The world after PPG16:
21st-century challenges for archaeology

Jan Wills

The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists is incorporated by Royal Charter.
Power Steele Building, Wessex Hall, Whiteknights Road, Earley, Reading, RG6 6DE

Contents

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction: the origins of the project

The title of this project reflects its origins in the aftermath of the celebration of the 25-year anniversary of Planning Policy Guidance 16 *Archaeology and Planning* in November 2015. The years since the publication of this government planning policy document (and its successors) have seen an enormous growth in the number of development-led archaeological investigations producing a great volume of data, the potential of which has only recently been fully demonstrated in new period-based and thematic synthesis. PPG 16 not only changed the place of archaeology in what were then called strategic planning and development control but also led to far reaching changes in the funding of archaeological investigation and in the structure of archaeological profession itself. The 25-year celebration (an event and a publication: *Building the Future, Transforming our Past: Celebrating development-led archaeology in England, 1990-2015,* Historic England 2015*)* led to a reflection on the current shape of professional practice and its future.

In the same year the creation of Historic England from English Heritage stimulated the re-examination of a number of aspects of archaeological policy and practice and Historic England's role therein. Beginning with internal review, and discussion with the Historic England Advisory Committee, Historic England then invited the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) to facilitate wider debate in the sector by organising a series of jointly sponsored discussions.

The context for these discussions was difficult: reductions in public spending following the financial crisis of 2007-8 have resulted in a halving of Historic England's funding over the last decade and significant reductions in public expenditure in other key areas. The most notable of these has been in local government, affecting the provision of archaeological information and advice, and the museum curation of the products of the greatly expanded numbers and size of archaeological investigations, both elements essential for the continuing success of the post-PPG 16 system in England. Developing political uncertainty around the impact of the decision to leave the European Union has raised questions about the future of environmental policies including the principle of environmental impact assessment and the protection of the rural historic environment.

Meanwhile, the private sector has faced great opportunities as well as challenges in capacity, skills, and training against the anticipated high demand for skilled professional archaeologists generated by planned large infrastructure projects and other development.

At a time when the legislative and policy framework is again changing rapidly, and the gains as well as the dis-benefits of post-PPG16 arrangements have become apparent, this project was designed to look forward to some of the key challenges of the next 25 years.

2. Project methodology: Southport review; online discussions and workshops

The *21ˢᵗ-century Challenges for Archaeology* project took place between January 2017 and the end of May 2018. It commenced with a review, conducted by Taryn Nixon, of progress with the Southport report vision and recommendations (*Realising the Benefits Of Planning-Led Investigation in the Historic Environment: A Framework For Delivery* (2011)), the products of an earlier sector review in what then felt like an optimistic time following the publication of Planning

Policy 5, *Planning for the Historic Environment* (2010). PPS 5 brought together for the first time policy on archaeology and the built historic environment, giving a new emphasis to public benefit. The Southport Group's report represented a first review of professional practice post-PPG 16 and looked forward to a new policy context, one that was soon superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework. The latter provides the current overarching policy context for most archaeological investigation and, at the time of writing, is itself under review. The 2017 review of progress with the Southport recommendations (*What about Southport? A report to CIfA on progress against the vision and recommendations of the Southport Report (2011), undertaken as part of the 21st-century Challenges for Archaeology project*, Nixon 2017) forms Appendix 1 to this report.

Six topics, ranging across the legislative and policy framework for archaeology, the methods of public sector service delivery nationally and locally, the standards and guidance that underpin archaeological work, and three aspects of the archaeological process, were chosen for discussion. The discussions took place in one-day workshops with invited participants, and in associated online conversations through the Historic England LinkedIn Group (managed by Robin Page) over two days for each topic. The online discussion was intended to engage a wider group of people thus complementing the small and tightly focused workshops. The topics, concentrating specifically on archaeology rather than the wider historic environment, were as follows:

1. *New models for archive creation, deposition, storage, access and research,* Workshop 7ᵗʰ April 2017, London, facilitated by Hedley Swain
2. *Professional standards and guidance: who sets them and what are they for?* Workshop 17ᵗʰ May 2017, London, facilitated by Mike Heyworth
3. *Designation and management of the archaeological resource in the context of a changing planning system,* Workshop 30ᵗʰ June 2017, Birmingham, facilitated by Gill Chitty
4. *New models for local curatorial services: potential future roles for local authority archaeology services and Historic England*, Workshop 25ᵗʰ September, York, facilitated by Ken Smith
5. *Synthesis of information from developer-funded investigation to create new historical narratives,* Workshop 2ⁿᵈ November 2017, London, facilitated by Chris Gosden
6. *Challenges of archaeological publication in a digital age: who are we writing this stuff for anyway?* Workshop 7ᵗʰ December, Oxford, facilitated by Barry Cunliffe

The order of the discussions was determined in part by the then impending government review of museums and the need to engage early with the topic of archaeological archives in order to input to this review.

Background papers and questions intended to stimulate discussion were made available via the CIfA website, and the Historic England LinkedIn Group, before each online discussion. The same papers and, in addition, the collated comments from the online contributors were then circulated to the workshop participants before each event. 85 individuals joined in the online discussions, and the material from these conversations forms Appendix 3 to this report.

The workshops, each of up to 35 participants, were independently facilitated by individuals from a variety of different parts of the sector and connected neither to CIfA nor Historic England. Invitations were extended to individuals mainly in their personal capacity but an attempt was also made to ensure that relevant organisations within the sector (and beyond) were covered by the invitation lists. Through this approach 162 people attended workshops including members of the following organisations:

> CIfA, Historic England, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, the Council for British Archaeology, the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers, the Society of Antiquaries of London, the British Property Federation, the Country Land and Business Association, the Local Government Association, the Federation of Archaeological Unit Managers and Employers, Historic Environment Scotland, Cadw, the Society for Museum Archaeology, the Archaeological Archives Forum, Arts Council England, the Archaeology Data Service, the National Trust, The Heritage Alliance, HS2;

and the following areas of the sector:

> consultants, contractors, English and Scottish local authorities, national park authorities, Welsh archaeological trusts, universities, and archaeological publishers.

Chatham House rules were used to encourage free discussion rather than the articulation of organisational policy.

Notes taken at each workshop were collated, a summary of the main points of discussion was produced, and a draft set of proposed actions was derived from views expressed on the day and online, in particular from the final plenary session of each workshop when participants were asked to identify priorities for action. In some cases organisations that might take forward the proposed actions were identified in the discussion. All of this material, together with the collated comments from the online discussions, was made available on the CIfA website.

