NOTES:

1. Two workshop sessions were held: one on SHED, with three specific questions; one on PastMap, with two questions

2. The following more general points were raised during the workshop; some of these points can also be related back to the workshop questions.

3. This note should be read in conjunction with the notes taken in response to the specific questions on SHED and PastMap.

Q&A after initial presentations

The following points were raised in discussion:

- How does this reflect the aspirations of the Carter Report (published in 2011) and the idea of a 'golden record'? In response it was recognised that the Carter Report had set out a long term vision for the development of Historic Environment Records in Scotland. This had advocated a centralised approach to data storage however this concept was not widely welcomed by those curating data. Technological developments have also meant that a central record is not actually essential since data linkage has become much more achievable. SMR forum will provide a response to the question 'why is it not possible to have a central record?'

- Have colleagues within the wider sector been involved in identifying gaps in the CORPUS project and to what extent is data held by Historic Scotland being examined? In response it was explained that phase 1 of the project was reviewing data held in ORACLE/CANMORE and will be due for completion at the end of October. Overall the programme will last 2-3 years and a phased approach is being taken to integrating HS data through a series of projects.

Break out 1 (SHED) – plenary

- In plenary discussion the length of the timescale (10 years) was queried. In response it was noted that there is a significant amount of work to be done and that this timescale is realistic.

- It was observed that it will be necessary (given the long timescale) to prioritise aims – data that is out there is already at risk due to budget cuts.

- It was noted that most local authorities have just set their 1-3 year budgets and it would be useful to have further detail on the timescale in order to align with these. In response – it is hoped that the document will be finalised by the end of the year and further information on implementation will be available then.

General comments on the SHED Strategy document

- Make aims more assertive and confident.

- Issues over copyright.

- Issues over some wording in the document; not 'will be adhered to where possible' should be adhered to full stop.

- Agree that most up to date data is important, but don't forget the legacy data, capture change and conflict in the information.

- Should remember to think about those out with the heritage section (education, interested parties, etc).

- Broadly speaking views are represented.

- Question of ownership.
- How to build on different opinions (e.g. display in PastMap).
- Should be more than just a map.
- Some data to be kept private, but opportunities to discover other data and promote partnership.
- Issues: resourcing, standards, concordance.
- Strategy should be more explicit as to its purpose. Idea of protection wasn't explicit enough.
- Word choice should be more ambitious.
- Better opportunities if there's a wider buy in.
- There should be an extra aim, making user generating content explicit. It is mentioned in the outcomes but not as an aim.
- Benefits: don't lead on from aims very obviously. E.g. more efficient working (is in aims but not benefits). Make them SMART, document has 'do this more', state how much more?
- Assess risks to HER's in the long term?
- Prioritise aims and objectives. Have a clearer focus.
- Strategy has to address the risk of impending cuts on local authorities and how to protect this. Better idea of timescales of implementation, to help local authorities work out budgets, resources.
- Make concordance/electronic submission to the most appropriate database a condition of grant
- Need for Performance Indicators

- The main drivers should be the current context; no statutory protection for LA data and service and reducing LA funding.
- Too much emphasis on digital data - need strategy for non-digital, and how to digitise
- What are the long term plans for enabling users to continue to the implementation of SHED?
- Concerned that the word 'protection' doesn't appear in the vision.
- Selling the Strategy: The SHED Strategy is very focussed on the sector – the audience needs to be widened in order to 'sell' the strategy more widely to colleagues in associated fields (e.g. Marine Planning) and to political masters.
- Pathways for data entry: Clarity was sought on the sources of (excavation) data and route(s) for data entry. For example will data from the field be entered via *Discovery and Excavation Scotland* as is the case currently? It was noted that the route for NTS data is through SURE.
- Local authority data: data from local authorities is generated in different places (including from community groups). Further clarity is sought on how the SHED Strategy will help data collation within authorities, against a backdrop of declining resources.
- In North Lanarkshire there are 3-4 ways in which data is collected, stored and transmitted to the public. It would be useful if the Strategy could advise on how best to process data with a view to working towards accessing data through a single portal.
- All parties felt that the strategy was a good umbrella, but without having more details it was hard to see how all the pieces fit together. Within this we discussed a few specific topics:
- Ownership - it is important that the original data owners were accurately attributed.
- Differing Interpretations – How do we accommodate the range of interpretations offered by different organisations of the same subject/site?

