

# Introduction

The Information Management and Practice (IMP) department at The National Archives (TNA) is responsible, on behalf of the Keeper and within the terms of the Public Records Act, for the supervision of selection of public records from over 130 public records bodies, their preparation and cataloguing at the departments, applications for closure and retention for the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council (LCAC), and then the transfer and accessioning of the records.

Last month (April 2013), for example, we accessioned over 10,500 records in one month.

Most of what we accession is to accruing series that TNA has been taking for some time. We have had some big collections to deal with recently, most notably the 'Migrated Archives' (FCO 141) from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), but we are also taking double the annual transfers for the next 10 years without increasing our staffing. Exceptional selection decisions are referred to the Records Decision Panel, which has representatives from all relevant TNA departments including Archives and Records Knowledge (ARK). A summary of decisions is published on our website <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/records-decision-panel.htm>.

Below are answers to specific questions. Relevant extracts from previous User Forum meetings which relate to these questions are included in Appendix 3

## Questions and Answers

### Information Management Consultants (IMCs)

#### Working practices and staff

Question	Answer
How many client managers does The National Archives currently have and how many years experience do they each have working in this field at The National Archives?	We no longer have staff in roles called client managers. Our IMCs have replaced that role. We have 13 IMCs with varying lengths of tenure.
What is the minimum and maximum number of departments that any one client manager can be expected to be working with at any one time?	Whilst each public record body has an IMC to support it, in practice, we focus on the top 20 departments which are responsible for 90% of the records transferred. We provide a helpdesk service for all other public record bodies and respond as required.
Does the workload for the staff team as a whole, involved in liaising with government, especially during the transition period from the 30 to 20 year rule for the release of documents, allow for sufficient and satisfactory consideration of the merits for preservation against the cost and space implications for not disposing of the records concerned?	Yes, from the analysis we have done, the IMC team is able to cope with the supervision of selection of double the annual rate. The IMCs work increasingly as a team, supporting and helping each other.
Under TNA's new Records Collection Policy, IMCs no longer cover specific record areas, now being regularly re-allocated to departments as priorities arise. Has this resulted in a loss of specialist knowledge of key department's holdings, together with the lowering of personal contact between IMCs and Departmental Records Officers (DROs)?	It's necessary from time to time to review IMCs' workloads and to re-allocate responsibilities accordingly. We always ensure a handover programme, record all our contact and transactions, so information can be shared about our work with departments. With the death of one IMC last year, and the retirement of two more, we are keen not to allow one person to build up too much knowledge of a department which is not recorded or shared with others.

	<p>The IMCs hold regular meetings with DROs to keep track of the work of the department on selection and transfer.</p>
<p>How are IMC staff selected? Is it progression via other TNA departments or outside selection? What qualifications are required? Today, which is most important: archival, historical or IT knowledge?</p>	<p>We follow the Civil Service requirements on open and fair recruitment. Vacancies are advertised within TNA and across the Civil Service first; only externally if that fails to recruit.</p> <p>The IMCs have two responsibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To support compliance in the transfer of records of historical value for permanent preservation under the Public Records Act 1958.</li> <li>2. To support capability in the management of records and information, regardless of format.</li> </ol> <p>Whilst qualifications in information or records or IT management are desirable they are not essential. The recent recruits to the IMC team are focusing more on digital records and so we have asked for a demonstrable understanding of records and information management in government, and the context in which knowledge and information are created, managed and used and an awareness of the technical capabilities and potential of electronic document and records management systems, and of new and emerging applications.</p>
<p>How much training is given before a new IMC visits a department solo? How do they appraise the preservational (sic) value of documents?</p>	<p>Apart from the formal TNA induction programme, a new IMC goes through a programme within the Information Management and Practice department to ensure they understand their role, before they would be allowed to visit a department alone. Appraisal is the responsibility of the DRO, not the IMC, but the IMC supervises their work within the appraisal policies in place i.e. the Records Collection Policy and any generic Operational Selection Policies</p>