It should be stressed that the proposed actions are those identified by project participants and workshop project leads. **They do not represent the policy of the project partner organisations (Historic England and CIfA)**, nor of other sector organisations, except unless they have been specifically adopted by those organisations or where individual actions have been subsequently already been taken forward by them (see 6 below).

Although the project was concerned with England invitations to the workshops were extended to colleagues in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and the discussions benefitted enormously from the contributions made by those from outside England who were able to attend.

The project was managed by Jan Wills, with support from CIfA staff. The overall project lead from Historic England was Steve Trow, then Director of Research; the Historic England leads for each specific workshop and online discussion were: Steve Trow (1), Duncan McCallum (2), Joe Flatman, with Deborah Williams (3), Trevor Mitchell, with Duncan McCallum (4), Barney Sloane (5), Steve Trow (6).

3. Workshop outputs

For each workshop the proposed actions, and the summaries of the main issues discussed, are presented below. The discussion questions and the background papers form Appendix 2 to this report, and the collated comments from the online discussion form Appendix 3.

The workshops focused on identifiying priority actions that were an achievable response to the issues discussed. The topics were wide-ranging, and the proposed actions were similarly very broad in scope and include both short term, limited, proposals as well as longer term aspirations. In total 73 actions were identified, albeit with overlap between the topics.

Workshop 1

Archaeological archives: new models for archive creation, deposition, storage, access and research. What can the sector do to redefine the archaeological archive and realise its public value?

Proposed actions

	Topic	Proposed actions	Link to summary below
1	Input to/influence on the DCMS Museums Review	• Discussion with review team	all
2	Monitoring the scale of the challenge	• Through projects such as 'Seeing the Light of Day' and SMA/HE surveys continue to model skills capacity and storage capacity and demand.	1
3	Advocacy	• Consider 'advocacy statement' or 'good practice statement' from ACE/HE on the value of archaeological archives – linked to implementing outcome of the Museums Review?	2
4	Strategic archive storage	• Discussion with ACE and others (HLF, DCMS) in the context of the Museums Review • Feasibility study for national (or regional) archive stores/resource centres, followed by preparation of business case for funding	10
5	Project management	• Review standards and guidance better to embed archive creation and assessment into all life cycle stages of projects. Include evaluating the significance of archives, for example at PX assessment stage	3, 8
6	Planning process	• Review implementation of NPPF policy on archives and develop best practice examples of policy, planning conditions, and WSIs. • Consider whether current policy/guidance is adequate, and what requires amendment should an opportunity arise.	7
7	Ownership of archives	• Seek legal opinion to test current/new views on title to artefacts. • Review implications with sector partners	9
8	Rationalisation of existing collections	• Targeted funding stream (? challenge funding) to allow museums to rationalise 'historic' archives in order to create some short-medium term storage headroom.	3, 12

9	Costs of archive curation, and storage (capital and revenue)	• Develop an understanding of whole life (? but time limited) storage costs (which covers both archive store/resource centres and deep-store type alternatives) with the aim of producing a transparent national costing model. • Consider how costs might be apportioned: developer/public funds	11
10	Leadership/liaison	• Review current structure to enable clearer leadership and better collaboration	4, 6
11	Archive usage	• Develop a better understanding of the professional and public usage (and potential usage) of archives in order to inform retention strategies. Include both museums and contractor stores. • Consider whether archives are 'findable' through existing systems, or whether there is a need for new or enhanced routes (national index, HERs, HIAS, Oasis)	5, 15
12	Selection and deposition	• Produce unified core guidance, endorsed by CIfA, SMA, HE, ALGAO, FAME etc, on archive selection and deposition (as an alternative to fragmented or 'competing' guidance). • Encourage academic studies on approaches to selection or digital alternatives to physical retention across a range of material types	12, 14
13	Implications for professional standards of selection/discard policies	• Review changes to recording practices/standards that might enable less physical retention	13

Summary of main issues discussed

1. The archives 'crisis'
The profession has been discussing problems with archive deposition and storage for many years without finding solutions, although there is now a greater degree of awareness of the issues and progress has been made on specific topics. Surveys of collecting museums and of the holdings of archaeological contractors have been undertaken, and national/international guidelines have been produced. A number of current projects are addressing selection and retention in existing museum collections, and (within the southwest region) a wide range of museum, planning and liaison issues.
It is notable that many of the eight recommendations of the SMA report of 2012 were designed to address questions that were, once again, central to the discussions in this workshop.

2. Valuing archives
In theory we understand the public benefit of archaeological archives but we have not articulated this well, either within the profession or to government or to the public. Archives are more often spoken of as a problem or a burden rather than a valued resource, and the focus is on the amount of

space required for their storage rather than their potential for use by researchers and the public. There is a need for advocacy of the value of our archives but advocacy needs to be grounded in the realities of current and future public expenditure.

3. Can we keep everything forever?
The general consensus was no. Clear policies and guidance should steer the creation of valued archives with assessed research and display potential. Curation should be dynamic, and archives periodically reviewed for their comparative significance in order to guide retention decisions.

4. Working together
Many individuals and organisations are involved in the creation, deposition and curation of archaeological archives: developers, consultants, contractors and their specialist advisers, local authority planning advisers, museum curators. Understanding and liaison can be patchy across these individuals/organisations: developers may not understand their responsibilities; there is a particular disconnect between those creating the archive and museums, often with little contact until the point of deposition; planning advisers may not have the capacity to monitor the archive element of a project. Cuts in local authority funding and staff mean that there is less capacity for liaison.

The low level of engagement of the academic community with this workshop, and archives from development-led archaeology in general, was noted. However, the potential for involvement of academics and researchers in many aspects of archive management and potential was identified.

The split of responsibilities between government departments (DCLG and DCMS), and between ACE, Historic England, and HLF is also a factor but unlikely to change, so we must make the existing arrangements work more effectively.

5. Archives usage
Although we have collected information on museum storage and staffing, volumes of archives awaiting deposition and other issues, we do not have good information on which components of archives are used, how they are used, whether in a museum or with contractors. Opinions and anecdotal evidence suggest everything from little use of the majority of archives through to frequent use, including of those held by contractors. Some museums will have information on use of their own collections but there is no overall assessment. Although it is felt that, increasingly, we have undertaken much of the data collection we need, this is an area that would benefit from survey and could include looking at public knowledge of and attitudes to archives.

6. Leadership
Many organisations are involved in developing archives policy and practice: ACE, HE, ALGAO, FAME, CIfA, SMA, and groups have been created to improve co-ordination of effort eg AAF, CIfA archives group. There is a perception that the sector is fragmented and that this is a barrier to action.

