

JOINT NAUTICAL ARCHAEOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE

Written Submission to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee's Inquiry on Heritage

January 2006

Introduction

The Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee ("JNAPC") welcomes the opportunity to respond to the new inquiry of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee into protecting, preserving and making accessible our nation's heritage.

The JNAPC was formed in 1988 from individuals and representatives of institutions who wished to raise awareness of Britain's underwater cultural heritage and to persuade government that underwater sites of historical importance should receive no less protection than those on land. JNAPC is widely recognised as a key body that speaks both collectively and authoritatively for both public and voluntary sector interests in the maritime and underwater cultural heritage. Some summary information on the JNAPC and its members is attached.

The JNAPC has devoted considerable resources to developing detailed proposals for legislative reform and would welcome the opportunity to give oral evidence to the Committee.

Background

Britain's position on the maritime edge of northwest Europe has ensured that these islands have one of the world's richest marine historic environments, including the remains of seagoing craft from the Neolithic to the 21st century. The current 'best guess' for the volume of shipping losses around the coast of the England alone throughout time varies between 100,000 and 500,000. The sites of historic wrecks are time capsules where organic material is often well preserved. We can get an insight into the way our ancestors lived, what they ate, how they traded and fought. For instance the only examples of English longbows ever found have come from the *Mary Rose*, and not just one or two, but boxes full of them!

As well as shipwrecks, there are the extensive former land surfaces on which people lived before a sea level rise cut Britain off from what is now mainland Europe around 10,000 BC. These land surfaces hold information about past climates, human habitation and land use. Of particular importance are the inundated former coastal regions where it is considered the majority of human habitation occurred in the past. If we do not understand how people lived in the continental shelf during the last million years we are not only failing to understand a substantial proportion of the whole prehistoric evolution and cultural development of the human race, but also ignoring previous eras of major climate change.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

Priorities for the Heritage White Paper

The White Paper must

1. Demonstrate, in the light of the *Sussex* and *Rooswijk* cases and the supposed heritage role of Green Ministers, how they will establish cross-departmental standards and co-ordination for heritage policy.
2. Show how UK provision and responsibilities for the Maritime Heritage will be integrated with a terrestrial regime that will only apply to England and Wales.
3. Provide for
 - a statutory system for heritage information.
 - extending statutory responsibilities of public bodies to manage areas and features of the historic environment for which they are responsible.
 - ensuring that all regimes regulating land use and development (including for example the proposed Marine Bill) make provision for heritage protection.
4. Introduce comprehensive new legislation for underwater cultural heritage, including wrecks and aircraft, submerged prehistoric landscapes and coastal and maritime structures.
5. Provide for the mandatory reporting of maritime heritage discoveries over 50 years old, removal of heritage from the salvage regime, and removal of the concept of ‘Salvor in Possession’.
6. Integrate with the Marine Bill in respect of proposals for Marine Spatial Planning, Marine Protected Areas and a Marine Management Organisation.

Effectiveness of DCMS, English Heritage and other relevant organisations

7. DCMS should take a much stronger lead role for the underwater historic environment in order to promote consistent policies across Government departments.
8. English Heritage and other UK state heritage bodies are making an important contribution to management of the marine historic environment but are severely restricted by out of date legislation and inadequate funding.
9. External bodies and NGOs need additional funding in order to develop, enhance and put in place a sustainable future for heritage-based outreach, education and training.
10. The introduction of statutory Historic Environment Records (“HER”) is essential to underpin the effectiveness of all national and local government, and introduce clearer developer awareness and more involvement of the public in their cultural heritage.

