



Scottish Historic Environment Data (SHED) Strategy 2013

Stage 2 Consultation – Collated Responses

(Document v2a)

This document represents the collated responses of 23 organisations for the Stage 2 Consultation that was undertaken between the 7th May and the 28th June by the SMR Forum (Scotland). Each consultation response has been made anonymous where possible, but a full list of those organisations who responded can be found at the end of this document.

Stage 2 Key Consultation Questions & Responses

1. Do you agree with the Scope of the Strategy as stated within Section 2.5 – 2.8? If not please suggest how it might be extended, contracted or changed.

Responses: Yes 7 No 4

Comments:

- Yes - a very sensible approach.
- FCS offer to join the SHED Programme Management Group if looking for input from wider sector organisations.
- Not clear from the 'Scope' section of the document what 'Scope' actually means. It does not define what the data actually is, and is a little vague about who it involves and who it does not. I would expect it so say explicitly who it is that's being targeting in this consultation and why. By the way, should the Ordnance Survey be cited as a partner anywhere? Might be important to take a constructive view on this, even if we do pay them lots of cash. Recognising the evolving digital mapping side could be wise.
- 2.5 It is worth adding 'educationalists' to the range of bodies listed here.
- Agree with the general ethos of the scope: to make it a partnership approach spread over the long term with delivery through the partner organisations during routine maintenance and development.
- For clarity it would also be good to see the general outcomes from the strategy implementation laid out within the scope. It is not currently easy to establish what the strategy will achieve in 10 years time.
- The SHED Strategy will be a great benefit to the heritage sector.
- It is important to recognise that it is not a strategy for all historic environment data, only those datasets specified in 3.5.

- Paragraphs 2.5–2.8 fairly reflect the spectrum of data users and curators, but they do not address sufficiently the scope of data which will be covered by the strategy. The detail in Principle 2 needs to be iterated in the scope in order to address this.
- This consultation question refers to paragraphs 2.5–2.8. If the intention is to include paragraph 2.9 as well, it should include reference to the full timescale of the strategy, rather than the first three years only.
- The beneficiaries of this strategy also include education at all levels, which is well made in the benefits section 7.3 later on, and this section could usefully refer to that section.
- The timetable for the implementation of the strategy is particularly vague, and offers the opportunity as currently described for nothing to happen. It would be useful for the three-year Development Phase to be better defined, measurable and include priorities for action.
- In 2.8 the public’s participation in our historic environment is somewhat underplayed, and this should include “managing” and “engaging”.

2. Do you feel that your interest or viewpoint is fairly represented within the Strategy as a whole? If not please explain why.

Responses: Yes 17 No 6

Comments:

- Add section (5.4) on Polygonisation: the importance of creating known site extents for our most significant sites to a national standard is recognised. This is a key outcome of the SHED Strategy (particularly for land management, SRDP applications and development control within the planning system) and is a key aspiration in terms of record enhancement.
- Would welcome more explicit mention to other existing programmes (DSP, HLA to enable Aim 1.2).
- DSP is an essential project (particularly for land management and development control) and deserves a statement of intent in order to enable Aim 1.4
- While PastMap is rightly identified throughout the SHED Strategy as the obvious starting point (section 4.3) - and the importance of polygonisation clearly noted - a national polygonisation standard (DSP) and national data enhancement initiatives (such as including HLA relict areas within other datasets, ensuring that 'new' sites discovered by the intensive HLA methodology are not left behind) should be promoted more explicitly.
- Strategy seemed potentially insular in respect of how to promote and provide access to Scottish Historic Environment Data. I

would have liked to have seen more emphasis on tying in the historic environment strategy with other non-historic data bodies, groups and applications, such as Scottish Government, SSDI, SEWeb and so on.

