

**SWOT analysis for NCCSS in relation to purpose, overall objectives and results sought (6 May 2014)**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local authorities have an interest in carved stones and recognized that many of the objectives, with particular reference to undesignated stones, fall on their plate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited resources – need to be focused and realistic.</li> <li>• Communication isn't working to optimum effect, improvements needed between regional and nation bodies, with a potential role for the NCCSS here?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b> to take a more strategic approach with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More strategic discussions in meetings, e.g. focus on gaps between organisations</li> <li>• More strategic communication (need strategy), particularly in relation to ALGAO members</li> <li>• Circulate more casework between meetings, so the focus in meetings is on casework that requires discussion</li> <li>• Reflection on NCCSS work and casework to provide, for example, an overview of carved stone issues and developments</li> <li>• Feed carved stones into research agendas, potentially through ScARF or regional research frameworks?</li> <li>• Limited capacity of Committee for lobbying, so encourage and support non-government bodies such as Archaeology Scotland and SoAS in their respective endeavours.</li> <li>• The NCCSS could learn more by inviting others to come and speak about their work but also to find out more about the workings of the organizations represented on the Committee.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliance on unpaid time</li> <li>• Poor strategic management</li> <li>• Personal rather than institutional interests represented on Committee?</li> </ul>