Balance between heritage and development

11. There is insufficient information about the archaeology of the seabed to inform planning decisions. Marine mapping of the seabed using high resolution remote sensing techniques is of paramount importance.
12. A comprehensive Marine Spatial Plan should be developed addressing the interests and requirements of all stakeholders, including heritage, out to the limit of UK jurisdiction.
13. The plethora of different regulatory regimes and licensing bodies has highlighted the need for closer collaboration and better standards for conducting EIA and SEA studies for the maritime heritage.
14. A clearer strategy for dealing with the depredations of the fishing industry on the maritime cultural heritage needs to be developed, particularly associated with submerged landscapes.

Access to heritage and the position of heritage as a cultural asset

15. There is a keen public interest in marine archaeology of both ships and people as testified by the large number of television programmes. It is our duty to preserve this history both for this and future generations.
16. Access is under-developed in relation to maritime heritage. More resources need to be made available, but the absence of Local Authority remit for submerged lands adjacent to their coasts is a barrier.
17. NGOs have done a great deal to foster responsible attitudes to the underwater cultural heritage, re-engaging people of all backgrounds with their maritime heritage. However they need more support to develop their capacity to tap into this rich seam of interest.
18. The Nautical Archaeology Society has developed the only modular avocational heritage training scheme (in either maritime or terrestrial heritage) that has been exported around the world. Such initiatives need more support and development.

Funding

19. The four UK state Heritage Agencies are under-resourced to fulfil their role of management of the underwater heritage.
20. We urge that the Olympics in 2012 should not adversely impact the level of funding for the long-term protection and management of the cultural heritage
21. The Heritage Lottery should continue to exist alongside other good causes to promote the educational, health and social benefits to be gained from people's involvement with and enjoyment of their heritage.
22. Maritime heritage NGOs need more support to develop their capacity to create opportunities for more people to become involved, and educate, enthuse and train them.
23. The principle that those causing damage to the heritage take financial responsibility for measures to address their impact should be extended to public bodies with strategic responsibility for the marine environment to fund survey and protective management.

Roles and responsibilities

24. All four state Heritage Agencies/Advisers should operate in the same way and in close collaboration with devolved Governments and where appropriate with DCMS. The role of the Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites could be widened.
25. There is a severe shortage of marine historic environment professionals and trained avocationalists. More investment is needed in professional and diver training, and access to the environment.
26. Museums need a new national collection, retention and conservation strategy to deal with the growing quantity of important material recovered from underwater sites, especially those on the foreshore or marine environment.

DETAILED COMMENTS**What the Department for Culture, Media and Sport should identify as priorities in the forthcoming Heritage White Paper;**

27. The recent case of the excavation of the *Rooswijk*, a Dutch East India Company vessel wrecked on the Goodwin Sands in 1739, illustrates very clearly the inadequacy of the current legislation for protecting underwater cultural heritage in the UK's territorial waters. Although the initial recoveries from the wreck were reported to one government department, DCMS, English Heritage and the Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites were not permitted to be informed and consequently were unable to consider protection by designation under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973. The cargo of silver bars and coins was recovered and passed on to the Dutch Government under an arrangement that has not been publicised, but we believe is based on the *Rooswijk* being claimed by the Dutch Government as a Sovereign vessel of the Netherlands and hence not necessarily subject to UK jurisdiction. It is believed that the Royal Dutch Mint may sell the bullion, and the artefacts and coin may be dispersed. Notwithstanding the issue of sovereignty, such an outcome may well be contrary to the Valletta Convention, which the Government has ratified, and contrary to the spirit of the Annex to the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, which the Government has agreed to adopt as 'best practice', although it has not ratified the Convention itself.
28. Whatever the detailed arrangements, this affair is uncannily similar to that of the British Government's contractual involvement with the US deep-water salvage company Odyssey to recover and sell off archaeological material from the *Sussex* which has been, and remains extremely controversial, as reflected by an Early Day Motion at the time the salvage contract was signed.
29. Both the *Rooswijk* and the *Sussex* cases illustrate the point the JNAPC has been making for several years, that the UK lacks any general joined up cross-departmental policy and standards for protection of the underwater cultural heritage in line with terrestrial provision. The contrast with the multilateral agreement over the Titanic and other international collaborations illustrate how sound principles *can* be applied and co-ordinated between Government departments, and this simply emphasises the lack of consistency in policy in an area regarded internationally as a litmus test of sound heritage protection. A fundamental issue for the White Paper therefore is to demonstrate how the UK Government is going to develop much clearer obligations on Green Ministers to establish cross-departmental standards and co-ordination for heritage policy.
30. A further overarching consideration for the Maritime Heritage is how current UK provision and responsibilities can be integrated with a terrestrial regime that only covers England (and Wales), and can be integrated with somewhat different provisions on issues such as licensing, metal detecting and portable antiquities that pertain in Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man and other regimes that are surrounded by UK territorial waters.

