



KEYWORDS: Rock art protection - Funding program - Project analyses - Australia

THE AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ABORIGINAL STUDIES' ROCK ART PROTECTION PROGRAM: DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST TWO YEARS' PROJECTS

GRAEME K. WARD

Abstract. This paper complements the initial presentation in *Rock Art Research* by Ward and Sullivan (Vol. 6, No. 1, 1989), in which were given the background to the development of the conservation program and details of the initial projects funded. It provides an outline of the results of the first year's funding, lists the successful applications of the second year's funding, discusses the results of both years' projects and provides a brief analysis of the differences between the two years' proposals, both those successful and unsuccessful.

INTRODUCTION

A discussion of the background to and development of the Institute's Rock Art Protection Program was provided by Ward and Sullivan in the previous issue of *Rock Art Research* (6: 54-62). In the initial year (Financial Year 87) the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS) received thirty applications from various sources, the total value of which was approximately \$480 000. A meeting at the Institute early in December 1986 decided funding for a total of twelve projects to expend the \$150 000 available. There was one grant with a national scope funded at \$26.2k and eleven regional projects whose average value was \$11.7k.

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs confirmed, late in September 1987, that a further year's funding for the Rock Art Protection Program was to be provided at the same level as the first year. The Institute called for proposals, and its advertisement of the project again stressed that the program had three main aims: (1) the physical preservation of endangered sites, including those threatened both by the natural elements or animals and by interference by humans; (2) the detailed recording of sites, especially those which could not be preserved; (3) research into the Aboriginal cultural significance of sites.

Thirty-one applications were received, their total value was again far in excess of \$400 000. A meeting to decide disbursement of the RAPP funds was held at the Institute in Canberra during October 1987; it comprised the following Council

Members, representatives of organisations and others: Dr A. Chase and Ms S. Sullivan (AIAS Council); Mr R. G. Bednarik (AURA); Dr J. Flood (AHC); three NASAC representatives: Mr R. W. Ellis (NT Aboriginal Sacred Sites Protection Authority), Ms C. Gartside (NSW NPWS) and Mr M. McIntyre (VAS); Professor D. J. Mulvancy (Joint Academies); Mr M. Robinson (WA Museum - invited State representative); Mr G. Walsh (Qld NPWS); Dr K. Palmer and Dr G. Ward (AIAS staff).

APPLICATIONS AND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

The 31 applications were received for funding of conservation projects from a variety of sources throughout Australia; further proposals advanced at the meeting as protection priorities brought the total to 34 project proposals. Two projects were considered to be of national scope. The total value of all proposals was in excess of \$450k. FY88 (along with FY87) proposals are characterised in Appendices A and B.

Sources of Applications

The range of sources could be divided into two major categories, those from individual researchers, usually based at tertiary institutes, and those from institutions, departmental, statutory or Aboriginal, with some form of responsibility, statutory or assumed, for the protection of cultural heritage.

Of the first category, two applications derived from a College of Advanced Education, four from

Table 1.
Summary of individual
and institutional sources
of FY88 applications
(n = 31).

Individuals			Institutions		
CAE	Unvrsty	Unattached	StateAuth.	OtherState	LandCouncil
2	4	2	13	7	3
8			23		

staff and students of three different Australian universities, and the remaining two from unattached individuals, one of whom proposed to be based at a university department should the application be successful. Of the second category, thirteen applications derived from four state and territory agencies directly responsible for the management of sites, three were submitted by other governmental agencies concerned with land management, another four applications were made by a state museum, and the remaining three were submitted by an Aboriginal land council (Table 1). Enquiries were made by other Aboriginal agencies but these did not result in applications being received at AIAS.

Applications were received from sources in all states and territories and for work in all states and territories (sometimes for more than one geographical area); these data are summarised in Table 2 (below). As the table shows, sources in the Northern Territory and New South Wales predominated.

The foci of the various proposals were evenly divided between locations in the north of Australia, where a large number of sites is known to exist, and the south of the country; a large proportion of the latter (nearly one third) were for work in New South Wales.

Proposal Criteria

The 31 applications could be characterised in terms of the reference each made to the three main criteria for protection listed above. As Table 3 shows, they were roughly evenly divided between the first two criteria, with only one application focusing upon the Aboriginal significance of its subject matter.

SUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS

During the meeting, six preservation and management and/or survey and documentation projects

were withdrawn from consideration by representatives of the applicants. None of the further three proposals referred to the meeting as conservation priorities from other AIAS sources or promoted during the meeting as being matters of urgency were funded. In the case of two institutions seeking funding for a total of five projects all applications were rejected and two 'seeding grants' were offered for projects to be redefined in consultation with a steering committee formed from among those at the meeting.

The three main aims of the Rock Art Protection Program, (1) the physical preservation and management of endangered sites including those threatened by the natural elements, animals or interference from humans; (2) survey and documentation of new and major sites; (3) research into the Aboriginal cultural significance of sites, were taken into account in assessing grant applications. A total of twelve projects were funded for a little less than \$150k (some money being retained for the purpose of publicising the program); all administrative costs were covered by AIAS. In some cases the amount of funding requested had been cut to allow the total available to be further spread. The successful applications can be summarised as follows:

- (1) Canberra College of Advanced Education (Dr C. Pearson, Cultural Heritage Science Division); Graduate Diploma in the Conservation of Rock Art (Planning Meeting) (National; Criteria met: 1, 2, 3); amount of grant offered: \$4882.
- (2) Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service (Mr E. Power, Central Region); Kenniff Cave Site Protection (Qld; 1); \$14 921.
- (3) Northern Territory Museum of Arts and Sciences (Mr G. Chaloupka/Mr B. Harney); Protection and Conservation of Wardaman Rock Art Sites (NT; 1); \$10 000 plus c. \$4000 carried over from previous year.

Table 2.
Summary of geographical
sources and foci of FY88
applications.

	WA	NT	SA	Qld	NSW	ACT	Vic	Tas	A*	Totals
Source	4	6	1	2	11	4	1	2	n.a.	31
Focus	5	7	1	3	10	1	1	2	2*	32
* Australia-wide or three or more States/Territories										

Table 3.
Summary by protection
criteria of FY88
applications.