- Adhering to standards – If data is to be shared we need to conform to standards but it can be very hard to maintain that across everyone in the face of differing resources and expertise. How would this be reflected in the strategy? How do we advocate for people to adhere to standards?

- Process – A clear, achievable and believable set of processes would be required to engage stakeholders and avoid unnecessary confusion leading to frustration and disconnect.

- Important to recognise context of SHED and make this very explicit. Managing change is vital

- There is a question of different data standards for different data sets – consistency of standards and how do we achieve consensus and agreement.

- Who or what defines the standards? How are users defined? How are user needs defined?

- Who is the main audience for the data? Perhaps be more specific. Would impact on the design and ability of an online resource

- Develop a central model which others can copy

- make it easier for groups to add to the national record

- What does the vision output look like? If a website, do we all have different ideas?

- Overall: more is needed on selling the Strategy to attract wider users to the data. The Strategy as a whole could have more operational emphasis – how will this document help local authorities in their work and make the case for maintaining resources?

- Key question is how additional necessary work will be funded

- Should be some monitoring of how data is used - i.e. Is more at-risk heritage being protected

- SHED/the portal can't be all things to all people: main focus should be on supplying data to people who interpret it for others.

- Technology: Take advantage of the opportunities that new technology has provided, e.g. Linked Data. Facilitate blue sky thinking despite not being able to deliver currently. Aims all look great, but difficulty in implementation. WFS and portal are not conflicting but are two different things. There will be difficulty in the lower, more detailed level of implementation.

- Standards: Who sets the standards? Standards for creation of new data is fine, however how do we deal with historic data? How to reach a consensus and work together moving forward.

- Partnership: How to get 'buy in', others already have their data online, 'why should we share?' Promote standards and cohesion of working. Value of partnership collaborative approach, which can lever additional resources.

- Strategy: How will additional work be funded? Sustainability, is 10 years too long, running out of steam?

Break out 2 (PastMap) – plenary

- It was questioned how data from other projects (e.g. in voluntary sector) might be accommodated. A collaborative approach is needed. In response – the intention is for PASTMAP to have wider influence than currently. The recently launched PASTMAP is the result of small scale developments within limited budgets. It was commented that PASTMAP could form a basis for others to develop their own apps.

- Finally there needs to be greater dialogue with education interests – an example given of an app developed by the Museum of London was mentioned.

General discussions on PastMap

Additional Datasets

- Master Map backing data, important for close scale mapping
- Terrain/relief data
- Tourist data e.g. heritage trails, doors open day information. Important for publicity
- There was an observation that at events such as this it is always the 'same faces' – need to get a wider range of people involved. And are other groups represented in the strategy, e.g. conservation officers?
- There was a discussion of the volume of datasets out there, e.g. HS have 400 access databases. A lot of resource is required to organise HE data.
- The fact that museums data is mentioned at all is a very good thing. Museum data is often at the periphery of discussions. One attendee stated that museums should have been much more involved in the development of the strategy.
- The core of all of this should be statutory requirement for local authority archaeologists – the data is no use if the service is switched off (in real life and digitally!)
- One attendee was concerned that SHED represented the trend away from protection of the historic environment.
- It is important that the context for data collection (planning, protection) is made explicit.
- A recommendation was made to replace the word education with 'learning' which is currently seen as more holistic.
- A general observation on the strategy was that it was too focused on the curatorial point of view, rather than the stakeholders.