

Patric Cadell

The National Archives of Scotland  
HM General Register House  
Edinburgh  
Škotska

## FINANCING OF ARCHIVES

UDK 930.25:336](100)

Izlaganje sa znanstvenog skupa

*U načinu financiranja arhivske službe postoje velike razlike od zemlje do zemlje. Svaka od preko 150 zemalja članica Međunarodnog arhivskog vijeća ima svoje osobitosti, koje su posljedica tradicije i organizacije arhivske službe, razine razvoja i veličine arhivske službe, položaja arhiva prema tijelima uprave, pa i načina na koji se u upravi pojedine zemlje vodi računovodstvo. U nekim zemljama nacionalni arhivi su odgovorni samo za tijela državne uprave, često ne sva, u drugima je u njihovoj nadležnosti i ostalo javno arhivsko gradivo, a često i određene kategorije privatnoga arhivskog gradiva. Postoje i velike razlike u pogledu opsega upravnih poslova koje arhivi obavljaju i usluga korisnicima koje se od njih očekuju, uključujući i očekivanja samih državnih tijela. Sve to čini teškom, ako ne i nemogućom pouzdanu usporedbu i komparativnu analizu prihoda i rashoda arhivskih ustanova.*

*No, bez obzira na sve te razlike, jedna je stvar jasna, a to je da niti jedna arhivska služba ne može djelovati bez nekog oblika subvencije iz proračuna. Veličina te subvencije se razlikuje, ovisno o organizaciji i nadležnostima arhivske službe i veličini prihoda koje arhiv ostvaruje vlastitom djelatnošću od usluga koje može naplatiti, ali općenito iznosi više od 90% ukupnih troškova arhiva. To znači da stabilnost financiranja arhiva ovisi o izdvajanju proračunskih sredstava za arhivsku djelatnost. U nekim zemljama postoji tendencija da se djelatnost arhiva u što većoj mjeri privatizira. U Novom Zelandu, na primjer, privatizacija je izvršena s takvom potankošću, da je sve što se moglo smjestiti u privatni sektor i privatizirano te više nije pod izravnom odgovornošću javnih institucija, kao zasebna financijska obveza proračuna.*

*Međunarodna arhivska zajednica je, međutim, više nego suzdržana prema takvom modelu koji bi tijela državne uprave poticao, prvenstveno iz financijskih razloga, da brigu za svoje arhivsko gradivo povjere izravno privatnome kontraktoru, jer se smatra da bi ti dokumenti time bili izloženi većem riziku.*

*Što se tiče prihoda koje arhivi ostvaruju vlastitom djelatnošću, oni pokrivaju razmjerno malen postotak rashoda arhiva i u pravilu se kreću od 1 do 3%. Gdje je taj postotak veći, radi se o posebnim izvorima, koji se ne mogu uzeti kao pravilo. Tako Nacionalni arhiv Škotske 19,5% svojih troškova pokriva vlastitim prihodima, ali je taj iznos umjetno napuhan, jer arhiv čuva nekompjutorizirani dio gradiva nacionalnog zemljišno-knjižnog ureda te ostvaruje nesrazmjerno velike prihode od fotokopiranja za odvjetnike, projektante i ostale koji potražuju informacije koje sadrži katastar. U Škotskoj, kao i u mnogim drugim zemljama, financijski propisi nalažu da se prihodi proračunski financiranih ustanova uplaćuju u proračun pa arhivi ne mogu raspolagati tim sredstvima i utrošiti ih za potrebe službe. Načelo po kojem svi prihodi što ih ostvare državne ustanove trebaju biti uplaćeni u državni proračun, iz kojeg se potom financiraju potrebe tih ustanova ima mnogo prednosti, ali se često loše odražava na učinkovitost i racionalnost u trošenju sredstava.*

*Stvaranje vlastitih prihoda je nešto čemu arhivi u budućnosti trebaju posvetiti veliku pozornost iako se ne mogu osloniti prvenstveno na taj izvor. Tu se postavlja pitanje što se sve i koliko može naplatiti. Prihodi se najvećim dijelom ostvaruju od fotokopiranja i mikrofilmiranja, no postavlja se pitanje u kojoj mjeri se može naplatiti sama dostupnost (putem članskih iskaznica za korisnike ili na drugi način), korištenje obavijesnih pomagala, kataloga i indeksa, elektroničkih izvora informacija koje arhivi izrađuju, istraživačke usluge koje zaposlenici arhiva mogu pružiti korisnicima, usluge čuvanja i obrade gradiva, naročito privatnoga i sl. Imajući u vidu raznolikost koja vlada u organizaciji i nadležnostima pojedinih arhiva, pitanje je kako odrediti financijske uvjete za pojedinu vrstu i opseg usluga. Normiranje usluga je gotovo nemoguće zbog razlika u tradiciji, nadležnostima i organizaciji rada pojedinih arhivskih službi.*

