

No 224

**THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

**AT A MEETING ON**

**TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2011**

**AT 9.30 A.M.**

**AT THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

**Present**

**TRUSTEES**

Oliver Stocken (in the Chair)  
Professor Sir Roy Anderson FRS FMedSci  
Louise Charlton  
Ian Henderson CBE  
Dr Derek Langslow  
Professor Georgina Mace CBE FRS

**In Attendance**

Sharon Ament	Director of Public Engagement
Joe Baker	Special Adviser to the Director
Anna Cuss (Minutes)	Executive Assistant to the Director and Secretary to the Board
Dr Michael Dixon	Director
Neil Greenwood	Director of Finance & Corporate Services
Professor Richard Lane	Director of Science

Closed session

**1322 PROGRESS WITH APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR OF SCIENCE AND THE SCIENCE STRUCTURE PROJECT**

The Director updated Trustees on progress thus far. Following interviews of a number of short-listed candidates in January, a decision was taken not to appoint, but to refine the search by amending the criteria and thus widening the field of potential candidates. In addition, the Director was taking a more visible role in speaking to and encouraging candidates to come forward. Since it was now unlikely that a new Director of Science would be in place before Professor Lane's retirement date, Trustees approved the proposal that an interim Director of Science from within the Museum should be appointed. This would assist in providing continuity and stability during a time of transition. It was agreed that Professor Phil Rainbow, currently Keeper of Zoology, be approached to take on this role from 1 June 2011.

**1323 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Daniel Alexander QC, Professor David Drewry, Professor Alex Halliday, Professor Jacqueline McGlade and Sir David Omand.

**1324 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 23 NOVEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the meeting of the Trustees held on 23 November 2010 were confirmed as a true record.

**1325 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETING OF 23 NOVEMBER 2010 (TP 11/01)**

Audit & Risk Committee – Professor Sir Roy Anderson had joined the Audit & Risk Committee for a term of two years from 10 February 2011, to replace Professor Edwards, who had retired from the Board in early February 2011.

Library Strategy – Trustees noted that, due to Professor Drewry's absence from the meeting, the final version of the Library Strategy would be presented to the May meeting of the Board.

Theft of silver specimen – Professor Lane gave an update on progress with return of this item, which had been stolen from the Museum in 1990. As recommended by Trustees in November 2010, return was being negotiated via the US authorities. The Museum's Head of Security, Andrew Wilkinson, was liaising with the Metropolitan Police and with the FBI via the US Embassy in London.

All other items of significance were addressed under the current agenda.

## 1326 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman reported on a number of items:

Board Appointments – the role requiring expertise in natural sciences with a specialism in either Botany and/or Palaeontology was currently being advertised with a closing date of 18 March. The second role, requiring expertise in science education at secondary level was currently awaiting approval by the Minister for Culture.

Advisory Group to the Commercial Department – Trustees recorded their thanks to all those who had contributed to the review and in particular the external advisors. The Chairman recommended that the latter be invited to join Trustees at their Annual Dinner on 17 May by way of thanks, since there had been no other social opportunity to do so.

Museum of Life – The Chairman recommended that the DVD to accompany the BBC TV series be made available to Trustees, who may not have been able to watch the whole series. The DVD was also a valuable tool for showcasing the Museum's work to prospective partners and donors and copies should be retained by the Development office for this purpose. Ms Ament noted that the TV series was now airing in Australia and there were plans to show it in other countries. There might be an opportunity to hold social events in host countries to coincide with the airing on TV.

## 1327 DIRECTOR'S REPORT (TP 11/02)

The Director highlighted a number of items from the report:

Fundraising successes – good progress was being made with the new capital campaign, The Evolution of the Museum, and two significant pledges had been made since the last meeting. Attention was being focussed on both existing and new donors and there had been excellent opportunities to engage with both at the recent Images of Nature gallery launch. Trustees recorded their congratulations to all those involved in achieving these successes and noted that the positive contribution made could help to reduce the need for expenditure savings as well as assist in maintaining the capital programme.