	(OSPs), or department-specific OSPs.
What does a lead IMC undertake?	The supervision and support of two other IMCs.
Do DROs produce the year-on-year Retention and Disposal Schedules or is it a joint departmental/TNA function?	DROs are responsible for Retention and Disposal Schedules based on their business requirements, legal requirements and the OSPs. We have some generic ones on our website <a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/projects-and-work/records-management-guidance.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/projects-and-work/records-management-guidance.htm</a> . Such schedules do not have to be approved by TNA.
Can IMCs influence the outcome of Keep/Destroy Selection Lists? Who is the final arbiter on whether to retain, transfer or destroy a piece and at what point in the 30 year rule (now 20 year rule) cycle does this take place?	Part of the IMC role is to review the Keep/Destroy Selection Lists and to advise departments to change the decision if it does not comply with our policies. This, usually with paper, takes place at second review stage, or at first review if there is only one.
Is an electronic paper trail now maintained of this work in the same way that pre-computer era accessions' history can be traced within PRO Class files?	Yes, departments do keep an audit trail of such decisions even though the Public Records Act (PRA) does not require departments to keep records of their work or to manage those records over and above safeguarding them and selecting them for preservation.

## Selection, Retention and Closed Records

Question	Answer
What is retention?	Records are destroyed according to a schedule unless they are selected for permanent preservation at TNA as records of historical value. Retention is when government departments have a need to keep documents. This is usually because of security or for administrative use. As FOI requests for retained documents depend on who holds the documents, requests are referred to the creating department. Each year approximately 1% of records are retained. For example, motorway bridge records are kept in the creating department rather than destroyed because they are still needed for continuing business use. They are not selected for permanent preservation and therefore can't be seen in Discovery.
Are departments allowed to delay transfer of records?	Departments are allowed to delay transfer of records if they receive approval from the Lord Chancellor after he has taken the advice of his Advisory Council.
Where are closed records?	Closed records are in TNA. There are approximately 150,000 closed records and they are catalogued in Discovery. Each year approximately 5% of transferred records remain closed on transfer. Where possible records are redacted (part closed) to only protect the information necessary and release the remainder.
How can a member of the public discover in some detail which records have been retained as exceptions to the 20/30 year rule and the means whereby that retention has been authorised e.g. Statutory Instrument?	Records which have been selected for permanent preservation but are retained are listed in Discovery with the relevant retention instrument information. The exception is those records retained under the Intelligence Instrument (which can be read on the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/172419/notes-security-intelligence-instrument.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/172419/notes-security-intelligence-instrument.pdf</a> ),

	but have to be re-reviewed every 10 years. Intelligence agencies are excluded from the Freedom of Information Act, but not the Public Records Act.
Is there any danger given the present workload-to-staff ratio, combined with the introduction of the 20-year rule, that security considerations could be used as a catch-all designation for withholding or disposing of certain material that might really only be time consuming to consider properly or politically embarrassing for one individual or party etc. but would be of significant interest to future researchers and not really of genuine security concern at all?	Applications to retain or close records all need approval by the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council. We have no evidence that departments are withholding or disposing of records without formal approval.
With ever-tightening budgets is there not a temptation to refuse records in order to reduce storage costs?	Because we keep records in perpetuity we ensure that the records selected by departments meet our collection policy. Space is not a consideration.
What percentage of retained documents has undergone 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> review as stated in TNA's appraisal policy?	Some departments still do 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> review, but some departments only review records once. We have no statistics on how many favour which method.
How many spot checks on first reviews has TNA made in, say, the last five years?	TNA does not check first reviews. This is the responsibility of the department and done in consultation with its business units according to its retention and disposal schedules. The records being accessioned now at 29 years old, were first reviewed over 20 years ago. Records created now in departments are mostly digital and the concept of 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> review does not apply. Instead departments need to apply their retention and disposal schedules to their digital information.
How is TNA able to supervise (as opposed to advise on) the selection of records for permanent preservation when there is no inventory of records held by departments?	Which records are to be selected are governed by TNA's Records Collection Policy, generic OSPs and any specific departmental appraisal policies. The appraisal documents describe the collections of records held.