Criterion	#	%
1 Physical preservation & management	31	52
2 Survey and documentation	28	47
3 Aboriginal significance	1	2
Totals	60	101

Table 4.
Summary by protection
criteria of successful
FY88 applications.

Criterion	Project												Ttl
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
1 Physical preservtn & mngmnt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	12
2 Survey & documentation	x	-	-	x	x	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	7
3 Aboriginal significance	x	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	-	-	-	-	3

- (4) New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service (Ms B. Conyers, Central Region); Red Hands Cave, Blue Mountains National Park - Interpretation (NSW; 1, 2); \$5800.
- (5) New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service (Ms B. Conyers, Central Region); Garigal Site Walk, West Head, Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park - Interpretation (NSW; 1, 2); \$13 000.
- (6) Northern Land Council (Dr F. McKeown/Mr M. Pickering); Management Project (NT; 1, 2, 3); \$14 000.
- (7) Conservation Council of the Northern Territory (Mr J. Fletcher/Mr H. Pierce); Management and Protection Survey, Gregory National Park (NT; 1, 2, 3); \$14 000.
- (8) Tasmania Department of Lands, Parks and Wildlife (Mr T. Blanks); Mt Cameron West Petroglyph Protection (Tas; 1); \$12 500.
- (9) Western Australian Museum, Department of Materials Conservation (Dr I. MacLeod/Mr P. Haydock); McKay Caves Complex, Mt Magnet - Environment Management and Conservation (WA; 1, 2); \$11 150.
- (10) Mr A. Watchman: Occurrence and Composition of Naturally Formed Silica Skins - their Effect in Preserving Rock Art; (Ntl; 1); \$26 305.
- (11) Western Australian Museum, Department of Materials Conservation (Dr I. MacLeod/Mr P. Haydock); Walga Rock, Cue - Environment Management and Conservation (WA; 1); \$6750.
- (12) Victoria Archaeological Survey (Ms R. Buchan); Grampians Rock Art - Interpretation (Vic; 1, 2); \$15 000.

('Criteria met' refers to the three criteria detailed above.)

SUMMARY OF THE AIMS OF THE SECOND YEARS' APPLICATIONS

The two national projects had very different foci. Pearson's application was to support a meeting of experts from around Australia to decide upon a curriculum and organisation of a postgraduate degree course in rock art conservation being planned for the Canberra College of Advanced Education. That by Watchman sought funds for a year-long study of the formation and potential usefulness of silica 'skins' in physically protecting painted rock faces; the researcher proposed to collect samples of silica skins from a variety of rock types and climatic locations; to make a detailed geological analysis of the silica skins; to identify the factors affecting their development and stability; to

make recommendations on their use and effectiveness; and to replicate naturally occurring silica skins by applying siliceous solutions to rock faces. It was anticipated that a major factor in the preservation of paintings would be better understood and perhaps able to be used artificially in their conservation.

The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service proposed to construct a boardwalk within Kenniff Cave, providing an elevated viewing platform and protecting the archaeological deposits there from disturbance by trampling and the painted imagery from being further obscured by dust. This application followed the success of those visitor control measures built in recent years at other rock shelter sites within Queensland national parks which have been subject to visitation pressures.

Other purely protective projects were that for which funds were sought by the Northern Territory Museum for Mr Bill Harney, a fencing contractor and member of the Wardaman community, who wanted to fence traditional sites in the Wardaman area; the continuation of the dune stabilisation project at Mt Cameron West engraving site being carried out by the Tasmanian Department of Lands, Parks and Wildlife; and the project designed by the Department of Materials Conservation, Western Australian Museum, to manage the environment of a site at Walga Rock. The Western Australian project deserves further note:

At Walga Rock, near Cue, the environs of the site had changed from being vegetated to largely barren since the time of European arrival in the area and this, as pointed out by Haydock and Rodda in an earlier study of the site, had adversely affected the preservation of the paintings there by leaving them open to the effects of dust, driving rain and microclimatic changes. The project proposed, in consultation with the Murchison-Gascoyne Aboriginal community and botanists, to transplant appropriate seedlings into the environs of the shelter with the objectives of physically protecting the decorated surfaces and re-establishing a favourable microenvironment.

Most of the remaining projects all had some combination of physical protection and interpretative aspects. Both New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service projects funded, those at Red Hands Cave (Blue Mountains National Park) and at Garigal (West Head, Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park) near Sydney, were designed to provide information to the public and/or to control public access to areas of rock art with the intention of protecting the art surfaces.

The Red Hands Cave is the only painted site open to the public in the eastern Blue Mountains; an old protective metal grid was being replaced

and the Service proposed to provide information in the form of signage and brochures to visitors to the site with the aims of promoting public awareness of Aboriginal culture, and of the significance of such sites to Aborigines, of the vulnerability and protection requirements of painting and petroglyph sites, and of promoting public awareness of the role of the Service in site management.

West Head, in the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park near Sydney, contains many painted shelters and engraved sandstone areas. The New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service sought to provide an educational resource for visitors including school students to the Park by developing a walk linking a stencil site with an engraving and a shelter containing an archaeological deposit, as well as carrying out conservation work at the painted site, upgrading paths and providing signs. The aims of the development were to provide information on Aboriginal culture, a demand recently intensified as a result of the introduction of Aboriginal studies in secondary schools; to present a more holistic picture of Aboriginal culture rather than one focusing on individual sites; to promote awareness of the range of sites in the region and their protection needs; and to encourage awareness of Aboriginal heritage, and of the contemporary importance of these sites to the Aboriginal community.

The McKay Caves complex near Mt Magnet on the highway to Cue was subject to adverse visitor impacts including some vandalism; access was uncontrolled. It was proposed by the Western Australian Museum's Department of Materials Conservation to develop a system of visitor management that would separate recreational use from viewing of the paintings, and that was non-intrusive upon the environmental and cultural context of the sites, thus encouraging their conservation without adversely affecting their presentation. Site use would be researched; areas revegetated as necessary; and information prepared for site-specific signage with the aim of raising visitor awareness of the environmental significance of the area and to provide information designed to foster cultural appreciation of the paintings there.

