7
4. Consultative process.....	10
4.1 Summary of workshop outcomes.....	10
4.1.1 <i>State Library of New South Wales, Sydney</i>	10
4.1.2 <i>Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide</i>	11
4.1.3 <i>Copper Coast Council, Kadina, South Australia</i>	11
5. Assessment of existing models	12
5.1 Listings of models assessed.....	13
5.1.1 <i>International models</i>	13
5.1.2 <i>Australian models</i>	14
5.2 Assessment criteria.....	19
5.3 Assessment summaries	21
5.3.1 <i>International</i>	21
5.3.2 <i>Australian</i>	48
5.4 Best practice - issues to be considered.....	73
5.5 Summary of outstanding models.....	75
5.5.1 <i>Outstanding international models</i>	75
5.5.2 <i>Outstanding Australian models</i>	76
6. Design criteria for draft model	79
7. Recommendations and conclusions	81
Attachment 1. Organisations approached for examples of existing models and related information.....	83
7.1 International	83
7.2 Australian.....	84
7.3 Other sources of information	84
Attachment 2. Workshop participants	85
State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.....	85
Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide.....	86
Copper Coast Council, Kadina, South Australia	87

1. Summary

The Heritage Collections Council (HCC) is an initiative of the Australian Cultural Ministers Council and represents a partnership among Museums, the States and Territories and the Federal Government.

The HCC established the Collections Management and Conservation Working Party (CM&CWP) to support and implement its objectives relating to collections management and conservation.

Specifically the CM&CWP, in conjunction with other HCC working parties, aims to:

- increase the knowledge, conservation and preservation, use and appreciation of Australia's heritage collections, including via on-line applications and
- encourage an acknowledgment and reinforcement of the value of original objects, collections and institutions in telling Australia's story, and their role in linking all Australians with their cultural heritage.

As part of its broad program, the CM&CWP engaged a consultancy team consisting of:

- Artlab Australia;
- History Trust of South Australia;
- State Library of New South Wales;

to review existing models for conservation and preservation assessment plans, including risk analysis models, and identify best practice examples, which can be promoted to museums, including through Australian Museums On Line (AMOL).

The preparation of conservation and preservation assessment plans is considered integral to the conservation and preservation of museum collections. Good conservation and preservation assessment plans involve assessment of priorities based on a knowledge of the significant items in a collection as well as records of the history and context of an object or objects within an organisation.

This consultancy falls within the Collections Management objective of the *National Strategy for the Conservation and Preservation of Australia's Cultural Heritage Collections*, that is "To ensure that collection management and access programs incorporate conservation and preservation procedures and practices", and specifically address Key Strategy CM4, that is to "Review existing Australian and international models for conservation and preservation assessment plans, including risk analysis models and asset management, and promote the use of best practice examples".

During the implementation of the consultancy, especially in the process of widespread consultation, the project team found general enthusiasm for the review process and the development of a national model for conservation assessment for Australian collection. Similarly, both national and international organisations that provided information were keen to see the outcomes of the consultancy.

Small museums that were consulted were especially enthusiastic about the model because it provided them with a clearer opportunity to be involved in the conservation assessment of their organisations as opposed to “just being told what to do by visiting experts”.

The model, which has been developed as the major outcome of the project, is largely an amalgamation of the best aspects of a number of existing systems and approaches. Some outstanding examples of assessment plans have been examined, including:

- *The illustrated Burra charter : Making good decisions about the care of important places* (P Marquis-Kyle and M Walker, Australian ICOMOS - 1994).
- *Preserving natural science collections : Chronicle of our environmental heritage* (National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property - 1993).
- *Levels of Collection Care* (Museum and Galleries Commission of the UK - 1998).
- *The Conservation Assessment : A tool for planning, implementing and fundraising* (Getty Conservation Institute/National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property - 1990).

Use of the proposed model should lead to more transparent and accountable conservation assessments. It proposes a stronger emphasis on stakeholder consultation and the use of a broader terms of reference in the assessment process. The result should be more practical reports, which will have greater stakeholder support.

The project team was not required to advise on the future use of the model, however, it believes that the draft model should be seen in the context of a longer term strategy. Four recommendations are therefore provided for the future development of the project.

1. The posting of the model on Australian Museums On Line should be structured to provide an opportunity for industry dialogue and debate, which will further refine the model. The debate will also assist in the development of a focused campaign to promote the model to all sectors of the industry.

2. The model should be presented in an illustrated booklet format, which is readily accessible to all users: museums and conservators. In particular, small and regional museums that will be the purchasers of conservation assessments should be able to refer to the booklet to inform themselves about the conservation assessment process and engage in constructive discussions with the service provider.
3. Conservators will be the principal implementers of the model. To encourage their adoption of the model, the Heritage Collections Council should work closely with the Australian Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Material to promote the model. It may be possible for the institute to link the use of the model to its professional accreditation program.
4. In the long term, and if there is industry consensus, the model should be developed into a formal industry standard. Such a standard will ensure a high level of quality in the preparation of conservation assessment plans to support and improve the preservation of Australia's cultural heritage.

DISCLAIMER

Information from a variety of sources has been assessed for the purposes of this study. Some of this material has not been published and is generally not available.

A large number of the reports examined were not developed specifically as models for conservation and preservation assessment planning. Nevertheless much of this material is of interest in terms of the information it contributes to the topic.

In the current analyses, aspects of some items have been rated poorly in terms of the evaluation criteria. This does not mean that they would be assessed similarly against different criteria for different purposes.

For further information contact the Heritage Collections Council Secretariat at:

Heritage Collections Council Secretariat
Department of Communications, Information Technology & The Arts
GPO Box 2154
Canberra ACT 2001
Phone: (02) 6271 1094
Fax: (02) 6271 1122
email: hcc.mail@dcita.gov.au

2. Project overview

The consortium consisting of Artlab Australia, the History Trust of South Australia and the State Library of New South Wales was formed in response to the invitation to tender for the consultancy from the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts on behalf of the Collections Management and Conservation Working Party of the HCC.

The objectives of the project was for the consultant to:

- review existing national and international models for conservation and preservation assessment plus,
- assess their applicability to the Australian Museum Sector.
- Consult with conservators and heritage consultants undertaking conservation assessments in Australia.
- Document local and regional issues in relation to conservation and preservation assessment plus,
- draft a report recommending best practice models.

In formulating its proposal, the consortium drew on its considerable experience in preparing conservation assessment plans for widely varying clients ranging from small regional museums to state and national institutions.

Considerable debate occurred within the consortium about who would use the guidelines. In particular, should they be specifically for small and regional museums to use to prepare their own conservation plans or were they for the use of the heritage industry more broadly. The final consensus was that the guidelines would be for the use of the heritage industry more broadly and that they would be presented in a way that would allow both clients (collection custodians) and service providers (conservators, curators, historians, architects) to use them to understand each other's requirements, expectations and constraints.

It is anticipated that the guidelines, once refined through practical application, could be developed into an agreed formal industry standard. At the outset there was no intention to create a 'pro forma' approach to the guidelines, rather the approach was to define the fundamental principles which need to be addressed in preparing an assessment plan.

The consortium applied a strategic planning methodology to develop the guidelines. Existing plans, models, systems and related material from international, national and local sources were reviewed and their applications, strengths and weaknesses assessed. A draft model was developed and tested against the requirements of Australian colleagues through a series of brainstorming workshops in Sydney and in South Australia. Through this process the opportunities and constraints for the application of the model were determined. The draft model was then further refined.

3. Project methodology

Within the overall budgetary constraints of the project, a project methodology was developed to create a model for preparing conservation assessment plans which drew upon existing work in the field and which allowed for the consultation of as wide a cross-section of the industry as possible.

The project methodology, broken down into activities, was as follows:

Step 1 Undertaking a preliminary review of existing national and international models to develop draft assessment criteria.

The existing models and related information were accessed by writing to, telephoning and e-mailing organisations internationally and nationally. A large amount of useful materials collected were not models but information on the topic. A list of organisations contacted is presented in Appendix 1.

A preliminary assessment was needed because the existing models varied greatly in approach, methodology and scope. To assess the strengths and weakness of the models a standardised set of assessment criteria was developed (see Section 5).

Step 2 Conducting a brain storming session among/by the project team to develop a general strategic approach to conservation assessment planning.

This was a critical decision-making stage since it affected both the assessment criteria for existing models and the form and content of the Australian model.

It was necessary to determine how the model would be used, ie would the model be used by small museums to develop their own conservation plans or would the model be for use by the industry more broadly, often where small museums would be a client of an appropriately qualified consultant. A consensus was reached by debating the long term trends in the development of conservation and the heritage industry in Australia and positioning the model to best advance the *National Policy and National Strategy for the Conservation of Movable Heritage*.

In effect it was agreed that the model would be used by both client and consultant, ie. it would be used by a broad variety of stakeholders.

Step 3 Developing draft assessment criteria for reassessing existing national and international models.

Once the preliminary assessment of existing models was complete and the use of the model determined, assessment criteria were developed to undertake a more detailed strengths and weaknesses analysis of the existing models.

Step 4 In order to test the early conclusions of the project team, a workshop of industry representatives was held to examine:

- how the model would be used.
- who would use it.
- the assessment criteria for existing models.

As a result of this process, it was possible to fine tune the assessment criteria as well as better understand its application within the museum sector.

Step 5 Undertaking a detailed assessment of existing national and international models.

The purpose of this step was to draw together the vast amount of information relevant to the consultancy. This information included existing models used in Australia and around the world and other material including studies and reports, which could provide input into the process.

By testing the strengths and weaknesses of the models against the assessment criteria, key approaches and methodologies were identified for possible inclusion in the Australian model.

Step 6 Developing design criteria for an Australian model.

Through a brainstorming session by the project team and drawing upon the information from the detailed assessment of the existing models, a set of design criteria for the Australian model was developed. The design criteria specify the characteristics of the model, the presentation style and the communication objectives taking into account the use of the model in the Australian context.

Step 7 Developing the preliminary draft model outline.

Based on the design criteria and drawing together the key elements of existing models, a preliminary draft model outline was developed. This would be used to illustrate the design concepts to participants in subsequent consultative workshops.

Step 8 Conducting workshops to consult with heritage industry about draft model outline.

Two workshops were held to present the model design concepts to industry representatives from both large and small collecting institutions. Based on feedback from these workshops the model outline was further refined.

Step 9 Developing the final version of the model.

The refined model was developed into its completed form by expanding each of the elements and developing examples to illustrate their meaning.

Step 10 Presenting the model to Collections Management and Conservation Working Party via Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.

Step 11 Posting the draft model on the Australian Museums On Line website and inviting comment.

Step 12 Refining the web version and getting people to use and continue to provide feedback.

4. Consultative process

The scope of the project placed some limitations on the extent to which widespread consultation could take place. Nevertheless, the project team felt that broad consultation was essential to the future acceptance of the model. A two stage consultative strategy was developed which could be adapted to fit a variety of conditions.

The initial and principal stage of consultation consisted of a series of three workshops held at critical times in the development phase of the project.

The workshops were held at:

- State Library of New South Wales, Sydney
- Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide
- Copper Coast Council Town Hall, Kadina, SA

A summary of the outcomes of these workshops is presented below and a list of workshop participants is presented at Appendix 2.

The final stage of consultation will occur after presentation of the draft model. This process will consist of posting the model on the Australian Museums On Line website and inviting comments via e-mail from potential users. These comments will help shape the strategy for promoting the model to the industry and may also result in further refinement of the model.

4.1 Summary of workshop outcomes

4.1.1 State Library of New South Wales, Sydney

The primary purpose of this workshop was to discuss the broad design concepts for the proposed national model for conservation assessment plans. The participants for this workshop represented large collecting institutions with considerable experience in conservation planning.

There was general support for the concept of a nationally accepted model. The principal thrust of discussions was therefore centred on the form and content of the Australian model. The following design elements were identified as essential to the future success of the model:

- the model needs to be workable in many contexts, from large to small agencies, which are managed in diverse ways.
- education and training in the use of the model must be an integral component of its introduction to clients.

- the model must be adaptable and flexible, so that it can be applied across a diversity of needs, and a modular format best meets this requirement.
- the style and language must be easily accessible to the widest range of stakeholders
- the model must embrace three broad functions, namely:
 - * collections information.
 - * examination and analysis of this information.
 - * development of recommendations as a response to the identification of issues which will effect the longevity of the collection or item.
- the incorporation of a review process in the model so that the action and results are regularly reassessed and modified as appropriate.

4.1.2 Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide

The purpose of this workshop was to discuss some of the information gathered in the review of existing national and international models and to present and discuss a preliminary design for an Australian model.

The participants represented both large and small collecting institutions.

There was general support for the model design that was put forward with several participants indicating that a uniform approach to conservation assessment plans would significantly improve their ability to manage their collections.

The small museum representatives emphasised the need for non-technical language to be used as much as possible. This segment also suggested that the reporting phase include a draft report presented to the museum committee so that they were given an opportunity to comment on the recommendations before they are finalised.