Have efforts been made to agree an OSP with the MoD?	The Ministry of Defence (MoD) noted with TNA in early 2013 that an OSP was a key requirement for the selection of defence-related records, and have placed a priority action on the development and submission to TNA's Records Decision Panel of a MoD OSP by the end of 2013. TNA and MoD have commenced discussion on the development of the OSP using the new guidance and template currently being developed and piloted by IMP.
Is there any slack in the system to allow for further considered consultation with experienced researchers, who are currently using and are familiar with the scope of the existing records held by The National Archives?	Consultation with researchers is done through the publication of draft OSPs. TNA has legal responsibilities which external researchers don't. Records Specialists from Advice and Records Knowledge (ARK) department are on the Records Decision Panel. It is their job to know the records and advise with all users in mind.
Why doesn't TNA encourage the idea of public consultation on the selection of public records for permanent preservation?	Most records received are for accruing series. For records outside those series, papers are presented to the Records Decision Panel and a summary is published on our website <a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/records-decision-panel.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/records-decision-panel.htm</a> . We publish draft OSPs on our website and invite the public to comment. Selection is done in line with these policies and is supervised on that basis. MoD undertook the exceptional step of holding a public consultation on the transfer of historical service personnel records to TNA between July and September 2008.
What sort of mechanism could be put in place to facilitate such consultation and would there be funding considerations requiring separate additional government funding?	We don't have plans for any further consultation.
Time for a review of Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council meeting summaries? The information they contain is sparse.	By the nature of its work the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Council (LCAC) is discussing sensitive content of closed and retained records. We are happy to pass your comments to the new LCAC Secretary to consider. Please note that LCAC is a separate public

	<p>authority to TNA. More detail about its work can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/advisorycouncil/default.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/advisorycouncil/default.htm</a></p>
<p>How is the 20-year rule going to work as the legislation suffers from the same problems as the 1958 and 1967 Public Records Acts as the 20 years is calculated from creation of the files and if, like in the case of the Treasury and possibly other departments, they could run to 1997 and would make a 20-year rule impossible to operate.</p>	<p>It has always been the practice that for closure period purposes, the date of a file is usually taken as the date of the last item or entry in the file. In the absence of a final date, then the date of creation is used instead.</p>
<p>What do you do about wrong decisions?</p>	<p>We work within the policies that exist at the time and record our decisions.</p>
<p>MoD retained records were condemned because of asbestos. What was TNA's role?</p>	<p>Some of MoD's records were found to have been stored in premises that lead to asbestos contamination. The issue went to the LCAC. MoD decided to scan and destroy the originals, and the uncontaminated copies were transferred to TNA. The problem was found, reported and dealt with.</p>
<p>What is being done about digital records?</p>	<p>We have a small dedicated team of four IMCs who are working with departments on managing their digital records and continuing the work of the Digital Continuity project, but digital is more of a challenge than paper. IMP works closely with colleagues in our Digital Preservation department. For example, some departments have a print to paper policy so there is a problem with having records both in digital and paper formats. Digital stores will need to be appraised. The challenge is sensitivity. Humans are currently reading paper files but they can't read all digital files because of the volume of material.</p>