The first recommendation of the SMA 2012 report – that ACE, Historic England and AAF should produce a national policy statement on the significance of archives – has not been implemented.

7. The planning system

At the introduction of PPG16 in 1990, and the rapid increase in developer funding for archaeological investigation, provision for the consequent archives was not properly thought through, specified or integrated into the planning system.

The NPPF has a good policy, and there is supporting guidance but additional guidance is required. The NPPF does not include a requirement for museums to accept archives, neither is there any specific funding mechanism to support archives or any guidance on situations where there is no collecting museum.

There is scope within national and local guidance and Local Plan policies to articulate better the responsibilities and the process of archiving, specifying this more clearly and fully in planning conditions and WSIs. There is some good practice in these areas that could be disseminated. Ideally more detailed phased planning conditions are needed, although more detailed model conditions drafted for the Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 in 2015 were not acceptable to government. Archive deposition is rarely monitored by local authority planning advisers, nor is enforcement of planning conditions often used to expedite archive deposition.

There is some use of Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 agreements to fund archives but there are competing needs for resources for (for example) education, libraries and roads; some existing good practice in this area needs to be disseminated.

There is a need for clearer overall guidance on archives in the planning process, with model/good practice examples.

8. Project designs and project management

The archive needs to be considered as one of the principal products through the life cycle of a project, as part of mainstream project management rather than as an end of project activity undertaken only by archives staff. Project documentation should set out how the archive will be created, managed and deposited with the costs (including specialist advice on selection, retention and discard) built into the overall project costs.

All projects should start with research questions, and the research potential of the archive should be considered as part of this. Research potential and significance can be reviewed as part of the post excavation assessment process and before deposition, so that the potential of an archive is known to the receiving museum (who should also have been involved in the assessment process).

9. Transfer of title

Artefacts are understood generally to be the property of the landowner from whose land they derive. However, difficulties in establishing ownership and obtaining a transfer of title to the receiving museum leave many archives in limbo. Linear projects and very large projects are a particular problem. Current research discussed in this workshop presents an alternative view of ownership; this needs to be explored and tested with further legal opinion. A simplification of this issue could assist with the movement of archives though the system.

10. Storage

The storage problems have been and are being well documented by previous and current surveys. They are not replicated for other museum collections because of the 'pipeline' of developer-funded archaeology that continues to produce new archives. Many of these have no collecting museum to go to and many other museums are nearing capacity. Where there is no museum home for archives

they are held by the archaeological contractor that produced them; there is a consequent and significant on-going cost to the businesses concerned.

The appropriateness of storage of archaeological archives in museums was questioned; some archives may have very little potential for display, education and engagement but high potential for specialist research.

New repositories for archaeological archives, linked to museums, are needed, on a national or a regional scale. The capital costs might come from ACE and/or HLF. There would be an issue of who would own and administer the new facility(ies).

11. Funding

The full cost of creating and curating archives is not understood, although at least one local authority has calculated the cost based on using deep storage. We need an agreed costing model.

Costs may need to be explicitly shared between the developer – perhaps for a defined period of time such as 25yrs – and public funds for the longer term.

Developers are not paying the full cost of the archives arising from their developments - charges currently levied vary enormously and *c* 55% of responding museums in the 2016 SMA survey do not make any charge for deposition.

Local authorities are under extreme financial pressure, leading to a loss of specialist staff (in museums and as planning advisers), and capacity generally. There is unlikely to be any more resource from local authorities.

The proportion of the project costs for archiving may be diverted elsewhere before the end of the project, leaving little to create and deposit the archive; this is a project management issue although it should also be seen in the context of a perceived under-costing of the archive component of projects generally.

The management of resources from developers was discussed: should this be paid into a central dedicated fund?

12. Guidance on selection and retention

'New archives': We have produced standards and guidance on creating archives but the standard is not always met and the guidelines are not widely followed. Many guidelines are too generic, not specific enough. Selection is seen as volume management, not as research archive creation and there can be pressure to reduce volume in order to reduce both deposition and storage costs.

Museums are often not involved in decision making when an archive is being prepared. In many cases expertise tends to lie with the archaeological contractor and commissioned specialist rather than the museum, although the relevant specialists may not be available at the optimum times on site and in archive preparation.

We could take some relatively simple decisions, such as not retaining archives from 'negative' sites – but guidance is needed even on this.

'Historic archives': while there is scope for rationalisation of existing archive collections this process has a cost and many museums do not have the funding or the expertise to undertake it. Current pilot projects funded by Historic England may encourage more organisations to undertake this, thus freeing some space for new material by, for example, selective retention of bulk finds based on agreed criteria.

There could be an adverse public reaction to the discard of their local archives and we need to take account of this.

13. Standards

Selection and retention needs to be considered along with standards in recording on site and in post excavation analysis – decisions to discard may result in a need for a higher level of prior recording.

14. Digital archives

The potential of digital technology to transform archives was acknowledged but not discussed in detail. Suggestions included retaining a digital only archive for those projects which produced little or no significant material, the artefacts themselves being discarded. On site developments in digital recording are not being paralleled in archive creation. Guidance on digital archiving is needed.

15. Information about archives

In order to improve use and accessibility is there a need for a new national index of archives? More easily accessible information could help to increase the use of archives for research. How would this link to HERs which should signpost where are local archives are?

16. Confidence

As a sector we lack confidence in articulating the value of archives, determining what they should consist of, and advocating for the resources they need. We are risk-averse.

The pace of development of new types of scientific analysis means that we feel a need to keep everything, just in case. There are excellent examples of the re-use and research on older archives.

However, if we don't make choices others will do it for us since not everything can be retained forever.