*Određene sličnosti mogu se nazrijeti u strukturi troškova arhiva na velikim rashodnim stavkama., kao što su osobni dohoci, administrativni i režijski troškovi. Uz manje razlike, najznačajniji su rashodi za osoblje koji iznose oko 55% svih sredstava kojima arhivi raspolazu. Drugu značajnu stavku čine režijski troškovi, no njih je nešto teže uspoređivati zbog razlika u računovodstvenim sustavima pojedinih zemalja, koji ponekad ne dopuštaju da se pouzdano identificiraju svi troškovi koji ovamo spadaju. Ima i drugih teškoća. Državni arhiv Škotske je sve donedavno morao državi plaćati zamašnu rentu za prostorije u kojima se nalazi, da bi mu onda država osigurala sredstva za pokrivanje tog iznosa, što je značajno utjecalo na strukturu troškova kako su računovodstveno iskazani. Kada se od toga odustalo, udio sredstava za oso-*

*blje je porastao sa 40% na oko 60% ukupnih troškova arhiva. Ove dvije zamašne stavke gotovo u potpunosti ograničavaju slobodu trošenja sredstava koju arhiv načelno može imati. Kada se pod mire troškovi osoblja i režijski i administrativni troškovi, na čiju visinu arhiv ne može utjecati, ostane vrlo uzak manevarski prostor u kojemu arhiv može doista slobodno odlučiti u što će ulagati sredstva.*

*Kod financiranja lokalnih arhiva javljaju se i drugi problemi, koji proizlaze iz odnosa države i lokalne samouprave i nedovoljno definiranih standarda za osnivanje i rad arhiva. U Škotskoj, na primjer, lokalna samouprava je negdje osnovala arhive, negdje ne, a ondje gdje arhivi postoje, ne raspoložu primjerenim brojem djelatnika i prostorom. Premda se očekivalo da lokalna samouprava osigura prikladno uređenje svojih arhiva, standardi za takvo uređenje nisu nikad specificirani, kao ni količina sredstava koja je za to potrebna. Iako ima određene ovlasti nad lokalnim arhivima, središnji arhiv ne može na ovo utjecati, niti nametati ikakve standarde.*

*Za uspoređivanje i analizu troškova arhivske službe vrlo je važno razviti standarde koji omogućuju takve usporedbe. Svi arhivi rade neke kalkulacije, na primjer za cijenu izrade fotokopije ili mikrofilma ili za istraživanje za korisnika, no upitno je da li je struktura troškova koji su tu uračunati ista. Da li je, na primjer, u cijenu fotokopije uračunat trošak pronalaženja gradiva koje će se kopirati, otprema gradiva na kopiranje i ulaganje natrag u spremište, troškovi održavanja opreme, režijski troškovi i dr.? Da li naplaćujemo i dio troškova za zaštitu i izdatke za administrativno osoblje? Da li znamo koliko služba košta po korisniku i mislimo li uvijek na isto kada govorimo o korisniku? Tko je sve korisnik arhiva i kako izrađujemo statistiku korištenja, kako mjerimo vrijeme koje je utrošeno za pružanje usluge? Ovakve analize na prvi pogled ne moraju imati veze s financiranjem, ali su vrlo važne kada treba opravdati sredstva koja su utrošena za arhivsku službu, jer je tada važno imati jasnu predodžbu o cijeni, odnosno vrijednosti posla koji je arhiv obavio.*

*Sažetak izradio Jozo Ivanović*

The International Council on Archives brings together directors and representatives of the archives of over 150 different countries. I believe that they represent over 150 ways in which archives can be managed. Not only does each service seem to be managed slightly differently, but each seems to have its own level of responsibility; each relates in its own particular way to the government department to which it is attached; each seems to have in its charge a different range of archive materials, from central government records narrowly defined to a broad range of public and even private records; and, in consequence no doubt, each archive is funded differently.

There are extreme situations. In New Zealand for example, privatisation has been taken to extraordinary lengths, and everything that could possibly be placed in

the private sector, and thus cease to be a financial charge on government is no longer a direct government responsibility.