4.1.3 Copper Coast Council, Kadina, South Australia

The participants of the workshop represented the regional museum sector.

The purpose of the workshop was to present the design of the model and to receive feedback about the applicability of the model in a typical area of regional Australia.

Again the concept and design were greeted favourably with the main comments related to:

- sensitivity of the model to the “politics” of regional museum committees.
- training of people who would implement the model so that they have the diplomatic skills to present difficult recommendations without offending the efforts of museum volunteers.
- using concise/clear language.

5. Assessment of existing models

The following table lists the information that was assessed as part of the investigation into existing national and international models. The assessment process informed the design of the draft model for Australia.

Some of the material examined could not be considered 'models' or examples of assessment plans as such. However, some of this material was very valuable in gaining a broad understanding of the issues being explored. Some of the material has not been published and is generally not available.

A large number of the reports examined were not developed specifically as models for conservation and preservation assessment planning. Nevertheless much of this material is of interest in terms of the information it contributes to the topic.

In the current analyses, aspects of some items have been rated poorly in terms of the evaluation criteria. This does not mean that they would be assessed similarly against different criteria for different purposes.

See next page.

5.1 Listings of models assessed

5.1.1 International models

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
Audiovisual Loan Service (AVLS) 1998		AVLS Internet home page. http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/solinet/disproc.htm	The Disaster Planning process.
Canadian Council of Archives 1995	J Dalley	book	The Conservation Assessment guide for Archives.
Canadian Museum of Nature 1995	R Waller	Storage of Natural History collections : a Preventive Conservation approach - Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections. (article)	Risk Management applied to Preventive Conservation.
Colombia University Libraries 1991	C Harris, C Mandel and R Wolven	Libraries Resources and Technical Services 35. (article)	A Cost Model for Preservation : The Columbia University's approach.
Getty Conservation Institute / National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property 1990		books	The Conservation Assessment : A tool for Planning, Implementing and Fundraising.
International Centre for the study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage (ICCROM) 1998		Sent by personal e-mail. May be available on Internet - not known.	Preventive Conservation Indicators.

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
International Centre for the study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage (ICCROM) / International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) / UNESCO 1998	B M Fielden and J Jokilehto	article	Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites.
Libraries Board of the University of Oxford 1993	K Swift	The Paper Conservator 17 - The Institute of Paper Conservation. (articles)	The Oxford Preservation Survey : The Main Survey.
Logical Management Systems 1998	G Sikich	http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byauth/sikich/allhz.html	“All Hazards” Crisis Management Planning.
B Lord and G Dexter Lord 1998		article	The Museum Planning Process.
Ministry of Wealth, Health and Cultural Affairs 1990		book	Delta Plan for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the Netherlands.
M Munley 1986		article	Asking the right questions : Evaluation and the Museum Mission.
Museums and Galleries Commission of the UK 1998		book	Levels of Collection Care: A self assessment checklist for UK Museums.
National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property 1993		book	Preserving Natural Science Collections: Chronicle of our Environmental Heritage.

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
New York State Archives 1996	M Holden	Abbey Newsletter Vol 20, No 7 - Society of American Archivists. http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byorg/abbey/an/an20/an20-7/an20-709.html	Customised tools for assessing preservation and access needs.
Northeast Document Conservation Centre 1994	Dr M Child	article	Preservation Planning.
Scottish Museums Council 1993	H Creasy	The Paper Conservator 17 - The Institute of Paper Conservation. (article)	A survey in a day : cost effective surveys of museum collections in Scotland.
UNESCO 1989	M Filippi, C Aghemo, G Cassetta, C Lombardi and M Vaudetti	Museum 164, No 4 (article)	Auditing the museum environment : A project in Italy's Piedmont region.
University of Iowa	R W Atkinson	Library Resources and Technical Services 30. (article)	Selection for preservation : A materialistic approach.

5.1.2 Australian models

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
Artlab Australia 1991		report	Conservation Management Review of Loxton Historical Village, South Australia.
Artlab Australia 1989		report	Conservation Management Review of the Old Highercombe Hotel Folk Museum, South Australia.
Artlab Australia 1990		report	Conservation Standards of Exhibition Venues for the 1990 Adelaide Festival.
Artlab Australia 1994		report	St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney Artworks Conservation Report.
Australis ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) 1994	P Marquis-Kyle and M Walker	book	The Illustrated Burra Charter : Making good decisions about the Care of Important Places.
Conservation Training Australia draft manual Heritage Collections Committee (HCC) 1998		hard copy	Developing a Conservation Plan.
Conservation Training Australia draft manual Heritage Collections Committee (HCC) 1998		hard copy	Collection Surveys, Condition Reporting.
Department for Communications and		book	Mapping Culture : A guide for Cultural

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
the Arts 1995			and Economic Development in Communities.
Department for Communications and the Arts/Australian Vice Chancellor's Committee of University Museums 1998		book	Transforming Cinderella Collections : The Management and Conservation of Australian University Museums, Collections and Herbaria.
Environment Australia (part of the Department of the Environment) 1998	M Pearson, D Johnston, J Lennon I McBryde, D Marshall, D Nash, and B Wellington	book	Environment indicators for natural and environment reporting : Natural and cultural heritage.
Ian Potter Conservation Centre University of Melbourne 1998		sent by personal email	Conservation Survey Proforma.
Museums Australia 1998		book	Caring for our Culture.
National Library of Australia 1998		Technical bulletin on National Library of Australia's Internet home page. http://www.nla.gov.au/niac/chg/assess.html	Preservation Needs Assessment Surveys.
National Trust of Australia 1996	James Semple Kerr	book	The Conservation Plan, edition 4.

ORGANISATION			MODEL
Organisation	Author(s)	Source (if applicable)	
Standards Australia 1995		publication	Australian / New Zealand Standard for Risk Management (AS/NZS 4360: 1995)
Western Australian Museum 1998		sent by personal email	Travelling Condition Report form.

5.2 Assessment criteria

In order to assess the range of material collected, a standardised set of assessment criteria was developed. These criteria were derived from a preliminary assessment of existing models by noting their key features bearing in mind the objectives for creating an Australian model.

The criteria were then applied to a pilot group of documents and consequently modified into the following form.

Cost	Is the model cost effective to implement? A model that is exemplary but unaffordable will be of little use in the Australian context.
Useability	<p>“Useability” has a number of sub-criteria which, together, assess how easy to use and effective the model will be in Australia. These sub-criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• is the model easy to understand?• is the model easy to implement?• is the model flexible enough to cope with different organisations and collection types?• is the model comprehensive in its coverage of factors, which may potentially effect the longevity of an item or collection?• to what extent does the model require expectations and outcomes to be documented?
Significance	How well does the model take the significance of objects and collections into account when developing recommendations?
Physical	<p>How well does the model cover the range of physical issues and, in particular, does it cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• building issues?• environment issues?• collection issues?
Management Practices	<p>Does the model take into account the wider issues related to the management of the organisation and what impact they would have on the conservation of the collection? In particular, does it consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• role & charter of the organisation?• management of people in the organisation?• structure of the organisation?

- disaster preparedness?

Stakeholder Participation How extensively and effectively do stakeholders participate in the conservation assessment process?

Outputs How clear, comprehensive and useful were the outputs? In particular:

- Does the model develop recommendations in a structured way?
- Are the recommendations prioritised?
- Does the model result in a costed action plan?
- Does it provide for timing milestones?

Disclaimer

Information from a variety of sources has been assessed for the purposes of this study. Some of this material has not been published and is generally not available.

A large number of the reports examined were not developed specifically as models for conservation and preservation assessment planning. Nevertheless much of this material is of interest in terms of the information it contributes to the topic.

In the current analyses, aspects of some items have been rated poorly in terms of the evaluation criteria. This does not mean that they would be assessed similarly against different criteria for different purposes.

5.3 Assessment summaries

5.3.1 International

The Disaster Planning Process	Audiovisual Loan Service (AVLS) 1998
--------------------------------------	---

The *Disaster Planning Process* is a succinct outline of the consecutive steps required to produce a successful plan to protect collections in an emergency. Presumably, more detail is available from the authors to assist the process. In essence the plan advocates development of a team, assignment of responsibilities, definition of scope, conducting assessment, determination and ranking of potential hazards, consideration of resource implications, prioritising actions, and implementation of the plan.

This logical and cohesive approach may be applied to the best practice conservation assessment model in two ways. Firstly, it is immediately applicable as the relevant criteria for disaster planning. But secondly, the general principles underlying the approach to assessment may be expanded to the whole conservation assessment procedure. Understanding the context of the assessment, clearly defining the objectives and roles of the team, considering all influencing factors such as resources and determining priorities are sensible inclusions in any assessment process.

As it was developed this sample model does not include all desirable aspects of a best practice model. The identification and consideration of the significance of the collection is not advocated, nor the role and charter of the organisation.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent excellent excellent fair excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very simple language. Easy to understand. • Logical process. Clear outline. • Applicable to many situations. • Concentrates on risk analysis and disaster preparedness. Does not address the greater environment. • scope and goals clearly defined as part of process.
Significance	poor	Requires that salvage priorities set, but no indication of how or why.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	fair fair fair	These issues are indirectly referred to by general term “determine hazards”, but no detail to help assessor determine what issues must be considered.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Indirectly considered as part of hazard determination. • Appropriate training of staff emphasised. • This issue is main purpose of assessment.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholder undertakes process.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan produced. • Not immediately evident, but most likely part of plan writing. • Not addressed.

The Conservation Assessment guide for Archives

Canadian Council of Archives
J Dalley
1995

The Conservation Assessment Guide for Archives is a specific manual for Archives inspired by and based on the National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property model. It aims to provide a standardised approach to assessing all elements critical to the preservation of collections, including policies, procedures, facilities, storage, environment, disaster management and staffing.

The manual is specifically for use by a professional conservator who actively completes the assessment, containing detailed questionnaires and guidelines for the report, but because the format is clear and the language is succinct and non-repetitive it is also useful for the client organisation. The responsibilities and roles of both the conservator and the archivist are clearly documented.

In essence this model is the same as *The Conservation Assessment* devised by the GCI/NICCP (see following), however the information presented in this model is more concise and as a manual it is therefore more readily interpretable by experienced professionals.

This model is highly developed and extremely comprehensive. It examines all relevant criteria for a best practice conservation assessment model, except the determination of significance of the collection or individual items. The significant involvement of the stakeholder institution, including determination of requirements and goals from the assessment, active involvement during the assessment of up to half as much time as the conservator, and joint prioritisation of the recommended actions together with the conservator is highly commendable.

This model together with the inclusion of consideration of significance can be readily applied to Australian collections.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent excellent fair</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very simple language. Easy to understand. • Logical process. Clear outline. • Applicable to many situations. • Concentrates on risk analysis and disaster preparedness. Does not address the greater environment. • Scope and goals clearly defined as part of process.
Significance	poor	Requires that salvage priorities are set, but no indication of how or why.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>fair</p> <p>fair</p> <p>fair</p>	These issues are indirectly referred to by general term “determine hazards”, but no detail to help assessor determine what issues must be considered.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>-</p> <p>fair</p> <p>good</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Indirectly considered as part of hazard determination. • Appropriate training of staff emphasised. • This issue is main purpose of assessment.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholder undertakes process.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>fair</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan produced. • Not immediately evident, but most likely part of plan writing. • Not addressed.

Risk Management applied to Preventive Conservation is a chapter from the book *Storage of Natural History collections : a Preventive Conservation approach* published by the Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections.

It describes in clear and precise detail a holistic approach to assessing the needs of a collection based on risk management principles. The desired outcome of the assessment is to implement solutions, which will reduce the overall risk to the collection.

The four step semi-quantitative process involves identification of all risks, both immediate and long-term; assessing the likelihood and magnitude of these risks; identification of all possible strategies to remove or significantly reduce the risks; and evaluating the cost and benefits of the identified strategies.

The risk management approach described is a thorough and logical process, which may be readily incorporated into preservation and assessment plans for all Australian collections. Relatively simple matrices for the calculation of risk and good suggestions for sourcing and/or determining the likely frequency of risks are described. The recommended areas to be examined for potential risk are the building, environment, collection issues and management practices.

As outlined, this risk management approach is not comprehensive and so can not be solely applied as a best practice model for conservation and assessment plans. The analysis of risks to the collection require further consideration in the context of the charter and role of the organisation and the significance of the collection.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>excellent fair</p> <p>good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language is succinct and clear. Very easy to interpret. • Complex process has been simplified into 4 successive steps, which can be readily applied. • Appropriate for all collections. • Does not relate risks to charter and role of organisation and does not address significance. • Purpose and benefits of assessment of potential risks is clearly defined.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>good</p>	The physical components are not examined systematically in this way, but all are referred to as areas of concern with associated potential risks.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>-</p> <p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. <p>These practices are addressed indirectly as areas with potential risk, but are not specifically listed</p>
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Successful analysis of risk requires that knowledgeable stakeholders undertake the process. However, does not encourage the use of appropriate professionals such as architects or conservators.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>fair</p> <p>fair</p> <p>fair</p>	Resource allocation in order to implement solutions to remove or reduce risks is the final process described. These outputs are the logical result of the risk analysis approach, but they are not specifically referred to.

