Data supply and Reconciliation between NRHE and HERs
(EH 6953)
Notes from workshop 6th November 2014

Workshop: The Bond Company, Birmingham, 6th November 2014 – Summary notes

Workshop Convenor - Graham Tait (Devon County Council)

Workshop Leader – Diana Edmonds (Bridgford Consultancy)

Main Recorder – Nick Davis (English Heritage)

What led us to this point?:

Background to the project and introduction to the Heritage Information Strategy – Gillian Grayson – PowerPoint presentation

(Presentation from Dave Batchelor – *HER Outcomes Framework* – put back until the end of the workshop).

Table Discussion:

Table 1: Ben Wallace (Facilitator), Andrew Minting (Recorder), Catherine Dove, Rob Edwards, Jack Hanson, Jennifer Morrison and Martin Newman.

- This is something which has been needed for some time.
- There are resource implications for the delivery of data to HERs.
- Resources for reporting from data.

Table 2: Nick Boldrini (Facilitator), Jane Golding (Recorder), Crispin Flower, Louisa Matthews, Keith May, Aisling Nash, Sarah Orr and Penny Ward

- [3 people in group had no knowledge of HIAS. One was aware that the Principles had been sent to HER Committee]
- Strong sense of déjà vu (we've been here before re NMR/HERs)
- Why haven't HERs been consulted on HIAS? Feels a bit like a 'fait accompli'
- This does not read like a list of principles: some are more like actions
- It's a list of things that people might like to sign up to

Table 3: Chris Webster (Facilitator), Gill Grayson (Recorder), Dave Batchelor, Andrew Dearlove, Lucie Dingwall, Tim Grubb and Helen Wells.

Table 4: Suzy Blake, Nick Davis, Sarah MacLean, Sam Mellonie, Graham Tait and Julia Wise.

- The principles of the Heritage Information Access Strategy need to be communicated more effectively.
- Is English Heritage (EH) serious about the idea of putting HERs into the forefront at the local level?
- Is streamlining the point of the exercise? There has been a significant duplication of effort which has not previously been acknowledged by EH. Measures that would eradicate this would be brilliant.
- Questions arose as to what preliminary consultation with HERs had taken place before the HIAS principles had been formulated. It was concluded that the basis of the project had been work done for TACOS.

Group Q & A:

- Are HERs capable of serving as the principle sources of data at local level? Whilst NHPP is likely to direct them down this path in any case, it has to be remembered that HERs are all staffed and resourced differently (and will continue to be so).

  GG agreed with this assessment.

- GG noted the strong links between the HIAS initiative and TACOS. The CBA was driving the latter project which would hopefully result in all the key players being involved in a co-ordinated way.

- GG also observed that progress so far had been complicated by the impending separation of EH and Historic England (HE).

- GG asked Keith May how he saw the current situation. KM replied that, whilst collaboration was eminently desirable, there was a trade off between this and how quickly the project could be structured and implemented. It was, however, important that the project shouldn't be seen as something which was being imposed by EH. Communication, both with HERs and other partners, was certainly something which should be developed.

- GG stressed that internal support within EH/HE was important since it was the expectation of the advisory board that EH (HE) would take this forward. In consequence a resource capability would need to be ensured.

How do things work at the moment?

Description of data and information flows between NRHE/AMIE and HERs – Martin Newman – PowerPoint presentation.

As a preliminary to his talk CW asked if, in the context of MN's talk, 'events' within the national record meant Excavation Index (EI) records. MN replied that he was referring to both the EI and all architectural surveys.

Chris Webster – *Data Concordance – results of sample analysis showing comparison of HER and NRHE data* – PowerPoint presentation.

Table Discussion and Q & A

Table 1:

Table discussion -

- Hope expressed that NHPP 2020 would supply resources for HERs.
- The NRHE data seems to be generally quite similar to that held by the HERs.
- Bad news: How do we go about identifying areas of overlap and rectifying discrepancies? Potentially difficult.
- Good news: Beneficial effect of raising the status of HERs as the primary source of local data.

Table 2:

Table discussion –

Even if number of new records to HER from NRHE is low: worth doing as a those few records could be very important e.g. if a site is about to be destroyed

Number of new records will vary from HER to HER anyway

Question - I didn't know the NRHE had some HER records
Answer - NRHE has some of our records, don't know exact mechanism for this, I assume it came from a past joint project

Unit of record issue: may have been easy to cross-reference at one point, often more complex now

- Bad news: Even if there is only a very small percentage of evidence within the national record that doesn't appear within the HER this might still constitute key data or relate to an important site.