Establishing a Development Trust – as reported at the November meeting, the Secretary of State for Culture had, in early December, announced a plan for encouraging philanthropy as a larger source of income. This included a pledge to provide match funding schemes and to allow DCMS' NDPB's, with the agreement of HM Treasury, to access historic reserves by transfer to charitable trusts, which would sit alongside the relevant statutory bodies. Whilst the establishment of a Development Trust would facilitate access to these reserves, it would also, more importantly for the Museum, aid in amplifying fundraising efforts. It was noted that the Museum had, in past years, benefited from a successful Development Trust and there were useful precedents from this experience to be taken into account.

Trustees briefly raised a number of issues which might arise from the setting up of a Development Trust, including the risks associated with coordinating two distinct bodies with separate governance and potentially differing opinions on priorities for raising and spending of funds. They noted that the establishment of any Development Trust would need to be carefully and sensitively managed.

Whilst in general agreement that a Development Trust was required, Trustees requested a more substantial paper for their May meeting. The Director added that the National Museum Directors' Conference (NMDC), of which he was Chair, was actively involved in discussions with DCMS about this and was seeking expert advice. This advice would be incorporated into the paper for Trustees.

Advocacy – it was noted that the Director's two-year term of office as Chair of the NMDC was due to end on 31 March 2011. The Chairman invited Trustees to comment on the proposal that he serve a second term, which was supported by other members and stakeholders, by 25 February. There was great benefit to the Museum in having this close link with other museums and with DCMS, but Trustees recognised that the Chairmanship represented a significant time commitment from the Director. If the Board was in agreement that he should go ahead, the Director would formally offer to serve a second term at the next meeting of the NMDC Board on 11 March.

NHM-Kew collaboration – the first joint meeting, to be attended by senior staff from both institutions, would take place on 1 March. The agenda for the meeting included potential collaborative opportunities in a number of areas, both in relation to collections and administration function. The Director would report back regularly on the plan to take forward agreed actions.

External communications and reputational risk – Professor Lane updated Trustees on progress with the court case relating to the theft of bird specimens from Tring in 2010 and with recovering the stolen items. In addition, he reported that the proposed expedition to the Dry Chaco region of Paraguay was still on hold as the Museum continued consultation with its partners in the project. A closing date for completing these consultations would need to be set since there was a deadline for use of the funds allocated to the expedition. Trustees asked that appropriate preparations be made to allow measured responses to be provided in the event of future media interest in these two areas, as well as the outcome of the human remains discussion earlier in the meeting.

Bribery Act 2010 – Trustees were made aware of the implications of the Act which was likely to be implemented in the coming months. Once a clearer view was given by the Secretary of State for Justice on interpretation and use of the Act, the Museum

would seek to provide updates on existing guidance for Trustees on this and other areas of conduct and propriety. The Chairman added that Trustee and senior staff expenses were to be published on the Museum's website on a twice-yearly basis henceforth in line with the Publication Scheme. The Directorate would contact Trustees individually to obtain relevant information for this purpose.

### 1328 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND REGISTER OF INTERESTS (TP 11/03)

None was declared.

### 1329 STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-16 (TP 11/04)

The Director presented the final draft of the Museum's Strategic Plan for 2011-16. The draft incorporated comments received at the Trustees' Strategy Day in September 2010 as well as the results of wide internal consultation, including with the recognised Trades Unions. Trustees made the following comments:

- there was some discussion over the intended audience for the plan. The Director confirmed that it was primarily for internal use, but could also be for external use, particularly with DCMS who might use the plan, with other tools, for measuring performance against targets. Trustees were concerned that the plan was rather complex for an external audience and suggested that a more concise version of the plan, minus any specifically internal jargon, with prioritised goals should be developed for publication on the Museum's website, targeted specifically at external stakeholders. The Director agreed to take this forward and added that there would also be an annual delivery plan to supplement the document.
- There was a debate over the heading referring to the Museum's position as the world's leading natural history museum. Whilst there was a need to reflect the aspirations and confidence of the organisation, Trustees were keen that the heading should not unintentionally alienate other institutions. They acknowledged that the aspiration was made clear in the following text, but asked that the wording of the heading be further considered.

Subject to the comments above, Trustees approved the Strategic Plan 2011-16.