A Cost Model for Preservation : The Columbia University's approach

**Columbia University Libraries
C Harris, C Mandel and R Wolven
1991**

A cost model for preservation is an article reporting in detail a method to identify and cost all the processes involved in the preservation of a collection. The results of which can then be used to improve practices and to plan appropriately for ongoing treatment.

For every function in all departments the exact costs of preservation are determined for a representative sample of the collection. The representative sample includes items with varying degrees of condition. Costs are calculated to include labour time, supplies, equipment, and contractual requirements. The average cost per unit artefact dependant on condition is then extrapolated for the whole collection in order to determine the indicative cost of preservation.

This process not only predicts the monetary resources required for future programming but also the time and staff resources. Project goals and milestones are encouraged in the planning process in order to monitor progress.

While this model does not address all preservation factors as outlined by the assessment criteria, its strength is its efficient approach to costing a large and complex process. Detailed and accurate costing of a small, but representative proportion of the collection quickly provides a reliable estimate of total costs and project scope. Potential problems, pitfalls and essential requirements become immediately obvious. This approach to assessment, costing and planning would be extremely beneficial in the best practice conservation assessment model.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">poor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple language, but ideas presented repetitively. • Process clear and logical, but lots of information to peruse. • Costing approach readily applicable to numerous situations. • Does not address all required preservation issues. • Purpose recorded.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Not addressed. • Comprehensive.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Briefly included. • Unnecessary double handling of processes identified and eliminated. • Not addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	All areas within the institution involved, resulting in maximum benefit to the organisation.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment undertaken to ensure effective future planning. • Project plan and milestones developed. • Detailed costs determined.

Auditing the Museum Environment is a detailed paper comprehensively describing an evaluation methodology developed by the Department of Energy and Architectural Planning in Turin on behalf of the Culture and Cultural Property Board of Piedmont Region to assess conservation concerns.

A two stage audit process undertaken in approximately one hundred of the region's museums and libraries is described. A qualitative survey is first completed by relevant professionals, including architects, engineers and conservators. This survey is aimed at quickly assessing the general environmental and building conditions based as visible evidence. Issues such as organisation structure, use of space, access and security are also addressed with the administrators. A second quantitative survey is then undertaken by conservators to collect accurate data support the visual conclusions. Instruments are used to measure environmental conditions, such as temperature, relative humidity and light levels. All information is evaluated and remedial action suggested.

The fundamental issues relating to conservation assessment are addressed in this early model which is elementary in nature. More sophisticated application of the process is required for a best practice model.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Very expensive process. Evaluates all museums in the Piedmont region over two years for a cost of \$8 million.
Useability		
• Effective communication	good	• Somewhat technical language and concepts.
• Simple to use	good	• Somewhat repetitive process.
• Flexibility	good	• Applicable to collections in buildings.
• Comprehensive	fair	• Doesn't address significance or risk management.
• Documented expectations	good	• Scope defined at beginning of process.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical		
• Building issues	excellent	• Examined in detail.
• Environment issues	excellent	• Examined in detail.
• Collection issues	excellent	• Examined in detail.
Management Practices		
• Role & charter of organisation	-	• Not addressed.
	good	

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>fair</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good examination of use and needs of space. • Responsibilities of staff addressed. • Not addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	fair	Advocates use of professionals.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remedial action list produced. • Not addressed. • Not addressed.

The Conservation Assessment : A tool for Planning, Implementing and Fundraising

Getty Conservation Institute and National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property 1990

The Conservation Assessment is the result of a joint project between the National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property and the Getty Conservation Institute. The project was designed to develop a consistent and standardised methodology for the conservation assessment of museum collections. The assessment package consists of a comprehensive overview manual together with two handbooks containing similar information, but specifically adapted for easy use by the professional assessor and the participating stakeholder institutions.

The Conservation Assessment approach to developing appropriate conservation plans for museum collections is three phased. The first phase is the collection of information that contributes to the care of collections using a standard survey form. It documents the physical environment, storage and exhibition conditions, potential risks, staffing, training, policies and collection procedures. This review is undertaken by a professional conservator and professional conservation architect together with assistance from the institution. The second phase of the assessment is the interpretation of the information into meaningful recommendations for improved care; and the third stage is documentation of the process and outcomes in a useful report. Detailed instructions to satisfactorily achieve all three phases are contained within the manual.

The Conservation Assessment is a well developed model, which is readily applicable to Australian collections. It offers a logical and comprehensive process to identify and reduce all risks to collections held in institutions. Careful editing by the professional assessor of some questions would allow this model to be adapted to various budgets or smaller collections. A clear understanding of the institution's needs is advocated prior to commencement of the assessment, in order to ensure that the resultant report is of use to stakeholders.

Consideration and documentation of the collection's significance is not addressed by *The Conservation Assessment*. Adding this process to the methodology already developed would render this model even more useful.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Costs reduced as much as possible by Stakeholder providing extensive detail before assessor proceeds with assessment.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent fair good fair good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple and easy to interpret language. • Logical process, but repetition of information makes it appear more complicated • Designed for all collections. Requires assessor to edit less relevant questions in order to adapt approach to smaller institutions • Covers all physical issues and management practices in extreme detail, but does not address significance or risk management • Advocates scope and aims be agreed between assessor and stakeholder before proceeding with assessment
Significance	-	Not addressed
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	excellent excellent excellent	All areas addressed in substantial detail
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	excellent good good excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All policies are examined comprehensively • Use of space analysed • Numbers and type of staff examined together with their level of preservation knowledge • Documentation of risks and development of a plan of action should they occur advocated
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Clients involved at all stages and comments required on draft report before it is finalised
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	excellent good -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough and comprehensive • Sometimes prioritisation is suggested, but the plan of action is the stakeholder's responsibility • Not addressed

The *Preventive Conservation Indicators* developed by ICCROM is a simple checklist of questions concerning collection care, designed as a self evaluation tool to quickly assess the status of preventive conservation in institutions. By compiling negative responses to issues, such as:

- the framework of the museum;
- finance and plans;
- staffing;
- the collection;
- building;
- environment;
- communication;
- priorities

allows for the development of an action plan to improve conditions.

This model provides useful questions to be addressed during the survey but does not provide context information to allow appropriate strategies to be developed to improve the situation. It is designed for a multi-disciplinary team and assumes that the team has considerable professional knowledge and experience.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Assume low cost since stakeholder conducts its own survey
Useability	fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and precise language, but no background information or references included
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fair good good - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections clear, but the relevant importance of each is not obvious • Applicable to all collecting institutions • All areas covered, but not in detail • Not evident
Significance	poor	Only briefly addressed as a small part of collection issues
Physical	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively thorough
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fair poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not particularly detailed • Does not address current physical condition

Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence and development of policies critical prior to assessment of collection needs • Encourages commitment to preventive conservation principles, but does not examine daily practices • Good emphasis of preventive conservation responsibilities for all staff • Only briefly addressed as a small part of collection issues
Stakeholder Participation in Process	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p>	<p>Encourages multi-disciplinary team to undertake survey</p>
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocates that areas of weakness should be improved, but no directions as to how to achieve these desired outcomes • Not addressed • Not addressed

Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites

International Centre for the study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage (ICCROM) / International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) / UNESCO
B M Feilden and J Jokilehto
1998

Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites is a detailed and comprehensive publication outlining a standard framework for the appropriate and successful management of cultural heritage. The guidelines are explained as principles, which may be interpreted and adapted as required to suit individual situations. As such they are universally applicable. The primary aim of the publication is to assist site management staff to become alert and self-sufficient in their practices, however it is acknowledged that adequate funding and the support of experts is necessary to facilitate this process.

Conservation theory and an awareness of site significance are emphasised as the guides to all action. Managers are encouraged to develop an understanding of the cultural value of the site, to complete an inventory, to engage appropriate professionals to conduct regular inspections, and to develop a strategic plan of care according to priority need and available resources.

As devised, this model is not a pertinent reference for the best practice conservation assessment plans for collections. It does not describe an assessment process and its

focus is too general. However, the theoretical principles it encourages are relevant criteria, which may be evaluated in the best practice model. The establishment of significance and determination of conservation priorities in this context is adaptable. The flexible nature of the documented requirements for good practice are also appropriate for a more specific collection care model.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Not relevant to this model which outlines principles for application to various organisations. Does acknowledge that adequate resources / funding required to implement principles.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and instructive. Provides a lot of background information. • Huge volume of information presented well in chapters. • Designed to be flexible and adaptable to all situations, internationally. • Extremely thorough in scope, but does deal specifically with many issues relevant to a conservation assessment of collections. • Clearly defined and summarised.
Significance	excellent	Fully documented. Significance governs all actions and must be preserved.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">poor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p>	This model does not focus specifically on these areas. More concerned with “big picture” principles. All are addressed indirectly in terms of adequate maintenance.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This model concentrates on management practices. All are to be guided by conservation philosophy. • Only indirectly addressed in terms of adequate maintenance.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Stakeholder is responsible for good management, but support of experts is expected.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p>	This model is not a true assessment process and outcomes are not the end product. Plans of action, prioritisation, costing and implementation are part of the overall management structure.

The *Oxford preservation survey* is a published paper describing two inter-related surveys carried out for the entire College and University Libraries holdings in order to determine appropriate preservation strategies. The first survey was a fact finding exercise, which concentrated on the environmental conditions, conservation policies and quantification of the collections. The second survey used this information as a basis for determining the overall physical condition of the collections based on statistical sampling.

This model examines most of the critical areas required for best practice conservation assessment. All physical influences including the building structure, environmental conditions, display and storage systems, access, use and condition of the artefacts are extensively analysed. The collection policies directly related to the conservation and the work practices of staff are also addressed. However, no emphasis was placed on examination of significance of the collection, the governing policies of role and charter of the organisation, or the existence or development of risk management associated with disaster planning.

While statistical sampling was employed to calculate the overall condition of the collection, the approach outlined remained extremely time and resource consuming, making it difficult to reproduce for all organisations. Refinement of the process would be required to allow this approach to be applied with flexibility as part of a best practice model.

This model supports the use of appropriate personnel to undertake assessment. It was found that significant input was required by a conservator to avoid misinterpretation and anomalies in the results of assessment.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown cost, but extremely time consuming. Took 4 years to complete.
Useability		
• Effective communication	good	• Easy to decipher.
• Simple to use	good	• Process clear, but does not include particularly detailed instructions.
• Flexibility	good	• Useful for collections with large numbers of artefacts.
• Comprehensive	good	• Significance and risk management not addressed.
• Documented expectations	poor	• Purpose briefly outlined, but expectations not documented.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>good</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed, but not as detailed as other physical issues. • Comprehensive. • Comprehensive.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>fair</p> <p>poor</p> <p>-</p> <p>fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the policies relating directly to preservation examined. • Minimal assessment of work practices. • Not addressed. • Addresses existence of policy, but little emphasis on need.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	<p>good</p>	<p>Regarded as important, but found that input of conservator helped to avoid misinterpretation and anomalies.</p>
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations to follow data analysis. • Not included. • Not included.

“All Hazards” Crisis Management Planning

Logical Management Systems
G Sikich
1998

All hazards crisis management planning is an article, which clearly explains the process of successful risk management in general terms so that it can be easily used by a variety of organisations and businesses. The benefits of careful and accurate planning are emphasised and typical management weaknesses to avoid identified. Numerous practical examples are cited to assist interpretation.

The process of crisis management is broken down into the logical steps, including compliance, which involves surveying and identifying risks; preparedness, which develops strategies to deal with the risks; training of staff; and dissemination of the information obtained throughout the process. The expected outcome is an educated staff who are all capable of acting appropriately should a disaster occur.

The principles of assessment, interpretation and development of an action plan are all essential requirements of a best practice conservation assessment process.

The general nature of this article however, does not focus on the relevant criteria for artefacts conservation assessment.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
-----------------	---------------	-----------------

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent good excellent fair good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear and illustrative language with lots of situational and application examples. • A logical and progressive process. • Applicable to all situations. • Only deals with risk management. • Aims recorded.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	fair fair fair	Not addressed in detail. Covered only generally in terms of potential risk.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- fair good good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Practices examined in terms of potential risk to smooth running artefacts. • Training and roles emphasised. • Concentrates on these issues.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Significant stakeholder input required.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	good - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive report of appropriate actions encouraged as part of management of risks. • Not included. • Not included.