Table 3:

Table discussion –

Members of the group were not entirely surprised by Chris's conclusions.
They would not expect HERs to contain as many architectural records.
They would expect EH to have done more research on historical events than HERs.

There were questions about Martin's Venn diagram, particularly about the unique NRHE segment. Members of the group were keen to have more data to back up the diagram.

10k matching took Chris half a day.
All were concerned about the amount of work involved and how much would need to be manual.

There was interest from some members of the group in taking the data and keeping it separate so that HER Officers could cross-reference to it as and when (NB However, this view changed during the course of the workshop and the table preference at the end of the day was to reconcile the data rather than cross-reference).

- Good news: There have been no horrible or unexpected discoveries.
- Bad news: A large amount of work will be involved in satisfactorily comparing the datasets and integrating new data. A basic visual reconciliation of the Somerset material took around half a day. Devon took longer but was attempted in more detail. This suggests that a full amalgamation would take years.

Table 4:

<u>Table discussion</u> -

- It seems odd that the data concordance consistently suggests that there are numbers of events in HERs than the in the national record. Other assessments (Evans 2013) have indicated that the reverse is true. HER audits (recently carried out for all three of the HERs sampled) seemed to bear this out (at least in terms of those event types recorded by the EI). This was particularly marked in the case of Devon.

  It appears probable that the numbers don't tell the full story. A more detailed assessment would be required to achieve a 'like with like' comparison.

- Many HERs have buildings data drawn from Heritage Statements. Once again, these would require a more detailed review to establish if these have definite equations within the national record.

- If the national data is migrated to HERs how would things be carried forward in the event of national recording continuing?

Good idea or not? – SWOT Analysis on the principle of 'supply and reconciliation

Table Activity

<u>SWOT for the Audiences</u>

Table 1: Ben Wallace (Facilitator), Andrew Minting (Recorder), Suzy Blake, Catherine Dove, Rob Edwards, Jack Hanson, Jennifer Morrison and Martin Newman.

Table discussion notes –

Strengths – one place to go for small defined area.
Weakness – hard to query on national context - resultant inconsistency.
Strength – no duplication of data.

Roles of EH/HE & HER need clarification – Where would data be updated in future?

Weakness/Threat – Inadequate resourcing.

Issues of variability of availability/presentation/data quality.
Variability of import timeframe.

Opportunity – For single point of access to the information, but managed locally.
Threat/Weakness – Questions of copyright – who owns the data?
Threat – Local/Regional Government organisation; HE changes.
Opportunity to promote HERs' status.

SWOT feedback – consensus re shifting the problem of accessibility.

Flip Chart (those issues seen as being most important in red/bold type):

Strengths –

- Data all in one place – (Local Context – non designated) (National – Designation)
- No duplication of effort/data
- Clarification of roles
- More efficiency
- Data reconciled

Weaknesses –

- Variability in accessibility
- Variability in data quality
- Variability in presentation
- Variability in recording practice
- Harder to create national synthesis
- Timescale for reconciliation (could take some longer than others)
- Lack of clarity over data ownership, responsibility and rights
- Public perception of value of data

Threats –

- Local service resources and capacity
- Some HERs may not get around to reconciliation of data
- Local government reorganisation
- Regional and national government reorganisation
- Changes to policy
- HERs still not statutory
- Access to background source information

Opportunities –
- **One stop shop for access to local HER data (eg through Heritage Gateway)**
- **To promote & reinforce status of HERs**
- Promote and reinforce the status of the national record
- Better partnership working
- Potential for better engagement with (new) audiences

Overall conclusion: This is a mixed bag including both good points and pitfalls. It is important, however, that audiences are the focus of the exercise. From their point of view the resulting benefits will outweigh any potential problems in achieving consolidated HER databases.

Q & A:

- Have casework officers been viewed as an audience?

  Answer: Not specifically. The review considered groups like officers, contractors and universities in general terms.

- It should be remembered that HERs and the records within them are an index to wider information holdings. Access to HERs will still be required to drill down into these holdings.

- Similarly, access will also be required to archive holdings at EH Swindon.

- Isn't this a case of shifting rather than solving the problem?

  Answer: No, this is actually a different problem. No-one has the definitive record.