#### (i) Plans to accommodate reduced grant-in-aid (TP 11/05)

Following completion of a programme of redundancies and reduction of recurrent budgets to achieve a 5% saving, the Museum's Executive Board had begun to plan for further expenditure reductions from 2012, in order to maintain a robust financial position through to 2014-15, which represented the end of the Comprehensive Spending Review period. The paper set out those steps which had already been taken and the expected next steps in order to present a more detailed plan to the Board in May.

Trustees agreed that this second phase should operate by the same principles which were applied during phase one, and noted the main recommendations from the phase one lessons learned workshop which would guide the project. In particular, they were pleased to see that the Board would be more actively involved in proposals to reduce capacity, particularly in situations where redundancy was contemplated, and most specifically in areas of science.

Trustees also noted the impact of the changes to the Civil Service Compensation Scheme and the consequent reduction in the cost of achieving savings from making posts redundant. The Director then outlined the key issues for the Executive Board to consider in providing a recommendation to Trustees in May. These focussed on organisational change, a review of administrative functions across the Museum, providing more clarity on targets for self-generated income by re-examining past performance and future planning, and determining the appropriate proportion of salary expenditure against unrestricted income (known informally as the 'Golden Rule'). The Museum would also need to maintain a degree of flexibility to deal with any unforeseen adjustment to funding levels.

Trustees agreed that the way forward, as set out in the paper, was appropriate and would consider the matter in more detail when the definite plan was presented to them in May.

### 1330 SCIENCE GROUP

#### (i) Third Quarter Report 2010/11 (TP 11/06)

Professor Lane focussed on a number of points from the report:

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – Professor Lane reported that the Museum would need to develop its approach to the Access and Benefit sharing requirements of the Convention on Biological Diversity over the coming decade: there would be responsibilities and impacts associated with collaboration in collections development and mobility and in research activities. The Museum would need to demonstrate more consistently how it is giving and sharing benefit from collections and research with those countries from which material originates. This varied by country at present and would continue to do so, but there was likely to be an emergence of greater international consensus on duties and systems.

Professor Sir Roy Anderson then asked whether there was any way that the Museum could be more proactive, such as by offering to train staff in curatorial skills from those countries. Professor Lane replied that the Museum was pressing for special provisions in regulation for non-commercial research to enable easier collaboration, and that training and

capacity building were part of the spectrum of collaborative options. The Museum would need the support of other museums and institutions to achieve this.

Mr Jackson said that although the current arrangements on access, research and mobility with other countries were diverse at present, a set of principles was likely to be introduced and this should lead to a greater degree of confidence in some countries that they could allow access under conditions of greater transparency and fairness. It was important to agree on this set of principles and working practices with other institutions in a range of countries.

Science Collections International (SciColl) – the Museum had taken a lead role in the OECD Global Science Forum initiative in building awareness of the importance of scientific collections for interdisciplinary research. With the first substantial steps being taken to establish SciColl as an independent organisation now being taken, the Museum intended to subscribe and increase UK involvement in the initiative. The Museum's leadership in this area was being recognised in the initiative informally being dubbed the 'London Protocol'.

Honorary Research Fellow – Professor Lane tabled a proposal that Professor Dianne Edwards, who had retired from the Board of Trustees on 6 February, be appointed as an Honorary Research Fellow for a period of three years. The scheme, which aimed to encourage scientific collaboration of high quality with scientists of high repute in their field, currently comprised 19 other Fellows. In view of Professor Edwards' research credentials and contribution to the Museum's goals, Trustees were very pleased to approve the proposal. Professor Lane would write to Professor Edwards on behalf of the Chairman to confirm her appointment.

(ii) Human Remains - recommendation (TP 11/07)

Trustees discussed the request from the Torres Strait Islands Authority and the Australian government that human remains from the Torres Strait Islands should be returned to Australia.

The TSI Authority had provided a written document in August 2010 in support of their request and both a five-minute and twenty-minute video presentation: the latter was circulated with papers for the meeting. The Australian government had provided a short overview of policy and law in Australia relating to indigenous human remains.

Trustees had also received a collection report by Museum staff on the 141 skeletal and soft tissue remains: data had been collected using non-destructive techniques to confirm provenance in existing documents and a number of archive sources had been consulted to provide better information on the history and origins of the remains. The report identified 19 individuals for whom provenance was clear; 119 for which provenance is not clear but for which there is reasonable certainty that they originate from one of the Torres Strait Islands, from southern New Guinea, or from the north of Australia as a result primarily of past collection of trophy heads; and three individuals from other parts of the world—in all probability two Europeans and one East Asian.

