

5.	Promote awareness of archaeological archives: seminars, workshops	
	<p><u>5.1 AAG AGM 2017</u> AGM went well SP is waiting for the synopsis of the talks in order to make them available on line. She has asked the speakers to submit by the end of May, six are still not back. DI is suggested to be the next year's AGM and event organiser.</p> <p><u>5.2 Community excavations</u> On Peter Alan's CBA paper (Bingham, Notts) he pointed out: 1) The storage crisis and the need to think about communications. 2) Physical availability of repositories and the costs involved; despite the HLF funding the local Museums are closed or there are added costs after a number of years after closure of project (actual deposition year) 3) Standards for archiving and the need for national guidelines, to suggest to HLF for storage and archiving but to address and promote the issue you need someone to take lead, CBA perhaps? in order to persuade the Trustees (HLF)</p> <p>SB said for Derby /Notts the HLF does not have experts to assess the bid on post excavation. Another matter is the Deepstore (Salt mines) long term storage: is not looking at selection/retention as due to vast space it can accommodate all finds from each archive. DI said that in Beds the Bedford Museum does accept archives from the local community groups.</p> <p>SP has pointed out that CBA is not represented in the AAF committee and about P Alan's article that it was not right to separate the above issues from the rest of the sector. Also that HLF should have a list for the PX stage of each project.</p> <p>KG commented that there is no provision for digital data either. SP added that there is no separate set of guidelines for community groups. DF would like to see a national document on compilation of an archive together with selection/disposal policies, local agendas and county repositories.</p> <p>KG said there is a huge HLF grant on storage crisis which linked the community excavations but there should be a decision on the lead and future decision making.</p> <p>SP commented on the documentation of all 'at home' storage archives to be ready for Deepstore for 5 years and then released for public benefit. In this group the smaller scale projects are not likely to be included and DI also added that the size of a project can make a difference when scoping with CBA.</p> <p>A good idea is to approach P Allen for the HLF forms so SP and DI have decided to do a draft response to him. Another idea could be the quantification of the community projects to feed to the SMA current project. Finally, TA suggested collaborations between AAF/ CBA/ CifA on the above.</p>	SP DI TA
6.	Focus on issues of standards, best practice, advocacy and access	
	<p><u>6.1 Seeing the Light of Day project</u> On the Light of Day SP said she came out of the meeting realising that the focus was the funding in the SW as well as the scale of the problem and similar to the SMA survey it felt like the target was to tell Museums which were not involved directly what was going on.</p>	SP DF

	<p>There are two consultants in this project one is allocated to speak to the County Archaeologists and the second one to Museum curators in order to collate this info in years. The question here is how relevant is this currently after the latest SMA quantification.</p> <p>DF expressed the idea of repositories becoming statutory. She would like to see comments from the AAG when the report comes out for the above. SP concluded that there are two levels of solutions for Museum storage and she will be updating the Group.</p> <p><u>6.2 Regional deposition standards</u></p> <p>A short briefing from SP on the Gloucestershire Museums standards. From Herts museums no one was following up the draft afterwards including County archaeologists. The different funding structures of the county Museums proved to be so instrumental.</p> <p>DF has added that the Archaeology collections are just growing on a national level as well as that the Gloucestershire curators were made redundant after the consultation. As a Group it will be a good to release a statement for the deleted Archaeology curatorial posts on a national level.</p> <p><u>6.3 Selection Toolkit</u></p> <p>There is a document from WA on selection strategy but has not been published yet (LM). The selection strategy for commercial units is suggested to go through ClfA and Development Control Archaeologists (DCs) but Museum Curators will have to be involved.</p> <p>ZH favours the idea of a (more generic) document that lists the value and research potential (e.g. relevant scientific analyses) for the full range of different archaeological material types.</p> <p>The toolkit needs to be more of a checklist: what types of documents to look at – who to talk to and agree them with?</p> <p>On that front SP said that Sussex is the first one to do it on a regional level while from the commercial units is WA but more on a local level looking at the Regional agendas with specialists recommendations.</p> <p>DF added that in Worcestershire they meet regularly with the DC and they have cooperated with the local unit specialists whilst holding PX talks. It is within her authority to reject deposition of an archive when another commercial unit does not follow the rules. The minutes of these meetings are fed to the Worcestershire HER, she does hope to make a link on this with ADS in the future. She concluded that in 2003 the SMA guidelines were compiled to represent the Museum’s collections rather than the selection that is required to take place in a commercial unit.</p>	<p>DF</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>SP has commented that anything more specific and detailed than a checklist would be more difficult to implement on a national level. Similarly anything too prescriptive may simply be mostly copied rather than selection strategy being applied on a site-by-site basis. It will be important to be included into WSI's at which stage should be CfA endorsed. DF suggested testing the toolkit for different sizes projects via HE/CfA funding. SP added that the selection strategy should be discussed with the local Museum at different stages of the project. KG suggested to have a deadline for our check lists for our tool kit so SP and the Group agreed on 16 June.</p>	All
7.	Group aims 1 to 5	
	SP introduced the above to our new members.	
8.	AOB	
	KG has asked all members to provide the travel costs for both London and Birmingham. ZH informed the Group that there is a HE office in Birmingham so she will check the availability for future meetings	All
9.	Next AAG meeting	
	KG to check the Wednesdays in September and suggest to the Group. A Resume to go out to all AAG members on topics they might want the Group to discuss.	KG