The Museum Planning Process

**B Lord and G Dexter Lord
1998**

The *Museum Planning Process* succinctly outlines the complexities of developing an all encompassing long range plan for collecting institutions. All activities are analysed in mini assessments, the results of which are considered together to produce an overall plan. Purpose statements, methods of analysis and the desired outcomes are listed for each mini assessment. Emphasis is placed on the danger of misinterpretation and inadequate use of resources if only a few areas of the institution are examined or if individual areas are examined in isolation.

This assessment model does not concentrate in detail on the issues, which relate specifically to the preservation of collections, namely the physical conditions in which

the artefacts exist and the work practices of the staff. Assessment of the disaster preparedness and the significance of the collection are also not considered.

However, the general principle of determining priorities in context with the purpose and desired direction of the organisation would be a valuable inclusion in the best practice model for conservation assessment plans. It is further commendable that this model advocates the involvement of all relevant organisational personnel together with expert advice.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succinct language which adequately explained process. • Logical process. • Applicable to collections housed in buildings. • Analyses the big issues that concern museum planning, but detail required for a conservation assessment not always covered. • Not obvious.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p>	All areas addressed as part of collection development and in light of possible renovation plans, but not incredibly detailed.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered critical to the planning process. • Not addressed. • Not addressed. • Not addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Advocates all relevant personnel and experts be involved.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of all mini plans. • Not addressed. • Not addressed.

The Delta Plan documents the rescue mission undertaken by the Netherlands Government to improve the preservation of its national cultural heritage, following the 1988 General Audit report, which found that the national collections were in a poor state.

The substantial sum committed by the Dutch Government allowed initial surveys to be conducted to document the problems, threats and backlogs of conservation work required by the collecting institutions, monuments and historic houses. Desired standards for all collections to attain were then developed for the areas of registration, passive conservation, active conservation and restoration. Finally, priorities were set according to the importance of the collection. Registration, passive and active conservation were all considered more crucial than restoration. As a result of these priorities many collection staff received preservation training and durability of artefacts became a significant criteria for acquisition.

The Delta Plan is a thorough model based on the sound principles of identifying the problems, developing solutions, costing and prioritising, and implementing the solutions. This useful approach may be applied to individual collections. Prioritising according to the significance of the collection or part of the collection is commendable approach when faced with problems that outweigh resources. Determination of significance also ensures that this essential component of an artefact or the collection is retained during collection care.

“The Delta Plan” model is designed to take stock of the ‘big picture’ of a vast and diverse situation. As such it does not allow for detailed examination of some elements of collection care, such as staffing practices and the use of space. Analysis of the role and charter of the individual institutions may have helped to ensure that the collections were relevant which in turn would assist the prioritisation process.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	fair	Assessment process undertaken in an efficient manner (over 1 year), but extensive resources required.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	good good good fair fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to interpret • Model based on a simple approach, to identify problems, develop solutions, and cost, prioritise and implement solutions • Possible to scale approach to match various situations • Focuses on big picture • Purpose defined, but individual institution aims not recorded
Significance	excellent	Priorities are set according to significance of

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
		the collection
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	good good good	All physical issues addressed in initial survey
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- - fair good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed • Not addressed • Only considered in terms of the resources required to implement the solutions • Addressed in initial survey
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Significant involvement in assessment process resulted in an increase of preservation knowledge
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	excellent excellent good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Comprehensive • Costing undertaken prior to final prioritisation

Asking the right questions : Evaluation and the Museum Mission

**M Munley
1986**

Asking the right questions is a very descriptive and theoretical article discussing in essence the usefulness of evaluation and review. The article concentrates on the relevance of evaluation in relation to the museum mission, but the theory is applicable to all assessments.

Evaluation is described as “a way of thinking, not just a questionnaire”. The main message of the article is that evaluation is only beneficial when its purpose and objectives are clearly defined from the outset of the study. It can contribute to problem solving by summarising achievements of past programs, provide feedback to improve current programs, and can test new programs. The essential steps involved in evaluation are identification of criteria for assessment, selecting appropriate standards for comparison, conducting assessment and finally rational decision making based on the findings of the assessment.

The principles outlined in this article are critical inclusions in a best practice conservation assessment plan. However, the detail of application of these principles outlined are not relevant.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Not relevant. Article is theoretical, not practical.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">good good excellent - excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very descriptive language. Essay-like. • Process clear, but theoretical. No practical examples. • Relevant to all organisations. • Detail of article not relevant to specific conservation assessment plans. • Main message of article is that outcomes be clearly thought through before evaluation undertaken.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	- - -	Detail of article not relevant to specific conservation assessment plans.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	excellent - - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensively considered. <p>These issues not relevant to the purpose of the article.</p>
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Advocates careful thought and involvement of stakeholder.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	good - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new approaches the final step of the evaluation process. • Not addressed. • Not addressed.

Levels of Collection Care is a handbook designed for museums of any shape or size to conduct a broad assessment of their conservation and collection care needs. It attempts to be “a mechanism which is simple to use, but not simplistic; inclusive rather than exclusive”.

Benchmarks against which the current situation and future progress can be measured are provided in a matrix of three attainable standards for each category of collection care. These include Basic Practice which is the minimum required to become a Museums and Galleries Commission registered institution; Good Practice which is

best practice tempered by realistic expectations, the level at which most institutions should comply; and Best Practice which is the highest standard to which all institutions can aspire. Following individual assessment, the participating institution is encouraged to develop and implement prioritised recommendation taking into consideration factors such as significance and policies for collection use.

Levels of Collection Care is an excellent reference model because it is not only comprehensive in scope of assessment, but succinctly defines the assessment levels. As such it is readily useable and understandable by assessor and stakeholder institutions alike. Since the assessor does not have to write lengthy explanations for the recommendations, this model becomes extremely cost effective. The language and arrangement of information is clear and accessible. This model could be readily applied to Australian collections of varying magnitude and type.

While this model encourages its use alongside consideration of significance and use of the collection, further emphasis and explanation of these elements would make it more useful and appropriate.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Possible for stakeholder or professional assessor to undertake majority of the survey
Useability		
• Effective communication	excellent	• Specific and clear language, easy to interpret
• Simple to use	excellent	• Very easy to use and to understand variables described in matrix
• Flexibility	excellent	• Readily applicable to varied collections
• Comprehensive	good	• Comprehensive in most areas, except significance
• Documented expectations	good	• Purpose of assessment clearly defined
Significance	fair	Reference made to considering all recommendations in light of significance but not addressed as part of assessment
Physical		
• Building issues	excellent	All issues examined comprehensively
• Environment issues	excellent	
• Collection issues	excellent	
Management Practices		
• Role & charter of organisation	excellent	• Purpose and mission examined
• Management of people in the organisation	excellent	• Use of building and maintenance addressed
• Structure of the organisation	good	• Thorough assessment
• Disaster preparedness	excellent	• Comprehensive
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholder can undertake process or can refer to matrix explanations of assessment levels in order to understand clearly its position. Model doesn't define for which sections it is critical to receive professional

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
		advice
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations made at end of process • Divided into short term, medium term, long term and ongoing priorities • Not addressed

Preserving Natural Science Collections : Chronicle of our Environmental Heritage

**National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property
1993**

Preserving Natural Science Collections is a comprehensive report in book form which records the findings of a collaborative project by the National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property, the Association of Systematics and the Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections to assess the needs and provide a plan of action to improve the care of American research collections.

The project involved extensive dialogue with research scientists, collection managers, conservators, conservation scientists, educators, institutional administrators, and specialists in relevant material research through meetings, correspondence, questionnaires, working groups and panels to establish common concerns and needs. The integrated plan of action documented in the report is intended as a catalyst for further discussion and a stimulus for the instigation of improved practices.

The evaluation and assessment process involved analysis of needs, identification of priorities, development of strategies to implement the priorities, proposal of training curricula and dissemination of the information gathered.

This approach to assessment is an excellent reference for the best practice model. The scope and aims of the evaluation are clearly documented, extensive consultation was undertaken with the stakeholders and professional advice was sort. Significant emphasis was placed on determining the significance of the collection prior to commencement of the conservation survey and incorporating preservation values into the mission statements of the organisations was considered paramount. All factors contributing to collection care were examined for potential risk and possible improvements including the building, environment, immediate conservation needs, and existence of disaster plans. The practices and training needs of staff were also addressed.

The documented recommendations to improve collection care are clearly defined in detail together with a summary for easy access. Priorities are listed and strategies to achieve the recommendations outlined.

Because the *Preserving Natural Science Collections* model is relatively simple in approach it offers flexibility together with comprehensiveness. However, it would be

extremely resource consuming to replicate the evaluation as undertaken. In a standardised form this model would be infinitely useful and appropriate as a best practice model. Insurance must be made that each criteria is addressed, but perhaps to a reduced degree.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to read. Good use of illustrations. • Logical process. Well outlined. • Relatively flexible and adaptable. • Addressed most critical issues. Only omits big picture context of the organisation. • Scope and aims clearly defined and documented in preface.
Significance	excellent	A whole chapter dedicated to significance at the beginning of the process.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p>	All issues covered in relevant detail.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p> <p style="text-align: center;">good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of preservation as paramount in mission statements emphasised. • Briefly addressed. • Staff awareness and training emphasised. • Briefly addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Comprehensive involvement and consultation with staff.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined in detail and summarised. • Strategies suggested to achieve priorities outlined. • Not addressed.

Customised tools for assessing preservation and access needs is a paper presented at the Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting in San Diego in 1996. It describes an assessment model used at both the New York State Archives and the Philadelphia City Archives to address the preservation needs of the collections and to establish priorities for action. This model relies on a number of matrices to make standardised decisions throughout the assessment process. All data collected during the surveys was stored in a sophisticated computer data base, which can be readily manipulated to produce specific information reports as required.

In total eight matrices were used to evaluate the collections. They were developed following identification of the factors involved in decision making and to what extent the factors influence the decision making process. Two examples include use verses condition and value verses condition. While the usefulness of the individual matrices is apparent and they are all obviously inter-related, no explanation is provided for determination an overall priority ranking for items in the collections.

The use of matrices provides consistency of evaluation, which may be usefully applied in a best practice conservation assessment model, especially if the number of assessed item is vast and undertaken by several assessors.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Very resource consuming - 3 people for 1 year
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p style="text-align: center;">good good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent good</p> <p style="text-align: center;">excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good and clear language. • Good matrices for various aspects of assessment, but no explanation of how they fit together. • Matrices applicable to all collections. • Covers all relevant areas, but not particularly detailed. • Advocates the importance of established goals prior to assessment
Significance	good	Intrinsic value of collection is part of the matrix to determine conservation needs.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p style="text-align: center;">good good good</p>	All issues addressed, but not in detail.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation 	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Briefly addressed.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Briefly addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholder's have significant involvement.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	good - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes developed from matrices. • Not included. • Not included.

Preservation Planning

**Northeast Document Conservation Centre
Dr M Child
1994**

Preservation Planning is an article describing the processes involved and the useful information to be gained from sensible planning. Preservation planning is considered by the author to be “like any other management practice, requiring the allocation of resources to activities and functions, which are important to carrying out the institution’s mission”.

The article is essentially theoretical in nature and does not describe in detail the practical considerations. Good planning is outlined involving definition of goals in the organisation’s mission and collection policy, determination of the significance of the collection and calculation of the potential risks through surveys. A systematic and appropriate plan of continued care is then developed by comparing this information to the available resources.

The article recommends use of the Association of Research Libraries *Preservation Planning Programme* and the computer software package *CALIPR* to assist documentation of information during the survey assessments.

The core planning principles outlined in this article can be readily applied to the best practice conservation assessment model. A clear understanding of context and direction is required to make sensible decisions and all levels of the organisation should share this knowledge. Consultation with relevant professionals is encouraged.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Not relevant. Article is concerned with theory of planning, not the process.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive 	excellent good excellent good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good explanations of the aims and processes of planning. • Theoretical and not very structured. • Useful in numerous situations. • Briefly covers all relevant areas.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented expectations 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed.
Significance	excellent	Importance of documenting significance emphasised.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	good good good	All these issues addressed, none in great detail.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	excellent fair good good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on defining mission and policies. • Minimal reference to use of space. • Addressed, but brief. • Addressed, but brief.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	excellent	Good management is the responsibility of the stakeholder. Encouraged to consult professionals as required.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	good - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of planning process. • Not addressed. • Not addressed.

A Survey in a Day : Cost Effective surveys of Museum Collections in Scotland

**Scottish Museum Council
H Creasy
1993**

A survey in a day is a paper describing the survey and assessment process undertaken for organisations belonging to the Scottish Museum Council. Because a large percentage of the Council members are small museums with mixed collections, untrained custodians and limited resources, the assessment process has been streamlined to determine all relevant information as efficiently as possible.

Pre-questionnaires are first completed by the organisation to familiarise the consultant conservator and to encourage the stakeholders to think about their needs. The conservator conducts a site visit of one day to evaluate environmental conditions and determine general condition of the artefacts on a room by room case. Three days are then allowed for preparation of a report, which emphasises preventive considerations to ensure overall improvements in collection care. The recommendations are listed in priority order and cost estimates are considered essential for future budgeting by the organisation.

