



Preliminary survey on Technical staff, Documentation systems and Inventories in African museums

Report

**Anne Ambourouè Avaro, Alain Godonou
Ecole du Patrimoine Africain – EPA
October 2009**

Contents

I. Introduction	p. 1
II. Methodology	p. 1
III. Survey results and analysis	p. 4
IV. Conclusions	p. 8
V. Recommendations	p. 9
VI. Annexes	p. 11
- Thanks	p. 12
- Contacts	p. 13
- Synthetic table of survey results	p. 14
- Countries of the A.U and UNESCO Conventions	p. 17
- Statistical data on countries	p. 20
- Survey form (English)	p. 21

I- Introduction :

The African Union commissioned the Ecole du Patrimoine Africain - EPA, after consultation with UNESCO and ICCROM, to carry out a preliminary survey to evaluate the situation and the state of professional capacities in the technical areas of collections' documentation systems, inventories and heritage protection on the continent.

This survey shows the will of the AU, in response to the preoccupations of African cultural development stakeholders to further the discussions and reflections on the strategy for the strengthening of the protection and promotion of African cultural goods.

The results of the survey shall be discussed during the 2nd Pan African Cultural Congress on "Inventory, Protection and Promotion of African Cultural Goods" which is scheduled to take place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from November 9 to 11 2009.

The objectives of the Congress are the following:

1. To improve the safeguarding of Africa's Cultural Heritage and upgrade the capacities, management, organisation and activities of National Museums, which responds to local needs and the agenda for the African Cultural Renaissance;
2. To position the National Museums as partners and resources for regional cooperation and the integration of Africa;
3. To mobilise all stakeholders in a concerted effort to share responsibilities and create synergies in the renewal of Pan African, Regional Cultural Institutions and National Museums.

Due to time limitation, we were not able to carry out an exhaustive survey of museums in all the member countries of the African Union. The data used here comes from a sample of 15 museums in 14 countries.

The survey was coordinated by Anne Ambourouè Avaro, Coordinator of the Publishing Department at EPA, based in Libreville, Gabon. This report presents the survey results as well as recommendations to be discussed at the Congress.

II- Methodology:

A- Reality of the *National Museum*

The terms of reference from which the objectives of the congress are derived and which are cited above use a key-concept: *National Museum*. It is necessary to clarify the concept of National Museum. What realities does this name entail in the various countries?

- A first reality is the National Museum which bears that name, which is located in the capital city and which has a status which gives it a relative autonomy. This is the case of the National Museum of Mali, in Bamako. It is almost the only public museum of the country which is of that size.
- There is also a sort of "national network of public museums", that is to say which are public service institutions and more or less linked to a ministry in charge of cultural affairs. Such is the case of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB), with a "main" national museum in Accra, the capital city, and more modest national museums, of secondary rank, in the rest of the country. This is also the case of the National Museums of Kenya (NMK). One could be tempted to think that this type of organisation is common to former British colonies in Africa. In the network of Zambian National Museums the status of national museum is designated so through government subsidiary legislation. Thus, though the Livingstone museum is the oldest and largest, the other 3 national museums; Moto Moto Museum in Mbala, Lusaka Museum in Lusaka, and Copperbelt Museum in Ndola enjoy equal national museum status.

- In Benin, the Musée Historique d'Abomey which was part of the current survey, and the importance of which is undeniable, does not have the official title of National Museum. This title is not used for any institution constituting the museum public service in Benin.
- In Dakar, Senegal, the institution which could automatically be regarded as a national museum, the Musée de l'IFAN located in Place Sowéto, is not part of the network of public museums attached to the Ministry in charge of cultural affairs. However the historical importance and the status of this museum are such that it would not be understandable if it had not been taken into account when studying national museums in Africa.
- Without speaking of issues of status which are not only complex but varied, and without prejudicing of the "size", it seems that sometimes *national museum*, where they are not legally or officially designated as such is synonymous with *public museum*, sometimes in opposition with *local museum*. Moreover, the concept of a national museum may not always and systematically describe a unique physical establishment as exemplified by the National Museums of Kenya.

B- Survey

1) Survey form:

The survey was carried out mainly by email.

A questionnaire in French and in English (cf. Annexes p. 19) was devised by Ms Anne Ambouroué Avaro and Mr. Alain Godonou. The aim of the questionnaire was to gather information and data to be able to know the state of the surveyed museums' staff (numbers, age, budget, training) and of the documentation of the collections (size of collection, presence or lack of a basic documentation system), and recommendations of museum directors to the Congress.

2) Selection of museums

A list of 18 museums was drawn up by EPA. The list was created from the network of museum professionals that EPA already had, and was completed and refined eventually by suggestions from museum colleagues (Mr. Luhila, Ms Deerpalsingh for example). The aim was to survey a variety of museums to include: regional representativeness (East, West, North, Southern Africa and the Islands), domain representativeness (ethnography, natural history, history...); language: English-speaking, French-speaking, Portuguese-speaking; size of collection.