Similarly, the Grampians interpretation proposal developed by the Victoria Archaeological Survey emphasised the information needs of visitors to the sites with the aim of enhancing visitor understanding and hence, it was argued, site protection. The project built upon the visitor appreciation survey undertaken the previous year which had clarified the needs of tourists at the sites. It was proposed to develop a self-guided interpretation program for visitors to accessible sites in the Grampians; to improve the way in which the sites were promoted and interpreted to the public (a workshop would be conducted targeting local tourist officers and ranger staff); and to remove graffiti from sites.

The two remaining projects encompassed all three criteria. Proposals from the Bureau of the Northern Land Council sought funding for three similar projects, each designed to find and to record in detail sites in an area of Arnhem Land subject to development pressure, to analyse the ar-

chaeological significance of the paintings, and to produce recommendations for their management and physical protection. The grant offered to the BNLC was to obtain assistance in developing a conservation/management program for the areas concerned. As finally approved, it was used to fund a consultant to find, document, and assess the Aboriginal significance of a sample of sites; to use the data obtained to formulate models for site location and type to assist the BNLC in planning and conducting further surveys and in developing practical strategies for site conservation; to establish guidelines to assist the BNLC in assessing sites; to make recommendations for the protection of sites, taking into account the views of traditional custodians; and to carry out any necessary practical measures possible at the time.

The Conservation Commission of the Northern Territory requested funding for two projects to explore for painting sites in two national parks. It was offered a grant for a consultancy to develop a management plan and conservation strategies for the resources in areas under its control. Its project, as approved, dealt with a relatively poorly known area about to become one of the Northern Territory's major parks, the proposed Gregory National Park; the aims were to record, document, protect and develop for visitor access (taking into account Aboriginal priorities) a Wardaman site in the Victoria River district; to conduct a workshop on site recording and protection for Commission staff; to produce policy and procedures for protection of paintings and petroglyphs and their presentation to the public.

PROJECTS NOT FUNDED

It is again instructive to consider the types and scopes of projects which were unsuccessful (cf. Ward and Sullivan, *RAR* 6[1]). Nineteen of the 31 initial applications were not funded; as in the previous year, most were acceptable proposals in terms of their statement of aims and methods. Of those unsuccessful projects considered, four were graded B (acceptable but of lower priority than those graded A), and of those remaining thirteen which were graded C, one was rejected as being outside the guidelines, and five were decided to be of lowest priority in the current circumstances (and individual applicants were recommended to re-apply for other AIAS grants); five others were rejected so that 'seeding grants' could be provided to the two institutions applying; and another was rejected pending clarification of the application of previous funds at the site. Of those four graded B, one was given priority should other offers of funding be rejected; the others were acceptable but described as being of lesser priority (often compared with similar projects in the same region).

Taking a wider view, it was clear that the members shared a generally perceived appreciation that priority should continue to be given to projects, firstly, whose major aim was direct protection and, secondly, where interpretation work would contribute toward appreciation and thus protection. This view was further reflected in the

Table 5.
Basic statistics of
FY87 and FY88
proposals.

	FY87		FY88	
	#	\$k	#	\$k
NUMBER OF PROPOSALS REC'D	30	-	34	-
Approx. Total Value	-	480	-	450
Approx. Average Value	-	16.0	-	12.4
or National focus (\bar{X})	2	23.1	4	17.5
& Regional focus (\bar{X})	28	15.5	30	12.7
NUMBER OF PROJECTS FUNDED	12	-	12	-
Total Value	-	150.0	-	148.8
Approx. Average Value	-	12.5	-	12.4
or National focus (\bar{X})	1	21.2	2	15.6
& Regional focus (\bar{X})	11	11.7	10	11.8

large proportion of the funding that went to a major project to evaluate the significance and potential value of a natural process claimed to physically seal many painted rock faces.

It is important to note here that, of those unfunded projects with a strong field research emphasis, that is, of survey and mapping of little-known areas, four were resubmitted to AIAS as recommended by the meeting, and three were offered funding from subsequent grant allocations during 1988.

Summary of FY88 Grants Funded

Received: 31 applications and three further proposals; combined value c. \$450k.

Funded: Twelve projects, total value \$148.8k; average grant \$12.4k; or two national grants totalling \$31.2k, and ten regional projects, average value c. \$11.7k.

Recommendation

Further discussion before the close of the meeting elicited agreement that any future consideration of disbursement of grant funds in this program, consideration should be given to survey and recording projects as a priority for funding.

Further Funding

Following announcement of the FY89 Budget, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs confirmed that a further year's funding was to be provided for the Institute's Rock Art Protection Program.

COMPARISON OF THE TWO YEARS' APPLICATIONS OF THE ROCK ART PROTECTION PROGRAM

Basic statistics of the two years' proposals are summarised in Table 5.

Table 6.
Comparison of sources
of FY87 and FY88
proposals.

	FY87				FY88			
	Received		Funded		Received		Funded	
SOURCE	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
INDIVIDUAL								
CAE/University	6	20.0	1	8.3	7	20.6	2	16.6
Unattached	8	26.7	1	8.3	1	2.9	0	0.0
Totals	14	46.7	2	16.6	8	23.5	2	16.6
INSTITUTIONAL								
StateAuthority	12	40.0	8	66.7	17	50.0	7	58.3
OtherState	1	3.3	1	8.3	3	8.8	2	16.6
LandCouncil	1	3.3	0	0.0	3	8.8	1	8.3
OtherAblOrgnztm	2	6.7	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	16	53.3	10	83.3	23	67.7	10	83.3
OTHER								
(AIAS meeting)	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	0	0.0
GRAND TOTALS	30	100.0	12	99.9	34	100.0	12	99.9

Table 7.
Comparison of
geographical sources
of FY87 and FY88
proposals.

GEOGRAPHICAL SOURCE	FY87				FY88			
	Received		Funded		Received		Funded	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Western Australia	4	13.3	1	8.3	4	11.8	2	16.7
Northern Territory	3	10.0	3	25.0	7	20.6	3	25.0
South Australia	3	10.0	1	8.3	1	2.9	0	0.0
Queensland	5	16.7	1	8.3	2	5.9	1	8.3
New South Wales	7	23.3	2	16.7	10	29.4	2	16.7
Capital Territory	3	10.0	1	8.3	4	11.8	1	8.3
Victoria	4	13.3	2	16.7	1	2.9	1	8.3
Tasmania	1	3.3	1	8.3	2	5.9	1	8.3
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	1	8.3
TOTALS	30	99.9	12	99.9	34	100.0	12	99.9

Notable in these figures is the reduction, in the second year, across several categories, of the average costing of individual proposals. The average monetary value of proposals considered in FY88 was only three-quarters that of those applications received in FY87. The average value of the projects funded in each year (except for the national projects) was almost the same.