## Transfer to Places of Deposit (PoDs) and Presentation

Question	Answer
<p>A long-standing complaint among readers is the lack of transparency concerning the transfer of some TNA-accessioned MoD classes without public consultation. [AIR 69 to RAF Museum and ADM 335 to Fleet Air Arm (FAA) Museum]. Ongoing cause for complaint is the regular acquisition by Regimental and other military museums or other depositories of MoD originated ephemera considered of little or no value to TNA. Of particular interest are sets of cards containing personnel or unit data, for which TNA has some, but by no means all, duplicating information. Matching such holdings at Kew would take up little space, but greatly enhance the research work of military historians who currently have to scour the country to locate such obscure sources.</p>	<p>On our website, along with our annual report, are details of records presented to Places of Deposit, which includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• approval given for the transfer of public records between The National Archives and places of deposit, in either direction</li> <li>• the appointment of approved places of deposit for public records with specific local relevance or particular specialist and administrative requirements, which are held outside The National Archives</li> <li>• approval given for the presentation of public records that have not been selected for permanent preservation at The National Archives to other appropriate bodies</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/our-performance.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/our-performance.htm</a></p>
<p>If a record is not for TNA or a PoD where does it go?</p>	<p>TNA and the creating department expend a lot of effort to find a home for records that are not selected for permanent preservation, but may be of continuing interest. No organisation is obliged to take such records if they do not want to.</p>
<p>Are there commercial options?</p>	<p>PoDs have to fulfil requirements under the Public Records Act. TNA does not want to be swayed because of a record's commercial value.</p>

## Data Protection Act (DPA) and Freedom of Information (FOI)

Question	Answer
<p>What criteria from the Data Protection Act are applied to murder files? There doesn't appear to be consistency e.g. parts of a file may remain closed because of living relatives of murder victims. Are the relatives of the murderers considered in the same way? A reader says that some files are open before their due date or remain closed even after they're due to be opened and some are partly opened and he would like to know why this may happen.</p>	<p>Access is under FOI (not DPA) and the reason for closure depends on the content of a file. Frequent reasons for closing crime files include protecting privacy of victims of crime, especially sexual crimes, juvenile defendants and witnesses as well as protecting surviving relatives in murder cases e.g. not making scene of crime photos available.</p> <p>Before FOI, the Public Records Act meant that all crime files had to be closed for 30 years. It is more sophisticated now and therefore can have a variety of closure periods. FOI allows for challenges to closure decisions.</p>
<p>How are the FOI requests investigated?</p>	<p>There are five staff handling FOI requests that could relate to any TNA record. Staff can't be experts in everything and by law they have to consult with the transferring department. Copies of documents are sent to the department if the expertise is not at TNA. TNA will always consult but it is ultimately TNA's decision. There is an internal review (complaint) process and appeals can be made to an independent regulator – the Information Commissioner's Office.</p>
<p>Will Air casualty packs need reclosure if next-of-kin complain?</p>	<p>Departments are responsible for determining which records should be open or closed at transfer.</p> <p><a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/our-services/sensitivity-reviews-on-selected-records.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/our-services/sensitivity-reviews-on-selected-records.htm</a></p> <p>When data protection principles were extended to unstructured manual records such as archival holdings from 2005, TNA had to take measures to ensure it wasn't breaching any obligations. Departments are aware of these considerations with current transfers but each matter turns on case specifics.</p>

	<p>LCAC is consulted and informed over reclosure issues in accordance with TNA's published policy <a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/legal/takedown-policy.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/legal/takedown-policy.htm</a></p>
--	---