Those of you who attended the ICA Round Table in Haarlem in 1991 will recall the extremely interesting position paper that our Dutch colleagues put before us. They set out a theoretical scenario in which the national archives would be financed by payments from the ministries whose papers they housed. The proposal was rejected because it was considered that a ministry made to pay for an archive service would be almost certain to look for cheaper accommodation than that offered by the national archives itself, and that as a consequence the documents produced by these ministries would be put at risk. As I say the proposal was rejected for good reasons – but not because it was a complete impossibility.

In Costa Rica the archives used to be funded out of a tax on cheque books and on the proceeds arising from the sale of revenue stamps. This was because – perhaps uniquely – the archives used to depend on the Ministry of Finance, because when they were first set up it happened to be the Minister of Finance who was interested in archives. For many years this resulted in an extremely well funded archive service. In Costa Rica they now do things more conventionally.

These are two extreme positions, but in the financing of national archive services every point on the spectrum in between is represented. Why should there be such variety? I think we must recognise that a standard pattern was never likely to develop naturally. After all, in many countries, especially in Europe, the National Archives are actually the oldest recognisable department of the administration of government. This is certainly true in Scotland, and I suspect that a similar case could be made for the national archive services of many other countries. The need for a national service was widely recognised, and the archive itself was set up in each country in response to a particular need, at a particular time and within particular administrative and financial constraints.

In each country it was also of course unique. Countries may have archives at different levels -federal, state, regional, local etc – and in some countries there are ministries which do not place their records in the national archives, but there is always a central national archive recognised as such. However because it is unique, it has no standard of comparison. It is only in comparatively recent times – really only since the foundation of the ICA, that national archivists have begun to meet with any regularity, and meetings of colleagues at lower levels are an even more recent phenomenon. We have had a relatively short period to compare our ways of doing things; if we were starting from scratch we might look around and take the French, or the English, or the Croatian model, but our archive services already have an existence; we have grown used to them in their current form, and in that form they provide us with the service we believe we need.

The second reason for such a variety in funding systems stems from differing requirements – which is really another aspect of what I have just said. In Scotland from very early times there was a heavy emphasis on centralisation, on the placing of all records, particularly those of the law courts (both national and local), and those relating to land tenure, in a central repository in Edinburgh. Indeed the first purpose-built archive building to deal with these records was constructed in the Castle at Edinburgh in 1540–42. In England on the other hand the national archives have always concentrated on a more closely defined collection of the records of central government. In Germany and Switzerland where a federal government links a group of powerful states of cantons, the Federal Archives are at a much higher level. These varying requirements – and all gradations in between – have their effect of funding.

And then there are different sensibilities, essentially connected with the communicability or non-communicability of information. I suspect that it is more expensive to run a system in which there is complete Freedom of Information as in Sweden, than to run the more closed systems of France or the UK, for example. I may be wrong about this; the statistics for what they are worth give no indication one way or the other. But once more there must be an effect on the cost of running the organisation.

National archives are responsible for widely differing ranges of ministries. The report *Archives in the European Union* published by the European Commission in 1994 has a very interesting table showing how the (then) 12 countries of the Union looked after their archives. Only in The Netherlands did the national archives have complete control over the records of all aspects of government including the legislature. For the others, the variation was enormous, though none – like Singapore – also ran the national museum.

Finally the extent to which the national archive service is responsible for archive services at lower levels as it is to some extent in France, and in South Africa and I believe in some cases in Russia, has a very obvious effect on the funding required for its day to day running.

One could go on at great length about the way in which national archives differ from each other, and as a consequence about the way in which their funding differs. One thing however is clear, and that is that no archive service can operate without some form of substantial government grant. In this if nothing else archive services clearly resemble each other. The size of this grant varies as I have suggested according to the responsibilities of the archive service, and also according to the amount of revenue that the archive can make from various value added services, but it nonetheless accounts generally for over 90% of the running costs of the service.

I should like to consider for a moment the services that an archive can reasonably sell before coming back to the level of central government support that it receives.

ves. While we generally do not charge for simple access (though a reader's card has to be bought at a modest charge in both France and Portugal for example) there is a clear acceptance that where an additional service has been provided – photocopying or microfilming are the most obvious – or where access is required for business, as opposed to cultural purposes, then it is perfectly reasonable to expect members of the public to meet the cost of the service they receive. All archives whose accounts I have seen have a finance line for revenue. Generally this is a comparatively small percentage of the net running costs of the service – 1.5% in South Africa, 2.5% in Australia, 2.75% in Sweden. In the UK, however, the percentage is higher – 8.5% at the Public Record Office in London, and 19.5% at the National Archives of Scotland. Our figure is inflated artificially by the fact that we hold the uncomputerised part of our national Land Register, and therefore have a disproportionately large business in photocopying for lawyers, planners and others who need the information it contains. I need hardly say perhaps that in common with the PRO we are obliged to surrender all this income to central government. The extent to which this happens in other countries is not apparent from their accounts, but it has been a source of frustration to me ever since I became head of our national archives (now nearly 9 years ago) that I cannot apply to a particular service the money that it raises. For example we publish books and leaflets, as do all archives, but we cannot apply the revenue from the sale of them to the publishing of further books. The principle that all income generated by a government agency should go formally to the state before being granted back to the agency according to its needs is many ways a laudable one, but its application in detail can frequently lead to what I would describe as inefficiency.