3) List of contacts

EPA had contacts for most selected museums (cf. list of contacts in annexes p. 13). Further contacts were provided as stated above by members of the network.

4) Surveying

All the museums of the list were contacted, mostly by e-mail. 14 of them replied by sending back the form filled in. Any additional details that were needed were dealt with by e-mail. For the National Museum of Gabon which did not return the form, information was provided by the 2007 survey.

C- Other sources of information

Additional and complementary information was gathered to complete and facilitate the analysis of data gathered during the survey.

- Statistical databases enabled us to gather economic and demographic information for each country covered by the survey. The GDP enabled us to elaborate indicators on the relative amount of resources allocated to *national museums*; demographic data on cities where museums covered by the survey were located enabled us to put into relief their levels of attendance by visitors.
- The UNESCO web site enabled us to measure the degree of commitment of countries members of the AU Member countries in so far as International Conventions that protect cultural heritage are concerned. The ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) web site gives a list of member states of this specialised institution, thereby giving an indication on the interest of these countries in issues concerning the conservation of cultural heritage.

- Surveys carried out by EPA on collections documentation and inventories in museums in past years were also used as sources of reference data to back up some analysis of the current survey results.

III- Survey results and analysis (see annex for synthetic table of survey results p. 14)

We think it important to stress the fact that the situation in Anglophone and Francophone countries differs greatly in some aspects, e.g. staff training and numbers, and number of collections.

Through the data gathered during the survey it appears that:

Staff:

By staff, we mean the entire members of staff of the museum, whatever their status, whether they are permanent or on contract.

Data gathered from the 15 museums that responded to the questionnaire show a total of 559 members of staff from the surveyed museums. This figure is sufficient to make projections, even if it is only a preliminary survey.

Training:

The proportion of staff possessing a degree in museum studies or museum related discipline (curatorship, conservation, outreach programmes) is of only 6%! This is an old development which still continues in African museums. Staff are recruited with degrees in various disciplines such as History, Archaeology, Sociology, Biology, etc., without any adapted museum professional training.

Unfortunately, too few people have the possibility of being trained on the long term: 9% of staff did benefit from a specialised training after having been employed.

On a more global perspective and to try to make comparisons with other professions we observe that the ratio between qualified staff entering museums versus the population of the towns where these museums are located is of one heritage specialist for a little more than 400.000 inhabitants! This is a very high ratio. Would not such a ratio for doctors, whatever the country considered, be detrimental?

From the details of the data gathered we can say that:

Except for most museums in Anglophone countries in our sample, and the case of Burkina Faso, staff who possess a degree in Museum related studies are relatively few. 5 out of 14 museums have no staff members with an undergraduate (BA) or postgraduate degree (MA +) in a museum related subject; 3 out of 14 only have one; 5 out of 14 have more than two. That brings to 32 the number of graduates from our sample of 14 museums with 559 members of staff.

But the situation between museums, in view of the figures above, is, however, very unequal between museums. 29 of these 32 graduates are located in five museums only.

Degrees were obtained at various institutions: University of Western Cape-South Africa, Osaka JICA Centre-Japan, CHDA-Kenya, EPA-Benin, ICCROM (PREMA)-Italy, Université Senghor d'Alexandrie-Egypt, etc.

Many staff members, nevertheless, have followed short term training sessions on various subjects relating to museums (conservation, documentation, education...). All surveyed museums have at least one staff member who followed a workshop or training session while employed in the museum. Some staff have followed several training sessions and workshops throughout their career, reaching for some, up to ten workshops or training sessions in a period of nine years.

Most of these workshops and training sessions were provided by WAMP, EPA, CHDA, ICCROM, Africa 2009.

This seems to show that African museums do not have many staff members which have an undergraduate (BA) or postgraduate (MA...) degree in the area of museum or museum related studies. Some staff, nevertheless, have attended a number of short training sessions and workshops.

Age:

The age pyramid is globally larger at the top than at the base, showing a relatively aged or ageing staff. On the global sample, about 40% of the staff in employment is less than 40 years old. But this proportion could yet be adjusted if we take into account the fact that in four museums relatively rich in staff members, the team is quite young (less than 40).

Only four museums have at least half their staff that is less than 40 years old. Four have less than a quarter of their staff which is less than 40 years old.

This seems to show that the museums do not actively recruit new and especially young people. This, from EPA's point of view, is particularly visible in training sessions and workshops: we tend to see the same participants over and over through the years. However, this is an average, with the situation varying a lot from one museum to another (from 1% less than 40, to 80% less than 40).

Gender:

There is near parity between genders in surveyed museum staff on average, with women slightly more represented: 51,5%.

Documentation of collections:

During the evaluation workshop of the survey on Museum documentation systems carried out by EPA for ICCROM/UNESCO in 2007, the four basic elements of a museum documentation system were defined as: accession number on the artefact, accession register in which the collection is recorded, location system and card catalogue and/or database recording all artefacts.

The range in the number of artefacts contained in the collections of the sample museums is very large: it varies from 1430 (Abomey, Benin) to 1,700,000 artefacts (Kampala, Uganda).