SWOT for the Managing Organisations

Table 2: Nick Boldrini (Facilitator), Jane Golding (Recorder), Crispin Flower, Sam Mellonie, Louisa Matthews, Keith May, Aisling Nash, Sarah Orr and Penny Ward.

Flip Chart (those issues seen as being most important in red/bold type):

Strengths –
- **Reduction of effort over time**
- **Clarifies responsibilities**
- Improved data quality

Weaknesses –
- **Cost (resources & human time/effort)**
- **Current IT infrastructure inadequate**

Opportunities –
- **Dataflows improvement**
- **Stimulus towards improved IT infrastructure**
- Process management
- Data quality improvement
- Strengthens role of HER
- Devolved national record – clearer focus & role

Threats –
- **Current climate – lack of resources**
- Non-participation (lack of capacity, lack of HER engagement)
- Status of NRHE
- Where will EH research go (if AMIE etc does not exist)?

SWOT for the Safety and Integrity of the Data

Table 3: Table 3: Chris Webster (Facilitator), Gill Grayson (Recorder), Dave Batchelor, Andrew Dearlove, Lucie Dingwall, Tim Grubb, Helen Wells and Julia Wise.

Table discussion notes-

There were mixed feelings on the table.
Good things could come out of this project but there were also possible pitfalls.
There was an opportunity to do something great. There would be benefits for HERs and also for their audiences. The group was very keen that audience needs should not be forgotten.
There was an opportunity to address some of the current weaknesses.
There would be real challenges and difficulties in getting there.
There was agreement with Penny Ward's point that we need to think about the level of detail accessible to users. HERs are only an index and there would still be a need to consult them for additional information. This had implications for the Heritage Gateway in terms of the level of detail accessible and the HIAS proposal to redesign the website. There were questions about the extent to which the NRHE was consulted as part of the planning process. The group would be interested in more information on this.

Flip Chart (those issues seen as being most important in red/bold type):

Strengths –
- **Data into planning process**
- **HER becomes more important nationally, strengthens role**
- Future security of EH/HE
- Move away from confusion about where to access data

Weaknesses –
- **Time and effort taken to transfer data**
- **Variability of local policies**

- Impact on customers of NRHE
- Possible fragmentation of national picture

Opportunities –
- Better opportunity for local knowledge and custodianship
- Opportunity for 'open' data
- Data into planning process
- Strengthening role could help with statutory status
- Delivering national overview in a different way
- Opportunities to promote data within local authorities (EH/HE has this role too)

Threats –
- Variable state of HERs
- Copyright/rights management issues with NRHE
- Variable resources within HERs to deal with project (technical and personnel)

<u>Q & A</u>:

- Concerning the question of Crown Copyright: This will cover paper archive and photographs. As far as English Heritage data (or data updated by EH) is concerned the information is covered by Database Right.
- Concerning the suggestion that more data will feed into the planning system through HERs, it should perhaps be noted that the biggest user of PastScape is the planning system. (CW observed that three-quarters of the reports which the Somerset HER received made no reference at all to the national record).
- This is an opportunity to create a better quality of data.
- If data is devolved to HERs, what will happen if any of these databases fail?

  On the other hand, won't the fact that these are now known to be unique databases re-enforce the stability of HERs?

What are the implications of not doing it?

<u>Table discussion notes</u> –

Table 1:

Just carry on as before.
Divergence of records gets worse.
Major overhaul of AMIE (but necessary anyway for other data).
HIAS says HE to retain secure copy in archive.
Danger of HERs appearing to be less significant/weaker position.

Table 2:

All the bad things become even worse

We will be here again at some point soon in the future

Increased audience dissatisfaction

Making HERs primary source of historic environment data will not secure future for HERs on its own but will strengthen the case for saving them

Local Authorities more likely to support the project if EH says HERs have to do this

Timescale very important consideration: will impact on HERs ability to undertake the work required

Table 3:

Mess becomes worse.
Users continue to struggle to find and access information.
HER statutory status could be harder to achieve.
There was full support for doing it. However, concern was expressed about the timescale. There would be big implications if the reconciliation needed to be done quickly.