- The role of Historic Scotland as an estate manager has not been fully incorporated.
- Strategy could be improved by emphasising the need to provide data through web services, data downloads and online access. There is a major focus on PastMap as the tool for delivery. Although I agree that this is a useful tool I believe that this is only one of many ways in which historic environment data can be used to promote and celebrate our heritage. Prioritising the concept of open data would enable others to improve accessibility by providing access to the data through many more applications.
- Welcome the emphasis on professional standards (which might be supplemented by reference to relevant IfA Standards and guidance). However, the draft Strategy fails adequately to deal with issues relating to museums and museum collections.
- In particular, we are supportive of the wide scope of content to be accommodated.
- We are encouraged by the principle to allow commercial organisations to contribute to the data.
- We feel that a single portal for access to relevant historic environment data will be a useful tool for ease and clarity.
- Welcomes this initiative to make information on Scotland's past freely available to as many as possible.
- It would be useful to have a clear presentation in the strategy of exactly how it will address the key issues raised previously, such as the protection of local expert advice to planning authorities, and the sustainability of such services in the face of public sector cuts.
- Several areas considered by the independent Carter report, such as the aspiration to have one-asset-one-record for this data, and the consideration of centralising the actual archiving and curation of the data (but not the creation, management and enhancement of that data), are simply considered "unworkable" with no explanation or transparent assessment of their feasibility. The Carter report considered these to be important relative to the ongoing sustainability of this resource and critical to the ease of access to the data. It is difficult to respond to this consultation without understanding better the reasoning behind such decisions.
- Museums are not represented here and do not appear to have been directly involved in discussion and creation
- Where are the conservation officers?; Where are the academic departments?; Where are the Building Preservation Trusts?
- Need to remember other local resources like museums and archives, not just HERs

- What about academic rigour and the value of peer-review of the strategy, from colleagues across Europe?
- Would like greater recognition of historic maps in PastMap, and the ability to incorporate them through web services (WMS/WFS)
- Recognition that concordance is a huge task
- Helpful that it recognises sustainability
- Accessibility aim is important to inform business and general public users
- Bringing in archives will be a big step forward
- Yes, a very inclusive SHED consultation – Carter report, co-operative approach
- Linked data, coordinating resources, directing people to more information
- Facilitate serendipity in data discovery
- Yes, I think HER's are one of the core datasets of the SHED
- Searchable GIS, integrating multiple source datasets
- Yes, improved sharing of data through improved technology – data management
- Should be explicit in new ideas; these are all things that either are or should be occurring in any case.
- No explanation of why certain options have been chosen and others not, e.g. Centralised database.

3. Do you agree with the principles that underpin the Strategy (Section 6.3)? If not, what additions or changes would you make?

Responses: Yes 7 No 3

Comments:

- Whilst the NPF is mentioned earlier in the document, it's only mentioned vaguely, and no connection with the actual outcomes are cited. As a consequence, the chance for meaningful alignment is lost. As a consequence, the language in 6.3 is not sharp enough.
- Under 5 (partnerships), for example, rather than 'commercial organisations', reference could be made to businesses and land managers, and to placemaking, sustainability and regeneration.
- As for standards, it might be wise to refer explicitly to Compliance as there will be IP, equalities, language (Gaelic), and DPP issues (personal data) to consider.
- International standards will be important, as will how we mesh with the UK's membership of HEREIN (in Europe), for example.
- Access – it is important to place Scottish Historic Environment Data within its wider context of publicly available environment and other data. Access should not be limited to a SHED portal or PastMap and current portals/applications should be encouraged to be used where possible and built on. If there is to

be a SHED portal or PastMap then they need to be tailored and scoped so that they are not duplicating other public sector resources but enhancing them.

- Strategy should promote broader access to a wider audience through pushing data to other non-historic portals and working with non-historic groups.
- Accessibility should include following current access standards/good practice such as DDA web accessibility/compliance.
- Partnership – the open partnership idea is a good model to build on and for clarity SHED nominated partners should be added to the list of possible partnership groups.
- Standards – agree that standards should be agreed through the Working Groups and SHED partners. I feel that the principle should be that standards have been agreed nationally, and where possible, they use (or are modelled on) current national standards and international standards to avoid duplication and to cover any legislative requirements. (I feel that the inclusion of the Sites and Monuments Record Forum is too detailed and causes confusion.)
- Storage – Does storage need to be something that is part of the SHED strategy? Could this not be picked up in other policies? If we are to include storage should it not include that data owners should design digital storage so that data can be easily provided to others where there are no security constraints?
- Concordance – I wonder if this principle would be more easily understood if it was discussing Linking Data rather than Concordance. This mirrors the language used in the aims and objectives section.
- 6.1 and 6.3 should make reference to the IfA/ALGAO Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services (http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/Standard_and_guidance_for_archaeological_advice_interim_approved.pdf). Services should be expected to comply with this Standard and should be encouraged to seek Registration.
- Principle 1 – This is an identification of the issue, and would be better placed earlier in the document, under the ‘Purpose’ section of the Introduction.
- Principle 2 – we feel that the data content should also include historic maps and plans.
- Principle 3 – agree that the data should be made available online for free, through a national portal. However the specification of PastMap as the portal should not necessarily be part of the principle, but rather moved to later in the document as a possible or preferred delivery mechanism.
- Principle 4 – The meaning of this principle is not clear.
- Principle 5 – Suggest re-wording to: ‘Allow museums, archives, academia...appropriately coordinated manner.’