In the current study, all surveyed museums have an **accession register**¹, which is one of the four basic elements of a documentation system. However, none of these museums have their entire collection recorded in the accession register, which means that a portion of the collection (going from 78% to 1%) is not recorded and therefore has no official existence. One museum professes to have 100% of their collection recorded, but the Curator himself has doubts as to the number of artefacts the collection contains. This creates a series of problems for the security of the collection: how can one carry out an efficient inventory/stocktaking of the collection if the document that is supposed to record all the artefacts is incomplete? How can the museum prove ownership of the part of its collection that is not recorded?

78,5% of museums (11 out of 14) say that they have a **card catalogue**². However, only one museum (Abomey, in Benin) has a complete card catalogue. The degree of completeness of the others varies from 0,3% to 95% approx.

64% of museums profess having carried out an **inventory/stocktaking** of their collection in the last ten years or are currently doing so. 14% (2 museums) made the inventory more than ten years ago. For those inventories that are finished, 5 out of 7 museums declare that the inventories showed that artefacts were missing. However missing artefacts could be more, since they are not all recorded. How can we know what we have lost if we did not know what we had in the first place?

All museums in the sample profess to have a **location system**, either location codes in the storage and display areas (4) or a location and movement register (3), or both (6). We would like to point out here that having only a Loans and Movement register is not enough. Location codes should also be positioned on storage and display areas, and reported in the appropriate documents. In this instance, only 6 out of 14 museums seem to be up to standards.

10 out of 14 museums have a **registrar**, or person in charge of the documentation of the collections. However, only 5 out of 10 (i.e. half) of these registrars have followed training in documentation. These results are slightly lower than the ones from the survey carried out by EPA in 2007 in different museums from the current survey, which stated that more than half of staff from the surveyed museums were trained in documentation.

¹ Official administrative document, which proves the museum's legal title to property. It is the base of the museum's entire documentation system. Artefacts are recorded in it as they are acquired by the museum as soon as they are given an accession number.

² Basic file of the documentation system. In it, cards are classified by chronological order of accession number, in the same order as in the accession register.

5 out of 14 (35%) museums have a **computerised database**. None however records the collections completely. The percentage of collections recorded in the databases vary from 0,1% to 56%.

To conclude, all museums in our sample have got the basic elements of a documentation system, but these are incomplete, except for one museum. This means that the museums may not know the extent of their collections, which poses a major risk to the security of collections. Incomplete documentation also has a negative impact on the efficiency of museums since it hampers proper management and use of collections (i.e. research, acquisitions, conservation, public programmes, designing of exhibitions, etc.).

Budget:

Annual budget:

All museums in the sample depend on the Ministry of Culture for their budget, except the Uganda Museum of Kampala which depends on the Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry and the Livingstone and Lusaka Museums which depend on the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources. The IFAN museum of Senegal, although it depends on IFAN, is autonomous, and finances itself, according to the information provided, through entrance fees and the rental of studios and exhibition rooms.

Museum budgets pay for staff costs (although this is not enough for some museums, which are in debt because of this) as well as running costs.

Only three museums of the sample have a specific budget for capacity building, which may mean that for the majority, this is not part of any policy or strategy within Ministries of which museums depend. Training, whether short or long term, is therefore financed by other means, supposedly grants and sponsorship...

Field realities prove that despite the fact that museums depend on the Government Ministries the practical situations can be very different. In particular, the institution can have an autonomous budget that it can manage more or less as it chooses, which is the case of the National Museums of Ghana, Lusaka, Livingstone, Mali and Burkina Faso, etc.; but it can also totally depend on the civil service structures, that directly manage the public budget that is allotted to the museum, which is the case of the National Museum of Congo, of the Musée Historique d'Abomey, etc.

Collections' budget:

66% of surveyed museums have no budget for their collections, be it for acquisition, conservation or exhibitions. The remaining 34% have a budget for only two of these aspects (acquisitions + conservation or conservation + exhibitions), except one, Mali, which has a budget to finance the three aspects of collection. Even then, the budget for acquisitions is only for two years (2009-2010).

This means that acquisitions depend on gifts and/or archaeological campaigns. In some cases, the museum acquired a few artefacts through money from entrance fees. The consequence of this is that museums do not have a growing collection, or at least it grows very slowly. This does not apply to museums which have an archaeological department however: these have a collection which grows steadily, sometimes creating problems of storage and a backlog in accessioning which is caused by the very high number of artefacts arriving, few staff, and reduced storage areas.

Exhibitions and conservation (which seems to depend on the planning of exhibitions) are often left to the efficiency of the museum in raising funds and to the good will of sponsors.

Visitors:

Only 10 of 15 museums gave us the number of visitors they get per year. The number of visitors/city population ratio is a first indicator of the impact of a museum on the community in which it is located.

In Northern countries (Europe / North America) 40% is considered a good average attendance rate.