## Specific record series and other questions

Question	Answer
<p>Can you confirm that TNA has made arrangements with MoD for the acceptance of Second World RAF Casualty packs (20,000 relating to aircraft lost on the continent) and when the first ones will be available to the public?</p>	<p>We have agreed with MoD to select the RAF Casualty Packs. AIR 81/1-1488 are currently in the process of being catalogued and prepared for transfer to TNA. [More detail in Appendix 1]</p>
<p>What are the policies and processes for selecting which of the Second World RAF Casualty packs should be preserved and which should not? British Aviation Archaeological Council (BAAC) would like all information relating to combat, crashes, locations and RAF operations to be released, as well as any information which may be directly relevant to crash sites, such as what was found and what was unaccounted for at the time.</p>	<p>TNA and MoD agreed in 2006 to select all files up to 1948 [revised later to 1949, the closure of the Missing Research &amp; Enquiry Section within the Air Historical Branch (AHB)], file nos. 25001 – 437510.</p> <p>Anything after 1949 which relates to requests for information and responses to queries was separated from the file by AHB and placed in a part B file. This part will not be selected and will be disposed of by MoD according to their Retention and Disposal Schedules. Any material post 1949 identified during the cataloguing process will be removed by the Records Review Team (Defence Business Services). All papers within the casualty file (details re crash sites, investigations etc) pre-1949 will be selected and transferred. [More detail in Appendix 1]</p>
<p>MoD believes that some Second World RAF Casualty packs may contain information about personal relationships and personal finance which was submitted in confidence and some may contain mortuary records which could be considered sensitive. What, if any, special arrangements does TNA consider necessary before readers can access the casualty packs?</p>	<p>MoD takes great care when reviewing records in terms of sensitivity, especially in terms of s40 of the FOI Act (personal data). Any material identified as requiring closure under the FOI Act or the DPA is identified and closure authorised through LCAC prior to transfer. There are provisions for reclosure of any open material which is deemed to be of a sensitive nature. MoD plan to include a label on each pack warning readers that there may be details on the file of a potentially distressing nature.</p>

<p>When did Information Management and Practice (IMP) first have details of AIR 81? What is the precise size of this class: total of individual files, number of boxes, shelf length in metres and total number of names they contain A-Z? Is the collection in its original state as when closed circa 1955, or has there been 'weeding' or subsequent redaction? What has been the Air Historical Branch involvement in its transfer? Will the entire class be released in stages or not until the full accessioning is complete? Can an approximate end date be given? Will labelling of AIR 81 boxes warning readers of their distressing contents be sufficient for the Executive Team to dismiss a request for reclosure from a next-of-kin anxious that a relative's exhumation details are not made public?</p>	<p>[See attached appendix 1]</p>
<p>How many departments have released 1982 Falklands related material? How did IMP handle this work? Were there any special problems relating to retention? Is transfer still ongoing? Would Argentine forces prisoner-of-war interrogation reports be among records transferred to TNA? Has any Falklands campaign material been passed to third parties?</p>	<p>[See attached appendix 2]</p>
<p>In 2008 the MoD consulted on the transfer of the four "inter-war" collections of armed forces service records. Why didn't TNA point out that their proposal created a significant chronological discontinuity in the release of Royal Navy service records? Why didn't TNA ascertain why the cut-off date of birth for the release of the army service records collection was 1895?</p>	<p>Records of servicemen with a date of birth before 1895 will not, in practice, be released until 115 years at the earliest and therefore conform to the ICO suggestion of later release.</p> <p>In terms of significant chronological discontinuity, it was always the intention to transfer records in chronological order.</p>
<p>Given the backlog in Treasury files being transferred (estimated to be 2,300 for Legacy, 9,000 for Current and 15,000 as a Forecast in September 2012) whereas since the report was taken there have been only 824 files transferred and of that only 275 covering the year 1981. What is happening as the time-lags still seen to be the</p>	<p>HM Treasury (HMT) started a large scale project in October 2012 to review files, dispose of those not selected, and to prepare the selected files for transfer. This includes all their paper records up to 1997. This is planned to be completed by April 2014. The figures published in January 2013, as collected in September 2012, were</p>