Workshop 2

**Standards and Guidance
What are they for and who sets them?**

Proposed actions

	Topic	Proposed actions	Link to summary below
1	Principles covering work undertaken across the whole of the historic environment	• Consider the creation of a high level statement of principles	5
2	Definition of roles, and of terms	• Define who does what ie who should publish/own/enforce/persuade • Articulate clearly the meaning, purposes and status of standards and guidance, and advisory/ technical documents	2,3,4
3	Clarification of what standards and guidance, good practice advice, and technical guidance exist and are required	• Map existing standards and guidance etc • Identify how they influence or are enforced • Identify gaps/overlaps, and seek consensus on results • Commission new material /remove overlaps	2,3,4
4	Professional standards and guidance	• Review how CIfA Standards and Guidance are used and perceived by others (incorporating results of any recent studies eg standards in artefact reports) – are they effective in a) maintaining minimum standards and b) promoting good practice? • Review enforceability of standards and guidance and reconfigure as appropriate • Consider splitting standards away from guidance/technical specifications • Review and update existing CIfA Standards and Guidance	6
5	Lack of common understanding of standards and guidance across the sector	• Develop and promote a better understanding of standards and guidance and how to meet them through training and professional workshops/seminars • Engage with all parts of the sector, including the academic community and community groups, to develop a common understanding, • Consider cross sector regional hubs/groups to bring sector 'silos' together	9
6	Compliance/enforcement	• Promote the use of accredited professionals by those specifying and commissioning as a route to compliance with standards • Set out enforcement/compliance mechanisms (eg through planning system, accreditation, professional institute's professional conduct	7,11

		process) to enable better understanding of how to take forward a complaint or a case of poor performance • Encourage Registered Organisations to embed compliance with Standards and Guidance in their training and CPD programmes	
7	Poor professional practice	• Invest in education and training in standards • Utilise provisions of Registered Organisations scheme • Consider how to support individuals confronting ethical dilemmas concerning bad practice/poor standards • Investigate the causes of poor practice: a consequence of resourcing, or ignorance, or just 'cutting corners'? • Disseminate appropriate information on professional conduct cases	10
8	Lack of innovation in professional practice	• Promote change and innovation within the profession through discussion, conference, workshops, journal • Link with revision of regional research frameworks • Identify innovative case studies from all areas of professional practice for publication and/or discussion at conference. • Consider how barriers to collaboration and sharing innovation in a commercial environment can be addressed	8
9	Implications of outcomes of synthesis projects for professional practice	• Review the methodological recommendations of the Roman Rural Settlement Research Project • Consider what and how to incorporate into Standards and Guidance or technical/methodological advice • Convene further discussion within the profession as needed.	12
10	Local government services: reduction in capacity and impact on standards	• Take issue forward into Workshop 4 discussions • Consider further the implications for professional practice and self-regulation	13

Summary of main issues discussed

1. The Southport vision

The vision set out in the Southport report was supported although the change in context was also recognised. We still need to articulate better the public value of the work we undertake, and to make further progress on many of the aspirations set out in the report.

2. Definition of terms

There is often a lack of understanding of what is meant by a 'standard' and by 'guidance'. The following definitions were agreed:

Standard: something you can measure against

CIfA Standard: a measurable outcome

Guidance: advice on 'how to…'

CIfA Guidance: how you might/should achieve the outcome… and avoid sub-standard work

Quality: fitness for purpos**e**

3. Volume of documentation from differing organisations

In total there is a great deal of material comprising standards, guidance, advice and technical specifications etc produced by different organisations, often overlapping in content but with differing terminologies. There is a lack of clarity in how these documents inter-relate, and how they influence or are enforced. Existing standards and guidance need to be mapped; gaps and overlaps can then be defined and filled/removed.

4. Who should produce which documents?

Whose responsibility is it to produce which documents? The roles of Historic England, professional institutes and other expert organisations need to be better defined. It was agreed that policy and advice on, for example, planning, is produced by government and public bodies; professional organisations provide standards and guidance (both ethical and methodological/technical). Who produces the latter should be the organisation in which the expertise resides: professional body, Historic England, CIfA Group etc; responsibility may be shared in appropriate circumstances.

5. Principles for work across the whole of the historic environment?

Should we aspire to a common high level set of overarching principles applicable for work across the whole of the historic environment eg a 'Conservation Principles' type of document? It might have political benefits ie one voice for the sector. It could realign the sector with the NPPF, and reflect the multi-disciplinary nature of many professional practices. It should link into broader public policy *cf* the well-being and resource-for-all approaches in Wales and Scotland.

6. Revising and updating CIfA Standards and Guidance

Most Standards and Guidance need some updating; certain topics require more radical revision. A review should include consideration of splitting standards away from guidance/technical specifications, and consider clarity of terminology and enforceability.

7. Enforcement/compliance, and self-regulation

Standards should be enforceable by professional bodies, but all professionals have a responsibility to adhere to standards through self-regulation, a concept that is not always fully recognised.

A review of Standards and Guidance needs to consider how they are used in professional conduct cases; in their current form are they at the right level and sufficiently robust?

8. Innovation

There is limited innovation within the profession. Many people are locked into PPG16 processes despite the policy changes (PPS5 and NPPF) and the beneficial outcomes of research-focused and reflexive

projects. There can be barriers to discussing and sharing innovation in a commercial environment. Challenges include resourcing, lack of time to innovate, lack of trust, reduced curatorial input and a need better to articulate public benefit

9. Creating a better understanding of standards and guidance though education and training.
We are not investing enough in discussion of professional practice, and the sub-divisions within the profession often militate against this. We need to consider how to bring people together eg through cross-sector regional hubs/groups, and to include all of those engaged in archaeological work including contractors, curators, community groups and academics. At present we don't have the right forums to bring people together. We should consider the planned and properly resourced use of online forums to provide cost-effective professional discussion.

10. Bad practice
Evidence of non-compliance is often difficult to establish beyond the anecdotal; widespread non-compliance is discussed but numbers of formal complaints are few. Lack of resources is not a valid reason for non-compliance with standards. There are barriers to individuals/organisations speaking out. There is a lack of understanding and/or confidence in how to make a complaints or seek enforcement eg CIFA procedures or through the planning system.

11. Support for professional accreditation
Professional accreditation is a way of promoting and enforcing professional standards and may become increasingly important if curatorial input diminishes. Many currently working in archaeology are not accredited, and national agencies and local government do not always support the use of accredited professionals; there is uncertainty about the implications of requiring the use of accredited professionals

12. Results of recent synthesis projects
Research projects utilising the results of the 25+ years of PPG16 and post-PPG16 developer funded archaeological work, especially the Rural Roman Settlement Research project, have produced important information on the quality of data collected, and standards in fieldwork, analysis and publication. The results of this and similar projects need to be reviewed and fed into the revisions of standards and guidance, and the production of technical specifications.

13. Local government curatorial services
The diminishing resources in local government and the impact of this on curatorial time to discuss, agree and monitor programmes of archaeological work was of concern. This affects compliance and the enforceability of standards through the planning system. It may militate against innovation since curatorial time to engage in innovative proposals at the design stage and on site is so limited. There needs to be a consequent increase in peer review and self- regulation; the latter is, anyway, a professional responsibility (*cf* 7 above).

14. Wales and Scotland
Changes in policy and guidance in Wales, and the development of different agendas in the devolved administrations that will influence professional practice were discussed.