Six of the museums which communicated their visitor statistics have a ratio of less than 1% (Accra, Kampala, Libreville, Livingstone, Lomé and N'djamena). The Natural History Museum of Port-Louis and the Musée de Carthage/Tunis are around 34%, the Musée Historique d'Abomey is around 45%, and Aswan 248%! These four museums are located in cities which are visited by tourists, the case of Aswan being of course exceptional.

Even if it is still necessary to refine and complete these different ratios, particularly for example, the indicators on the attendance rates calculated for each segment of the national urban population, we can consider that less than 1% as a global attendance ratio is very low.

Therefore, it seems that outreach programme policies and in consequence the systems for observing visitors, seem to be at an embryonic stage on the continent.

IV. Conclusions

Please keep in mind that the data presented in this report were collected in the context of a preliminary survey, from a sample of museums, which may be representative, but remains relatively small. We cannot therefore make definite conclusions except to show main trends which should therefore be checked, confirmed or otherwise, by a more in depth and systematic survey.

From this different data, we can take into consideration the following main points:

Strong points:

Concerning technical staff:

- 1- All museums of the sample have at least one staff member who has followed training (short term or long term) in a museum related topic.
- 2- A majority (71%) of these museums have a person who is in charge of the documentation of collections

Concerning documentation and management of collections:

- 3- All surveyed museums have at least an embryo of a basic documentation system...
- 4- There appears to be some activity regarding the increase of collections in 90% of museums, despite the lack of funding (putting aside the specificity of archaeological collections). However, we have had few answers as to how these acquisitions were financed, when they were not gifts.

Weak points:

Concerning technical staff:

- 1- Most staff has attended short workshops. In 35% cases, there is no staff with a degree in museum related studies.
- 2- There is no budget for capacity building, meaning staff development is not taken into consideration or as a strategy by the heritage authorities. Museums have to rely on fund raising and sponsors to enable them to send staff for training. However, fund raising is also an art and needs to be taught if museums are to find financial resources on their own for capacity building and other aspects of their work.
- 3- Staff ageing
- 4- Staff mobility is also an important aspect in some museums as directors and other staff are appointed for, sometimes, too short periods of time. They get trained, but this training does not always benefit the institution as they are most often appointed to other sectors too soon after training, thus not allowing the institution to profit from their expertise and train other colleagues. Money, time and energy are spent on training people who may not stay long in their post.
- 5- Some museum staff in the survey (and those museums we refer to have small collections) have been trained in documentation of collections (whether they are or not in charge of collections' documentation). Despite this, the basic documentation elements of their museums may still be incomplete. One wonders what stops them from improving the situation.
- 6- Staff numbers: considering that the staff versus local population ratio is still feeble in general, the disparities observed can only be explained rationally by the absence of an overall policy or by the fact that public services have given up. It is not normal that the IFAN museum of Dakar (only 7 staff members for a town of 2.167.000 inhabitants) has so few human resources whereas the museum of Abomey which in the past was part of the same network of museums which the Dakar museum was at the head of, has so many more (27 staff for a town of 78.000 inhabitants).
If in our sample the National Museum of Togo in Lomé and the IFAN museum in Dakar are extreme cases, it may be that they are not the only ones on the continent.

Concerning documentation and management of collections:

- 6- 92% of the sample museums have not got their collections entirely accessioned: this is a great problem since if the artefacts are not recorded, there is no means of knowing what has disappeared, particularly in large collections, or for "minor" artefacts.
- 7- 61% of the sample have no budget for their collections, which means that their acquisition, conservation and display may not be part of any policy or strategy for the heritage authorities.

In general there is an obvious lack of harmonisation of heritage policies on the continent. It seems that no one learns neither from failures nor from the successes of others, not even those of ones neighbours!

V. Recommendations

The following recommendations are a mixture of our own and the ones given by the surveyed museums.

Recommendation 1: Need for capacity building

To manage a museum requires specific training. Therefore, capacity building must be made a priority strategy for relevant Ministries responsible for heritage to increase levels of trained staff as the ratio of one heritage specialist for 400.000 inhabitants is too feeble and should be multiplied by four at least in order to achieve a certain amount of efficiency in African museums.

Professional capacity building of Museum staff is required in curatorship and conservation, especially in the area of collection management. The current situation in many museums seems to imply that the raising of efficiency and professionalism of museum staff is not an important issue for relevant Ministries responsible for heritage.

Perhaps relevant Ministries responsible for heritage should include in their budget a line for capacity building of museum staff, so that training is not only subjected to the good will of sponsors.

Considering the importance of collection documentation in the protection, preservation and use of museum collections and noting the inadequate documentation of collections in African museums as well as the insufficiency of trained staff responsible for collection documentation, it is recommended that a ten year programme of training and support be drawn up to cater for the training of museum staff in documentation and provide support to documentation upgrading efforts in museums of sub Saharan Africa.

Staff mobility seems to be a problem in some museums:

- Relevant Ministries responsible for heritage should keep track of trained museum staff and ensure they stay in the museum service long enough to have an impact on museum services. Indeed, staff are trained to benefit the institution they are appointed in, in which they can then implement what they have learnt and train their colleagues. If they are appointed elsewhere too quickly, the whole effort becomes ineffective.
- Museum directors should study and understand what factors make their staff leave (lack of career evolution, lack of resources, pay...), and try and improve the situation working together with the relevant Ministry.