31. Other key overarching issues include the need for a statutory system for heritage information; extending statutory responsibilities of public bodies to manage the historic environment that they are responsible for; and ensuring that all regimes regulating land use and development (including for example the proposed Marine Bill) make provision for heritage protection.
32. Protection for underwater archaeology lags its terrestrial counterpart by at least eighty years and so there is an urgent need to catch up. A priority for the forthcoming Heritage White Paper must therefore be to introduce comprehensive legislation for the protection of the underwater cultural heritage, or marine historic assets (“MHA”) as currently being defined. Marine historic assets include not just wrecks but traces of humans and animals from submerged prehistoric landscapes, as well as coastal structures and aircraft.
33. Where possible, new legislation should provide for a seamless approach for improved protection for both terrestrial and marine historic assets. However there are special considerations for MHA including ownership and the difficulty of access to the environment. Among other things, new legislation should provide for the mandatory reporting of finds for anything over 50 years old, the removal of cultural heritage from the salvage regime, and the removal of the concept of ‘Salvor in Possession’. A useful model to be considered should be the Australian legislation.
34. New DCMS legislation must integrate with, and take advantage of, the Marine Bill currently being drafted by Defra for the natural environment. The main areas of overlap are Marine Spatial Planning, Marine Protected Areas and a Marine Management Organisation. We believe there are strong similarities between the protection needed by the marine historic environment and the marine natural environment and there is a need to avoid duplicated and confusing system of consents, information provision and enforcement regimes. It is important that DCMS, Defra, DTI, the Crown Estate, the nature conservation agencies, and the Heritage Agencies work closely together to develop a common procedure that covers protection of both natural and archaeological sites of importance.

The remit and effectiveness of DCMS, English Heritage and other relevant organisations in representing heritage interests inside and outside Government;

35. DCMS cannot act alone and is influenced by other Government departments such as DfT, Defra, DTI, MoD, FCO and Treasury. At present there is insufficient joined up government and DCMS should take a much stronger lead role for the underwater historic environment in order to promote consistent policies across Government departments and to prevent future occurrence of cases such as the *Rooswijk* and *Sussex*. This lead role should also apply to ensuring the implementation of the Valletta Convention across all departmental activities and the potential ratification of the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, which is the only available tool at present for protection of MHA beyond territorial waters.
36. The new maritime archaeological unit of English Heritage and other state heritage bodies are making an important contribution to the development of management of the marine historic environment in the UK but their activities are severely restricted by out of date legislation and inadequate funding.

37. External bodies and NGO's require additional funding in order to develop, enhance and put in place a sustainable future for heritage-based outreach, education and training that is a fundamental adjunct to new legislation, and for the continued development of policy.
38. There should be a statutory duty for local authorities to have, or have access to, a properly resourced Historic Environment Record ("HER"), which also has responsibility for its local territorial sea where appropriate. HERs will be essential for the reporting of finds, recording of MHA, fieldwork, and providing an index of other sources of information. This requires an extension of Local Government's remit beyond the current one of Low Water Mark. Funding of HERs will be required to meet the benchmarks and standards being prepared by the Heritage Protection Review. As well as underpinning the effectiveness of all Government Departments, devolved administrations and cultural heritage agencies (of which English Heritage is only one) in ensuring effective management of the marine and terrestrial heritage alike, this will bring greater involvement of Local Government and local communities in MHA in their areas.