Workshop 3

Designation and management of the archaeological resource in the context of a changing planning system

Proposed actions

	Topic (*cf* summary below)	Proposed actions	Who
2	Brexit legislation and policies	• Develop and keep under review a list of anticipated legislation and areas of policy development, together with legal provisions to be introduced in each topic area • Develop priorities for lobbying, discussions with politicians/civil servants, developers, industry etc • Work closely together across the sector to maximise effectiveness, individual organisations or collectives leading as appropriate	• TAF and constituent bodies, Heritage Alliance, HE
3	Heritage legislation – proposed changes	• Develop list of priorities for legislative amendments, and agree action plan • Share with other sector bodies • Take to HEPRG to agree most effective routes to progress • Test the scope for more radical thinking about the future via a working group	• HE • HEPRG • CIfA/ALGAO and other TAF members • Heritage Alliance
4	Heritage legislation – using existing provisions better	• Confirm list of areas of existing legislation/policy that could be used more effectively to secure better protection • Scope project to investigate potential, opportunities and risks	• HE • HEPRG • CIfA/ALGAO and other TAF members
5	Scheduling (a) proposals	• Develop a medium to long term plan for the future use of scheduling, to include an assessment of the existing schedule, and policies/priorities for new additions to the schedule, both from existing knowledge and new discoveries. Publish a list of priorities. Link to NI project. • Test through consultation with the sector. • Manage expectations by producing a realistic policy document setting out HE capacity/intentions regarding scheduling • Review links between the HE Listing Group and local authority teams to maximise efficiency and to ensure that scheduling cases come forward in accordance with the	• HE, in consultation with sector

	Scheduling (b) management	• agreed policies • Review public engagement with and transparency of the scheduling and SMC processes	
6	National Importance project	• Disseminate the project report from the National Importance pilot projects • Develop a National Importance Programme (building on the results of the pilot project) to support implementation of paragraph 139 of the NPPF • Utilise expertise, and test concepts and implementation, through a programme board with sector representatives • Work with local authority colleagues in particular to consider resource implications, and implementation in strategic plans and development management • Explore how the NI project can assist in responding to changes in the planning system eg Identify how NPPF paragraph 139 sites might be identified for exemption from certain permitted development rights, brownfield registers and other PiP categories	• HE, with ALGAO, CIfA,
7	Current and proposed changes in planning legislation and policy	• Continue to work together to influence government as the proposed changes to the planning system are worked through • Collect information on archaeology and planning casework to use in support of lobbying to maximise protection of the historic environment as the system changes, and to capture changing practice amongst Local Authorities • Identify any necessary future amendments to correct shortcomings/problems in current regime.	• HE, TAF and constituent bodies, Heritage Alliance • CIfA with sector partners
8	Be more strategic	• Explore the implications of the introduction of PiP and the impact on strategic planning and development management • Identify changes in practice, information requirements, and - if required – changes to guidance or secondary legislation	• ALGAO, CIfA
9	Intelligibility of current system	• Produce straightforward short guidance on the current system of protection and management (covering both heritage and planning legislation and policy) that can be used to explain to partners and the public how heritage assets are protected and	• HE/ALGAO • HEPRG

		managed, why and by whom. Use to support/explain other actions such as 5 and 6 above.		
10	Holistic management of the environment	• Work towards joining up management of the environment (through both systems and people), through breaking down remaining barriers between the buried and the built historic environment, and in the longer term between the natural and the historic environment.		
11	Devolution	• Maintain dialogue with Welsh, Scottish and Northern Ireland colleagues to share increasingly different experience of systems and work practices in order to learn best practice from each other. • Learn from the experience of other UK nations in order to develop proposals for change in England	• TAF • HE	
12	Local authority capacity	• Take results of discussion and identified importance of the issue (including 13 below) forward into Workshop 4	• CIfA/HE	
13	Supporting and developing local authority services	• Develop skills through peer review and mentoring • Explore how to give recognition to and celebrate best practice	• ALGAO, HE, CIfA	
14	New initiatives, good practice examples and other resources	• Identify an online space for the sharing and dissemination of evolving professional practice • Promote more sharing of case studies and examples at CIfA and other conferences, workshops etc	• ALGAO, HE, CIfA	
15	Public benefit	• Articulate better the public benefit delivered by our heritage protection and management systems	• All	

Summary of main issues discussed

1. The political context

Current political uncertainties formed the background to much of the discussion – about the direction of travel of government in the short-medium term, following the general election, Brexit, and in the context of the on-going EU negotiations. How will recent events in London around issues of fire safety and building regulations affect the deregulation impetus?

2. Brexit and forthcoming legislation/policies

Brexit, and the suite of consequent forthcoming legislation, was discussed as both threat and opportunity. While there is a risk to current mechanisms, eg EIA regulations and in changes to agricultural support post-CAP, and the scope for specific heritage legislation seems minimal, many of

the forthcoming bills and strategies may offer opportunities for progress eg Agriculture Bill, Digital Strategy. Preparation needs to be undertaken now in order to take advantage of opportunities that may arise.

3. Heritage legislation – priorities for change

Although there is pessimism with regard to the potential for new heritage legislation we should maintain a priority list of proposed changes - to the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (the 1979 Act) or to other appropriate legislation including planning - in order to take any opportunities that do arise. These should include: reform of class consents to prevent on-going damage to scheduled monuments, interim protection, protection for sites without structures, removal of the defence of ignorance, statutory status for local authority historic environment services. It was recognised that change takes time and that we need to plan for the medium to long term; further innovative thinking is needed on heritage protection for the future.

4. Heritage legislation and policy – using what we have better

Existing legislation should be used more effectively (see 5 below), and little used provisions should be (re)examined to assess their potential eg Part II of the 1979 Act, archaeological protection through use of Conservation Areas, exempting land from Permitted Development.

5. Scheduling

The low levels of current scheduling were discussed, and the contrast with the built historic environment, its different legislation and the much greater extent of designation, were noted. The 1979 Act is underused. There are also problems with the content of the existing schedule and the quality of some sites currently protected. There is a lack of transparency in the system including in the SMC process. There are many specific issues eg urban scheduling, area scheduling, the question of grading of scheduled sites. Work to improve the existing schedule should be linked with implementation of the National Importance project.

6. National importance

There is a good policy in the NPPF, paragraph 139, regarding sites which are of national importance but which are not scheduled. The Historic England pilot project on National Importance (NI) has not progressed but there was very strong support for this initiative to be taken forward, in partnership with local authorities and others in the sector. Government departments should be engaged and they should see the initiative as an implementation of existing policy, facilitating sustainable development and environmental management. No new policies or regulation is necessary for implementation.