Comparison of Proposals by Source

It is useful to compare the sources of the various conservation proposals considered by AIAS during each of the two years of the program so far (Table 6). In the initial year, approximately equal numbers of applications were received from individuals, on one hand, and land and heritage management agencies on the other, whereas in the second year three times as many proposals derived from institutional sources. While the level of interest from individuals attached to tertiary institutes was about the same as in the previous year, a substantial reduction was recorded in applications

from 'unattached individuals'. Notable is the comparable level of interest expressed by land councils and other Aboriginal organisations.

Applications continued to be received from across Australia albeit in diminished numbers from most states and territories (Table 7). The notable exceptions were the Northern Territory (seven applications) and New South Wales, from where ten applications were received (nine of these derived from the NSW NPWS).

Comparison of Proposals by Geographic Focus

In terms of the focus of the current proposals there was again a wide spread, with concentration on the northern Australian areas (as reflected in the large numbers for work in northern Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland). There was also a significant increase in the number, resulting in a large proportion of all applications (10/35: nearly 30%), focused on New South Wales, probably reflecting the perceived visitor pressures on sites in the relatively densely settled areas along the south-eastern seaboard (Table 8).

Table 8.
Comparison of
geographical foci
of FY87 and FY88
proposals.

GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	FY87				FY88			
	Received		Funded		Received		Funded	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Western Australia	3	10.0	1	8.3	6	17.1	2	16.7
Northern Territory	5	16.7	4	33.3	7	20.0	3	25.0
South Australia	4	13.3	2	16.7	1	2.9	0	0.0
Queensland	6	20.0	1	8.3	4	11.4	1	8.3
New South Wales	7	23.3	1	8.3	10	28.6	2	16.7
Capital Territory	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Victoria	1	3.3	1	8.3	1	2.9	1	8.3
Tasmania	1	3.3	1	8.3	2	5.7	1	8.3
Australia-wide *	2	6.7	1	8.3	4	11.4	2	16.7
Totals	30	99.9	12	99.8	35	100.0	12	100.0

* Australia-wide or three or more States/Territories

Table 9.
Rock Art Protection
Program conservation
criteria.

1	PHYSICAL PRESERVATION & MANAGEMENT
1a	Research & development of physical conservation techniques
1b	Physical protection & management of threats (i) from natural sources, native and domestic animals: installation of drip-lines, vegetation removal, removal of nests, stock fencing; (ii) from human sources: installation of grids, barriers, provision of walkways, upgrading of paths, etc.
1c	Assessment of threats to conservation and development of site management plans prior to implementation of protective management measures (cf. 2c)
1d	Protection & management of site through provision of educational information in the form of signage, brochures, guided walks and the training of staff, development of public awareness (cf. 2d)
1e	Monitoring of visitor impact
1f	Retouching/repainting/'renovation' of images
2	SURVEY & DOCUMENTATION OF NEW & MAJOR SITES
2a	Search for unrecorded sites in little-known areas
2b	Detailed recording and mapping of known sites or site complexes, assessment of resources
2c	Production of recommendations for management (cf. 1c)
2d	Production of detailed documentation about sites and/or site contents (cf. 1d)
2e	Analysis of motif or other data, relationship to environmental factors, or other research-oriented aspects, modelling of research results, etc.
3	RESEARCH INTO ABORIGINAL CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF SITES

Comparison of Proposals by Subject Focus

With the increase in the variety of subject foci displayed by the second-year conservation proposals, it was found impractical to characterise proposals in terms of the four categories used in the description of the initial year's applications (Ward and Sullivan 1989: 57-8). Instead, subdivisions were made of the three criteria originally enunciated in the main aims of the Program as adopted by the Rock Art Working Group. So developed, the RAPP Conservation Criteria can be structured as presented in Table 9.

Using the criteria developed above, the proportions of FY88 proposals considered and projects funded, as divided into the various criteria sub-categories of Table 9, can be compared with those of the previous year (Table 10).

Considering only the totals for each major criterion (protection/management, survey/documentation, Aboriginal significance), the pattern in the two sets of proposals appears to reflect remarkable similarity of each of the two years' proposals; the third category shows a significant decrease in number and proportion of all proposals for funding (from approximately 10 to 2%), and the first category shows an increase (from approximately 43 to 53%). If, however, one considers the subcategories within each major criterion, some interesting differences are apparent.

Firstly, there was more than double the number

of proposals to develop protection/management (from visitation) of a site (Category 1b[iii]); similarly, there were more than double the number of proposals for protection through education of visitors (Category 1d). On the other hand, there were significant reductions in the number of protection assessment studies (1c) and visitor impact studies (1e) proposed. May one conclude that authorities/land managers are tending to decide that the basic work has been done and that the knowledge can now be applied? An echo of this is sounded in the drop in the number of 'research and development' (1a) applications received.

Generally, there appears to have been an increase in the proportion of multifaceted proposals.

Secondly, despite the few applications in the search (2a) category funded the previous year, there was an almost two-fold increase in proposals involving this focus; there were slight drops in the numbers of proposals which included the preparation of detailed documentation (2d) and development of analyses (2e).

Thirdly, only one application could be seen to have as a focus the investigation of Aboriginal cultural significance (Criterion 3); the drop is more profound if one considers that the proposal included here is one which involves teaching about the appreciation of and investigation of significance, rather than one involving field or analytical research.

Table 10.
Comparison of the first two years' proposals in terms of various criteria (all subject foci mentioned).