The balance between heritage and development needs in planning policy;

39. At present there is every indication that much archaeology lies hidden on the seabed but there is very little information about where it actually is. There is, therefore, insufficient information about the archaeology underwater to inform planning decisions. Planning is also an important aspect of the proposed Marine Bill and this underlines why it is so important for DCMS to be involved in its development.
40. In English waters there are some 33,000 wreck sites, 5,200 of which have known positions and only about 70 are protected under one or other regime. 27,400 wrecks have been recorded but their positions have not been located. A further 7,400 fishermen's fastenings may indicate further wrecks; 1,100 aircraft are protected under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986. The estimate of wrecks in Scotland is 9,000, Ireland 3,000 and Wales 4,000. The best estimate of total shipping loss in UK waters is a few hundred thousand.
41. 10,000 years ago you could have walked from Harwich to Copenhagen on what are now submerged landscapes. Palaeolithic remains exist in marine aggregates as they do on land. Mesolithic sites (10-5k BP) exist on the Dogger Bank and Bouldnor Cliff in the Solent. Other examples are: flints found off Tynemouth; drowned Bronze Age fields in the Scilly Isles; prehistoric traces of humans and animals in Morecambe Bay; Seahenge; submerged forests in the Severn estuary and 2,300 submerged pre-historic sites located around Denmark. Dutch fishermen land about 20 tonnes of prehistoric mammal bones and 2000 mammoth teeth per year, some of them worked artefacts; and UK fishermen must be doing the same although not reporting them. However, the overall number, location, or extent of such sites is not known.
42. Both wrecks and submerged land sites are a unique and irreplaceable cultural resource. Once destroyed, this heritage will be lost forever. Much is physically fragile, exposed on the seabed and in the inter-tidal zone, and subject to many and varied threats: natural erosion; induced erosion; fishing and trawling; oil, gas platforms and pipelines; undersea cables; wind farms; harbour works and channel dredging; aggregate extraction; coastal development; salvage; and irresponsible sports diving.

43. In essence we do not know what is down there. In order, therefore, to assist the formulation of planning policy and to inform future coastal and offshore management, an immediate programme of seabed mapping should be commenced in conjunction with Defra using high-resolution remote sensing techniques. From this a comprehensive Marine Spatial Plan for the UK should be developed addressing the interests and requirements of all stakeholders. The plan should not be limited to the 12 nautical miles of the territorial sea but should stretch to the limit of UK jurisdiction as required under the Valletta Convention.
44. The balance between heritage and development can be addressed through other legal regimes for licensing development including Strategic Environmental Assessments (“SEA”), Environmental Impact Assessments (“EIA”), and effective use of the EIA process to identify problems and solutions. In conjunction with Marine Spatial Planning the SEA and EIA process should achieve a balance between economic and conservation interests. The mechanisms to investigate and mitigate against impacts to the marine historic environment during development are becoming recognised. There is a need to ensure the development sector has a statutory duty to include the conservation of the underwater cultural heritage and is fully aware of these responsibilities and their implications. Currently the plethora of different regulatory regimes and licensing bodies responsibility for the marine environment, and the lack of any recognised standards for conducting EIA and SEA studies for the maritime heritage, has resulted in even more variability in the adequacy of Environmental Assessments than there is for the terrestrial environment. Establishing closer collaboration and better standards for maritime heritage SEAs and EIAs would do a great deal to enable damage to be avoided or mitigated effectively.
45. An area that this will not tackle is the depredations caused by seabed trawling, which is thought to be at least if not more damaging to the maritime heritage than ploughing is on land. Ploughing is now at last being taken seriously for the terrestrial heritage but there is no such thing as marine agri-environment schemes to match those on land. A clearer strategy for dealing with the effects of the fishing industry on the maritime cultural heritage needs to be developed.