It was felt that the starting point for NI work should be HERs but the potential of other data sets eg SHINE should also be considered. Criteria for the identification of non-scheduled sites of national importance – and sites that have the potential to be nationally important but are not demonstrably so from existing information – should be defined, tested on a data sample, and then implemented. Outputs from the project could also be used to improve the schedule, to feed into Local Plans and also to explore the potential to amend the GDPO to protect more assets from Permitted Development (PD). This work will have resource implications for Historic England and local authorities, but its urgency is greater in view of changes to the planning system (7 below).

The national importance pilot reports can be found at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/scheduled-monuments/national-importance-programme/

7. Changes in planning legislation and policy

The changes to the planning system, actual and proposed, as part of the government deregulation agenda and in order to increase house building, have the potential adversely to affect key aspects of the way in which archaeology has been successfully managed through the planning system since the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 16. Areas of concern include the extension of PD rights, Permission in Principle (PiP), scrutiny of the use of pre-commencement conditions, and the review of the National Planning Policy Framework. Government has indicated its commitment to maintaining protection of the historic environment but some of the proposed changes appear to challenge that commitment.

8. Being more strategic

In view of the changes to the development management process (eg PiP) it will be even more important to 'front load' the system, using designation, implementing NI, and providing high quality information from HERs to input to Local Plans, Neighbourhood Plans and other strategies, so that better information is available when the principle of development is considered. This implies a need for further investment in, for example, strategic survey such as NMP, characterisation, revision of research frameworks, implementation of the lessons from synthesis projects such as the Roman Rural Settlement Research project, predictive modelling. Despite the resource implications this approach (desirable in itself) is made more necessary by loss of flexibility at the point of change with the introduction of PiP. It can also be argued to give greater certainty to developers and facilitate sustainable development. It would not however compensate entirely for the loss of information from detailed site-specific evaluation.

9. Intelligibility of the current system

The system of protection is fragmented, between different legislation eg the 1979 Act, the planning system, and the different organisations/teams that deal with it. There is a need to re-articulate how the different elements of the whole system work together (even if there is no change in legislation or policy) including scheduling, NI, local listing, HER sites. This could improve intelligibility for users and help to dispel the view (still persisting in some areas) that scheduled monuments represent the extent of the archaeological resource.

10. Holistic management of the environment

The desirability of holistic legislation, policy and management for the environment was supported, including bringing together archaeology and the built historic environment and, as a longer-term objective, linking together the natural and historic environment. Collaboration with natural environment colleagues is needed to build common agendas; specific initiatives could include for example seeking recognition of historic environment features within natural environment designations (eg SSSIs, NNRs).

11. Devolution and divergence

Divergence in legislation, policy and political agendas between England, Wales and Scotland was discussed; specifically the role of heritage in cross-cutting social policies in Scotland and Wales, and the recent changes in legislation and policy in Wales including many of the desired amendments to legislation identified in 3 above and the new statutory basis for Historic Environment Records. There was a perception that England is falling behind.

12. Local authority capacity

Concern about local authority capacity surfaced in every discussion; whatever the system of protection is it cannot be effective if there isn't an effective delivery mechanism. The reduction in staff numbers, the loss of experienced and senior staff, and the impact of this on the quality of decision-making were identified as issues, as were the vulnerability of the system to changes in political and senior management priorities in local authorities. Can we articulate the risk to local authorities and to the historic environment of reductions in staffing?

Statutory status for local authority services would make a difference, although in itself would not necessarily deliver sufficient resources.

13. Supporting and developing local authority services

The importance of defining and raising standards and performance in local authorities was recognised, and the need for a means of recognising and rewarding good practice was identified. In this context the LGA peer review process, and the important role of the professional institute, including the CIfA Registered Organisations scheme, were discussed.

There are however, in practice, few sanctions against local authorities that ignore their responsibilities under, for example, NPPF polices.

The need for a strategic overview of how local authority services are evolving was considered: for example, advice is needed on how best to deliver historic environment services including where they are located within the authority, optimum arrangements in two-tier authorities, between other groupings of authorities eg in regions, the desirability multi-disciplinary teams of specialists including archaeologists, built historic environment advisers and natural environment specialists rather than single, isolated professionals. Who/which collaborations could provide leadership and best practice advice on delivering historic environment services in the 21st century? Could there be transitional funding for change?

14. New initiatives, good practice examples and other resources

Many examples of developing practice were mentioned at the workshop eg London (Greater London Archaeological Priority Areas), Surrey (identification and protection on non-scheduled nationally important sites, linked to NPPF and Local Plan policies), Chester (definition of character zones of differing significance including nationally important sites/zones), Dudley (brownfield sites risk assessments). These demonstrate how practice is evolving within the current system (despite the resource and capacity problems) but are not being widely enough discussed or disseminated. All of these have required the investment of resources.

Other very useful sources of information such as the Historic England monthly planning bulletin, and the Historic England casework information database were mentioned (https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/planning-cases/).

15. Public benefit

We need to articulate better the public benefit of what we do, including to other agencies, organisations, and individuals outside the heritage sector. We also need to engage the community more in protection and management, and in the planning and designation processes.

Workshop 4

New models for advisory services: potential future roles for local authority archaeology services and Historic England

Proposed actions

	Topic (*cf* summary below)	Proposed actions	Possible owners
1	Leadership and advocacy	• Review current advocacy priorities in respect of LAs and agree joint plan of action	• CIfA, ALGAO, CBA, other TAF members
		• Clarify the strategic role of Historic England in respect of local authority archaeology services	• HE
		• Review current level of engagement with LA lead members and officers	• HE
		• Identify a lead Executive Team member within Historic England on local authority issues	• HE
		• Review progress on implementation of Culture White Paper commitments, and specify forward plan	• HE
2	Politics	See 1 above	
3	National/local roles	• Examine national/local interface as part of current HE casework review, and consult with local authorities and sector partners on proposed changes	• HE, with LAs and sector partner organisations
		• Articulate the national/local role in short clear guidance covering legislation, policy and service delivery: 'who does what' and what is delivered, both for the historic environment and other cross-cutting issues	• HE, with ALGAO, IHBC, and other sector partners
		cf Workshop 3 recommendation 9	
4	Strategic thinking about change	• Recognise the role that LA services fulfil is essential role in the delivery of the current system of heritage protection and management in England *cf* 3 above	• HE, with ALGAO, IHBC, and other sector partners
		• Create and fund a small sector task group to identify options for improving the status of LA services eg through establishing a statutory duty	• TAF, with HE input
		• Promote preferred option(s) through joint advocacy to government	• sector
5	Legislation and policy	See 4 above	
		• Share experiences, and use the changes in	• HE liaison with