- Principle 6 – Suggest re-wording to: ‘Storage of data will meet nationally accepted standards.’
- Remove Principle 7.
- Principle 8 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Concordance should be put place to aid the interpretation and use of the data.’
- This section could be substantially strengthened to present inspirational principles, such as item 4: Curation, where the principle should be to work together to remove double handling of data completely, item 7: Storage, should simply highlight the need for the curation of the archive to be secure and include the long-term sustainability of the data, and remove the dependence on corporate IT since other solutions may well emerge during the development of SHED, and 8: Concordance, removing “where possible”.
- It is possible that PastMap may not form the long-term delivery strategy for SHED, and so this should be removed from item 3.

4. Do you agree with the aims that underpin the Strategy (Section 6.4)? If not, what additions or changes would you make?

Responses: Yes 13 No 8

Comments:

- Suggest an edit: "Aim 1: To make major improvements and enhancements to the sharing of, links between, access to and quality of the information about the historic environment". Data enhancement is surely an aim of the SHED Strategy - but more is made of 'avoiding duplication' than 'record enhancement'.
- There is a fundamental gap in the aims, and that is major Gaps in the data itself. The absolutely core aim of SHED, and of the new HS/RCAHMS merged body pushing the HE Strategy, should be the building of a solid evidence base for the historic environment in Scotland. From this is should be possible for many of our key workstreams (e.g. planning advice and decisions, statutory compliance, grants, academic research, input to the Curriculum for Excellence, climate change mitigation, development of traditional skills, new designations, de-designations etc.) can be carried forward with confidence – i.e. knowing what’s out there is a top priority. At present, the most yawning gaps in our online data are for our already recognised designated sites. This is increasingly embarrassing, especially when the user interfaces on the web look ever-more sophisticated. The fact is, however, that a lot of this data exists in the case files of HS, the NMRS and HERs/SMRs. Unlocking this information should be a priority, especially for the new merged body.
- in the list of initiatives it should make statements about what HERs are doing - including data cleaning for going on line,

regular updates of information, responding to/working with local groups to record sites on the ground

- Aim 3 is slightly unclear as to what is meant by improved functionality. From reading the full strategy I take this aim to mean content enhancement to allow better analysis of data. If this is right I don't know if functionality captures that fully. I would probably suggest using different phraseology.
- For clarity Aim 4 should be changed to data security rather than safety. Also data security might be better suited to be included within Aim 2 as part of Data Standards.
- For Aim 5 the emphasis should be on promotion rather than training.
- The aims should more directly address the crucial importance of maintaining and, where necessary, improving professional support for the data which is available. In many respects, the effectiveness of SHED will depend upon the expertise which is available to maintain and interpret the data and to advise the public and other stakeholders in relation thereto. Although the Vision does identify the need for the resource to be 'professionally managed' and 'continually updated', this important aspect should be more clearly elaborated in the aims.
- The strategy fails to address the desirability of ensuring that services that manage historic environment data and offer advice based upon it comply with the IfA/ALGAO Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services, of encouraging them to seek IfA Registration.
- Aim 2 – Suggest re-wording to 'To develop standards and consistency within and across the data.'
- Aim 4 – Suggest changing 'safety' to 'security', for consistency between this aim and objective 3.4.
- Aim 5 – Suggest defining who/what the strategy aims to train/promote.
- Aim 4 should be to remove duplication rather than minimising it, and safety might usefully be changed to security.
- A separate aim should be to improve and develop the data management systems for curators specifically, since this is often different from the requirements presented by the public and other users of the data.
- Another aim could be to increase integration of historic environment data with other spatial and non-spatial datasets, helping to mainstream the understanding, protection and use of the historic environment, and reducing barriers to its understanding by other decision-makers outwith the heritage sector.
- Aim 1: addressing Intellectual Property Rights must be included under this aim. It is a precursor to sharing information. (Currently IPR is referred to under Aim 5). Examples were given of where an organisation/company had to seek permission to use information that they themselves had generated – the