Income generation is a matter to which we shall all have to give a great deal of attention in the future. Quite apart from the traditional photocopying and microfilming, there is the question, in all its ramifications, of charging for access and for copies obtained through electronically networked catalogues and indexes; there is the question of charging for research services which go beyond simply indicating what an archive service holds (a proportion of the revenue that comes to the Public Record Office derives from this source); and there is the question of the exact financial conditions on which private records are held in a national archive service.

Having pointed out at some length all the ways in which funding for archive services varies from one country to another, can I now look at where there are similarities? It would be useful if we could say simply that every country should put a certain sum per head of population towards the cost of an archive service, or even that every national archive service should aim to raise a standard percentage of its revenue, but this is impossible because of all the variety in traditions and in ways of doing things that I have already outlined.

Where there does appear to be some similarity is the proportion of the total funding of an archive service devoted to the broad categories of staffing, accommodation, and other administrative expenses. With modest variation, the cost of staff accounts for around 55% of the total funding available to the archive service.

Accommodation comes next, though here again national variations begin to creep in. Until very recently in the National Archives of Scotland we had to pay a notional sum of money as "rent" for the premises we occupied, even though they were mostly owned by the state. Government provided us with the funding to cover this sum of money and we solemnly paid it back to government each year. The idea was to impress upon us (and indeed on other government departments) the value of the premises we occupied, but the essential silliness of this arrangement has now been appreciated and will stop. This change will have the effect of raising the *proportion* of our funding for staff from just over 40% to around 60%. This latter figure seems a better one, since in general the smaller the country the higher the proportion of funding that needs to be spent on staff. Accommodation costs, however, are very difficult to compare from one country to another, partly because of variants in accounting conventions used, and partly because in some – even quite sophisticated – sets of accounts there is no identifiable sum which relates specifically to accommodation. In Sweden buildings cost distinctly more than 50% of staff costs; in Scotland they are now, with the changes I mention, around 42%. But behind all this lies a host of other questions. Does the archive accommodation belong to the state or is it leased; to what extent is depreciation included in the costs; to what extent as the servicing of these buildings – electricity and other services for example – included in the cost of accommodation rather than in those for general expenses etc?

Another completely hidden factor is the freedom that the national archivist has to spend the money allocated to him. Theoretically I have complete freedom of action; in practice the two major items of staff and accommodation leave me with very little room for manoeuvre, and even within the limited area of general administrative expenses there are always costs that are fixed outside the organisation – one may economise on electricity, but its price is determined by outside forces. I can choose how many staff I want and at what grade, but in the end the number of staff is limited by a balance between available funding and the performance targets that one is expected to meet.

I have confined my remarks so far to a consideration of national archive services. Much the same, however, can be said about local services, except that the variation is more extreme and more obvious. In the UK, and particularly in Scotland, there is little legislation to compel local authorities to set up an archive service. Some have done so, some have not, but services that do exist are almost all, certainly in Scotland, inadequately staffed and accommodated. There is an unwillingness in the

UK on the part of central government to place too many obligations on its local equivalent, and while I have some limited authority over what happens to local archives, I cannot set them up, nor can I enforce any standards upon them. I certainly cannot suggest an appropriate level of funding. As I said earlier Scotland was a country which tended to centralise archive services. This was the case until the 1970s when local authorities began, quite properly, to establish their own archives. However they did so independently of the central service, and though they were expected to "make proper arrangements" for their archives, the standard for these arrangements was never specified, nor of course was the level of funding that they should receive.

You may feel that I have said enough to indicate that we can learn little from each other in the area of funding archive services beyond noting the almost infinite number of different ways of doing things. This is probably so at the moment. Indeed one of the things I have noted since the very earliest days of my involvement with the ICA is that the best we can do is to appreciate that there are indeed other ways of doing things, and that the system under which we as individuals are obliged to work is not the only one that functions effectively. However I believe that we could perhaps learn from each other if we were sure that we were all meaning things in exactly the same way.