		legislation and policy in other UK countries to inform initiatives in England	Cadw, HES
		• Track emerging Brexit legislation and policy developments for opportunities (and risks) to achieve change (*cf* Workshop 3, recommendations 2 and 3)	• HE and sector
6	Funding	• Include funding as an element of work on service delivery models (9 below) eg maximising use of all funding streams including direct charging for services	• Project team, see below
		• Promote the use of a proportion of planning fees to support specialist services	• ALGAO, LGA, HE
7	Loss of staff	• Continue annual survey of staff numbers, but consider extending to map performance against agreed functions (8 below), record impact on service delivery	• HE, with ALGAO, IHBC
		• Identify areas where there is no service in place and assess impact; feed results into strategic work (4 above)	• ALGAO, with sector partners
8	Definition of roles and functions	• Define the role of local authority archaeology services, drawing on existing CIfA and ALGAO documentation	• ALGAO, CIfA, with sector partners
		• Gain sector consensus and use to support advocacy	• sector
9	LA service delivery models	• Review a sample of current range of service types and funding bases, assessing viability and risk	• HE funded project, with ALGAO, CIfA, CBA and other sector partners
		• Produce a range of alternative models for service delivery, with associated performance measures. Provide financial incentives for change	• Project team, with HE implementation
		• Identify and promote existing good practice, and success stories, in service delivery. Link to mentoring initiative (11 below)	• ALGAO, with sector partners
10	Performance	see 7, 8, 12 above	
11	Training and mentoring	• Create training and mentoring programme for LA staff, especially for senior professional/manager in an authority, utilising skills of successful services and importing other advisers (eg business skills) as necessary	• ATF, with ALGAO, and HE support
12	Demonstrating public benefit	• See 3 above	

Summary of main issues discussed

1. Leadership and advocacy

There is a general need for more strategic engagement and advocacy, eg with council leaders and senior management, explaining the purpose and value of local authority archaeology services.

There is a lack of sector recognition of the issues – local authorities are not making enough noise, the sector is not doing enough advocacy.

The role of Historic England in respect of local authority services was the subject of extensive discussion and expressed concern. The majority view was that Historic England has stepped back from active and strategic engagement with the future of local authority services, notwithstanding the Culture White Paper commitments (and with the exception of the active engagement with HERs through HIAS) to a focus on designated assets and statutory casework. There is perceived to be a 'national advocacy vacuum' in the historic environment sector; this is considered to compare unfavourably with the relationships between some other local government services and their equivalent national agencies.

2. Politics

Ultimately national and local politics will determine the shape and level of local government services (including public sector spending; the roles, structures and funding of local government), underlining the importance of leadership and advocacy (*cf* 1 above). Political choices will affect Historic England as well as local authorities although this was not extensively considered in the workshop. At local level political issues can militate against co-operation between individual authorities and lead to the breakdown of multi-authority combined services.

3. National/local roles

The workshop discussions focused more on local authorities than on Historic England services but there was felt to be scope for examining the divisions of responsibility and how the national and local teams do or don't work effectively together (on, for example, strategic planning, development management, agri-environment/land management advice). Some statutory roles eg for SMC cases (since they often parallel planning cases) could be re-examined for possible devolution, although opinions are divided on this issue. It's important to remove any areas of overlap or duplication at a time of scarce resources.

A lack of understanding of the respective roles of Historic England and local authority staff can work to the detriment of the latter since the perceptions of the public and senior managers are often that it is Historic England's responsibility to look after the historic environment.

4. Strategic thinking about change

In a situation where there is well-documented decline in service capacity and widespread concern about the future, there are few current initiatives to explore possible change or future solutions. In the workshop discussions there was little support for radical change, possibly because of the desire to defend what still exists, and also in recognition that the shape and scope of services is being driven strongly by bigger political issues and that it is difficult to influence. However, it was also recognised that strategic thinking needs to take place in order to support advocacy and to be ready for future opportunities.

5. Legislation and policy

Achieving statutory status for HERs and local authority advisory services is regarded as desirable and worth pursuing, especially since the provision of HERs in Wales has become a statutory duty of Welsh ministers, but there is also pessimism about whether it is achievable and a recognition that this, in itself, will not necessarily bring funding. Brexit may bring some legislative opportunities, both for heritage legislation *per se* and also for achieving change as part of non-heritage legislation.

6. Funding

Cuts in local authority budgets have been severe and pressures to increase spending on services where demand is growing, eg social care, have exacerbated the financial impact on non-statutory and lower priority services. Changes in the funding basis of local authorities over the next few years, and the loss of the central government support grant, is likely to worsen this position as well as increase the disparities between different areas of the country in the levels of local services that can be funded.

Many services have also suffered from the decrease in the availability of external funding from Historic England as many national programmes, undertaken as partnership projects with local authorities, have come to an end, and as Historic England itself has had a much reduced budget.

As public sector funding has decreased many authorities have looked to increased planning fees and to direct charging (eg for HER information, and for specialist advice on development proposals) for support. Planning fees do not however always help to support specialist services, especially when these are located within a different tier of local government. There is evidence that developers are willing to pay more for a better service.

There can be specific problems in two-tier areas where the service is provided by the upper tier but most of the planning fee income arrives at the lower tier.

7. Loss of staff

Since 2006 there has been a 36% decline in numbers of archaeological staff in local authorities in England to a total of 262.8 FTEs in 2017, a year in which numbers of planning application and LBC decisions increased by around 3.5%. In addition, there has been a loss of senior posts as a result of retirements and restructurings, leading to a loss of expertise, and of influence across broader corporate policy. There are fewer senior historic environment staff who can act as advocates for the services and functions. There are more smaller and one-person services, a loss of critical mass, weakening the ability of staff to offer good levels of service, to engage with communities and to be pro-active in service development.

The downsizing may be driven by political objectives, eg a wish for 'smaller government', as well as by budget pressures.

8. Definition of roles and functions

There is no generally recognised definition of /specification for the local authority role, although there is material to work with eg the CIfA Standard and Guidance, the ALGAO and TAF statements, current work on HER standards, and the new suite of Welsh guidance for comparison. The Heritage 2020 Capacity Building Group has identified this as an issue across the historic environment.