Flipchart (Table 3 only) –

<u>Implications of not doing?</u>

- Continue to muddle along
- Doubling up on effort
- Won't get increased role for HER
- Statutory status more difficult
- AMIE replacement implications for EH
- Continue to have inaccessible records
- EH will need to continue to fund projects to do reconciliation

---

<u>Group discussion</u>-

Flipchart (Group Discussion)

<u>Not</u> doing it

1 Fail to get benefits
- Muddle along

2) Continue to get worse
- Potential failure of some HERs

3) Avoiding addressing identified problems & not realising benefits
- Lack of credibility to the profession

---

4) Repeatedly funding same issues

Conclusions -

- We will continue to 'muddle along' and there will be no enhanced benefits for users.
- Everything that is bad will get worse. Given the difficulties facing some HERs – including possible failure (now and in the future) there is the potential of more muddle and duplication.
- Identifying a problem and then <u>not</u> doing anything about it will damage the credibility of all the resources involved.
- Money will have been wasted if a problem is investigated, subsequently not satisfactorily addressed, and then re-emerges.
- What is the timescale to complete the process likely to be? This will have an impact on the capability of HERs to undertake the work. If the work is seen as being urgent, will a shorter timescale be demanded?

Vote (on a show of hands) as to whether the project should proceed.

There was overwhelming support for the project proceeding.

If we go ahead, what are the essential and desirable criteria?

23 criteria were provided to the group. These are listed below. These were then judged by each of the three tables as to whether they were Essential, Desirable, Not Important or Undesirable. The results are appended in bold type.

1) Local Authority HERs should be the first point of call for, and primary trusted source of investigative research data and knowledge - **Essential 3**.

2) English Heritage should be the first point of call and primary trusted source of national datasets such as the National Maritime Record – **Essential 1, Desirable 2**.

3) English Heritage should continue to champion the development, maintenance and implementation of standards for the creation, management and storage of digital historic environment data – **Essential 3**.

4) Investigative research data or knowledge should be readily uploaded, validated and accessed online – **Desirable 2, Not Important 1**.

5) The national overview should continue to be delivered online through the Heritage Gateway – **Essential 3**.

6) Such data or knowledge should not be at risk of loss, fragmentation, inundation (in data) or system obsolescence – **Essential 2, Desirable 1.**

7) English Heritage should, on behalf of the nation, ensure that a security copy of all such data exists – **Essential 3.**

8) Digital data should be supported by material archives in safe repositories accessible to the public – **Essential 1, Desirable 2.**

9) English Heritage should stop adding or amending terrestrial NRHE records – **Essential 3.**

10) All HERs should include all terrestrial NRHE records in one form or another – **Essential 3.**

11) All HERs should reconcile and merge all terrestrial NRHE records with existing HER records - **Essential 3.**

12) All HER records (including new NRHE imported records) should be accessible online via Heritage Gateway – **Essential 1, Desirable 2.**

13) All HER records (including new NRHE imported records) should be accessible in GIS via the Web Map Service – **Desirable 3.**

14) The EH maritime dataset should be accessible online via the Heritage Gateway – **Essential 1, Desirable 1, Not important 1.**

15) The EH maritime dataset should be accessible in GIS via a Web Map Service – **Essential 1, Desirable 1, Not important 1.**

16) All HER records should be cross referenced to the NHRE (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Essential 2, Undesirable 1.**

17) All NRHE records should be cross-referenced to the HER (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Not important 1, Undesirable 2.**

18) All HER Events should be cross-referenced to Excavation Index records (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Essential 1, Not Important 1, Undesirable 1.**

19) All Excavation Index records should be cross-referenced to HER event records (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging – **Not Important 1, Undesirable 2.**

20) All Geophysical database records should be cross-referenced to HER Events (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Essential 1, Not Important 1, Undesirable 1.**

21) All HER Events should be cross-referenced to Geophysical database records (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Essential 1, Not Important 1, Undesirable 1.**

22) All Maritime HER records should be cross-referenced to the National Maritime dataset (literally just a cross-referencing of UIDs – no other concordance/merging) – **Desirable 1, Not Important 2.**

23) HERs should stop recording Maritime information – **Essential 1, Desirable 1, Not important 1.**

<u>Preferences by Table:</u>

Table 1:

Essential – 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 23

Additional –
- £ for integration of data <u>and</u> continuing provision

Desirable – 8, 12, 13

Additional –
- Statutory Status of HERs.

Not Important – 4, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22

Undesirable – 16, 17, 18, 19

<u>Table discussion notes</u>:

EH updating of NRHE needs to be stopped, but how will that work when HERs not online/staffed?

Lots of questions regarding security of data, especially idea of EH providing backup archive.

Ben W on monuments/events differences (inconsistencies) in recording.

Criteria assessment above considered in context of current project rather than generally.