Trustees were reminded of discussions and consultations with the Islanders. The collection report had been given to the TSI representatives and to the Australian Government during a visit by Museum staff to the TSI in 2009: discussions on return and scientific interest had taken place on that visit. Further discussions had taken place in London in September 2010 between community representatives, Museum representatives (including Mr Alexander), and Australian officials. Dr Richard Lane had visited Sydney in February 2011 for discussion with community representatives and Australian civil servants.

Information on the remains had been considered in December 2010 by a scientific panel for the NHM which had made a report commenting on past scientific use and future scientific value for research. One member of the panel had contributed additional comment that diverged from the main report on some points. Trustees were also able to consult the NHM Policy on Human Remains 2010 and the DCMS Guidelines for the Care of Human Remains in Museums 2005.

It was noted that the wishes of the TSI community were clear: complete and rapid return to Australia and subsequently to the Islands. Community representatives had discussed past research with Museum representatives and had been open to discussion on proposals for future scientific research, were the remains to be returned. The potential for DNA analysis to increase the accuracy of provenance had been discussed. However, they had been clear that their primary interest was in the return of remains and that any future research after return would be subject to community discussion and approval. The view of the Australian government was to support the expressed wishes of the community.

It had not been possible to fully clarify what the final nature and place of care for all the remains would be—this was a discussion that the community planned to undertake once remains were returned. However, it was inferred that some remains might be placed back in traditional keeping places, and others might be buried in line with current practice in the TSI.

Possible legal issues had not changed since Trustees considered the previous claim. The TSI Authority and Australian government had been asked whether they wished to raise any legal issues that were relevant to making a decision: there had been no response to this question. It was noted that the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples had been signed by a number of governments, including the UK and Australian governments. The declaration proposes a right of indigenous people to the repatriation of human remains.

It was further noted that the Museum held 33 hair samples from the Torres Strait Islands that appeared to have been collected from people while living. These had not been included in the original community report or considered by the scientific panel but were included in the request for return from the Torres Strait Islanders. A further provenancing exercise for the hair had been undertaken in the autumn of 2010 and it suggested that most of the samples appeared to be the property of another UK institution. Discussions with that institution had been initiated and Trustees would be asked to consider return of any hair belonging to the Museum on a future occasion.

Trustees watched the five-minute video presenting the views and wishes of the Torres Strait Islanders.

Trustees were asked to consider five options:

1. Remains would be kept in the NHM and access granted to bona fide researchers and those having cultural or genealogical connection to the remains.
2. Remains would be kept in the NHM but access to the collection would be given only with the consent of the Torres Strait Islanders.
3. Acknowledge that geographical location and consent is of paramount importance to the claimant community whereas the nature of care of the remains and access is the primary concern of the Museum and its user community. The remains are therefore moved to Australia and agreement sought on access to the remains for study by the community or outside parties.
4. All forms of data or sampling are carried out before return to the TSI.
5. The remains would be returned to the TSI without further action or discussion on their future.

Option 3 was recommended for decision.

Trustees discussed the scientific significance of the remains. It was noted that the remains from the Torres Strait Islands were globally significant with a high value for science, and were part of an important international comparative collection that was actively used by scientists studying human origins, variation and other areas. A substantial amount of relevant information was already available on the remains, with the exception of DNA analysis. It was suggested that much DNA work might be more readily be conducted in collaboration with the living community, but that some diversity may only now be represented by the remains. It was noted that understanding the particular historical conditions of life on the islands—diet, health and other topics of potential interest to the Islanders themselves—could only be effectively achieved by the study of the remains themselves using stable isotope analysis or similar approaches.

Trustees acknowledged the strong feelings of connection of the community to the remains and noted the statements of continuing responsibility by the community for the care of the remains. They confirmed that the available evidence pointed to some specific connexions of individual remains to particular islands, and that, with the exception of three individuals, there was a general connection between the majority of the remains and the Torres Strait Islands.