CRITERION	FY87				FY88			
	Received		Funded		Received		Funded	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 PROTECTION MANAGEMENT					1	1.6	1	4.4
1a (R & D)	3	4.2	1	4.6	1	1.6	1	4.4
1b(i) (natural)	7	9.7	6	27.3	7	11.5	5	21.7
1b(ii) (visitation)	4	5.5	3	13.6	9	14.8	2	8.7
1c (assessment)	8	11.1	3	13.6	5	8.2	1	4.4
1d (education)	5	6.9	3	13.6	11	18.0	3	13.0
1e (visitor impact)	3	4.2	1	4.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
1f (retouch)	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	31	43.1	17	77.3	32	52.5	13	56.5
2 SURVEY / DOCUMENTATION					1	1.6	1	4.4
2a (search)	5	6.9	0	0.0	7	11.5	2	8.7
2b (mapping)	10	13.9	0	0.0	8	13.1	2	8.7
2c (recommendation)	8	11.1	1	4.6	5	8.2	2	8.7
2d (documentation)	5	6.9	1	4.6	3	4.9	0	0.0
2e (analysis)	6	8.3	1	4.6	4	6.6	0	0.0
Totals	34	47.2	3	13.6	28	45.9	7	30.4
3 ABORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE								
Totals	7	9.7	2	9.1	1	1.6	3*	13.0
TOTALS	72	100.0	22	100.0	61	100.0	23	99.9
* This figure affected by re-definition of two projects								

This analysis may be misleading, since all foci mentioned in an application have been included in Table 10. If only the major thrusts of each proposal are used as the basis for the analysis (Table 11, see p. 134), could different conclusions be possible?

As Table 11 shows, the overall patterns of the two years' proposals again are similar, with a slight trend toward overall de-emphasis of Criterion 1 proposals in favour of Criterion 2. Possibly significant differences are seen in (a) the reversal of proposals emphasising categories 1b(i) and 1b(ii) and, similarly, those emphasising categories 2a and 2b. However, without considerably more analysis—in order to place appropriate emphasis upon each of the stated aims of each proposal—it is not clear what allowance should be made in the current Table for artefacts arising from the mode of presentation.

Attention now can be focused upon those projects which were funded as presented in Tables 10 and 11.

The first significant difference between the results for the two years can be seen (Table 10) in the significantly greater proportion of funding of Criterion 2 projects in FY88 compared with FY87 (33 cf. 14%) and a commensurate reduction in Cri-

teria 1 projects funded (62 cf. 77%). It is clear, however, that although there were still, in FY88, considerably more—nearly twice as many—Criteria 1 than Criterion 2 projects funded, the proportion (13:7) had diminished greatly compared with the previous years (17:3).

Looking more closely at Table 10, it appears that the reductions in Criterion 1 funded projects were fairly evenly spread across the various sub-categories, but that the increases in Criterion 2 were concentrated in 2a (search), 2b (mapping) and 2c (recommendations), with reductions in 2d (documentation) and 2e (analysis).

Table 11, presenting the primary aims of the funded projects, emphasises these conclusions, showing that while Criterion 1 almost totally outweighed Criterion 2 (92 to 8%) in the first year, there was a more even distribution of funding (75 to 25%) in the second. Again, however, it must be stressed that the method of analysis is relatively superficial.

There was a slight increase in the proportion of projects designed to research or document the Aboriginal cultural significance of sites and site complexes (as indicated in Table 10) but, as Table 11 shows, this aim was a minor one in projects whose major focus was course development or the

Table 11.
Comparison of the first two years' proposals in terms of various criteria (main subject foci only).

CRITERION	FY87				FY88			
	Received		Funded		Received		Funded	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 PROTECTION MANAGEMENT					1	2.9	1	8.3
1a (R & D)	2	6.7	0	0.0	1	2.9	1	8.3
1b(i) (natural)	6	20.0	6	50.0	3	8.8	3	25.0
1b(ii) (visitation)	1	3.3	1	8.3	6	17.7	1	8.3
1c (assessment)	3	10.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	1	8.3
1d (education)	3	10.0	3	25.0	4	11.8	2	16.7
1e (visitor impact)	2	6.7	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
1f (retouch)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	17	56.7	11	91.7	18	52.9	9	75.0
2 SURVEY DOCUMENTATION					1	2.9	1	8.3
2a (search)	4	13.3	0	0.0	7	20.6	0	0.0
2b (mapping)	5	16.7	0	0.0	3	8.8	0	0.0
2c (recommendation)	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	2*	16.7
2d (documentation)	2	6.7	1	8.3	2	5.9	0	0.0
2e (analysis)	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
Totals	12	40.0	1	8.3	15	44.1	3	25.0
3 ABORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE								
Totals	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
TOTALS	30	100.0	12	100.0	34	99.9	12	100.0

* This figure affected by re-definition of two projects

preparation of recommendations for protection.

Distribution by Geographical Focus

At various times, concern has been expressed at the geographical (or, more strictly, state or territory) distribution of grants, and it is useful to make a comparison here of the spread of projects funded by national and state/territory categories (Table 12). The money value of projects, however, is probably more revealing of the distribution of resources (this is also detailed in Table 12).

A major proportion of FY88 funding (more than a fifth) was directed to the two national projects and this represents a significant increase on the previous year.

National projects aside, comparison of the state/territory distribution of funds shows that the north of Australia again was favoured both in terms of the bulk of the successful proposals and monetary value of funding, with an even greater share of the available funds than in the previous year; more than half of these went to the Northern Territory. Less funds were divided among the southern states in FY88. Comparison of Table 12 with Table 8 shows that, generally, the allocation of funds reflected the geographical foci of conservation proposals.

It might be observed that a major 'loser' in FY88 compared with the previous year was South Australia, with a small proportional reduction being experienced by Queensland. Major gains absolutely and proportionally were made by the national category (there were two projects in FY88 as opposed to one in FY87) and by New South Wales while all other states except Tasmania gained some increment both absolutely and proportionally.

It might be more meaningful to some to measure the absolute amounts distributed to each state in terms of that state's population or in terms of the relative distribution of taxation revenue. A more useful comparison might be made in terms of the number of painting and engraving sites in each state/territory, but these figures are not available in even approximate numbers. It could be agreed, however, that the three northern Australian states, Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland, have the greatest proportion of sites, followed by New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, with Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory well under-represented. Even in this light it could be argued that the Northern Territory continues to obtain a disproportionately large amount of funding, and Western Australia, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory obtain

Table 12.
Comparison of distribution of funded projects by national importance and state/territory location in terms of number of projects, monetary value and proportion of funds disbursed.