<p>same i.e. about a year and the indications that at least two files have been retagged.</p>	<p>for all the records held, including those overdue for destruction.</p>
<p>Who is responsible for vetting the Treasury files, is it Treasury or Iron Mountain? As documents (e.g. GCHQ and staff reports of living people) have been released and it is unclear whether researchers can use them. If Iron Mountain are running this then can they not take over all of the government archives leading to privatisation of the archives?</p>	<p>I assume your question on the vetting of files refers to their review for any sensitivity under the FOI Act. It is the responsibility of HMT to undertake this review, and their decision whether they use their own staff or contract the work to an external provider.</p>
<p>The lack of Treasury series (including T 500 and T 501) which are not in Discovery, T 499 and T 502 onwards are there. Why are the existing entries for the series in the T series lacking the correct information or are 'economical with the truth' (see T 484 for the Operational Research Division was created in 1982, it was previously the joint Treasury/Civil Service Department Operational Research Unit in T 391 until the abolition of the Civil Service Department but Discovery does not say that). It is clear that TNA had accepted large runs of files all with the same dates (see the transfer/cataloguing guidance on this and even though the separate dates are on the file covers) making research difficult and time-consuming.</p>	<p>The absence of T500 and T501 references on Discovery will be rectified shortly. The absence of these references was created by a simple oversight that they were available to be used by TNA staff. We attempt to date all files to the correct year, both for accuracy and to assist research purposes. If, however, instances have been identified where inaccuracies are present, please feel free to use the contact details provided on this page on our website <a href="http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/discovery-faqs.htm">http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/discovery-faqs.htm</a></p>
<p>What about records from the BBC?</p>	<p>The BBC is not a Crown body. It is excluded from the Public Records Act.</p>

**APPENDIX 1****AIR 81**

The National Archives first began discussing the management of the RAF Casualty Packs in 2006. At the time, it was noted RAF Casualty packs were archived with the Ministry of Defence (MoD)'s commercial storage supplier.

The files were at the time not considered as 'closed', as when the Air Historical Branch (AHB) and the Service Personnel and Veterans Agency (SPVA)'s Joint Casualty & Compassionate Centre (JCCC) answer queries on the casualty (in order to keep all the papers together) the query and the response were added to the old file. This was only ascertained by MoD Central Records in 2006.

MoD Central Records agreed with AHB that when they recall a casualty pack to answer a query, they would remove papers from a date to be set by TNA (later agreed as the date of closure for the Missing Research and Enquiry Section – 30/09/1949) from the pack and put them in a new part which will then need to be attached to the old file part so when one file is called for both (or all) parts arrive.

The RAF casualty packs are reviewed for selection by MoD Central Records (CMemR), who removed the papers from the TNA agreed date onwards (if they are still on the file) and create a new file part which will have to be indexed and archived. Only the pre-1949 section of the file would be archived. The secondary 'Part B', containing only queries and responses from surviving relatives, would be retained by MoD and disposed of according to MoD's Retention and Disposal Schedules. The Air Historical Branch are and have assisted in the selection and review of the packs, however responsibility for selection and transfer is with MoD's Records Review team (Defence Business Services).

In terms of current preparation (AIR 81/1-1488), no definite number can be given by the Ministry of Defence in terms of total meterage, boxes, and number of individual names as these pieces are currently being prepared by Ministry of Defence who have advised that they will only be able to give an accurate figure once the preparation phase is complete. However, it is anticipated that MoD will complete this by the end of June 2013. A previous forum (18/04/2013) noted that 700 pieces had been prepped and 306 have been boxed.

In terms of the entire collection of RAF casualty packs, MoD provided the following detail in 2006:

- Total number of boxes and meterage: 4000 boxes / 1794 feet. This included incidents other than casualties and deaths
- Anticipated selection 3722 boxes / c.1600 feet (those files which covered deaths), file numbers 250001-437510.

The programme of review by MoD is discussed in quarterly meetings which the MoD's Departmental Record Officer (DRO) conducts with the Records Review team (Defence Business Services) and TNA's Information Management Consultant (IMC).

**Previous forum response regarding AIR 81:**

**Forum 18/04/2013:** (2.6) (Item 4.10 02/2013) Jeff James (Director of Operations and Services) provided the following update from Michael Rogers (Information Management Consultant) on when the Air 81 (Air Ministry: Casualty Branch P4(Cas): Enquiries into Missing Personnel, 1939-45 War) records will be transferred to TNA:

*According to our last update in March, the files (1488 in total) have been sifted and given piece numbers. Of these around 700 have been prepped and 306 have been boxed.*