copyright having been transferred to the National Monument Record.

- Aim 1: There are data protection issues – data being collected for a single purpose which should then be destroyed. The purpose of data collection, even within each local authority, can vary.
- Aim 1: Data sensitivity is also an issue that needs to be addressed under data accessibility. The wording under this aim needs to be more assertive.
- Aim 1.1: Is PastMap enough for what SHED aspires to do?
- Aim 1.1: We felt the portal needs to be more than a map
- Aim 1.2: Linking is one of the key issues and we discussed clear labelling of data ownership
- Aim 1.3: We felt there may be political, commercial and technical barriers to be overcome on this
- Aim 1.4: We discussed what you do when you only have a vague site reference or you wish to obfuscate a find spot location. Large polygons aren't that helpful but neither are inaccurate coordinates. A point on a map will be interpreted as a location even if it has been intentionally relocated to protect a find spot. Mapping is not the right tool in this scenario.
- Aim 2: Some possible issues about harmonisation of data, accuracy of find spots
- Aim 2.2: 'adherence to international standards' is key and ought to be listed first. Objectives under this aim were felt to be broadly correct. Consistency arises from the development of standards. Within local authorities standards for polygonisation varies.
- Aim 3.1: The wording is a little clunky – this is about how data can be used. To achieve this we need to understand the needs of data users.
- Aim 3.2: Perhaps more reference needed to move towards user generated content and how the 10 year strategy can keep up
- Aim 3.3: Data should be kept up to date however it is also important to understand the evolving interpretation of a site/past understanding. It was noted that there is very little bibliographic referencing at national level.
- Aim 3.4: Data protection appears again under this aim.
- Aim 4: Should eradicate not minimise duplication
- Aim 4.1: Duplication and effort and data should be REMOVED not reduced
- Aim 4.2: There is scope for achieving efficiencies in fundraising by avoiding duplication of effort.
- Aim 4.3: There was some discussion over the moderation of user-generated content – noting the difference between data and opinion. It is important that users understand the authority behind the data – especially that for undesignated sites.
- Aim 5: The objective is to secure a better contribution from contributors.

- Aim 5.1: RCAHMS could go to universities rather than having students come to RCAHMS. There is a need to push the Strategy out – to ensure that users of data (for example local authority councillors) are aware of the data that is available. In England different levels of training are provided through HELM. Online training for community groups is another potential opportunity.
- A further aim required, about data integrity/accuracy/value
- Additional aim: further identification and engagement of data producers and user groups beyond the finalisation of the strategy
- Missing aim: Learning (covering formal education & layered interpretation principles)
- Aims/objectives all good. Only caveat 5.4 on IPR - cross reference Shakespeare review? Open data. (in Section 6.5, sub number 5.4)
- How will the different aims be prioritised? E.g. Portal vs. web services. More data/more standards
- Resources should be addressed

5. Do you agree with the objectives that underpin the Strategy (Section 6.5)? If not, what additions or changes would you make?