Table 2:

Essential – 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18

Notes:

- 5 – Annotation on master sheet: words *national overview* underlined word *"virtual"* added.

- 7 – Annotation on card "*EH should ensure this happens but is not necessarily the holder of the security copies*".
- 7 – Annotation on master sheet: "*check back up copy is made*".
- 10 – Annotation on master sheet *with existing HER records* crossed out, "*In one form or another*" added.
- Annotation on cards: 11 seen as having 10 as an essential precursor.
- 16 – Annotation on master sheet and card "*Essential but not a show-stopper*".
- 18 – Annotation on card "*Part of NRHE so assumed to be part of 7*".

Additional –
- Alignment of terminology control between NRHE & HER terminologies – National thesauri are used but local ones need cross-referencing.
- Consultation with ALL HERs re timescale, data formats, requirements.
- Extra funding/resources need to be provided, ie HERs are not doing this from existing resources, including timescales.

Desirable – 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15

Notes:

- 2 - Annotation on card "*and NHLE*".
- 2 – Annotation on master sheet adds "*and statutory datasets*".
- 12 - Annotation on card "*As an index*".
- 12 – Annotation on master sheets and card (with reference to words '*All HER records*') – "*This is the problem: "publishable" makes it ok*".
- 13 - Annotation on card "*same qualifications as 12*".

Not Important – 22, 23

Undesirable – 17, 19, 20, 21

Notes:

- 17 - Annotation on card "*if that is all that is done*".

Table discussion notes:

We don't want a half-way house (just linking records), need to go for full reconciliation of records

If local authorities have strong business reasons for recording maritime data we cannot ban them from continuing to do so: criteria is not important for this project but perhaps is something for HIAS guidance

However if both HERs also continue to record maritime data we will still be in the same position as now

Table 3:

Essential – 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21

Notes:

- 3 - Annotation on card *"English Heritage"* crossed out *"recognised national body"* inserted.
- 5 - Annotation on card: wording extended to conclude *"Heritage Gateway or its successor"*.
- 11 - Annotation on card: wording extended to conclude *"as and when resources allow"*.
- 12 - Annotation on card *"Apart from confidential records"*. Also wording extended to conclude *"Heritage Gateway or its successor"*.
- 14 – Annotation on card: wording extended to conclude *"Heritage Gateway or its successor"*.
- 16 - Annotation on card *"It's part of the reconciliation process"*.
- 21 Annotation on card *"(If Geophysical Database/Archive stays with EH/ADS)"*.

Additional –

- Identification and provision of resources to do the work.
- Identify an achievable timescale.

Desirable – 2, 4, 13, 22, 23

Not Important – 17, 18, 19

Undesirable – None

Table discussion notes-

Would there be issues for LAs in relation to the national security copy? Agreements would need to be in place and this could be a tricky issue to manage.

National standards to be developed and maintained but HE does not necessarily have to do this. Could there be a role for FISH? (See tweak to HIAS principle card to reflect this discussion).

The resource needed to deliver this would need to be identified and then provided to HERs. (Recorded as additional criteria).

There was some uncertainty about the criteria relating to cross-referencing. Green Group would prefer to do the full merge rather than go with a half-way house solution. Cross-referencing should only be done as a step towards full reconciliation.

The roles of EH/HE and HERs in relation to he maritime record needed further analysis.

If we go ahead, what is the most effective and efficient method?

Nick Boldrini and Crispin Flower – PowerPoint presentation.

Group Discussion

- CF confirmed that his analysis did not include the concordance of event records.

  This was seen as a source of concern as, in numerous cases, not including events would orphan monument records from the source of the evidence on which they were based.

- Another point was raised about source records. It seemed likely that concordance here might also present issues. How would HER content equate to AMIE sources?

  MN was hopeful that the broad format would correspond reasonably well. However, each edition of a particular book would require a different entry.

  Would it be possible for some bolt-on mechanisms to be devised to automate those elements of the concordance process which involved 'standard' sources?

- NMP data may give an interesting parallel here. This seems to be surprisingly quick to concord.

- SHINE has taught us that work of this type cannot be done satisfactorily without money. SHINE had still not achieved 100% national coverage. (CF commented that Natural England were nonetheless very happy with the result).

- Option C seems to present a better mechanism in terms of the provision of funding and resources. A more gradual process would allow specific issues to be isolated and individual solutions devised. It would also permit a more controlled migration corresponding to HER priorities.