STATE / TERRITORY	FY87			FY88		
	#	\$k	%	#	\$k	%
National	1	21.2	14.1	2	31.2	21.1
Western Australia	1	16.2	10.8	2	18.0	12.1
Northern Territory	4	37.1	24.7	3	38.0*	25.6
South Australia	2	21.4	14.3	0	0.0	0.0
Queensland	1	18.2	12.1	1	14.9	10.0
New South Wales	1	10.2	6.8	2	18.8	12.7
Capital Territory	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Victoria	1	12.5	8.3	1	15.0	10.1
Tasmania	1	13.2	8.8	1	12.5	8.4
TOTALS	12	150.0	99.9	12	148.4*	100.0

* Excludes \$4k carried over from FY87

disproportionately small amounts. It might be noted, however, that the RAPP funds are not the only monies available for this purpose in each area, other potential sources being state agencies, the National Estates Grants and the Australian Heritage Grants programs.

CONCLUSION

In the second year of the Rock Art Protection Program, funding was divided among twelve of the 34 proposals considered by AIAS during October 1987. The monetary value of all proposals considered exceeded \$450k; the funds available for expenditure totalled \$150k.

Proposals were received from individuals working at universities and a CAE, those not attached to any tertiary institution, and from various organisations; most applications derived from state agencies with heritage management and/or land use responsibilities and Aboriginal land councils. Proposals came from all states and territories, with the Northern Territory and New South Wales being best represented. The focus of proposals for protection work was evenly divided between locations in the north where a greater proportion of sites are known and the south of Australia but with a large proportion of the latter focused upon New South Wales, perhaps reflecting perception of threats due to visitor pressure on a limited number of sites.

The proposals considered varied greatly in scope and aims. Among them were two of national scope, a postgraduate course curriculum development exercise and one concerned with basic research into the potential of natural silica skins to protect paintings. The regionally oriented projects funded were fairly evenly divided between those focused upon physical preservation and management works and those concerned with survey and/or documentation of sites; proposals to study the Aboriginal significance of imagery ran a poor third.

The twelve funded projects included two 'seed-ing grants' designed to meet a wide range of cri-

teria and achieve multiple objectives. The two proposals of national interest were funded; one was widely but indirectly concerned with all protection criteria while the second met only the first criterion. The ten successful regional applications varied in aim and objective but all sought to address physical preservation and management matters, and another six were also concerned with survey and documentation of sites. A summary of the aims of all funded projects is provided.

Of the proposals not funded, the majority were considered worthwhile as projects but were not given as high a priority as the successful ones generally because of their aims. (Four were subsequently resubmitted to AIAS for consideration for funding from other sources, three successfully so.) The meeting's priorities were clearly with proposals concerned with immediate and direct conservation measures and those seeking to control visitation rather than projects seeking to survey for 'new' sites or to record in detail known subject material. On the other hand, the meeting made a recommendation that future consideration should be given to other priority criteria of the program.

In comparing the various proposals and the distribution of the first two years' funding, these points might be made: there was a slight increase in the number of proposals considered and a small proportional decrease in the overall monetary value of proposals; there was a commensurate reduction in average cost of the FY88 proposals compared with those of the initial year. There was an increasing tendency for applications to come from institutional sources rather than from individuals, with a marked reduction in requests from 'unattached' workers. There was, again, a wide spread of applications from across all states and territories but the distribution was biased by disproportionately large numbers of applications from two regions. The focus (as opposed to the source) of proposals saw an increase in the tendency to emphasise the north of Australia (WA, NT, Qld) compared with other regions, with 55% of proposals directed there.

In terms of the various RAPP criteria, there was an overall similarity of pattern in the two years' proposals with the exception of a reduction in the number of applications for research into the Aboriginal significance of petroglyphs and paintings. When the proposals are considered in terms of the subcategories of the extended conservation criteria, it becomes noticeable that there were marked changes in emphasis in the second years' proposals. There appeared, for example, to be a new tendency (within Criterion 1 proposals) toward application of methods to particular sites rather than the stress on assessment studies of the previous year. On the other hand, there was an increase in the proportion of proposals with multiple functions. Within Criterion 2, there was a marked increase in the number of applications in the 'search' category.

When the successful proposals are considered it is seen that while the proportion of Criterion 2 projects funded increased markedly over that of the initial year, there were still nearly twice as many successful Criterion 1 proposals; there was a slight increase in the proportion of projects investigating Aboriginal significance of sites, even if this was not the major concern of these studies.

Comparison of the territorial distribution of funding in the first two years of the RAPP shows that, the national projects aside, the northern Australian states and territory again were favoured both in terms of the bulk of the successful proposals and monetary value of funding, with an even greater share of the available funds than in the previous year; more than half of these went to the Northern Territory.

A summary of the results of the various applications of the RAPP funding will be offered elsewhere. Appendix C provides a list of the various reports resulting from the initial two years of the RAPP; these may be consulted at the AIAS Library in Canberra.

Dr Graeme K. Ward
Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies
G.P.O. Box 553
Canberra, A.C.T. 2601
Australia

REFERENCE

WARD, G. K. and S. SULLIVAN 1989. The Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies Rock Art Protection Program. *Rock Art Research* 6: 54-62.