There were many factors considered in the request for return, but Trustees highlighted two areas of principle from the NHM policy that had dominant weight in informing their decision:

- The first is that the Museum is committed to the scientific study of humans as part of its mission and to maintaining access to knowledge;
- The second is that the Museum acknowledges different cultural perspectives on meaning, value and duties with respect to remains and consequently is willing to consider requests for changes in custody, care, location and use.

Trustees agreed to the relevance of these two principles and therefore decided:

- in view of the broad provenance of the majority of the remains of the Torres Strait Islands and the existence of a modern community with connexions to the remains; the impact of the feelings of separation and unfulfilled responsibility on the community; and the importance of location of the remains to the community;
- in view of the continuing scientific value of the remains and value of continued future access to the remains; the substantial level of research information accumulated to date and available for research;

that:

1. They were minded to return the remains to the Torres Strait Islands
2. They should progressively transfer authority and responsibility for the remains within a process of discussion and cooperation with community representatives. This should result in a protocol that would cover:
  - conditions of future care for the remains
  - frameworks for future access by scientists
  - the process of transfer
  - This protocol is expected to be completed within six months

3. They would fund a six-month placement for a member of the TSI community to work with the Museum to share both scientific and museum skills, and to develop better understanding of how indigenous perspectives might inform the Museum's future activities.
4. The remains of the two Europeans and one east Asian would be retained by the Museum.

### 1331 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT GROUP

(i) Third Quarter Report 2010/11 (TP 11/08)

Trustees noted the report, in particular the successful launches of both *Images of Nature* and *Sexual Nature*, during this period.

(ii) Report from the Advisory Group to the Commercial Department of the Natural History Museum (TP 11/09)

Ms Ament reported that, as part of plans to assess a range of challenges facing the Museum's commercial teams in the light of the current economic environment, a group of external experts had attended workshops at the Museum from 8-9 December 2010. The workshops, which to an extent followed the same practice followed by the Visiting Groups to science areas, had been extremely productive, providing useful stimulus for new ways of thinking. The outcomes of the activity were outlined in the circulated report, which also included a brief management response.

It was worth noting that the Group had acknowledged a number of successes including the continuity of Museum-branded products across all licensees and stores, the vibrancy of the main shop, the excellent presentation of the Museum's website and performance achieved in some areas despite a shortage of skill level. To build upon these strengths, a series of quick wins had been identified, as well as some medium term goals and larger, long term themes for further development. The quick wins, which largely involved minor changes to operations, had already been implemented, to benefit immediately from the momentum brought by the Advisory Group. One of the most successful of these had been the introduction of a small charge for internal maps of the galleries. In terms of the medium and longer term recommendations, Trustees made the following observations:

- engagement with some areas of online trading was considered to be important for the Museum in order to compete with other national museums and satisfy customer expectation. It was recognised that there had been limited investment in e-commerce since its launch and business cases were required to justify the range of products. An eShop could be integrated with other sales such as tickets for special exhibitions and events and facilitation of donations and membership sign up online. Although the group had not specifically looked at retail, Trustees agreed that increasing conversion was essential, particularly during off peak periods. The research which was planned to explore visitor requirements would inform product ranges in the shops and also influence the future online offer.
- that the value of visitors to the Museum, both engaging with them and generating income from them should be optimised. Opportunities to convert visitors to members and to develop the membership scheme beyond benefit access to patronage should be maximised. Trustees agreed that an evaluation of the existing scheme and comparable others and of what participants might require from it would be very valuable. Ms Ament agreed to bring a report to the November Board meeting.
- the proposed review of commercial partnerships was considered to be very valuable since this was likely to be of greater importance as spending cuts were implemented across the public sector. An increase in collaborative projects held benefits for both parties and a clear strategy together with increased confidence in this area would bring rewards
- that the Museum might promote its catering facilities more proactively to both visitors to the Museum and those living and working in the South Kensington area. Ms Ament confirmed that the Museum needed a tactical response, in particular, to catering for high visitor numbers and to that end there were plans for a jointly run café outlet on Exhibition Road.