Access to heritage and the position of heritage as a cultural asset in the community;

46. The cultural heritage is an important asset that carries immense popular support and as such has tourist and economic value. In a recent English Heritage study, over two thirds of overseas visitors came to England for the Heritage. The marine historic environment holds one of the largest archives of information concerning the nation’s national and international development prior to the 21st century. There is a keen public interest in marine archaeology of both ships and people as testified by the large number of television programmes. It is our duty to preserve this history both for this and future generations.
47. Access is under-developed in relation to maritime heritage. More resources need to be made available to make this hidden heritage available to a wider public through museums, virtual presentations, diver trails, local amenities and societies. As stated above a major limiting factor is the absence of Local Authority remit below Low Water Mark and the lack of funding for HERs, museums and societies to promote local access to the maritime heritage.

48. The Nautical Archaeology Society (“NAS”), the national societies representing sports divers and several regional and local groups (notably the Hampshire and Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology) have developed good working relationships and excellent outreach initiatives that have done a great deal to foster responsible attitudes to the underwater cultural heritage, including excellent collaboration with the Receiver of Wreck. There is a growing number of initiatives supported by a wide variety of sources for excellent outreach work for adults, youth and children alike, but compared with terrestrial involvement all these efforts are still only reaching a relatively limited number of people, and the potential in this area has still only just begun to be developed. It offers enormous scope for re-engaging people of all backgrounds with their maritime heritage, both in the UK and around the world, but voluntary bodies need more support to develop their capacity to tap into this rich seam of interest.
49. Over the last 20 years the NAS has developed a modular training scheme that goes from basic introductory level to equivalent of an MA in practical underwater archaeology, which has now been adopted on a franchise basis in Scotland, NE England and 18 countries round the world, often with the support of official government recognition. This is the only scheme of its kind for either maritime or terrestrial heritage that has been exported around the world. The NAS is collaborating closely with the IFA, which is actively developing professional standards in this area, to establish a basis for clearer benchmarking of training against standard National Vocational Qualifications. It is hoped that English Heritage, having not renewed its previous grants for the NAS training scheme will be providing funds to support the developmental work needed in this area.

Funding, with particular reference to the adequacy of the budget for English Heritage and for museums and galleries, the impact of the London 2012 Olympics on Lottery funding for heritage projects, and forthcoming decisions on the sharing of funds from Lottery sources between good causes;

50. Museums and galleries, national and local, should be encouraged to develop collections and research expertise in the whole range of maritime heritage (as indicated above) but particularly in marine and nautical archaeology.
51. The four UK state Heritage Agencies are under-resourced to fulfil their role of management of the underwater heritage. English Heritage has an insufficient maritime budget mainly because inadequate financial resources were transferred across by DCMS when it passed responsibility for maritime archaeology to English Heritage in 2002. English Heritage needs the resources to fund a proper strategy for its section of the marine historic environment, an area three quarters the size of mainland England, and to improve training and communication at every level, inter-governmental, members of the public, divers, and interest and lobby groups. Lack of funding has also prevented systematic data exchange between English Heritage and HERs, which will be necessary in future to develop their maritime roles. HERs will also need additional funding to enable them to carry out potential future roles in providing specialist advice services on marine development and marine designations.
52. We urge that the Olympics in 2012 should not adversely impact the level of funding for the long-term protection and management of the cultural heritage.