APPENDIX A: Outline of FY87 conservation proposals

RAPP #	STATUS	SOURCE	FOCUS	CRITERIA	SOUGHT	GRADE	GRANT
FY87 01	Uni	ACT	NT	2d 2e 2c 3	5.000	A	3.500
FY87 02	SA	NT	NT	1b(i)	17.600	A	11.200
FY87 03	SA	NT	NT	1b(i)	16.300	A	11.200
FY87 04	SA	NT	NT	1b(i)	15.000	A	11.200
FY87 05	OA	WA	WA	1d 3	22.000	A	16.200
FY87 06	Ind	Vic	NSW	2b 2c 2d 3	20.000	B	0.000
FY87 07	Ind	Vic	SA	1b(i) 1b(ii)	18.300	A	4.200
FY87 08	Ind	ACT	A*	1a	22.500	B	0.000
FY87 09	OA	WA	WA	2b 2d 1e 3	22.500	B	0.000
FY87 10	OS	Qld	Qld	1b(ii) 1c	20.700	A	18.200
FY87 11	Ind	SA	SA	2b	5.600	B	0.000
FY87 12	Ind	Qld	Qld	2a 2b 2e	18.500	C	0.000
FY87 13	Uni	Vic	Qld	2b 2e 2c	10.000	C	0.000
FY87 14	Uni	ACT	NSW	2a 2b 2c	10.700	C	0.000
FY87 15	SA	SA	SA	1b(i) 1b(ii) 1c	20.000	A	17.200
FY87 16	Ind	NSW	NSW	2a 2e	19.800	C	0.000
FY87 17	Ind	WA	NT	2a 2c	8.300	C	0.000
FY87 18	Uni	SA	SA	1e 2b 2c 2d 2e	19.000	B	0.000
FY87 19	Uni	NSW	NSW	2e 2c	19.500	C	0.000
FY87 20	SA	NSW	NSW	1a	3.500	C	0.000
FY87 21	SA	NSW	NSW	1d 1a	23.600	A	21.200
FY87 22	SA	NSW	NSW	1d	20.000	A	10.200
FY87 23	LC	WA	WA	3 1d 1f 1c	12.800	B	0.000
FY87 24	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(i) 1c 1b(ii) 1d 2b	14.800	B	0.000
FY87 25	SA	Vic	Vic	1e 1c	14.840	C	12.500
FY87 26	SA	Tas	Tas	1b(i)	19.220	A	13.200
FY87 27	Ind	Qld	ACT	2d	2.700	C	0.000
FY87 28	SA	Qld	Qld	2b 2c 1c 3	26.300	C	0.000
FY87 29	SA	Qld	Qld	1c 2a	10.800	C	0.000
FY87 30	Uni	NSW	Qld	1c 2b 3	18.900	C	0.000
*** Total ***					478.760		150.000

APPENDIX B:
Outline of FY88 conservation proposals

RAPP #	STATUS	SOURCE	FOCUS	CRITERIA	SOUGHT	GRADE	GRANT
FY88 01	Uni	ACT	A*	1c 1d	12.351	B	0.000
FY88 02	OS	NT	NT	2c	20.000	C	0.000
FY88 03	Uni	ACT	A*	1 2 3	5.370	A	4.882
FY88 04	Uni	ACT	WA NT	2a	4.200	C	0.000
FY88 05	OS	Qld	Qld	1b(ii)	14.920	A	14.921
FY88 06	SA	NT	NT	1b(i)	34.738	A	10.000
FY88 07	SA	NSW	NSW	1d	5.800	A	5.800
FY88 08	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(ii) 1d	18.800	C	0.000
FY88 09	SA	NSW	NSW	2b 1c	5.928	C	0.000
FY88 10	SA	NSW	NSW	1d	13.800	A	13.000
FY88 11	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(ii) 1d	12.800	B	0.000
FY88 12	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(ii)	18.600	C	0.000
FY88 13	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(ii) 1d	4.800	C	0.000
FY88 14	SA	NSW	NSW	1d	7.700	C	0.000
FY88 15	SA	NSW	NSW	1b(ii) 1d	3.600	C	0.000
FY88 16	LC	NT	NT	2a 2b 2e 2c	13.420	C	0.000
FY88 17	LC	NT	NT	2a 2b 2c 2e	13.420	C	0.000
FY88 18	LC	NT	NT	2a 2b 2e 2c	13.440	C	0.000
FY88 19	OS	NT	NT	2a	28.839	C	0.000
FY88 20	SA	Tas	Tas	2b 2d	8.158	C	0.000
FY88 21	SA	Tas	Tas	1b(i)	12.500	A	12.500
FY88 22	SA	WA	WA	1c	19.650	A	11.250
FY88 23	Uni	ACT	A*	1a	27.260	A	26.305
FY88 24	Ind	SA	SA	2b	7.996	C	0.000
FY88 25	Uni	ACT	NSW	2d	4.472	C	0.000
FY88 26	Uni	Qld	Qld	2a 2b 2c	2.647	C	0.000
FY88 27	SA	WA	WA	1b(i)	19.660	A	6.770
FY88 28	SA	WA	WA	1c 1b(i) 1b(ii)	6.050	C	0.000
FY88 29	SA	WA	WA	1c 1d	12.325	B	0.000
FY88 30	SA	Vic	Vic	1d 1b(ii)	19.990	A	15.000
FY88 31	Uni	NSW	Qld	2e	15.434	C	0.000
FY88 32	A*	M*	WA	2a 2b	15.000	B	0.000
FY88 33	A*	M*	Qld	1b(i) 1b(ii) 1d	10.000	C	0.000
FY88 34	A*	M*	A*	2d	25.000	C	0.000
FY88 35	LC	NT/ meeting	NT	2c 2a 2b 3 1b(i)	0.000	A	14.000
FY88 36	OS	NT/ meeting	NT	2c 2a 2b 3 1b(i)	0.000	A	14.000
*** Total ***					458.668		148.428

APPENDIX C:

List of reports resulting from the first and second years' grants, AIAS Rock Art Protection Program

LEGEND

Expressions in square brackets:

R/n/n numbers an AIAS Report.

IR/n/n numbers an Interim Report.

Ms and pMs represent Manuscripts and Pamphlet Manuscripts held by AIAS Library; Ms* or pMs* indicates that, while the volume is held by the Library, it awaits expressions of options from the depositor and is not yet available to readers. B indicates a monograph number.

Photographs are held by name of photographer or depositor; N/n/n/n indicates a negative (black and white or colour), while colour transparencies are given individual numbers (currently in the series 9/n/n/n).