Examining the options

Feedback from groups on the options

Table 1:

> Flip Chart –
>
> *MANUAL INTEGRATION*
> *(a, b or c will require manual work to clean up the data)*
>
> *RESOURCE DEPENDANT*
> *?cost of developing automated system (option A or B)*
>
> *Or spend resource on data cleaning/reconciliation*
>
> *C Website with accountable system preferred…*
>
> **But with potential flexibility to automate some elements*
> **Maintaining visibility of 'retired' NRHE records until they are integrated in HER*
> **Process which can be adapted/improved as lessons are learned (pilots/phases)*

Table discussion notes –

Options – Which do we prefer? Reservations?

References to experience of NMP, PastScape, manual checking.
Bad experiences of imports and lack of correlation.

CD – data audits have identified issues.
Worries regarding costs of all three + huge time implications, manual definitely preferred.

Pilot schemes to inform way forward.

Feedback to group -

There had been some indecision but, since all three options would ultimately involve an element of manual processing, Option C had been preferred as it seemed more flexible. It was seen as allowing continuing improvements to an ongoing process
This decision had been based on the presumptions that:
- It would be possible to devise some mechanism to automate the concordance of source records.
- The NRHE would remain visible (possibly through the Heritage Gateway) until full concordance was completed.

Table 2:

> Flip chart –
>
> Preferred option – C

Table discussion notes –

Fully automated import – terrible idea, you would need to decide whether to take all your records off the HG until verified, or leave them there looking a mess!

Speed is not always good, could undermine record quality

Fully automated import records: won't these look different to the HERs own records?

Is it important to keep track of progress nationally? Yes: if work funded from a central pot, but no if funded by each individual LA.

HERs collectively have a national responsibility too, so answer (to above Q) is yes either way. Also, comparing progress with neighbouring authorities may work to put pressure on host authority

What are the implications for the national (NRHE) record? Won't we see an interim period of patchy coverage? How will the sign-off process work?

Feedback to group -

Option C had been preferred as it was technically simple and was the only one which offered a 'level playing field' since it was 'platform independent'.

The following improvements could, however, be envisaged:
- Some type of block update might be applied to record components having standard/consistent format and content.
- Some definitive end point for the transition process would have to be agreed beforehand. Otherwise the concordance project had the potential of being entirely open-ended.

Table 3:

Flipchart –

<div align="center">Options</div>

~~Option a~~
~~Concerns about creating mess~~

Table discussion notes –

There were concerns about the fact that there could be a long transition phase and that we needed to understand the implications for the AMIE database.

In the transition phase, what data would be visible to whom?

There were questions about where any new data created by EH/HE would go. It was felt that data supply and reconciliation would only work if no more data is added to the NRHE.

Feedback to group -

The conclusions reached by this table were similar to those arrived at by Table 1.

Option A was seen as something that would create a great deal of mess for the HER and, in any case might well prove technically impossible.

Option B might have some parallels with the existing OASIS routine.

Option C seemed the least troublesome of the 3 options.

Response and discussion

CF saw disadvantages in the generally preferred model (C) in that it would be very time consuming and potentially endless. However, he saw some partial automation of the model as being feasible. The question which needed to be answered in this respect was, is this good value for money?

Question: Are these models predicated by the assumption that AMIE will continue to be maintained or that maintenance will cease and the record 'broken up'?

CF replied that the models only worked if AMIE ceased to be edited.

Comment: It will be impossible to anticipate all the potential issues before embarking on the process of concordance. Thus option C (which leaves the way open for fine-tuning the process in the light of accumulated experience) would be most preferable.

HER Outcomes Framework

Dave Batchelor - PowerPoint Presentation (intended as part of previous session *What led us to this point?* (see above) but delayed).

Plenary (Graham Tait)

Looking back at the questions initially posed:

Is this a good idea? In general it seems the answer is 'yes'.

What are the criteria? Here judgement had been clouded when some apparent ambiguities emerged. However, a majority consensus did ultimately seem to have been arrived at.

What method? Here some progress seemed to have been made. Much additional thought and work would though, be required, particularly relating to criteria and resources.

Next steps: Future developments for the project will involve:

- Another phase including trial pilot work and costing.

- An online discussion - to take place on the HER Forum between 17th and 21st November. This may take forward some of the findings of today's workshop.

- Further discussions with other national projects including OASIS, ADS and EngLaid.

- A final project team meeting and the production of a report by early 2015.

N J Davis   14 November 2014

Heritage Information
Partnerships Supervisor

English Heritage