53. We firmly believe that the Heritage Lottery should continue to exist alongside other good causes: it has a clear remit with very well recognised and much appreciated outcomes, especially where it enables people to get involved. The educational, health and social benefits to be gained are very much more than just preservation of heritage. But the value of heritage in these ways is poorly recognised, so what it can do for people is likely to be lost if it is submerged within the other good causes.
54. Although there is probably now a wider range of funding sources before in maritime heritage, many voluntary bodies in underwater cultural heritage (as with terrestrial heritage) are so small that even having the capacity to develop project proposals that meet funding bodies' criteria can be a challenge. The capacity of such bodies to create opportunities for more people to become involved, and educate, enthuse and train them is so limited that this in itself is probably inhibiting the release of funding that may already be available.
55. The principles of EIA, that those causing damage to the environment should take moral and financial responsibility for safeguarding it or offset any losses, is fundamental to the protection of the marine cultural heritage from damage or requiring its proper reporting and recording when it cannot be saved. This is likely to be of crucial importance as the threat of development from energy, aggregates, ports and other developments offshore continues to grow. But at a more strategic level the SEA Directive should be used to establish a similar wider responsibility on public bodies to carry out broader surveys and help develop more opportunities for public involvement in protection and management of the maritime heritage. The Crown Estate has established on a small scale the type of scheme in this area that needs much greater resourcing. Likewise, the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund has provided much needed injection of support to help offset the damage potentially caused by marine dredging. This principle deserves wider application to other bodies (for example modest contributions from the climate change levy might be used to help deal with damage to the maritime heritage related to renewable energy schemes).

What the roles and responsibilities should be for English Heritage, the Heritage Lottery Fund, local authorities, museums and galleries, charitable and other non-Governmental organisations in maintaining the nation's heritage; and whether there is an adequate supply of professionals with conservation skills; the priority placed by planning authorities on conservation; and means of making conservation expertise more accessible to planning officers, councillors and the general public;

56. English Heritage should be the designating organisation for England, both for land and the sea, and should continue to advise DCMS and other Government Departments. Historic Scotland, Cadw and DoE Northern Ireland should operate in the same way and in close collaboration with devolved Governments and where appropriate with DCMS. The role of the Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites should be widened to provide independent advice to Government, both nationally and internationally, on a range of maritime heritage issues including wrecks and submerged land sites and to help develop better cross-departmental collaboration.

57. There is a severe shortage of marine historic environment professionals and trained avocationalists. English Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund should make more funds available for projects in relation to the marine historic environment, particularly for investment in professional and diver training, and access to the environment. These are likely to be the single most important requirements needed to ensure that there is capacity to deal with the increasing pressure on and access to the maritime cultural heritage.

58. Museums need funding for a new national collection, retention and conservation strategy to deal with the growing quantity of important material recovered from underwater sites, especially those on the foreshore or maritime environment. Such sites routinely provide quite exceptional conditions of preservation that hardly ever apply to terrestrial remains. While it is clearly accepted that not every well-preserved timber or artefact is worthy of long-term preservation, the position has now been reached where it has been impossible to find museums to take material that is of real importance for future research. Rather than see timbers from an Elizabethan merchantman found in the Thames estuary destroyed for want of proper conservation by a museum, the NAS has taken the novel step of relocating them in a lake near Portsmouth accessible to divers, but their long-term conservation is as yet unproven. An enthusiastic local group who have conducted an award-winning investigation of a wreck near Weymouth have found no museum prepared to accept their donated collection of finds and archives. It is dispiriting and counterproductive when much valued work carried out with the public interest at heart by volunteers is thus discarded.

Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee
c/o Council for British Archaeology, 66 Bootham, York, YO30 7BZ

January 2006

Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee

Members

Chairman

Robert Yorke

Organisations

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers
 British Sub Aqua Club
 Council for British Archaeology
 Hampshire & Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology
 Institute of Conservation
 Institute of Field Archaeologists, Maritime Affairs Group
 ICOMOS
 National Maritime Museum
 National Museums & Galleries of Wales
 National Trust
 Nautical Archaeology Society
 Professional Association of Diving Instructor
 Shipwreck Heritage Centre
 Society for Nautical Research
 Sub Aqua Association
 Wessex Archaeology
 Wildlife and Countryside Link