*The Air Historical Branch (AHB) has requested all these files be marked with labels stating they may contain material likely to upset some readers and this work is yet to be carried out. In addition AHB has currently recalled 65 of these records usually for the purposes of answering Freedom of Information (FOI) requests and is in the process of sending them back to the Ministry of Defence (MoD).*

*Once the files are ready and in one place, our Transfers Advisor for MoD will physically check them and approve them for transfer. I am unable to define when this work will be completed and when the records will be ready for transfer, however I hope to implement an agreed transfer programme with MoD in the near future that will establish when all transfers will be ready for transfer and when they will be available to the public.*

**08/05/2012:**

Andrew Dyer (Information Management Consultant) reported that the MoD has now made a decision to transfer the Air Ministry: Casualty Branch P4(Cas): Enquiries into Missing Personnel, 1939-45 War, in the series AIR 81.

The documents had previously not been transferred due to the sensitive nature of some of the material within these files (such as autopsy reports) which were potentially covered by exemptions in the Freedom of Information act. A recent decision relating to different but comparable records where the same exemptions were successfully challenged has contributed to the decision to transfer. Equivalent records for the Army (held in WO 361) are already open and those for the Navy (held in ADM 358) are in the process of being opened.

It is not currently planned that the material in AIR 81 will be redacted but sensitive material will be housed in envelopes that are clearly marked with a warning.

It may take some time for the AIR 81 documents to become available as they haven't been catalogued or cleaned. However the 1939 material is in the process of being prepared.



**APPENDIX 2****Falklands Campaign records**

The National Archives (TNA) released records relating to Operation Corporate as part of a special press event in December 2012. This press event included records from the Cabinet Office, Number 10, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Other departments have recently transferred records which have been released as required under the 30 year rule and the 20 year rule Implementation Plan; however whether these contain details regarding Operation Corporate and subsequent actions relating to the campaign would need to be ascertained through Discovery or through individual research. Ministry of Defence (MoD) records relating to Operation Corporate continue to be identified and selected for transfer. See Discovery for those currently available to the public, for example:

- ADM 202 – Royal Marines: War Diaries, Unit Diaries, Detachment Reports and Orders
- ADM 53 – Navy Department: Ships logs
- WO 305 – Army Unit Historical Records and Reports
- AIR 27 – Air Ministry: Operations Record Books, Squadrons
- DEFE 58 - Royal Air Force, Strike Command: Reports, Files, Memos and Operation Orders

In terms of interrogation reports of Argentine Prisoners of War (POWs), The National Archives has no knowledge of any collection of records held or created by MoD, Armed Services or other Her Majesty's Government (HMG) body.

TNA has not noted any special problems regarding retention of MoD material. Retentions are authorised under the provisions of the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act and Lord Chancellor's Instruments.

We do not believe any Falklands Campaign material has been passed to third parties.

**APPENDIX 3****Home Guard – previous forum comments:****18/04/2013**

(2.5) (Item 4.9 02/2013) Jeff James reiterated the post meeting note regarding the pilot Home Guard digitisation project: *As noted previously, the pilot Home Guard digitisation project identified that a significant number of individuals who served in the Home Guard were of a much younger age than previously thought, meaning that their records are still closed and that digitisation is not currently commercially viable. Once a much higher proportion of the collection can be opened and digitisation becomes commercially viable, commercial partners can be sought to digitise the collection in its entirety. This is likely to be some years in the future.*

**Q.** If this project is not yet attractive enough to a commercial partner is there any prospect of the work being carried out in-house?

**A.** In partnering with a commercial organisation we seek to minimise the risk to public funds whilst maximising the revenue generation potential. Where we are unable to attract interest from partners but believe there is still potential to generate revenue then we may digitise 'in-house'. The reality with the Home Guard series is that they are a huge set of records and we would not accept the risk in-house. Once the project becomes more commercially viable partners can then be sought to digitise the collection.