To strengthen the profession and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of museums, it is necessary to encourage the training of staff to undergraduate and postgraduate (BA, MA, +). As stated in the survey, there are already African institutions capable of providing such training. It is also important to ensure that staff are not only trained to these levels, but are sufficient in number.

Recommendation 2: Need for standards in African museums

As recommended in the EPA survey on documentation of museum collections of 2007, the setting of standards for African museums should be an incentive for achieving results, be it in collections management or in the level of education required for key staff members. Professional organisations such as AFRICOM and ICOM could be called upon to study the means of creating, encouraging and implementing such standards.

Ministries of culture, relevant Ministries responsible for heritage and heads of museums should take interest and be aware of the importance of a good documentation system for museum collections,

whether manual or computerised. Only they can give the necessary drive, and ensure in the long term that the work on good documentation system is done. Also, part of the budget of a museum should be dedicated to the creation and maintenance of a documentation system, as well as to the maintenance of the collections.

It should be noted that a good complete documentation system requires an enormous amount of time, thoroughness and energy (the more so if the collection is large, e.g. more than 5000 artefacts) to set up and maintain. This should be taken into consideration when embarking on the setting up of a documentation system, for the appointment of adequate staff, not only in terms of training, but also in terms of sufficient numbers and stamina.

Also, the survey results of 2007 showed that **90%** of museums which had started a computerised documentation system had failed, for various reasons. This should be kept in mind for further projects and strategies. Negative factors to the computerisation must be known and conquered before embarking on such plans. The knowledge of the reasons of the failure of documentation projects (whether computerised or not) is important for any future project.

Museum records are very important in the fight against illicit trafficking in Africa. An artefact which is accessioned and documented is more difficult to sell. Also, international policing institutions such as INTERPOL require that any stolen artefact should have been accessioned in order to issue a search warrant. In the fight against illicit trafficking in African cultural heritage, it is important that links are created between museum professionals, police and customs, and that training is provided to all these people in standard documentation methods to raise their awareness.

Recommendation 3: Harmonisation of policies on a regional level

African states should harmonise their policies and practices in the management of museums and their financing. The African sub-regions seem a suitable level to start that work, in order to later extend to the rest of the continent.

The international credibility of the continent also depends on the ratification of the International Conventions which protect and promote cultural heritage, particularly the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. A number of African countries have not yet ratified these conventions and should be encouraged to do so.

This report will be submitted and discussed during the 2nd Pan-African Congress which will take place from November 9 to 11, 2009 in Addis Ababa. It will be a basis for discussions and exchanges in order to better meet the needs of African museums in the area of documentation systems, inventories and technical staff, to help them become “partners and resources for regional cooperation and the integration of Africa”.

VI - Annexes

Our thanks to:

Many thanks for your patience and cooperation, and for taking time to complete the questionnaire and answer all our questions!

Raymond Agbo
Léonard Ahonon
Chedlia Annabi
Saloni Deerpalsingh
Vincent Katanekwa
Samuel Kidiba
Candia Leone
Mubiana Luhila
Kilaban Mbayam
Ossama Meguid
George Mudenda
Rose Mwanja Nkale
Vikas Rupear
Samuel Sidibé
Alimata Tanly
Ibrahima Thiaw
Yves Tublu

Our thanks also to:

the committee of experts who took time to read through the report and add their expertise to the end product.

- Mubiana Luhila, Director, Museum Development & Marketing, National Museums Board, Zambia
- Catherine Antomarchi, ICCROM
- Gaël de Guichen, ICCROM

Contacted museums

	Museum	Contact
1	National Museum of Uganda, Kampala	Rose Mwanja Nkale, Commissioner mwanjankale@yahoo.com
2	Musée National du Burkina Faso	Alimata Tanly, Director tanlyalimata@yahoo.fr
3	National Museum, Accra, Ghana	Raymond Agbo, Deputy Director roagbo@yahoo.com
4	Musée National du Congo	Samuel Kidiba, Director kidibas@yahoo.fr
5	Musée National du Tchad	Kilaban Mbayam, Curator kilabanmbay@yahoo.fr
6	Musée d'Art africain de l'IFAN, Sénégal	Ibrahima Thiaw, Curator thiawi@yahoo.com
7	Musée national du Mali	Samuel Sidibé, Director musee@afribone.net.ml ; musee@afribonemali.net
8	Musée National du Togo	Yves Tublu, Curator tukofo@yahoo.com
9	Musée Historique d'Abomey, Bénin	Léonard Ahonon, Manager ahononleonard@yahoo.fr
10	National Museum Livingston, Zambia	Vincent Katanekwa, Director livmus@microlink.zm
11	National Museum Lusaka, Zambia	George Mudenda, Director lusamus@zamnet.zm ; mudenda.georges@yahoo.com
12	Copperbelt Museum, Zambia	cbmus@zamnet.zm
13	Moto Moto Museum, Zambia	motomotomuseum@yahoo.com
14	Mauritius National Museum	Vikas Rupear, Curator mimuse@intnet.mu
15	Musée de Carthage, Tunisie	Chedlia Annabi, Curator chedlia@gmail.com
16	Musée d'Anthropologie, Angola	Fernando Manzambi Vuvu mavufernando@hotmail.com
17	Musée des Arts et Traditions, Gabon	Bouassa Mihindou museegabon@numibia.net
18	Nubia Museum, Egypt	Ossama Meguid ossama7@netscape.net