Responses: Yes 6 No 4

Comments:

- although we would welcome more commitment to the development of polygonisation (perhaps with mention in Aim 3.1 and 4.2) and the availability of a polygonised 'land management' layer as a downloadable GIS shapefile with hyperlinks to parent records. This may be getting too detailed - something for the later development.
- Firmly embedding polygonisation as a key outcome now will help to justify bids for resources later on.
- A key point is that the big strategic data gap is mentioned in Section 5, but then disappears from the strategy. It needs to be cited much more explicitly and then promoted as a major priority – indeed, a fundamental justification for the project itself, and for the resources that are needed to support it. At the moment, there is a vague notion that social media and user-generated content might fill this gap. This is not only not good enough, but it has the potential to undermine the professional standards required to underpin the confidence that is needed in the data, if it is to be used to support decision-makers and make a real difference (e.g. contribute to the NPF).
- For Aim 1 Objective 1.1 it would be useful to include the necessity for any current portal to be interlinked with other more generic portals such as SSDI to limit duplication. Any historic

portal should enhance not duplicate. It would also be useful if the portal could include links to other historic environment tools, such as applications, as well as information.

- For Objective 2.1 I would like to see it broadened to suggest that we have a voice for standards that affect historic environment data as well as those that are particularly designed for historic environment data. I feel that we should have a voice for wider standards and their implementation, such as INSPIRE.
- For Objective 2.2 it would good if it could say 'Work with other non-historic environment sectors to ensure...' to capture a broader approach to data standards that are in line with Scottish Government and EU.
- For Aim 3 it might be useful to have an objective that outlines agreement of the prioritisation of optional data that could be gathered by data owners to improve data analysis/functionality.
- Objective 3.4 would be better placed under Aim 4.
- For Objective 4.4 it might be useful to add in 'to ensure the long-term curation where necessary' as not all data necessarily needs long term curation. It might also be useful to include within the objectives that standards for archiving, including retention and disposal, are agreed nationally.
- For Objective 4.5 for clarity I would add – '...creation and collation of data when it is gathered from various different sources.' as not all data is gathered from different sources.
- Objective 5.1 and 5.2 should be merged so as not to overemphasise training over raising awareness of its existence, uses and value, which I feel is the main objective.
- Objective 5.4 is about data security and constraints and should be part of Aim 2 and data standards.
- Objective 5.5 would be better placed under Aim 3, which is about improving data through additional content to allow better analysis.
- An additional objective might be to provide guidance about Historic Environment data in plain English. It could explain the nature of historic environment data and how it links together. This could be a useful exercise to promote understanding and access as well as a more holistic approach.
- Would like to see included in the objectives the introduction of a statutory duty for planning authorities to have access to a professionally supported and maintained Historic Environment Record, and an objective of accredited compliance with relevant professional standards.
- Obj 1.2 - Suggest removal of 'where possible'.
- Obj 1.3 – Suggest re-wording to 'All data sources to be available online...'
- Obj 1.4 – Suggest moving this to objectives under Aim 3.
- Obj 2.1 – Suggest re-wording to 'Influence the development of national...'

- Obj 2.2 – Suggest removal of ‘...as far as possible within the Scottish context.’
- Obj 2.3 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Achieve consistency across the data...’
- Obj 2.4 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Agree protocols for data editing...’
- Obj 3.1 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Improve interactive abilities of the data, so that it can be used for research and managing change.’
- Obj 3.2 – It is Scottish Canals’ view that the issue of data standards and principles has already been sufficiently covered in under Aim 2 and its objectives. User Generated Content is a specific issue, and we feel that it would fit better under Aim 5, relating to the training of non-professional users of the data.
- Obj 3.3 – Suggest that this would fit better in the objectives for Aim 4.
- Obj 4.2 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Identify and raise resources that can help...’
- Obj 4.3 - Suggest re-wording to ‘Establish processes that can ensure the security of data...’
- Obj 4.5 – It is unclear what is meant by ‘improving efficiency’.
- Obj 5.1 – Suggest re-wording to ‘Seek opportunities and identify resources...’
- Obj 5.5 – The enhancement of existing content has not been addressed previously in the document, and should be made an aim in itself.
- As with the underpinning principles these objectives should not be qualified, and terms such as “where possible”, “where appropriate”, “as far as possible”, and so on.
- In item 4.1 a strengthening of the commitment to remove duplication of data is required, for example to read “Agree and implement ways in which duplication of data can be removed.”
- Item 4.3 - is safety or security the issue?
- There are major changes underway in academia with regard to public funding of research and the requirement for Open Access to the results of that research, and it may be useful to have an objective in the SHED strategy to consider the potential implications of Open Access, particularly under Aim 1, and especially if this reaches to other areas of public funding in the future.
- The objectives in section 6.5 read as actions, and could be structured into a timetabled series of SMART objectives with the help of stakeholders.