**12/02/2013:**

**Q.** When will the remainder of the Home Guard records be released?

**A.** We will take this away and find out. *(Post meeting update: As noted previously, the pilot Home Guard digitisation project identified that a significant number of individuals who served in the Home Guard were of a much younger age than previously thought, meaning that their records are still closed and that digitisation is not currently commercially viable. Once a much higher proportion of the collection can be opened and digitisation becomes commercially viable, commercial partners can be sought to digitise the collection in its entirety. This is likely to be some years in the future).*

**Inventory of government records - previous forum responses:****12/04/2013:**

(2.6) **Q.** At the last User Forum, User Advisory Group delegate Graham Woolgar advised that he had suggested that an inventory of documents being held by government departments be added to the TNA website. Has there been any further developments regarding this?

**A.** Yes. In September 2012, 80 government bodies that transfer records to The National Archives provided data on the volume and transfer status of the records they hold that were created up to 1984. The Record transfer report has been published on our website and can be accessed here:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/record-transfer-report.htm>

**Presentation of records - previous forum responses:****10/01/2013**

3.5 Q. (Item 2.2 November 2012) Royal Observer Corps (ROC) service records. Do TNA have any say in what happens to records that are presented to places of deposit?

A. Details of our role are annexed in our annual report 2011-2012 which can be viewed here:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/annualreport-11-12.pdf>

*Post meeting note: TNA's responsibility is the supervision of the selection of records for permanent preservation (i.e. those that are selected to be treated as public records, for ultimate transfer to TNA or to another approved Place of Deposit). We do not supervise the disposal of records not selected (and disposal includes presentation under s 3.6).*

*The decision to offer records that have not been selected for permanent preservation to another institution is made by the relevant government department (sometimes in consultation with TNA, but not always). These offers require the approval of the Lord Chancellor under s 3(6) of the Public Records Act; a power that has been delegated to the Keeper and thence to the Head of Archive Sector Development. TNA advises on the suitability of the institution to receive the records. We endeavour to ensure that records are only presented to institutions which can manage them responsibly and sustainably, especially where they involve ongoing Data Protection issues. It is fair to say that we are more pro-active in this now than we have been in the past. Presentation is described more fully in the Records Collection Policy (para 4.2)*

*<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/records-collection-policy-2012.pdf>. The draft of this recently published policy did go out for consultation.*

*Operational Selection Policies (OSPs) occasionally make reference to disposal under s 3(6) for records which are not to be selected. Again, the OSPs are subject to public consultation before being finalised.*

*As presentation of records is a matter for the relevant government department, TNA has not gone out to consultation over decisions or proposals on the presentation of specific collections, such as Royal Observer Corps service records. However, as stated above, it is sometimes covered more widely within the OSPs.*

**08/11/2012:**

2.2 Royal Observer Corps service records

Records relating to the service of ROC personnel were presented by the MoD to the ROC Museum Trust in 2011. We are also aware of a number of deposits relating to specific units in local record offices noted on the National Register of Archives, and the Museum has deposited its own collection of archival material with Hampshire Archives and Local Studies (HALS). The catalogue is available on the HALS website:

[http://calm.hants.gov.uk/Dserve/Dserve.exe?dsqIni=DserveE.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqPos=6&dsqSearch=\(\(text\)='observer'\)](http://calm.hants.gov.uk/Dserve/Dserve.exe?dsqIni=DserveE.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqPos=6&dsqSearch=((text)='observer'))

As far as we are aware the presented service records do not form part of the deposit at HALS and remain with the Museum Trust at the Peninsula Barracks.

Records presented under s.3(6) cease to be public records and are no longer subject to the Public Records Act; however, as a matter of policy The National Archives continues to take an interest in records that have been presented and the institutions that receive them.

**Information Management and Practice (IMP) department - previous forum updates:**

11/10/2012:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/user-forum-minutes-october-2012.pdf>

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/user-forum-information-management-and-practice-october-2012.pdf>

**Records Decision Panel - previous forum updates:**

12/07/2012:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/user-forum-records-decision-panel-terms-of-reference-july-2012.pdf>

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/user-forum-selection-decision-tree-july-2012.pdf>