We have all had to make some calculation for example of the cost of supplying a page of photocopy or a frame of microfilm. We calculate this on all, or some of the actual costs involved – finding the item in the catalogue, withdrawing it from the shelf and returning it, the costs of machinery and paper for the photocopying process, the cost of billing etc. Do we charge for general overheads, for accommodation, preservation, for cataloguing?

When we have to justify the costs of the archive service, have we ever stopped to consider how much the service costs per user? Who is a user? Is he someone who comes into an archive, and perhaps decides that he is in the wrong place? Does he come to see an exhibition; does he come with a group; does he come, get a reader's ticket and consult a catalogue; does he come, get a ticket, consult a catalogue and then order out a file and read it; does he make contact by letter, e-mail or telephone and need an answer; does he come from some part of government, in short who is the user of an archive, how do we define him, and how do we calculate how much he costs every time he contact with us?

How do we compile statistics of use? When an item is taken off the shelf, do we count only an item for an actual reader, or do we include those for staff use, but possibly for a photocopy ordered by letter, for administrative use, or for conservation?

When we measure the time that certain activities take, do we start when the letter was written or when it was received, when the order for the item, was placed or when processing began? How do we calculate our conservation statistics? Clearly it



normally takes far less time to do some minor work to a single document than it does to repair a badly damaged volume.

Yet both are a single item. You may say that these matters are not related to funding, and of course in professional terms they are not. But if we are to justify the work of a national archive service, if we are to be able to argue for increased funding, and in particular if we are to justify the money spent on the service when set against all the other important things that a government has to do, then a very clear notion of the cost of our activities is essential. If we can also say that these costs are calculated according to internationally recognised rules, then, we will be in a much stronger position to argue our case. As I said at the beginning, national archives services are unique, and we suffer to a certain extent from the fact that we cannot justify our costs and our work by direct comparison with other organisations within the government of which we are a part. Though international comparisons can never be exact, they do at least offer a measure of support, some proper validation for what we do, and a way in which the value of our work can be independently assessed.

When Dr Kolanović asked me to speak about the funding of archive services, I did not think that the subject would be particularly difficult. I felt certain that it would be possible to find some common features. I am afraid I was completely wrong. All I have done over the last 20 minutes is to demonstrate that variety in this area is infinite. I hope however that it may be possible to give some thought to the terms we use, to a clear definition of what we measure, and to a degree of co-ordination in the way which we produce statistics, so that comparisons can be made internationally, and perhaps so that, eventually, appropriate standards can be set.

#### Summary

### FINANCING OF ARCHIVES

The International Council on Archives brings together over 150 different countries, and when their national archivists meet and compare what there do, there seem to be as many different ways of running national archive services and managing their funding.

Much of this variation derives from national traditions, from the general level of prosperity and development, from the size of the archive service, from the department of which it is a part, and although this is always less obvious, from the range of government activities for which the archive is in fact responsible. The same is true at a local level, though here the matter is complicated by the extent to which the national archive service is itself responsible for regional or local archives. In many ways the interest in discussing this subject at an international meeting is precisely the ex-

tent to which the practices of one country differ from those of another, and therefore in examining what one country can learn from another.

In the United Kingdom, all the national archive services are financed directly by government, in the case of England and Scotland through the equivalent of the Department of Justice, and in Northern Ireland through the Department of the Environment (though responsibility there will shortly pass to the Department of Culture). All three archive services are government agencies with a measure of independence. I shall examine the nature, the extent and the reality of this independence, at the same time I shall look at the ways in which a number of these activities are financed in other countries, and at the degree of autonomy that they enjoy.

There is also the difficult question of the extent to which archives should be able to raise their own funding. In Europe it is generally considered that access should be free, though in some countries there is a cost attached to a reader's ticket, and in at least one other a charge on each researcher is an important part of a national archive's revenue. It is generally accepted, however, that where value has been added, reprographically or electronically for example, a charge may reasonably be made. But where does this start, and should archive services have to depend on funding from such sources?

Finally I shall give some thought to the benefit of the development of "standards" in this area, so that it is possible to compare one archive with another. Do we all mean precisely the same thing when we speak of a researcher? When we produce statistics for a number of items taken off the shelves for consultation, do we always collect statistics in the same way? When we cost a service, what elements are allowed for the service itself, for the administration that lies behind it, for accommodation, and perhaps even for the general preservation of the records?

No firm answers will be offered, but I believe it will be helpful to raise these issues, and to open them up to discussion.