6. Do you agree with the benefits that derive from the strategy (Section 7)? Are there any that you feel should be added?

Responses: Yes 14 No 6

Comments:

- Suggest an edit: "Change managers: including Scottish government officers, local authority staff, conservation NGO specialists, land and historic building managers".
- If this were a business case to be put to ministers (as ultimately I hope it will be), it would need to be sharpened up.
- If accessibility is truly to be a benefit to all then it is likely to be provided through the free and open delivery of historic environment data. This would allow others to use the data in many different applications. These in turn would allow people to interact with the data more easily. I feel that training, due to resources, is only ever likely to benefit a certain few.
- In addition to private-sector developers and landowners, mentioned in 7.3, reference should also be made to public-sector developers and landowners.
- Suggest that the benefits are transferred into the past tense, for example, 'Increased consistency and coherence of information'.
- Item 7.1 suggests that the planned activities (presumably those listed as objectives in the preceding section?) would be added to during the process of development of the strategy. While flexibility will be necessary, this rather undermines the objectives in the previous section, many of which should be seen as a priority and the initiation of new activities should be resisted while the core objectives are implemented.
- In 7.2, minimising duplication should be replaced with removing duplication in the Quality data section.
- Minor edits in this section include "User-Generated", "Private Sector:" remove "who may be" after "The public:", but otherwise this section makes clear the benefits to a wide range of people.
- Delivery: how sustainable is the Strategy over 10 years in the face of swinging cuts?
- Is 10 years too long? Run out of steam, considering the amount of aims and objectives
- Dependent on local authorities/partners/etc 'buy in', supplying data. Other resources/repositories already available online – why should we share?
- Benefit to Historic Environment itself: awareness, understanding, protection
- Partnerships can lever additional resources internally and externally – political advantage
- Keep possibilities open for all user groups. Including crowd sourcing possibilities, user development
- It is the public's data. Open Government Licence System. 'Adopt' not 'promote' (section 3.5)
- Chance to hit Scottish Government buttons in NPF and Next Generation web access – we provide content and bring users into 'digital enablement'

- Greater publicity at this cross-institutional resource leading to greater resources and funding. Appealing to high level management
- Even more collaboration and co-operation between sector organisations
- Less duplication of effort, delivered through increased communication and working together
- Sustaining new partners with different/varied funding models
- Access to data which users might not have been aware of at all, ideally a synergy between an SMR, historic maps and artefact find spots. Possible problems – mainly such different data sets coverage. Conversely we should not predict how users might which to use different datasets. User focus, browse ability
- How is data/users equalised for standards, who sets standards?
- Less duplication of data, but we still need to promote local curation, hard to reconcile?
- SMARTER' benefits, so they are measurable
- Can access all historic environment information online without worrying that I have missed something
- More enjoyment of the data
- More efficient working practices
- Addressing real risk to the survival of this crucial resource
- A strong, well resources world-leading resource for research, protection and advice
- More focussed access to different areas, responding to user needs
- Websites that deliver well
- Clear way forward rather than returning to the same points repeatedly
- We liked about the intentions of the strategy: Linking of data across the sector, the ability to discover others content, the inclusion of other local resources from museums, etc, links to Oasis, DES and other national initiatives, concordance – creating key linkages between organisations data, standards – Normalisation of sector data.

7. Do you have any other comments, additions or corrections to make with regard to the Strategy?

Responses: Yes 10 No 2

Comments:

- None - other than to reiterate how well the SHED Strategy is written and structured.
- we shouldnt have to enter information onto both HER and Canmore and I realise that the new PASTMAP is aimed at facilitating the links between the two. I welcome this.