Synthetic table of survey results:

	Benin Abomey History Museum	Burkina Faso National Museum, Ouagadougou	Chad National Museum, N'djamena	Congo National Museum, Brazzaville	Egypt Nubia Museum, Aswan
Total staff (of which permanent / women / less than 40 years old)	27 (3 / 15% / 15%)	27 (22 / 70% / 60%)	13 (10 / 38% / 46%)	35 (21 / 33% / 33%)	120 (80 / 50% / 65%)
Degree in MS* (BA, MA or PGD)	0	6	0	0	N/A
Training in MS while in post	1	4 approx.	2	5	N/A
Global budget (of which staff / capacity building)	73,000 USD (36,500 USD / 0)	148,210 USD (139,500 USD / 0)	39,214 USD (N/A / 0)	43,576 USD (45,755 USD in 2009 / 0)	271,764 USD (90,490 USD / N/A)
Collections	1430	6500 approx.	3000 approx	3256 approx.	5000
Acquired in last 2 years	30	3000	0	50	40
Recorded in Accession register	99%	80%	18%	N/A	N/A
Card catalogue	Yes (1430)	Yes (10 000)	Yes (527)	Yes (N/A)	Yes (5000)
Location system	Yes (codes + register)	Yes (codes + register)	Yes (codes + register)	Yes (register)	No
Computerised database	No	No	No	Currently being developed	No
Inventory (missing)	2002 (missing)	2002 (none)	1996 (missing)	On going since 2008	2008 (none)
Registrar (Trained in DMC**)	Yes (DMC)	Yes (DMC)	No	Yes (N/A)	Yes (N/A)
Budget for collections (acquisitions / conservation / exhibitions)	1,430 USD (acquisitions+conservation)	0	0	0	27,139 USD (0 / 18,000 / 9,000)
Visitors (of which schoolchildren / Nationals) per year	2008: 35,000 (62,5% / 16,55%)	N/A	2007: 2402 (42% / 93%) 2008: 1187 (57% / 96%)	0 (museum opened to public in July 2009)	600,000 (20% / N/A)

*MS: Museum Studies or museum related studies; ** DMC: trained in Documentation of Museum Collections

	Gabon* National Museum, Libreville	Ghana National Museum, Accra	Mali National Museum, Bamako	Mauritius	Senegal Musée de l'IFAN
Total staff (of which permanent / women / less than 40 years old)	21	70 (64 / 26% / 22%)	58 (47 / 29% / 27%)	25 (25 / 25% / 30%)	7 (6 / 1% / 1%)
Degree in MS (BA, MA or PGD)	1	6	1	0	0
Training in MS while in post	2	5	1	2	7
Global budget (of which staff / capacity building)	N/A	999,551 USD (581,204 / 3242)	1,268,000 USD (287,000 USD / 0)	N/A	Depends on IFAN.
Collections	2400	23,000 approx.	10,000 approx.	N/A	9272 approx.
Acquired in last 2 years	25 approx.	3	512	N/A	0
Recorded in Accession register	80% approx.	95%	60%	25% (currently doing backlog work)	100% (+ or -)
Card catalogue	No	Yes (12,013)	Yes (8700)	Yes (N/A)	Yes (9272 approx.)
Location system	Yes (register)	Yes (codes + register + database)	Yes (codes + register)	Yes (loans forms)	Yes (codes)
Computerised database	Yes (419) - stalled	Yes (200) – on hold for training	Yes (5600)	No	No
Inventory (missing)	No	1988 (missing)	On going	On going	1999 (missing)
Registrar (trained in DMC)	No	Yes (DMC)	Yes (N/A)	Yes (N/A)	Yes (N/A)
Budget for collections (acquisitions / conservation / exhibitions)	N/A	4,000 USD (conservation+exhibitions)	436,000 USD for acquisitions in 2009 and 2010 only / for conservation and exhibitions, depends on exhibitions programme. But insufficient	19,292 USD (4,823 USD / 4,823 USD / 9,646 USD)	0
Visitors (of which schoolchildren / Nationals) per year	Closed since end 2007 for refurbishment 2004: 780 (5 school groups / N/A) 2006: 3500 (48 school groups / N/A)	12,000 (60% / 15%)	N/A	50,000 (for natural history museum)	No visitor statistics

* The National Museum of Gabon did not complete the questionnaire. For the purpose of the study, information dating from the 2007 survey has been used. We are fairly confident that nothing has changed, apart from a slight increase in the size of the collection, due to two gifts (about 25 artefacts) in 2008-2009.

