

Minutes of the meeting of

THE SCOTTISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS ALLOCATION PANEL

Thursday, March 23rd and Friday March 24th 2017 Chambers Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1JF

Present: Dr Evelyn Silber (chair), Dr Neil Curtis, Paul MacDonald, Jacob O'Sullivan, Murray Cook, Dr Mary MacLeod Rivett (by Skype)

Attending: Stuart Campbell and Natasha Ferguson (TTU);

Assisting: Andrew Brown (Solicitor to QLTR), Barbara Finlayson (Assistant Solicitor to QLTR)

Apologies: Neil Curtis (for 23rd), Murray Cook (for 24th)

Note: no representative of NMS or Historic Environment Scotland was present

The sole business of the meeting was TT120/16 The Galloway Hoard. In welcoming all to the meeting the Chair expressed her thanks to the TTU, to Historic Environment Scotland, to the Solicitor to the QLTR and to the Panel for the work put in since 2014 on the preparation of the material, the conservation programme, communication with the applicants, and for their patience during the long process.

1. The Chair reviewed the papers from both applicants which had been circulated to the Panel in advance and the independent valuations, two commissioned by TTU and one commissioned by the finder in addition to the standard case documents supplied by TTU. The finder had expressed his views in two letters also available to the Panel.

2. The Chair emphasised that the first task for the Panel was to consider the data on individual artefacts and the Hoard as a whole given by the three external valuations and make a recommendation on the ex gratia payment to the QLTR.

3. The second task of the Panel was to consider the two applications made for the allocation of the Hoard by the Stewartry Museum (Dumfries and Galloway Council) and the National Museum of Scotland, examining the case made by each in accordance with the Treasure Trove Code of Practice and the criteria for allocation in the case of multiple applications outlined in Appendix M of the Code.

4. The three valuations were scrutinised at length, the comparative valuations for each artefact being considered and the views of all members being sought individually. Where comparator artefacts were cited in the valuations the

relevance and condition of these was considered as well as the age of any comparator dates from auctions.

5. The meeting resulted in the Panel agreeing unanimously to recommend a valuation of £1,982,200 to the QLTR.

6 On resumption the following day, the Panel considered the case for allocation made by the applicants. Each of the criteria was considered in turn and each Panel member was invited to comment on the relative merits of the case made by both applicants. The finder's view that the allocation should be made to the National Museum of Scotland was taken into account.

7. In conclusion the Panel agreed unanimously that the National Museum of Scotland had made a stronger, more soundly evidenced and specific case, demonstrated a clear understanding of the conservation and security requirements for the Hoard and had a clear deliverable strategy for making the material available for research, display and for fundraising to cover the substantial ex gratia payment. Dumfries and Galloway had made a strong case for the local and regional significance of the Hoard and the contribution it would make to their collections. However, their application had not demonstrated the capacity to meet its curatorial and conservation needs nor to support research and information dissemination at a national and international level required for a find of this importance and complexity.

8 The Chair thanked all present for the time and expertise they had given to this case. The panel's recommendations would be forwarded to the QLTR.

Dumfries and Galloway Council appealed the recommendation of the QLTR and an Appeal meeting of SAFAP was held on 28 April 2017.

Present: Dr Neil Curtis, Paul MacDonald, Jacob O'Sullivan, Dr Evelyn Silber (chair), Dr Mary MacLeod Rivett and Murray Cook (by Skype and conference call) (Panel members) with Barbara Finlayson, Stuart Campbell and Natasha Ferguson

For the avoidance of conflict of interest no representative of the National Museum of Scotland or Historic Environment Scotland was present.

In considering the appeal papers submitted for both museums SAFAP evaluated these against both the initial and supplementary applications that had been considered at the meetings on 23 and 24 March. It was noted that Dumfries and Galloway had submitted a longer document but that sections 1 and 2, 12-15 were aspects that could not be considered against the criteria set out in appendix M of the TT Code of Practice.

After careful discussion which once again examined each case against the criteria the Panel unanimously rejected the appeal and confirmed their recommendation for allocation to the National Museum of Scotland.