- This is a hugely important initiative, so much so that it should be enshrined within the functions of the new merged body, especially as its principles lie at the heart of the RCAHMS Royal Warrant. So it has my total support.
- Conservation Areas boundaries need to be added to Pastmap
- By way of further context in terms of existing projects and related strategies, we are delighted to say we have successfully secured funding that will assist with the continued production of Discovery and excavation in Scotland and help us explore new methods of reporting and presenting information on current archaeological work in Scotland.
- Alongside the new form development, we will be creating an interactive, searchable, map-based webpage displaying information on new archaeological sites, activities and finds as the work is reported. This will display new archaeological information received by us to anyone accessing the Discovery and excavation in Scotland page on the Archaeology Scotland website. Registered users will be able to login and access more detailed information on each of the sites. The map will have options to allow people to carry out searches relating to their particular areas of interest such as types of sites, finds and archaeological remains from particular time periods. Search results will also display any submitted images and show links to other websites that contain further information such as RCAHMS and community or academic research websites. The webpage will grow and develop as new information is received and will also provide links to 65 years of past copies of Discovery and excavation in Scotland, allowing people to search these publications for information about known sites.
- It would also be useful to address outcomes as well as benefits and tie them back into the strategy. What does the strategy hope to achieve in 10 years and how will this be prioritised? Is the strategy to deliver: (1) more interest in the historic environment and its value, (2) the ability to protect the historic environment more fully or (3) provide a lasting resource that can be used to improve our understanding of our heritage and historic environment? Outcomes allow you to prioritise objectives and aims and can enhance the benefits.
- Roles – HS is also a Historic Environment Estate Management group and should possibly be added to FC/MOD/NTS etc. Would SNH also be within this group as they sometimes categorise historic landscape information and also own heritage assets?
- Responsibilities – As above HS should be added to Estate Management Organisations as they manage Properties in Care.
- National Library of Scotland and also National Archives hold many historic environment datasets and I would hope to see them included under Management of National Archive. Historic maps are often seen as a major historic environment record.

- It would be nice to look at what aims fell within each Workstream and if possible what benefits/outcomes they will hope to achieve.
- It would also be good to see a list of current partners as an Appendix and to provide updates of this to all partners as and when people were added. Partners should not be limited to one per nominated group but should possibly be more aligned with data ownership/curation.
- I was concerned with the reference to particular data inaccuracies within the strategy document. Although I understand that they do highlight some of the issues, picking particular ones to the exclusion of others, may be construed as unfair and unrobust.
- IfA Standards and guidance are missing from bibliography: indeed there is no mention of IfA anywhere in the document.
- We are disappointed by the lack of consideration of professional standards in addition to data standards, and the failure to address the role of professional accreditation in demonstrating and ensuring that those standards are maintained.
- Section 8, 'Delivery of the Development Phase' – Diagram of Primary Resources and Roles. Suggest insertion of 'and others' into blue box containing 'NTS, FC, MOD'. Otherwise, Scottish Canals is not represented as a public body which manages historic environment data.
- To be successful the Strategy will require transparency in its consideration and implementation of priorities, and it should be an aspiration to be the world-class leader in the curation, management and accessibility of historic environment data. To this end the concept of "ownership" of this data should be removed, this is Scotland's past, it is Scotland's data and belongs to the people of Scotland. In many, if not most cases, it has been created and curated through public funding and the underpinning principle of free access to everyone is very much welcomed. In this spirit it may be worth replacing the term "ownership" in the diagram on page 17 with "curation". In addition, the function of many, if not all, of the organisations in the figure on page 18 is not simply "management" but curation and protection of these resources and this should be made explicit since it drives much of the actual management.
- The timetable of 10 years may be too long, and a shorter 5 year strategy should be adopted, with a clear timetabling of prioritised actions.
- The Strategy needs to be 'sold' very heavily and there needs to be a quantifiable benefit. There needs to be an end point – to make the Strategy more tangible. The Strategy needs to secure buy-in at every level within the sector and also beyond.

List of Organisations who responded

Forestry Commission Scotland
NOSAS
Historic Scotland
Shetland Amenity Trust
IHBC
Archaeology Scotland
East Lothian Council Archaeology Service
Institute for Archaeologists
Scottish Canals
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
RCAHMS
North Lanarkshire Council
University of Edinburgh
Treasure Trove
Northlight Heritage
National Library Scotland
SEPA
Building Learning
University of Glasgow
ALGAO
National Trust Scotland
Built Environment Forum Scotland
GUARD Archaeology Ltd