This sample model has several useful components, which may be applied to the best practice conservation assessment process. The most significant and critical factors

contributing to collection care, including the environment, storage, display, artefacts condition, staff work practices, are thoroughly examined and sensible and prioritised recommendations are provided. The stakeholder also has high involvement in the process. Most commendable is the fact that the survey has been streamlined to suit clients' budgets.

The weakness of this model is that it is artefact-focused from a conservator's point of view. The assessment process is not conducted in context of the organisations role and charter. Nor is the significance of the collection or parts of the collection determined. Undertaking this type of evaluation prior to environment and artefact analysis may in fact assist the streamlining process to which this model aspires.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Affordable and good value for money.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent excellent excellent good fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, simple language. • Straightforward, logical process. • Flexible and adaptable. • Detailed analysis of most critical concerns, but does not address in context of big picture of museum or significance of collection. • Purpose outlined.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	excellent excellent excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive and detailed. • Comprehensive and detailed. • Comprehensive and detailed.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- excellent - excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Thorough. • Not addressed. • Thorough.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Pre questionnaire sent to organisation, involvement during assessment and check draft report.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	excellent excellent excellent	These are the desired outcomes of the report regarded important to allow the Museum to budget.

Selection for preservation proposes a model for making preservation decisions for large library and archive collections based solely on the intrinsic value of the items. It recommends conservation only of items of significant value, while items of high use should be replaced, and those of low use but possible research value should be microfilmed and discarded. The author believes that this minimal and simplistic approach to the decision making process is highly adaptable.

This severe and simplistic evaluation method is not appropriate for the best practice conservation and preservation assessment model for collection care. The principle of addressing significance as a criteria for decision and priority making is useful, but must never be considered alone.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability		
• Effective communication	poor	• Very complex and technical language. Difficult to interpret.
• Simple to use	good	• Model is relatively simple, but explanation and discussion confusing.
• Flexibility	poor	• Only applicable to large research collections.
• Comprehensive	poor	• Concentrates on material approach, not in context with other concerns.
• Documented expectations	-	• Not addressed.
Significance	good	Preservation decisions made solely on value.
Physical		
• Building issues	-	• Not addressed.
• Environment issues	-	• Not addressed.
• Collection issues	good	• Use and physical condition examined.
Management Practices		
• Role & charter of organisation	-	None of these issues are addressed.
• Management of people in the organisation	-	
• Structure of the organisation	-	
• Disaster preparedness	-	
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholder makes decisions, but no consultation with professionals.
Outputs		
• Recommendations	-	• Not applicable to decision making process.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritisation 	fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect prioritisation due to nature of categories.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costed action plan 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed.

5.3.2 Australian

Conservation Management Review of Loxton Historical Village, South Australia

Artlab Australia
1991

The *Conservation Management Review of Loxton Historical Village* is a report prepared by Artlab Australia documenting the assessment of the environmental conditions and the collection needs of the organisation. The aim of the report was to produce a working manual for the custodians, which would provide immediate and long term solutions to ensure longevity of the collection.

The report is not comprehensive. It concentrates on the environmental factors and collection issues, but does not include assessment of the other preservation concerns associated with the significance of the collection and the broader management practices. Many of the building issues identified are only superficial.

This is an underdeveloped assessment model, which has some useful application for collection assessments. However in developing a comprehensive best practice model a greater depth of issues should be addressed.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Low cost to stakeholder (1 day visit and report) for wealth of information.
Useability		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication 	fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and readily interpretable language, but information presented is repetitive.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple to use 	fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment process not immediately obvious.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easily adaptable to many collections.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely thorough for the physical issues and disaster planning, but does not address role and charter of organisation or significance of the collection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented expectations 	poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims of assessment process from the assessor's point of view are identified, but no evidence of stakeholder's expectations.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues 	fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial examination of building

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	<p>structure undertaken. Not detailed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensively assessed.
<p>Management Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>-</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>-</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Thorough examination. • Not addressed. • Good preventive approach suggested.
<p>Stakeholder Participation in Process</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Not evident.</p>
<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations are general. Would be better if more detail provided. • Short and medium term priorities identified in 6 and 18 month action lists. • Not addressed.

**Conservation Management Review of
the Old Highercombe Hotel Folk
Museum, South Australia**

**Artlab Australia
1989**

The *Conservation Management Review of Old Highercombe Hotel Folk Museum* is a report prepared by Artlab Australia documenting the assessment of the environmental conditions and the collection needs of the organisation.

The report documents in detail the preservation issues associated with the environmental factors and the physical display and storage of the collection. It also identifies the need for disaster planning. However, the other factors influencing preservation such as role and charter of the organisation, significance of the collection and daily museum practices are not addressed. Many of the building issues identified are only superficial, suggesting that the use of a conservation architect would have been beneficial.

The recommendations section is clear and readily interpretable. It is presented at the beginning of the document for ease of use and the inclusion of cost estimates for many areas allows the scope of the problems to be immediately recognised by the stakeholder.

In general, this is an underdeveloped conservation assessment model, which requires expanding to include greater depth of issues and consideration of all museum practices in order to be considered appropriate as a best practice model.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Relatively low cost to stakeholder generating much useful information.
Useability		
• Effective communication	fair	• Good use of simple, non-technical language, but information presented is repetitive.
• Simple to use	fair	• Difficult to interpret order and importance of assessment process.
• Flexibility	good	• Applicable to many organisations, especially varied historical collections.
• Comprehensive	fair	• Areas examined documented in detail, but does not address role and charter of organisation, significance of collection, or museum practices.
• Documented expectations	good	• Aims of assessor are well documented, but no evidence of stakeholder's input.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical		
• Building issues	poor	• Not comprehensive. Only superficially addresses major problems.
• Environment issues	excellent	• Extremely thorough.
• Collection issues	excellent	• Extremely thorough.
Management Practices		
• Role & charter of organisation	-	• Not addressed.
• Management of people in the organisation	-	• Not addressed.
• Structure of the organisation	-	• Not addressed.
• Disaster preparedness	good	• Good preventive approach suggested.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	-	Not evident.
Outputs		
• Recommendations	excellent	• Summarised and highlighted at beginning of document.
• Prioritisation	fair	• Priorities listed, but relative importance of each or time line of required implementation not included.
• Costed action plan	good	• Estimates of costs very useful for stakeholder.

The *Conservation Standards of Exhibition Venues for the 1990 Adelaide Festival* is an assessment report prepared by Artlab Australia to meet the specific needs of the instigating stakeholder. A comprehensive survey was undertaken of several buildings to determine their suitability as exhibition venues. The analysis and suggested recommendations deal only with the physical building issues, such as security and access; and the environmental issues which pose greatest risk to artefacts, including light, temperature and relative humidity.

This focused approach on only some aspects of collection preservation does not meet the comprehensive requirements of a best practice conservation assessment model.

And while this model sensibly includes the stakeholder's brief, which aims to ensure that the organisation's needs are understood and met, the impractical and ideal list of recommendations were most likely impossible to implement.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown.
Useability		
• Effective communication	good	• Language is clear and easy to understand.
• Simple to use	good	• Process of assessment is logical and systematic.
• Flexibility	poor	• Purpose designed assessment based on specific brief to address building issues only.
• Comprehensive	poor	
• Documented expectations	good	• Brief from stakeholder included indicating their concerns and aims well documented in introduction.
Significance	-	Not addressed, but not a significant concern for the purpose of this model
Physical		
• Building issues	good	• Model is essentially concerned with these issues.
• Environment issues	fair	• Most significant risk areas of temperature, relative humidity and light covered, but dust, pests and pollutants not addressed.
• Collection issues	poor	• Minimal examination of display systems.
Management Practices		
• Role & charter of organisation	-	• Not addressed, but not necessary for the specifics of this model.
• Management of people in the organisation	poor	• Very brief and superficial.
• Structure of the organisation	-	• Not addressed.
• Disaster preparedness	-	• Not addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	fair	Inclusion of brief indicates that stakeholder's concerns addressed, but no evidence of their participation in process.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Outputs		
• Recommendations	fair	• Thorough list of recommendations produced, but very idealistic and not practical to implement.
• Prioritisation	fair	• Present, but difficult to interpret in order to apply recommendations actively.
• Costed action plan	-	• Not addressed.

St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney, Artworks Conservation Report

**Artlab Australia
1994**

St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney, Artworks Conservation Report is an extremely detailed and comprehensive report in several volumes which records the current condition and prescribes conservation recommendations for all works for art, furniture and internal fittings in the Cathedral.

A team of appropriate personnel were used to conduct surveys and offer advice. This included conservators to assess the artefacts, conservation architects to provide advice on structural issues and historians to determine significance of both the individual items or collections as required.

This report is an extremely good reference model for best practice conservation assessment procedures. The general approach to assessment is logical and simple, but comprehensive. It involved consultation with the client, determination of significance of the collection, assessment of all influencing preservation factors, and the development of prioritised recommendations. In this instance, significant resources were required to complete assessment, but it is possible to scale the process and adapt it to suit other collections or organisations.

While it is clear that the stakeholder's requirements, their level of involvement throughout the process, and consideration of the role and charter of the organisation were taken into account, they are not formally documented. Neither is disaster preparedness covered.

The comprehensive list of recommendations, including many levels of priorities and a costed action plan, is readily useable by the stakeholder. The scope of required actions is immediately apparent and several options are available depending on resources and the clients desired outcomes.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Very expensive procedure producing enormous benefits, but not possible for all organisations to undertake assessment to

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
		this level
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>good</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>good</p> <p>excellent fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear language, supported by useful explanations. • Easy to decipher, even though process is complex. • May be difficult to apply detailed assessment to this level for all organisations, but possible to modularise. • Extremely comprehensive. • Purpose outlined, but objectives not defined.
Significance	excellent	Discussed in detail for individual items or collections as appropriate. Determination of significance undertaken by appropriate professionals.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>good</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could have been addressed more fully. • Thorough. • Covered in detail.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>poor</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>fair</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taken into account, but not formally addressed. • Detailed analysis. • Briefly addressed. • Not addressed.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	fair	Significant, but not well documented.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many levels of recommendations with a strong emphasis on hierarchy. • Overall plan developed. • Detailed costs provided.

**The Illustrated Burra Charter :
Making good decisions about the care
of Important Places”**

**Australis ICOMOS (International
Council on Monuments and Sites)
P Marquis-Kyle and M Walker
1994**

The Illustrated Burra Charter is a book produced to explain the principles, process and practice of the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Burra Charter). It contains a large number of illustrated

examples of the use of the Charter in different contexts. The Burra Charter and the Guidelines to the Burra Charter are included in the book.

The Burra Charter provides “guidance on conserving significant places, by expounding principles and recommending a logical order of work”. It “can help you to adopt a logical mode of thought, but won’t make decisions for you”. The Burra Charter is a model for the conservation of places, rather than simply the conservation assessment of places, and as such it states the preferred ethical stance of a minimalist approach to the conservation of places, and also indicates under what circumstances different ethical approaches are acceptable.

The Illustrated Burra Charter clearly sets out the essential sequence of steps in conservation planning for a place, but does not prescribe the techniques to be used or the level of detail in each case. The three main stages are assessment of cultural significance, followed by the development of the conservation policy and strategy, and concluding with the implementation of the strategy. Each stage is critical and is developed in a systematic way from the previous stage. The detailed Guidelines and the illustrated examples show what should or may be included in a conservation plan, enabling the reader to clearly understand the intended desirable outcomes.

The Illustrated Burra Charter model is a rigorous one, which enables a great degree of consistency in the assessments of widely varying places, while still allowing a reasonable level of flexibility. The Charter is very relevant to this project and many issues are applicable to the development of assessment plans for cultural collections. The process of investigating and establishing firstly significance, then conservation policy, followed by an implementation strategy is both sound and straightforward.