In conclusion, Ms Charlton, who had chaired the group on behalf of Trustees, confirmed that the review had been a very positive experience for all participants. The NHM Commercial Team had greatly welcomed the input and experience of the visiting group. Progress on the actions which had been identified would be fed into the business planning cycle of the Museum. It was intended that Trustees would be kept up to date with progress against the actions as part of the quarterly public engagement report to the Board and a full review of overall progress would be submitted in February 2012.

### 1332 CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP

(i) Financial Review to December 2010 (TP 11/10)

The review, which had previously been considered by the Audit & Risk Committee on 10 February, was noted without comment.

(ii) Third Quarter Health and Safety Report 2010/11 (TP 11/11)

Trustees noted that there had been two RIDDOR reportable accidents during this quarter, both of which involved visitors falling down stairs. Investigation into both accidents had concluded that the Museum could not have prevented their occurrence and therefore no further action was required.

### **1333 AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE REPORT**

In the absence of Sir David Omand, Dr Langslow, as a member of the Audit & Risk Committee, gave a verbal update on the meeting held on 10 February 2011. There were two main items to report:

Financial Reporting Standard (FRS) 30 – Heritage Assets – The Committee had discussed application of the Standard, which applied to all heritage assets that were held and maintained principally for their contribution to knowledge and culture. The Standard aimed to ensure that the financial statements provided useful and relevant information about a body's holding of heritage assets. The Committee agreed that collection items held prior to April 2001 would not be included in the Museum's balance sheet as to provide a robust figure was both unmanageable and unaffordable and the cost of providing such a figure was disproportionately high compared to the benefits to user of the accounts. However, the Museum would continue to capitalise and hold in the balance sheet those collection items purchased since 2001, future purchase and donated items. In addition, the Museum would comply fully with other disclosure requirements of the standard, including justification for non-capitalisation, details of collections held and policies relating to acquisition, preservation, management and disposal.

Trustees agreed that this was an appropriate response.

Major Corporate Risks 2011/12 – the Committee discussed risks for the coming financial year and agreed to monitor progress at each meeting. Professor Lane gave a presentation on the risk that external funding of science was harder to win and reduced our scientific research activity. It was clear that, in the current environment of spending cuts, there were challenging times ahead, particularly in maintaining grant awards from the UK Research Councils. However, the Museum had been successful in obtaining other sources of external funding and continued to take positive steps to mitigate future difficulties.

### **1334 PERFORMANCE (TP 11/12)**

#### **(i) Third Quarter Corporate KPIs Report 2010/11**

The Director reported that attendance had fallen back slightly in November and December against prior year, with December being particularly affected by heavy snow. However, January attendance had risen again above prior year's record, suggesting that there was no steady downward trend to support the anticipated tail off in visitors after the boom experienced when the Darwin Centre first opened. It was very likely that the Museum would exceed 4.6 million visitors by 31 March. Nevertheless, predicting future attendance remained difficult, and the recent reduction in visitor spend on site also made self generated income projections more complex.

Trustees noted the increase in the number of children under 15 participating in educational activities both on and off site against the same quarter in prior year. This was largely due to the high number of booked school visits taking part, in particular, in the increased offer available in the Darwin Centre.

### **1335 AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE BOARD MEETINGS (TP 11/13)**

The rolling agenda for future meetings was noted.

### **1336 EVENTS DIARY (TP 11/14)**

The events diary was noted.

### **1337 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Scott exhibition – Ms Ament referred to the devastating earthquake which had affected New Zealand that morning. She would be in contact with the Museum's joint partners on the Scott exhibition in New Zealand, namely the Antarctic Heritage Trust (AHT-NZ) and the Canterbury Museum as soon as practicable. Both were located in Christchurch which had been at the epicenter of the earthquake. It was possible that there would be some risk to the delivery of the exhibition as a result, though Ms Ament confirmed that the structure of the exhibition was being manufactured in the UK. The exhibition was due to open in Sydney in June.

Cora Diamond – Ms Ament reported that the world's largest known vivid yellow pear-shaped diamond, the 110-carat Cora Sun-Drop, was due to go on display in *The Vault* on 24 February. With the assistance of a generous loan from leading specialised diamond manufacturers, Cora International, visitors will be able to see the diamond, for a limited time. The diamond would replace the Star of Africa, which had also been on temporary display and had now been returned to the British Crown.

### **1338 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 17 May 2011 at 0930 at The Natural History Museum.