Paul Gilman
 Jane Maddocks
 Gill Chitty
 Garry Momber

 Julie Satchell
 Chris Dobbs
 Gillian Hutchinson
 Mark Redknap
 David Thackray
 George Lambrick
 Suzanne Pleydell
 Peter Marsden
 Ray Sutcliffe
 Stuart Bryan
 Anthony Firth
 Helen Meech

Individual representation

Sarah Dromgoole
 Steve Waring
 Michael Williams

Affiliation

Leicester University

 Wolverhampton
 University

Observers

Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites
 Cadw
 The Crown Estate
 English Heritage
 Environment Service, Northern Ireland
 Historic Scotland
 Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Receiver of Wreck
 Ministry of Defence
 Ministry of Defence
 Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland

Tom Hassall
 Sian Rees
 Carolyn Heeps
 Ian Oxley
 Brian Williams
 Andrew Burke
 Sophia Exelby
 Peter MacDonald
 Bob Stewart
 Robert Mowat

JOINT NAUTICAL ARCHAEOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE

THE JNAPC - PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

The JNAPC was formed in 1988 from individuals and representatives of institutions who wished to raise awareness of Britain's underwater cultural heritage and to persuade government that underwater sites of historical importance should receive no less protection than those on land.

The JNAPC launched *Heritage at Sea* in May 1989, which put forward proposals for the better protection of archaeological sites underwater. Recommendations covered improved legislation and better reporting of finds, a proposed inventory of underwater sites, the waiving of fees to the Receiver of Wreck, the encouragement of seabed operators to undertake pre-disturbance surveys, greater responsibility by the Ministry of Defence and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office for their historic wrecks, proper management by government agencies of underwater sites, and the education and the training of sports divers to respect and conserve the underwater historic environment.

Government responded to *Heritage at Sea* in its White Paper *This Common Inheritance* in December 1990 in which it was announced that Receiver's fees would be waived, the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England would be funded to prepare a Maritime Record of sites, and funding would be made available for the Nautical Archaeology Society to employ a full time training officer to develop its training programmes. Most importantly the responsibility for the administration of the 1973 Protection of Wrecks Act was also transferred from the Department of Transport, where it sat rather uncomfortably, to the then heritage ministry the Department of the Environment. Subsequently responsibility passed to the Department of National Heritage, which has since become the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

The aim of the JNAPC has been to raise the profile of nautical archaeology in both government and diving circles and to present a consensus upon which government and other organisations can act. *Heritage at Sea* was followed up by *Still at Sea* in May 1993 which drew attention to outstanding issues, the *Code of Practice for Seabed Developers* was launched in January 1995, and an archaeological leaflet for divers, *Underwater Finds - What to Do*, was published in January 1998 in collaboration with the Sports Diving Associations BSAC, PADI and SAA. The more detailed explanatory brochure, *Underwater Finds - Guidance for Divers*, followed in May 2000 and *Wreck Diving – Don't Get Scuttled*, an educational brochure for divers, was published in October 2000.

The JNAPC continues its campaign for the education of all sea users about the importance of our nautical heritage. The JNAPC will be seeking better funding for nautical archaeology, and improved legislation, a subject on which it has published initial proposals for change in *Heritage Law at Sea* in June 2000 and *An Interim Report on The Valletta Convention & Heritage Law at Sea* in 2003. The latter made detailed recommendations for legal and administrative changes to improve protection of the UK's underwater cultural heritage.

The JNAPC has played a major role in English Heritage's review of marine archaeological legislation and in DCMS's consultation exercise *Protecting our Marine Historic Environment: Making the System Work Better*, and is currently represented on the DCMS Salvage Committee reviewing potential requirements for new legislation. The JNAPC has also been working towards the ratification of the UNESCO Convention with the preparation of the *Burlington House Declaration*, which has been presented to Government.