Handoff control assurance: Museum incoming loan condition check

Prepared by: David Garcia
Review date: September 22, 2026
Report: COR-730316
Evidence source: incoming loan file / SRC-108367
Report purpose: Assess whether an operational handoff is controlled

Review mandate

Review trigger: A loan crate arrived for the North Gallery, but the object list, arrival condition notes, environmental requirements, and signed loan terms do not agree about what can be installed.

Review question: Which object and care conditions are supported by the incoming loan file before an installation sequence is proposed?

Scope under review: The review follows the loan agreement, object identifiers, packing list, arrival photographs, condition report, gallery environment record, insurance evidence, and any request to change the approved display conditions.

Evidence and criterion

Evidence source: incoming loan file (SRC-108367).

Review criterion: For museum incoming loan condition check, the review criterion is whether the source record supports the selected verification step. Compare the agreement, object list, crate photographs, and registration entry with the registrar's proposed identity reconciliation.

Review method: The review uses incoming loan file as the source record and tests the result against the selected verification approach. Compare the agreement, object list, crate photographs, and registration entry with the registrar's proposed identity reconciliation.

Finding and boundary

Recorded evidence: The lender's list names a bronze figure as NF-27, while the crate label and receiving photograph show NF-72; both numbers appear in the museum's preliminary installation plan.

Bounded cause: The incoming loan file establishes the observed condition but does not establish an independent root cause beyond that condition.

Practical effect: The practical effect considered here is bounded by the operating condition. The education team has designed a touch-based activity around a reproduction but its draft labels use the loan object number.

Correction and handling

Operating constraint: The education team has designed a touch-based activity around a reproduction but its draft labels use the loan object number.

Handling decision: Keep the activity separate from the loaned object and revise the draft identifier to avoid implying public handling approval.

Corrective action: Reconcile the lender's identifier, crate label, and museum record before the preparator assigns a case or treats the object as received.

Ownership and verification

Next step owner: Connor Santos (Exhibition preparator).

Next step: Ask education staff for a proof of the corrected activity card and retain the loan object's access boundary in the exhibition file.

Verification criterion: Compare the agreement, object list, crate photographs, and registration entry with the registrar's proposed identity reconciliation.

Report limitation: An arrival inspection records the object's observed condition at a stated time; it does not establish when a change occurred, determine liability, or replace the lender's agreed conditions.