In applying the *Illustrated Burra Charter* model to collections, a further element to consider is disaster preparedness, which is addressed only in terms of security and maintenance issues.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Cost flexibility - can be staged, parts may be done by volunteers, level of detail variable, opportunities to identify constraints on the work done and future work needed
Useability		
• Effective communication	good	• Language of Charter itself is quite formal and prescriptive ie ‘must’, but is designed to be used in situations where legislation is involved eg Heritage Registers, Tax Incentives Scheme
• Simple to use	good	• Booklet is clear and easy to read while still being comprehensive, introduction outlines ways of using booklet; once model is understood it is very easy to apply to different situations
• Flexibility	good	• Quite flexible for different cases - has capacity to be done in stages; designed

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	<p>for everyone, not just professionals; sets out steps but not techniques or level of detail, allowing for variation; lots of examples of application in different circumstances & for different places; provides guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive for its purpose ie places not collections • Clearly states process and expected outcomes - both what must and may be included - including details of process, constraints & future work needed
Significance	excellent	Significance guides everything that follows in the conservation policy and strategy - good approach to and discussion of significance, mainly for places but also addresses single movable items and 'contents' collections
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>good</p> <p>poor</p> <p>poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good approach to assessment of building fabric and how this fits in context of planning process • Only addressed in terms of the setting of a place - not relevant for buildings & sites, and not addressed for collections • Only in very broad terms (ie as far as 'fabric' can apply to collections), although removal of 'contents' from a place is addressed - no discussion of survey methodology
Management Practices		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not broken down in this way, but addressed in broader and more far reaching terms - "conservation policy should identify a management structure through which the conservation policy is capable of being implemented" - includes • looking at existing structure & assessing its relevance/appropriateness to achieve the implementation of the strategies (including those responsible for day to day management etc); includes agreement between client and practitioner etc Only in terms of security and maintenance, not disaster planning
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Specified at key stages of the process
Outputs		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key outputs are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * statement of significance * conservation policy * implementation strategy • Included in implementation strategy • Action plan in implementation strategy - financial resources may be included (report to include constraints on the task and future work needed, eg if planning incomplete)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritisation 	good	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costed action plan 	good	

Collection Surveys, Condition Reporting

Conservation Training Australia draft Manual for Heritage Collections Council 1998

Collection Surveys, Condition Reporting is one module of the draft manual produced by Conservation Training Australia for the HCC. It is a very simple, basic level outline of a commonly used model for undertaking collection surveys and condition reporting of individual items. It includes sections on examining objects, what to record, consistency in recording, collection surveys, survey forms and condition reporting. The language is direct and easy to follow for the intended audience, especially, of volunteers in small museums. Some additional guidance in selecting the appropriate level of survey outcome would be a benefit. There is no consideration of broader museum management issues such as staffing, role and charter etc. Significance is not addressed.

This model is not a model as such for collection conservation plans. However, it gives a useful approach to the surveying segment of a conservation assessment process.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Not addressed
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use 	good fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct language, easy to understand • No framework for assessment, collection surveys section does not actually address what should be included in a survey for a particular level of outcome • Options for different levels discussed • References to other sections, some examples included; no reference to computerisation of information • Objectives of module and self-evaluation included; refers to setting objectives for surveys and purposes of reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility • Comprehensive 	good fair	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented expectations 	good	

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Significance	-	Not addressed
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	poor poor good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect references only • Indirect references only • Good
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- - - fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed • Not addressed • Not addressed • Addressed indirectly
Stakeholder Participation in Process	poor	Partially addressed indirectly
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	poor - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not thoroughly addressed • Not addressed • Not addressed

Developing a Conservation Plan is one module of the draft manual produced by Conservation Training Australia for the HCC. It is a very simple, basic outline of a commonly used model for preparing a conservation plan for a collection. It includes sections on:

- the reasons for having a conservation plan.
- carrying out a survey of the collection.
- collating and assessing the survey.
- setting priorities.
- resources
- developing an action plan.

The process is defined in a flow chart, which is expanded somewhat in the text. The language is direct and easy to follow for the intended audience of volunteers in small museums. Significance is addressed in a limited way in terms of assessing priorities for treatment of individual items. There is no consideration of broader museum management issues such as staffing, role of the organisation and charter.

This is an unsophisticated model, which has some useful applications for collection assessments. However, in developing a comprehensive best practice model a greater depth of issues should be addressed.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	fair	Mentions different levels of survey and plan possible. No specific discussion on costs or staging of the planning process. Model is one that could be workshops in stages if necessary.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	good fair fair good good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very simple and direct (first person) language; easy to understand, basic level model; flow chart describing process • Reasonably simple model; no discussion of how to go about surveying or who should do it, or what should be included for what level of outcome; no framework to assist in decision making • Not modular, talks about range of surveys but not how to assess required level • Refers to other sections of manual for more information; no reference to computerisation • Objectives of this module of the manual are clearly stated, with built-in self-evaluation for people using it. Refers to setting objectives for surveys at a basic level.
Significance	fair	Addressed only in terms of setting priorities, not as part of survey (ie collecting information on significance). Refers to other sections of the manual relating to significance.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	fair good good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specifically addressed but referred to • Addressed as key issue • Addressed as key issue
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- - fair fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed • Not addressed • Availability of resources addressed • Addressed indirectly (eg leaking roof as an example). Modules on disaster planning elsewhere in manual.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	-	Not addressed
Outputs		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes recommendations but does not call them this
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritisation 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costed action plan 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refers to assessing resources and an action plan, but not a costed action plan - implied?

Mapping Culture: A guide for Cultural and Economic Development in Communities **Department for Communications and the Arts**
1995

Mapping Culture is a reference booklet and self-use guide for communities, outlining an approach to identifying cultural resources and suggests activities and projects to record and effectively use these resources. The significant benefits of cultural mapping are recorded as economic, social and regional development. They may include enhancement or increases in creativity, tourism, environment planning, education, entertainment and new information networks.

While it is obvious that this model lacks many of the required criteria to be considered a conclusive best practice conservation assessment process, certain aspects are adaptable. The thorough approach to the assessment of significance of cultural resources is especially admirable. Significance governs all following actions.

Because *Mapping Culture* is designed to systematically examine a diverse range of cultural issues and does not concentrate on individual organisations or collections. As such, it does examine in detail the physical conditions and management practices, which contribute to the continued preservation of artefacts. Neither is the methodology outlined a pure assessment, resulting in a list of recommended actions. Instead, it incorporates the desired outcomes into the process.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Extremely expensive process to complete, but provides enormous value to the entire community.
Useability		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well segmented with clear and simple language.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple to use 	excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections divided. Good use of headings, allowing easy access.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible to implement only some segments if required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't cover the required areas for conservation assessment, but extremely comprehensive for its designed purpose.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented expectations 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives clearly defined. Benefits detailed as community development, tourism, creativity,

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
		environment planning, education, entertainment and new information networks.
Significance	excellent	Comprehensive chapter on assessment of significance and its importance to the process.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	- - -	Not applicable to this model. Not included.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	fair - - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly addresses these areas in some sections. • Not applicable to this model. Not included.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Advocates broad community involvement, publicity and education.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	- - -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not relevant for this model. Implementation of outcomes is part of the culture mapping process.

Transforming Cinderella Collections: The Management and Conservation of Australian University Museums, Collections and Herbaria

**Department for Communications and the Arts and Australian Vice Chancellor's Committee of University Museums
1998**

Transforming Cinderella Collections is a very thorough report, which details the current conservation status of collections owned or administered by universities in Australia and provides recommendations to address their needs. The report also investigates the existing framework for policy development, the degree of documented collection information, and the significance of the collections and their accessibility.

Most information for the conservation survey was derived from correspondence and questionnaires. Only sample collections received site visits from professional conservators. The components examined during the surveys were extensive.

An extraordinary amount of information is compiled in *Transforming Cinderella Collections*. As a sample model for conservation and preservation assessment plans it is an excellent reference. The aims and expected outcomes of the analysis are clearly defined and the stakeholder is involved throughout the assessment phase. Emphasis is

placed on determining the significance of the collection prior to commencement of the conservation survey, during which all relevant building, environment and collection issues are considered. The ensuing recommendations to improve collection care are documented in priority order and where possible costs are estimated.

The *Transforming Cinderella Collections* model is essentially simple and resource conscious (using stakeholder questionnaires where possible), the degree of information recorded is vast, and replicating the model to this degree would be extremely time consuming. However, reducing the degree of information recorded for each analysis component to match available budget would render this model flexible.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	While process as documented was extremely expensive, an extraordinary volume of information compiled in an efficient manner
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	good fair good excellent excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succinct and easy to interpret • No clear detail of how to undertake an assessment • Extremely comprehensive, but directed at large collections only • Extremely thorough • Clearly defined at beginning of assessment process
Significance	excellent	Significance is fully documented and emphasis is placed on undertaking this process before proceeding with needs assessment, in order to ensure appropriate decisions are made
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	excellent excellent excellent	All areas comprehensively documented and examined
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	excellent fair good excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully examined and recorded • Not detailed • Needs and current practices assessed • Examined in detail
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Stakeholders involved through questionnaires
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation 	excellent excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Comprehensive

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costed action plan 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs estimated where possible to predict in advance

Environmental Indicators for Natural and Environment reporting : Natural and Cultural Heritage

**Environment Australia, part of the Department of the Environment
M Pearson, D Johnston, J Lennon, I McBryde, D Marshall, D Nash and B Wellington
1998**

Environmental Indicators for Natural and Cultural Environment Reporting establishes indicators to monitor on a national scale the state of and major impacts on places and objects of natural, indigenous and historic value. The report is one of a set of eight developed in conjunction to monitor the environment in a broad sense. All reports are consistent in treatment of common issues and cross referenced where appropriate.

Environmental Indicators for Natural and Cultural Environment Reporting recommends a total of forty-three key indicators, of which eight are general and applicable to all heritage situations. In summary, the indicators advocate knowledge of heritage sites, documentation of condition, assessment of available and required resources and training needs, development of community awareness, and implantation of recommended action plans. Monitoring strategies and practical approaches to interpreting and analysing each indicator are also discussed.

This model considers knowledge of heritage values essential to the monitoring and reporting process. The most appropriate available framework identified for establishing the significance for places is that provided by the National Estate criteria. However, reference is made to the ACT Heritage Act (1991), a commissioned study to establish specific criteria to determine the significance of objects and other documents to follow concerning objects conservation and management.

The requirements and thorough approach to evaluation outlined in this report are relevant to a best practice conservation assessment model. Establishing significance prior to assessment so that all analysis is undertaken in context is exemplary. Continual monitoring and addressing problems as required are also commendable.

This report is extremely well laid out. The language is simple and explanatory, and the information easy to find, interpret and apply. Good summaries are provided for each indicator, including a description, rationale, analysis and interpretation, management design and strategy, outputs, data sources, and links to other relevant indicators. As such this process may be readily applied by a variety of stakeholders.

This report does not however, examine in detail the issues specific to collections, such as the structure, use and access to buildings, analysis of the harmful environmental conditions, and the effectiveness of display and storage systems.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown. Presents a model to implemented in various situations and cost will vary accordingly.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>excellent excellent</p> <p>excellent fair</p> <p>excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple, clear and explanatory language. • Extremely well laid out. Information easy to find, interpret and apply. • Readily adaptable to varied situations. • Extremely comprehensive for its intended purpose of addressing broad environment issues, but not detailed for specific issues relating to conservation assessment plans of collections. • Aims, expectations and intended use clearly outlined. Good summaries for each indicator including description, rationale, analysis and interpretation, management design and strategy, outputs, data sources, and links to other indicators.
Significance	excellent	Emphasises establishment of significance first. Essential to process.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>fair</p> <p>fair</p> <p>fair</p>	These issues not specifically addressed in detail. Covered as part of the condition statements.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>good</p> <p>fair</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included as part of establishing and monitoring heritage value. • Not addressed in detail - part of the condition statements. • Number and training needs of staff, and resource requirements examined in detail. • Addressed indirectly by process of monitoring and improving conditions.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Advocates management and community awareness.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>excellent</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Thorough and comprehensive. Strategies for implementation also provided.</p> <p>Not included.</p> <p>Not included.</p>

The *Conservation Survey Proforma* is a standard outline of the topics included in surveys conducted by the Ian Potter Conservation Centre, which may be modified to suit client's needs. It details a very comprehensive approach, which may be readily applied to the best practice model.

In a logical format, almost all components which contribute to the care and preservation of collections are documented and analysed. These include museum policies, use and access of the collection, available resources and staffing, building structure and use of space, maintenance, the environment and individual item condition. The only omission from this model is assessment of significance which would assist the prioritisation of action to be taken.

Even if it is not possible to assess in detail all the elements outlined in this approach, an awareness of the current state of play for each will be beneficial to the stakeholder. In this way, this model maintains flexibility and may be adapted to many organisations.

Placing an executive summary of the findings and recommendations of the assessment at the beginning of the report as this with this model is also a useful method of ensuring access to the information.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	–	Not known.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	good good good good fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and precise language. • Logical format. • Adaptable to various organisations and collections. • Extremely thorough for all areas, except significance. • Not identified as a specific section of the assessment, but most likely included in the introduction.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	excellent excellent excellent	All areas comprehensively examined.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation 	excellent good excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully assessed. • Maintenance issues examined. • Fully documented.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaster preparedness 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of policy determined.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not known.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations Prioritisation Costed action plan 	good - -	Outcome of process. Since proforma assessed, it is not known if recommendations outlined in this way.

Caring for our Culture

**Museums Australia
1998**

Caring for our Culture is a book of guidelines presented in question and answer format, designed to assist Australian museums with self-evaluation of their programs, to ensure that they are working effectively and fulfilling their purpose. The questions posed critically examine the current situation of the museum and provide a mechanism for developing clear priorities for improving direction and systems.