	Togo National Museum, Lomé	Tunisia Museum of Carthage	Uganda National Museum, Kampala	Zambia Nat. Museum, Livingstone	Zambia Nat. Museum, Lusaka
Total staff (of which permanent / women / less than 40 years old)	5 (4 / 50% / 33%)	36 (23 / 45% / 80%)	46 (38 / 37% / 60%)	47 (41 / 26% / 17%)	26 (22 / 34.6% / N/A)
Degree in MS (BA, MA or PGD)	1	5	7 (1 BA, 6 PGD)	6 (1 BA, 5 PGD)	1
Training in MS while in post	1	1	9	7	4
Global budget (of which staff / capacity building)	N/A	100,000 USD (N/A / 30,000 USD)	58,394 USD (31,000 USD / 0)	300,000 USD (300,000 USD / 0): only pays partial staff: museum in debt	N/A (N/A / 0)
Collections	- 3000 approx	100,000	1,700,000 approx.	300,000 approx.	6000 approx.
Acquired in last 2 years	73	300 approx.	250	70	500 approx.
Recorded in Accession register	50%	60%	80% (ethnographic dept) Registers for 3/4 dept. all incomplete	93%	80%
Card catalogue	No	No (but all artefacts have a card)	Yes (60,000): ethnographic dept.	Yes (25,000)	Yes (20)
Location system	Yes (codes)	Yes (codes)	Yes (codes)	Yes (codes + register)	Yes (register)
Computerised database	None	Yes (11,000)	Yes (50,000: ethnographic coll. only)	Yes, under development (300)	No
Inventory (missing artefacts?)	2009 (none)	On going (none)	Ongoing	2005 (missing)	2006 (none)
Registrar (trained in DMC)	No	Yes (DMC)	Yes (No, only in records management)	Yes (DMC)	No
Budget for collections (acquisitions / conservation / exhibitions)	0	60,000 USD (15,000 conservation; 45,000 exhibitions)	0	0	0
Visitors (of which schoolchildren / Nationals) per year	5,000	Site: 600,000 Museum: 110,000	50,000 (75% / 7%)	53,000 approx. from 2005 (N/A / 41%) Marked drop in 2008, esp. foreigners	N/A

Countries of the African Union (U.A) and UNESCO Conventions

	1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property	2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage	2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage	2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions
Afrique du Sud	Acceptation			Ratification
Algeria	Ratification		Approbation	
Angola	Ratification			
Benin				Ratification
Botswana				
Burkina Faso	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Burundi			Ratification	Ratification
Cameroon	Ratification			Adhesion
Cape-Verde				
Comoros				
Congo				Ratification
Côte d'Ivoire	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Egypt	Acceptation		Ratification	Ratification
Eritrea				
Ethiopia			Ratification	Ratification
Gabon	Acceptation		Acceptation	Ratification
Gambia				
Ghana				
Guinea	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Guinée équatoriale				
Guinea-Bissau				
Jamahiriya	Ratification	Ratification		

arabe libyenne				
Kenya			Ratification	Ratification
Lesotho			Ratification	
Liberia				
Madagascar	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Malawi				
Mali	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Morocco*	Ratification		Ratification	
Mauritius	Acceptation		Ratification	Ratification
Mauritania	Ratification		Ratification	
Mozambique			Ratification	Ratification
Namibia			Ratification	Ratification
Niger	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Nigeria	Ratification	Ratification	Ratification	Ratification
Uganda			Ratification	
République centrafricaine	Ratification		Ratification	
République démocratique du Congo	Ratification			
Tanzania	Ratification			
Rwanda	Ratification			
Sao Tomé-et-Principe			Ratification	
Senegal	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification
Seychelles	Ratification		Ratification	Adhesion
Sierra Leone				
Somalia				
Sudan			Ratification	Ratification
Swaziland				
Chad	Ratification		Ratification	Ratification

Togo			Ratification	Ratification
Tunisia	Acceptation	Ratification	Ratification	Approbation
Zambia	Ratification		Ratification	
Zimbabwe	Acceptation		Ratification	Acceptation

* Morocco is no longer member of the AU.

A few statistical data on countries and towns in which surveyed museums are located:

		Town in which museum is located	Population of the town	GDP/inhabitant (in dollars)	Total country population (2009 estimate)
1	Benin	Abomey	78.000	1.500 (2008)	8.790000
2	Burkina Faso	Ouagadougou	825.000	1.200 (2008)	15.746.232
3	Congo	Brazzaville	1.080.000	4.000 (2008)	4.012.809
4	Egypt	Aswan	241.261	5.400 (2008)	83.082.869
5	Gabon	Libreville	420.000	14.400 (2008)	1.514.993
6	Ghana	Accra	1.963.460	1.500 (2008)	23.832.495
7	Mali	Bamako	850.000	1.200 (2008)	12.666.987
8	Mauritius			5.063 (2008)	1.284.264
9	Uganda	Kampala	1.353.236	1.100 (2008)	32.369.558
10	Senegal	Dakar	2.167.000	1.600 (2008)	13.711.597
11	Chad	N'Djamena	797.000	1.600 (2008)	10.329.208
12	Togo	Lomé	750.000	900 (2008)	6.019.877
13	Tunisia	Carthage (Tunis 1.996.000)	30.000	7.900 (2008)	10.486.339
14	Zambia	Livingstone	109.218	1.500 (2008)	11.862.740
15		Lusaka	1.267.458		



Survey on inventories and staff in African museums

The African Union commissioned EPA, after consultation with UNESCO and ICCROM, a preliminary survey to evaluate the situation and the state of professional capacities in the technical areas of collections inventories and heritage protection on the continent.