RAPP GRANTS FY87

(1) **The Shape of the Dreaming: Report on the cultural significance of Victoria River rock art** by Darrell Lewis and Deborah Rose 1987 (processed, 70 pp., includes 18 figures, 13 plates, references). [Ms2566]

NB: Report published by Aboriginal Studies Press in AIAS Report Series, 1988, as **The Shape of the Dreaming. Report on the cultural significance of Victoria River rock art** by D. Lewis and D. Rose. 79 pp., includes 18 figures, 12 plates, references (ISBN 0 85575 187 8). [B L673.29/S1]

(2) **Report on acquittal of 1986 Grants, Rock Art Protection Pro-**

gramme by George Chaloupka 1987 (TS, 2 pp., plus one b&w plate and 13 colour plates). [Ms*]
Copies of colour plates lodged in AIAS Photographic Archives. [Chaloupka.G1.CP: N4436]

- (3) **Awareness Program: Aboriginal rock art sites and others and the need to protect them and the natural environment (course co-ordinators Ken Colbung and Jan Rodda)**, draft final report by J. Rodda 1987 (TS, ii + 18 pp., plus appendices [photocopies of course materials]). [pMs4658]
- (4) **The Paroong Cave Preservation Project** by Robert G. Bednarik. Australian Rock Art Research Association, Melbourne 1988 (processed, ii + 63 pp., includes seven figures, 35 b&w plates, references and three appendices). [B B412.51/P1]
- (5) **Final Report on the Hook Island - Nara Inlet Art Site Protection Project - A joint project of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies and the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service** 1988 (processed, iii + 9 pp., includes three figures, references, plus 28 colour plates, four appendices including 12 b&w plates and perspective drawings). [Ms2604]
- (6) **Arkaroo Rock Painting Sites Conservation - Final report** 1989 (processed, 14 pp., includes one map, eight plates, plus three appendices: Excavation by N. Draper, radiocarbon determinations; Report on dust damage by D. Lambert; Costing. [pMs4657])

- (7) **Conserving Australian Rock Art: A manual for site managers** 1988. (TS, 119 pp., includes six figures, two tables, 31 colour and three b&w plates, references and three appendices). [Ms2562]
NB: Published by Aboriginal Studies Press in AIAS Report Series, November 1989, as **Conserving Australian Rock Art: a manual for site managers** by D. Lambert, edited by G. K. Ward (X + 112 pp., includes five figures, three tables, 31 colour and four b&w plates, references, three appendices, and index) (ISBN 0 05575 210 6).
- (8) **Market Research Study. Guided tours of Aboriginal sites at West Head** [report to] National Parks and Wildlife Service by Cameron McNamara P/L 1987 (processed, 33 pp., includes two tables, recommendations, references, plus three appendices). [Ms2620/Ms2619]
- (9) **Visitor Survey of Aboriginal Art Sites within and adjacent to Grampians National Park, September 1987, Final Report** by Fay Gale and Jacquie Gillen 1987 (processed, 82 pp. [acks pp. 3 to 20 recommendations], includes one map, 21 tables, plus 12 b&w plates and five appendices). [Ms2524]
- (10) **Petroglyph Protection: Mt Cameron West Aboriginal Site - Results of conservation programme undertaken in 1987** by S. Brown 1987 (TS, 3 pp., plus 8 pp. appendix on long term project proposal). [pMs*]
- (6) **Recording and Assessment of Rock Art Sites at Lungai (Victoria River Crossing area), Gregory National Park. A report to the Conservation Commission of the Northern Territory and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies** by R. G. Gunn 1989 (TS, 68 pp., includes references, 8 tables, 38 figures, plus 38 colour plates, nine appendices [pp. 69-106] including 12 figures). [R89/105]
Collection of thirteen colour negatives [Gunn.R1.BW: N4708 to N4720] and 85 colour transparencies [Gunn.R1.CS: 97516 to 97600] lodged in AIAS Photographic Archives.
- (7) **Rock Art Protection Project. Petroglyph Protection: Mt Cameron West Aboriginal Site - Results of Conservation Programme undertaken in 1988. A report to the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies** by S. Brown 1989 (TS, 4 pp.), plus **Mount Cameron West. Notes for the Proposed Management Plan on Archaeological Aspects**, 7 pp., plus **Mt Cameron West Rock Art Protection Project: An assessment of the Conservation Programme undertaken to June 1988** by T. Blanks and S. Brown 1988 (TS, 18 pp., includes references). [pMs4629]
A collection of ten colour transparencies [Brown.S1.CS: 97360 to 97369] lodged in AIAS Photographic Archive.
- (8) **Environmental Management and Site Conservation Programme: The Granites Complex, Mt Magnet** by P. Haydock 1988 (processed, vi + 27 pp., includes management recommendations, one figure, ten plates, bibliography, plus two maps). [pMs4641]
- (9) **Silica Skins: Their Composition, Formation and Role in Conserving Aboriginal Rock Art. Final Report presented to Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, May 1989** by Alan L. Watchman (processed, i + 76 pp., includes recommendations, references, four appendices incl. figures and plates). [Ms2673]
- (10) **Environmental Management and Site Conservation Programme: Walga Rock Revegetation Project** by P. Haydock 1988 (processed, vi + 11 pp., includes one figure, ten plates, bibliography and two appendices: 'Management proposal' by P. Haydock and J. Rodda (3 pp.); 'A report on the potential for revegetation of an area adjacent to painted rock surfaces: Walga Rock, Cue, Western Australia' by G. Cockerton, Australian Revegetation Corporation, Perth, 1987 (12 pp.)). [pMs3393]
- (11) **Grampians Rock Art - Interpretation. Interim report** received from D. Ranson, Victoria Archaeological Survey, July 1989. [R89/75]

RAPP GRANTS FY88

Résumé. Le texte original dans Rock Art Research par Ward et Sullivan (vol. 6, no. 1) consiste du contour pour le développement du programme de préservation des détails des projets étant récipier des bourses originales. Ce texte est complémentaire. C'est l'aperçu des résultats des bourses de la première année les candidats élus des résultats pour les deux ans, et une analyse brève des différences entre les propositions de chaque année, celles réussies et celles non réussies.

Zusammenfassung. Dieser Artikel komplementiert den früheren Beitrag von Ward und Sullivan in Rock Art Research (Band 6, Nummer 1, 1989), in dem der Hintergrund zur Entwicklung des Schutzprogrammes sowie Einzelheiten der ersten unterstützten Projekte gegeben wurden. Er umreißt die Resultate dieser Förderung im ersten Jahr, beschreibt die erfolgreichen Gesuche für Kostenzuschüsse im zweiten Jahr, erörtert die Resultate der Projekte beider Jahre, und bietet eine kurze Analyse der Unterschiede zwischen den Anträgen beider Jahre, der erfolgreichen wie der erfolglosen.