The book is divided into two sections. Part one focuses on theoretical matters, purpose, planning and policies. The questions are likely to generate debate and ideas. Part two is dedicated to the more technical undertakings and operations of a museum. The questions and answers provide a minimum standard for museums to aspire to.

As a reference model for conservation and preservation assessment plans for museum collections, *Caring for our Culture* is comprehensive and extremely useful. Determination of the mission and policies which govern the museum is stressed as critical prior to any assessment of the collection. All elements which contribute to collection care and conversely contribute to neglect if ignored, are then covered in detail. Elements include the structure and use of the building, access and security, environmental control, physical condition of the artefacts, and storage and display conditions. The experience and appropriate training of staff are also considered.

When comparing *Caring for our Culture* to the assessment criteria for conservation and preservation plans for museums and collections, it is obvious that while goals are identified throughout the book, a guide to prioritisation of the goals into a logical plan is not provided. Professional conservation advice is also not emphasised in order to answer adequately questions relating to condition and longevity.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective communication Simple to use Flexibility 	excellent excellent excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple and easy to understand Well laid out and easy to follow Adaptable to all collections

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Purpose defined
Significance	good	Addressed, but not emphasised
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p> <p>excellent</p>	All areas covered in extensive detail
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>excellent</p> <p>fair</p> <p>good</p> <p>fair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive • Not detailed • Thorough • Policy advocated, but threats not examined in terms of risk
Stakeholder Participation in Process	fair	Stakeholder to undertake assessment in-house, but no emphasis of need for professional advice
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>fair</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes recorded at end of each examined segment, but not compiled into succinct plan • Not addressed • Not addressed

Preservation Needs Assessment Surveys is a document outlining a comprehensive model used to assess the preservation needs of a collection. It advocates that all preservation decisions should be made on a known and rational basis, in line with the organisation's purpose, collecting policies and resources. It also highlights that conservation priorities are rational since preservation almost always exceeds available budget.

The *Preservation Needs Assessment Surveys* incorporates all the required criteria to undertake a thorough assessment of a collection's current situation. It is particularly strong in critically addressing the building, collection, environment, and disaster preparedness issues. The questions detailed are broad enough to allow adaptation of this model to various collections.

When considered as a rounded model for conservation and preservation assessment plans for museum collections the “Preservation Needs Assessment Survey” lacks only strategies to turn the identified needs into prioritised recommendations.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> good good good excellent fair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to understand, straight to the point, good example questions • Clearly delineated sections • Adaptable to numerous collections • Extremely thorough examination • Aims not specific
Significance	good	Addresses importance of individual items and looks at the context of the collection
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> excellent excellent excellent 	All areas comprehensively assessed
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> excellent good good excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines collections in the overall context of the organisation’s goals • Looks at use of collection and maintenance • Documents current level of preservation understanding and assesses training needs • Looks at potential risks as well as the existing programs to avoid them
Stakeholder Participation in Process	good	Background information supplied by stakeholder to assessor. Stakeholder is responsible for instigating assessment
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fair - - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends making recommendations following process, but is not part of process • Not addressed • Not addressed

The Conservation Plan is a comprehensive manual designed to provide a standard approach and reference to the preparation of conservation plans for Australia’s built heritage, specifically those places having European cultural significance. The methodology outlined may be summarised as gathering, analysing and assessing all information which bears upon policy decisions regarding conservation of the site. This

guide embraces the intention of both the Australian Burra Charter and the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter are followed by this guide.

Determining the significance of the place is emphasised as the first requirement for any conservation plan. Only then can the conservation policy be developed, taking into account other relevant factors such as the condition of the site, external policies which may affect the site, the intended use of the site, and the stakeholder's requirements and available resources. Strategies for implementation of the conservation policies should be provided as outcomes of the conservation plan.

The Conservation Plan is an excellent reference model for conservation and preservation assessment plans for museum collections. It is a logical three-phase approach beginning with setting priorities, followed by gathering and analysing information, and concluding with the development of strategies to ensure appropriate steps are taken to ensure longevity. This approach is infinitely flexible and may be applied to any collection. Emphasis is placed on determining and documenting a brief with the stakeholder before the assessment phase is undertaken to ensure all desired outcomes are accommodated. Most importantly, the significance of the collection/site is considered paramount and must be determined prior to the development of conservation policies to ensure that they are relevant and all significance is retained.

The Conservation Plan was written as a reference for producing a conservation plan for built heritage. As a model for conservation and preservation assessment plans of museum collections it lacks analysis of risk management principles, specifically identifying and reducing the risks of fire, flood etc. The role and influence of operational staff on the site/collection are also not addressed.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Unknown, but would be flexible depending on application
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent excellent good good excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple and clear language. • A logical three phase process involving setting priorities, gathering and analysing information, and developing policy and strategies • May be applied in numerous situations or collections • Looks at physical issues and significance, but not risk management or disaster planning • Brief developed before process undertaken
Significance	excellent	Significance is paramount to the entire process, from which all planning follows
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues 	good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of fabric emphasised

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment issues • Collection issues 	<p>poor</p> <p>poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed indirectly • Addressed indirectly
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed together with significance • Use analysed • Not addressed • Not addressed
Stakeholder Participation in Process	<p>good</p>	<p>Involvement encouraged before and after process, but not during process</p>
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	<p>good</p> <p>good</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations are the outcomes of the process • Strategies and options developed to accommodate resources • Not addressed

Australian / New Zealand Standard for Risk Management (AS / NZS 4360 : 1995)

Standards Australia 1995

The *Risk Management Standard* is a document which identifies the elements involved in good risk management. Succinct and well defined steps are described, which when followed in sequence are aimed at supporting sensible and appropriate decision making. It is based on the premise that if all possible negative outcomes are known, then steps can be taken to control their impact.

The risk management process is outlined as identification of risks, analysis of the potential harm and likely frequency, assessment of possible methods of prevention or control, treatment to negate where possible, and management of remaining concerns.

Because this standard is focused and highly specific it does not address all the criteria required of a best practice conservation assessment model. This is intentional and the authors encourage that the standard be read in conjunction with other applicable standards when required.

But, this standard does provide invaluable information concerned with some of the required criteria of the best practice model, namely disaster preparedness. The process is clearly and logically explained and good flow charts assist interpretation and practical implementation. Emphasis is placed on defining the role and charter of the organisation prior to interpreting and attempting to control risk.

The approach to assessment outlined in this standard may be readily included in the best practice conservation assessment model, but consideration of other relevant criteria is also required.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	-	Not relevant. Model documents principles to apply.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	excellent good excellent good -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and informative language. • Information organised well. • Designed for a range of applications. • Covers most required criteria, but omits significance. • Not included.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	fair fair fair	All these issues covered in general terms.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	excellent - - excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluated first prior to risks, in order to ensure that survey covers required areas. • Not addressed. • Not addressed. • Purpose of document is this areas. Good flow chart to explain process.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	-	Not addressed.
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	good good -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and implementation of actions are part of the management process. • Prioritising required to allow sensible implementation of actions. • Not addressed.

The *Travelling Condition Report form* is a concise summary of the current condition of an individual artefact at any point in time. It is designed to provide easy access to

the most critical information concerning an artefact during an extended loan period. It is not intended to provide comprehensive assessment of all factors that will extend or diminish the life of the artefact.

This model is not appropriate as a best practice model for collection conservation plans, however it contains a useful layout for surveying the condition of individual artefacts.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Cost	good	Low cost to complete.
Useability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective communication • Simple to use • Flexibility • Comprehensive • Documented expectations 	good good fair poor -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and precise. • Simple layout. • Only applicable to individual artefacts, but from any collection. • Concentrates only on physical condition of artefact. • Not addressed.
Significance	-	Not addressed.
Physical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building issues • Environment issues • Collection issues 	- - good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed. • Not addressed. • Concentrates on physical condition of artefact.
Management Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role & charter of organisation • Management of people in the organisation • Structure of the organisation • Disaster preparedness 	- - - -	Specific purpose of this model does not include these issues. Not relevant.
Stakeholder Participation in Process	-	Not relevant
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations • Prioritisation • Costed action plan 	- - -	Not addressed.

5.4 Best practice - issues to be considered

The concept of best practice is not easy to define and the consultancy team has spent considerable time exploring its meaning. The working definition:

Best practice embraces those activities, processes and approaches which are considered to be the most effective means/mechanisms for undertaking a task by a broad group of participants within an area of specialisation.

was used as a starting point and point of reference for the work of this project.

Best practice issues identified during the assessment of existing models and related documentation are tackled below. These are presented in the order in which they would need to be considered in the assessment planning process.

- consultation with client to establish needs of organisation
 - * use questionnaires as a good way to establish context, prepare the client organisation and familiarise the assessor, saving time and resources.
 - * have assessment undertaken by professional conservators, conservation architects and historians when appropriate.
 - * consult with all relevant / involved personnel.
- develop objectives and the scope of the assessment process
- examine and document the role and policies of the organisation
- determine the significance of the collection - all decisions made in this context
- assess environmental, building and collection issues
 - * sample a representative proportion of the collection as a good way to reduce time and resources for the assessment process.
 - * use matrices to simplify the assessment process and ensure consistency in decision making.
- assess work practices and staffing issues
 - * eg training issues.
- assess risk management practices (disaster planning principles)
 - * identify all risks.
 - * assess the likelihood and magnitude of occurrence.
 - * identify all possible solutions and evaluate for costs and benefits.
 - * implement action to remove risks where possible.
 - * implement action to reduce and manage other risks.
- identify and evaluate all possible solutions, including costing where possible.
- prioritise actions and develop practical and achievable plans
 - * short, medium and long term

- develop strategies for implementation of action plans
 - * use examples, flow charts.
 - * provide minimum and ideal standards for the client organisation to aspire to summarise recommendations for easy access by the client.
- circulate the draft report to the stakeholder for comment
 - * especially use clear and simple explanatory language.

5.5 Summary of outstanding models

In the course of this consultancy it has been possible to examine numerous examples of conservation assessment plans and related documentation. The widespread availability of material on this topic reflects the importance of the assessment plan as a vital tool in the management of collections and sites.

From the material examined, there has emerged a large group of models which have been identified as outstanding with respect to the concept of best practice outlined in section 5.4. These examples are summarised below and have contributed significantly in the development of the design criteria discussed in sections 6, *Design criteria for a draft model*.

5.5.1 Outstanding international models

The Conservation Assessment guide for Archives. (Canadian Council of Archives, 1995)

A highly developed and comprehensive reference model based on the “The Conservation Assessment”. Examines in detail most of the critical areas of preservation. Advocates considerable involvement of the client during determination of objectives and joint prioritisation of recommended actions.

Only omits consideration and documentation of the significance of the collection.

The Conservation Assessment : A tool for Planning, Implementing and Fundraising. (Getty Conservation Institute/National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property, 1990)

A well developed reference model which provides a consistent and standard methodology for the assessment of collections. It details a logical and comprehensive approach which is extremely thorough in addressing the most critical areas of concern. A clear understanding of the client institution’s needs is advocated.

Only omits consideration and documentation of the significance of the collection.

Levels of Collection Care : A self assessment checklist for UK museums. (Museums and Galleries Commission of the UK, 1998)

An excellent reference model which is not only comprehensive in scope of assessment, but succinctly defines three levels of collection care to aspire to. It is readily understandable and useable by both the assessor and the client. Offers flexibility and adaptability to numerous client situations.

Encourages, but does not emphasize consideration of significance and use of the collection during assessment.

Preserving Natural Science collections : Chronicle of our environmental heritage. (National institute for the conservation of cultural property, 1993)

An excellent reference model which outlines an assessment process based on analysis of client's needs, identification of priorities, development of strategies, proposal of training curricula and dissemination of information.

The scope and aims are clearly identified, extensive consultation with all relevant client personnel undertaken and expert advice sought. Emphasis placed on determining significance prior to assessment and incorporating preservation principles into the mission statement. All critical preservation factors considered including building, environment, collection and disaster preparedness issues. Recommendations prioritised and a summary outlined.

5.5.2 Outstanding Australian models

St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney, Artwork's Conservation Report. (Artlab Australia, 1994)

An extremely good reference model with a comprehensive, yet logical and simple approach. Involves consultation with client, determination of significance, assessment of all influencing preservation factors and development of prioritised recommendations.

The Illustrated Burra Charter : Making good decisions about the care of important places. (Australis ICOMOS, 1994)

A rigorous model which enables a great deal of consistency in the assessments of widely varying places, while still allowing a reasonable degree of flexibility. The process of investigating and establishing significance, then conservation policy, followed by implementation strategy is both sound and straightforward.

It presents a process, but does not actually make the decisions.

Clearly sets out sequential steps in the conservation planning process.