This survey shows the will of the AU, in response to the preoccupations of African cultural development stakeholders to further the discussions and reflections on the strategy for the strengthening of the protection and promotion of African cultural goods.

The results of the survey shall be discussed during the 2nd Pan African Cultural Congress on « Inventory, Protection and Promotion of African Cultural Goods » which is scheduled to take place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from November 9 to 11, 2009.

You may be invited to participate in the debates at the Congress to which the following objectives have been set by the AU:

4. To improve the safeguarding of Africa's Cultural Heritage and upgrade the capacities, management, organisation and activities of National Museums, which responds to local needs and the agenda for the African Cultural Renaissance;
5. To position the National Museums as partners and resources for regional cooperation and the integration of Africa;
6. To mobilise all stakeholders in a concerted effort to share responsibilities and create synergies in the renewal of Pan African, Regional Cultural Institutions and National Museums.

Please take time to read the questionnaire carefully and to reply to the questions as precisely as possible. Do not hesitate to contact me if some questions are not clear: the more your answers are to the point, the more the final document and suggestions that we bring forward will be relevant and adapted.

We would be grateful if you could return the completed surveys **by 20 August 2009**, to the email addresses listed below.

We thank you for your cooperation.

Anne Avaro
Coordinator of the Publishing Department
Ecole du Patrimoine Africain
01 BP 2205
Porto-Novo
BENIN
anne.avaro@epa-prema.net, cc : ib@epa-prema.net

Survey form

A. Identification:

Name of person who answered the form:

Contact:

Title/Function in the museum:

B. Museum:

1- Status of the museum:

National museum:

Other (please specify):

2- Type of museum:

What type of museum is it?

- natural history

- ethnography

- army

- history

- fine-arts

- other (specify)

3- Number of visitors per year: Of which nationals: Of which children:

C- Staff

1- How many staff does the museum have?

Of which:

- Civil servants (permanent staff).....

- On contract

- Intern(s)

2- Percentage of women:

3- Percentage of less than 40 years old:

4- Number of people per department or service (please join an organisation chart if possible):

5- Global museum budget:

6- Budget allocated for staff:

7- Budget allocated for capacity building (professional training):

D- Collections

1- Is there a person in charge of documentation of collections (registrar)?

Yes No

2- If yes, name of person in charge of documentation of collections and contact:

.....
.....

3- How many artefacts are there in your collection? (if this is an estimate, please put in brackets)

4- How many artefacts has your museum acquired (gift, bequest, purchase, field collection...) these last 2 years? (if you don't know, please write NA ; if an estimate, please put in brackets)

5- Budget for collections

5-1 Do you have a budget for acquisitions? How much?

5-2 Do you have a budget for conservation? How much?

5-3 Do you have a budget for exhibitions? How much?

6- Accession register*

6-1 Does your museum have an Accession register?

6-2 What proportion of your collection is listed in the accession register?

7- Location system

7-1 Does your museum have a system to locate the artefacts in the collection?

Yes No

7-2 What does this system consist in?

- loans and movement register *.....

- location codes

- other (specify)

8- Card catalogue (or catalogue file)*

8-1 Does your museum have a manual card catalogue?

Yes No

8.2- If yes, how many cards does the file contain? (if this is an estimate, please put in brackets)

9- Collection management software

9-1 Does your museum have a collection management software (computerised database) for its collections?

Yes No

9-2 If yes, how many artefacts are in the database?

10- Inventory

10-1 When was the last time you carried out an inventory of your collection?

10-2 Are any artefacts missing?

11- If you have any recommendations, ideas or concerns that you would like to submit to be discussed during the 2nd Pan African Cultural Congress, please feel free to express them below.

Glossary

Accession register: The accession register is an official administrative document, which proves the museum's legal title to property. It is the base of the museum's entire documentation system. As an official document, unique and irreplaceable, the accession register must meet the following criteria: *permanence*, *clarity* and *security*. It must be hard backed, bound and with numbered pages.

Catalogue file (or card catalogue, or master file): The catalogue file is the basic file of the documentation system. In it, cards are classified by chronological order of accession number, in the same order as in the accession register.

Loans and Movement Register: This is a bound book in which are indicated the different movements of an object inside and outside the museum. The register records, among other things, the destination, the departure date, the expected day of return and its effective return date.