Transforming Cinderella Collections : The management and conservation of Australian University Museums, Collections and Herbaria.

(Department for Communications and the Arts/Australian Vice Chancellor's Committee of University Museums, 1995)

Excellent reference model in which the aims and expected outcomes are clearly defined and the stakeholder is involved throughout the process. Emphasis placed on establishing significance prior to commencement of the assessment. All relevant building, environment, collection and staffing issues are examined during the survey phase. Recommendations are listed in priority order and where possible costs estimated.

Conservation Survey Proforma. (Ian Potter Conservation Centre, University of Melbourne, 1998)

A good reference model which assess in a logical manner almost all the components which contribute to collection care. Museum policies, use and access of the collection, available resources and staffing, building structure and use of space, maintenance, the environment and individual collection condition are all evaluated.

Only omits consideration and documentation of the significance of the collection.

Caring for our Culture. (Museums Australia, 1998)

Comprehensive and extremely useful reference model. Determination of mission and policies which govern the museum are stressed as critical prior to assessment of the collection. All elements of preservation examined in detail, including the structure of the building, access and security, environmental control, physical condition of artefacts, storage and display conditions.

Preservation Needs Assessment Survey. (National Library of Australia, 1998)

Reference model which incorporates all the relevant criteria for a best practice model. It is particularly strong in addressing the building, collection, environment and disaster preparedness issues. The questions are broad enough to allow adaptation to various collections.

The Conservation Plan, edition 4. (National Trust of Australia, 1996)

An excellent reference based a logical three phased approach beginning with setting priorities, followed by gathering and analysing information, and concluding with the development of strategies to ensure appropriate steps are taken.

Significance is considered paramount to the assessment process and must be established prior to development of conservation policies. Emphasis is also placed on determining a brief with the client.

6. Design criteria for draft model

Based on the information gathered in the review, the project team defined a set of characteristics which an Australian model for conservation assessment planning should have. These characteristics formed the design criteria for the model.

The table below lists various characteristics which were to be included in the design of the Australian model.

Design Criteria	Characteristics
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • table of contents, on one page, in order to readily scan format of document
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outcomes recorded as a list of priorities
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outcomes also recorded as a schedule of action / plan of action
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • security and access to be addressed in building issues
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess resources (both to complete survey and to then implement resources)
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate survey process (during and after completion)
possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produce a database as a outcome
possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommend a standardised database format/s ?
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • draft report to client for comment before finalising
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • record authorship and date of report
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategies for implementation of recommendations
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scope of survey
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • definitions / glossary of technical terms
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • references to detailed and explanatory sources
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • definitions of priorities eg immediate (no extra resources required), short term (some additional resources required), and long term (extensive planning and significant new resources required)

Design Criteria	Characteristics
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> summary of current conservation situation, including achievements to date
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> if recommendations lengthy, separate into each section of survey
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate personnel to undertake relevant sections of survey
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> purpose of conservation assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * to provide recommendations and priorities for conservation action, both immediate and long term; * to facilitate the development of long range institutional plans for the care and preservation of collections; * to serve as a fund raising tool for future conservation projects.
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> definition of conservation assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * a broad study of policies, practices and conditions, all of which have significant impact on conservation and preservation of collections; * identifies problems, analyses causes of problems and suggests a plan of action; * goals are to develop an overall collections care program and to establish conservation as integral to the museum's mission.
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pre-assessment survey/questionnaire by stakeholder
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> client and assessor must work well together, jointly determining goals of assessment
refer to AHP/ Winkworth report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> definition of significance: rare because of distinctive nature, creative masterpiece, creative oddity, historic first, or last remaining example A = exceptional significance B = considerable significance C = some significance D = little significance
yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> good flow chart: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. establish context (management practices /significance) 2. identify parameters (physical) 3. evaluate conditions (analyse / prioritise) 4. recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce time between survey and report to maximise the report's usefulness and to ensure it is readily implemented
yes	good method for risk assessment:

7. Recommendations and conclusions

During the implementation of the consultancy, especially in the process of widespread consultation, the project team found general enthusiasm for the review process and the development of a national model for conservation assessment for Australian collection. Similarly, both national and international organisations that provided information were keen to see the outcomes of the consultancy.

Small museums that were consulted were especially enthusiastic about the model because it provided them with a clearer opportunity to be involved in the conservation assessment of their organisations as opposed to “just being told what to do by visiting experts”.

The model which has been developed as the major outcome of the project is largely an amalgamation of the best aspects of a number of existing systems. There is a number of outstanding examples of assessment plans which have been examined and they include:

- *The illustrated Burra charter : Making good decisions about the care of important places* (P Marquis-Kyle and M Walker, Australis ICOMOS - 1994).
- *Preserving natural science collections : Chronicle of our environmental heritage* (National Institute for Conservation of Cultural Property (1993).
- *Levels of Collection Care* (Museum and Galleries Commission of the UK - 1998).
- *The Conservation Assessment : A tool for planning, implementing and fundraising* (Getty Conservation Institute/National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property - 1990).

The application of the above approaches and other ideas and suggestions to the development of an Australian model should lead to conservation assessments which are more transparent and accountable. Stakeholder consultation and broader terms of reference in the assessment process are strongly emphasised as ways of ensuring reports are more practical and have greater stakeholder support.

Though the brief for this project did not ask the project team to advise on the future use of the model, the team believes that the draft model should be seen in the context of a longer term strategy. Therefore, four recommendations are provided which indicate the team’s suggestion for the future development of the outcomes of the project.

1. The posting of the model on Australian Museums On Line should be structured to provide an opportunity for industry dialogue and debate which will further refine the model. Such debate will assist in the development of a focused campaign to promote the model to all sectors of the industry.

2. The model should be presented in a illustrated booklet format which is readily accessible to all users: museums and conservators. In particular, small and regional museums that will be the purchasers of conservation assessments should be able to refer to the booklet to inform themselves about the conservation assessment process and engage in constructive discussions with the service provider.
3. Conservators will be the principal implementers of the model. To encourage adoption of the model by conservators nationally, the Heritage Collections Council should work closely with the Australian Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Material to promote the model. It may be possible for the institute to link the use of the model to its professional accreditation program.
4. In the long term, and if there is industry consensus, the model should be developed into a formal industry standard. Such a standard will ensure a high level of quality in the preparation of conservation assessment plans to support and improve the preservation of Australia's cultural heritage.

Attachment 1. Organisations approached for examples of existing models and related information

7.1 International

- The American Institute for Conservation of Historic & Artistic Works
Suite 301, 1717 K Street NW
Washington DC 20006
USA
- The Canadian Conservation Institute
1030 Innes Road
Ottawa Ontario K140M8
CANADA
- English Heritage
23 Savile Row
London W1X 1AB
UNITED KINGDOM
- The Getty Conservation Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive
Suite 700
Los Angeles CA 90049-1684
USA
- ICCROM
13 VIA DI SAN MICHELE
I - 00153
Rome
ITALY
- The International Council of Museums (ICOM)
Maison de l'UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75732 Paris cedex 15
FRANCE
- International Institute for Conservation of Historic Artistic Works (IIC)
6 Buckingham Street
LONDON WC2N 6BA
UNITED KINGDOM
- National Museums & Galleries on Merseyside
Conservation Centre
Whitechapel Road
Liverpool L1 6HZ
UNITED KINGDOM
Contact: Andrew Durham
- Scottish Conservation Bureau
Historic Scotland Longmore House
Salisbury Place
EDINBURGH EH9 1SH UK
Contact: Ms Carol E Brown
Manager Conservation Bureau
- United Kingdom Institute for Conservation
37 Upper Addison Gardens
LONDON W14 8AJ
UNITED KINGDOM

7.2 Australian

- Australian War Memorial
4 Callen Street
MITCHELL ACT 2611
Contact: David Keane
- International Council on
Monuments and Sites
(ICOMOS)
PO Box E303
KINGSTON ACT 2604
- Museum Internal Services
Western Australian Museum
Cliff Street
FREMANTLE WA 6160
Contact: Dr Ian MacLeod
Manager
- Museum of Victoria
PO Box 666E
MELBOURNE VICE 3000
Contact: Marcelle Scott
- Museums Australia
PO Box 2926
FITZROY VIC 3065
Contact: Executive Director
- National Museum of Australia
GPO Box 1901
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Contact: Janet Hughes
- State Library of Victoria
328 Swanston Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
Contact: Mr Alan Howell
Manager Collections
- Victorian Centre for
Conservation of Cultural
Materials (VCCCM)
57 Cherry Lane
LAVERTON VIC 3026

7.3 Other sources of information

- American Association of Museums
- American Institute for Conservation
(AIC)
- Australian Institute for the
Conservation of Cultural Material
- Australian National Maritime
Museum
- Australian Vice-Chancellors
Committee (AVCC)
- Chdev-1
- Conservation Distribution List
- Heritage Preservation
- Historic Houses Trust of New South
Wales
- Ian Potter Conservation Centre
University of Melbourne
- Icom-cc
- Museums Australia Inc. (NSW)
- Museums Australia Inc. (VIC)
- National Trust United Kingdom
- Scottish Conservation Bureau
- State Library of New South Wales
- University of Canberra

Attachment 2. Workshop participants

State Library of New South Wales, Sydney
25 September 1998, 2.00 - 4.00pm

Presenters: Ian Cook, Heather Mansell

Name	Organisation	Address
Stewart Laidler	Art Gallery of NSW	Art Gallery Road The Domain Sydney NSW 2000
Rose Peel	Art Gallery of NSW	Art Gallery Road The Domain Sydney NSW 2000
Narelle Jarry	Artlab at the MCA	Museum of Contemporary Art Circular Quay Sydney NSW 2000
David Horton-James	Australian Museum	William Street Sydney NSW 2000
Sarah Slade	Australian National Maritime Museum	GPO Box 5131 Sydney NSW 1042
Mary Gissing	Powerhouse Museum	500 Harris Street Ultimo NSW 2007
Avryl Whitnall	State Library of NSW	Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000

**Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide
19 November 1998, 9.30am - 12.00pm**

Presenters: Peter Cahalan, Ian Cook, Keith Fernandez

Name	Organisation	Address
Dianne Osborne	Adelaide City Archives	GPO Box 2252 Adelaide SA 5001
Jenny Hodgeman	Adelaide City Archives	GPO Box 2252 Adelaide SA 5001
Sue Scheiffers	Adelaide Gaol Museum	42 Gaol Road Thebarton 5031
Bernard Whimpress	Adelaide Oval Museum	Adelaide Oval North Adelaide SA 5006
Leigh Summers	Ayers Historic House Museum	288 North Terrace Adelaide 5000
Arthur Jeeves	Charles Sturt Memorial Museum	C/- 11 Winston Crescent West Beach 5024
Maureen Holbrook	Embroiderers Guild Museum and National Textile Museum	16 Hughes Street Mile End 5031
Geoff Speirs	History Trust of SA	Edmund Wright House 59 King William Street Adelaide SA 5000
Peter Templeton	Museum Designer	19 Linwood Court Wynn Vale SA 5127
Paul Mazourak	RM Williams Museum	5 Percy Street Prospect 5082
Jim Rogers	SA Aviation Museum	C/- 23 Ashmore Road Bellevue Heights 5050
Jenny Tonkin	State Library of South Australia	North Terrace Adelaide SA 5000
Peter Jenkins	State Library of South Australia	North Terrace Adelaide SA 5000
Trevor White	Woodville Historical Society	C/- 2 Airdrie Ave Seaton SA 5023

Copper Coast Council, Kadina, South Australia
23 November 1998, 11.00am - 1.00pm

Presenters: Geoff Speirs, Ian Cook, Keith Fernandez

Name	Organisation	Address
Mick Vort-Ronald	Banking and Currency Museum	3 Graves St Kadina SA 5554
Beryl Neumann	Maitland National Trust Museum	PO Box 106 Maitland SA 5573
Keith Burnen	Minlaton Museum	30 Second St Minlaton SA 5575
Tom Chambers	Minlaton Museum	PO Box 120 Minlaton SA 5575
Jim Harbison	Moonta Mines Museum	PO Box 191 Moonta SA 5558
Dan Caldecott	National Trust, Minlaton	PO Box 254 Minlaton SA 5575
Lois Bandt	National Trust	32 Rossiters Road Moonta Bay SA 5558
Jim Bandt	National Trust	32 Rossiters Road Moonta Bay SA 5558
Moranne Coombs	National Trust Museum	15 Randolph St Port Hughes SA 5558
Henry Carslake	National Trust Museum, Balaklava	22 Francis Street Balaklava SA 5461
George Rajkovic	National Trust Museum, Balaklava	38 Humphrey St Balaklava SA 5461
Sandra Wood	National Trust Museum, Kadina	Lot 153 Kadina SA 5554
Nelda Gerschwik	National Trust, Maitland	PO Box 118 Maitland SA 5573
Susan Hanrahan	Stansbury Museum	PO Box 12 Stansbury SA 5582