9. Developments and diversification in local authority services across the country

Current structures

The current system could work but it doesn't have the funding it needs. Local government structures and services in general have become more diverse: in authority type, area covered, with combining of management and sometimes services across new geographical areas and some outsourcing (although many authorities have drawn back from the latter following unsatisfactory outcomes). Likewise, there are many different configurations of archaeology services, in their locations, parent departments, size, and scope of functions. The current level of service varies from none (often in district authorities that have opted out of combined arrangements in two tier areas), to an area where the service depends on voluntary input, to services that have become self supporting through charging, have combined with other disciplines to produce a more robust service, or have been outsourced within a larger heritage organisation. It is very difficult to generalise but successes were reported amongst teams that were larger (alone or in combination) and/or were located within an organisation that has a heritage or environmental remit eg in heritage trusts or national parks, and where there is a clearly identifiable 'brand' that can attract public support. Some models make it easier to have a public profile and gain public support.

Comparisons were made with the Welsh system where the network of Trusts, with a close relationship with Cadw, has been stable for 40 years and where there has been progress on policy and legislation.

Other models

Discussions touched on the possibility of regional structures (but there is no government infrastructure to underpin this), more combining of services to achieve critical mass (including with other historic environment/heritage professionals/natural environment), becoming more self-financing (probably a viable option where there is a high level of development and a strong local economy ie the south and east). There is enough material to review and undertake a cost benefit analysis of existing and alternative models, define service levels, specify a range of viable options, and link these to performance measures and financial incentives (carrots and sticks). The cost benefit analysis of different models for HERs, undertaken at the time of the Heritage Bill in 2008, was mentioned as an example.

10. Performance

We don't know how well local authorities are doing since we don't have any performance measures, and with the exception of the Historic England survey in the southwest region, we don't have any user views. Anecdotally, some local authorities are thought to be delivering a good service but others are not and there are no sanctions. We need to be more open about the problem areas, what is working and what isn't; it's not enough just to count staff numbers. Examples of planning cases that have gone wrong and other disasters would be useful. Can we link improved performance to funding?

11. Training, support, mentoring of local authority staff

Local authority staff can be isolated from their peer groups and poorly supported where their line management includes no senior historic environment professionals. Senior staff also need opportunities for professional development, peer group discussion, and training/mentoring in

management and leadership. There is expertise within local government amongst those who are managing services successfully, and in essential knowledge areas such as business skills and communications. Training and mentoring programmes could help to support and develop local authority staff and lead to improved outcomes for services and for the historic environment. Existing good practice should be shared.

12. Demonstrating public benefit

We don't articulate the value of the historic environment (intrinsic and economic etc), nor the case for local authority services very well: why they are important and what they deliver, both for the historic environment but also for other agendas since the historic environment is a cross cutting issue: eg health and well being; placemaking; identity (*cf* Wales and Scotland); sustainability; social, economic, cultural and environmental agendas. Ironically, as resources diminish, it is often community engagement that cannot be sustained.

The potential of a disaster (*cf* the Rose theatre) to make the case was discussed – would we be ready to respond?

Workshop 5

Synthesis of information from developer-funded investigation to create new historical narratives

Proposed actions

	Topic (*cf* summary below)	Proposed actions	Possible owners
1	The nature of synthesis	• Define more clearly what we as a sector mean by synthesis	• All
2	The structure of the profession	• Use regional structures (see 5 below) to promote cross-sector contacts	• All
3	Standards	• Review existing professional standards and guidance, in particular for: fieldwork, grey literature reports, digital archiving, and develop a programme of revision and enhancement • Develop and promote standard approved terminologies, methodologies and variables for use in recording, analysis and reporting of all archaeological material • Increase availability of training to encourage compliance with standards and guidance • Review HER recording standards and implement to improve data quality	• CIfA • HE, CIfA, specialist groups • CIfA, HE • ALGAO, CIfA

4	Access	• Improve access to HER data by:
		   ○ Clearing Oasis backlogs of unvalidated reports
		   ○ Assessing and addressing other HER backlogs
		   ○ Promoting sector buy in to HIAS
		• Set timescales for submission of reports, in CIfA standards and in WSIs, and enforce
		• Set standards or approved specifications for the redefined digital archive (*cf* 3 above, and link to Workshop 6), and timeframe for access
		• Database of contracts in progress
			• ALGAO, HE
			
			• CIfA
			
			• CIfA, ADS
			• FAME

5	Research-focused investigation	• Regional research frameworks: accelerate completion of next generation of RRFs and plan to regularly review and update • Engage all parts of the sector in RRFs work including academic, curatorial, contractors, consultants, local societies • Incorporate RRFs into Oasis • Investigate potential to develop cross sector 'regional hubs' out of RRF communities as a focus for ongoing collaboration, potentially linked with museums, archives, HERs and	• HE • HE, with sector partners • HE • HE with sector partners

		advice functions	• CIfA, ALGAO, FAME, HE
		• Promote research-led and reflexive approach to archaeological investigation	• HE
		• Pump-prime other period syntheses projects (*cf* Roman Rural Settlement)	
		• Enable the write up of key backlog sites through competitively tendered projects	• HE
6	Curatorial capacity	(More fully discussed in Workshops 3 and 4, and addressed by the actions recommended from those workshops)	
		• Promote curator engagement with sector initiatives such as RRFs, and other opportunities for cross-sector working	• ALGAO, HE
7	Developer attitudes	• Continue to promote the value of archaeology and the public benefit delivered by archaeological projects	• All
8	Articulating value and public benefit	• Review work undertaken across historic environment to date and consider funded project to address issues identified	• CIfA, HE
9	Self regulation	• See 3, 4 6 above	
10	The planning system	• Explore the potential to develop a more strategic approach to large scale development, incorporating pre- and post-development synthesis, and utilising the HAZ programme or a modified version	• HE, ALGAO
11	Funding	• Produce guidance to online funding opportunities	• FAME

Summary of main issues discussed

1. The nature of synthesis

The nature of synthesis – what it is and what it is not – was discussed throughout the day. Synthesis brings together multiple data sets, enables patterns to be identified, and leads to the construction of new narratives that can engage the public as well as justify funding. It should not just be the province of academics, although practice in the profession and its legislative and policy context can make it difficult for others to engage.

2. The structure of the profession

The current structure of the profession - fragmentation and the existence of academic/contractor/curator silos – and the project-by-project funding model can militate against collaboration to produce synthesis. Some of the most productive projects have been collaborations between eg commercial companies and universities (eg the Roman Rural Settlement Project), but resource pressures and the commercial environment may militate against building partnerships.

3.   Standards

The need for better, more rigorous standards or specifications - across professional practice - was a strong theme during the workshop but particularly relevant to the workshop theme: in data recording and data structure; in standardisation of terms and recorded variables; in grey literature (where even basic locational information is frequently incorrect); and in the structure and inter-relationship of the archive/grey literature/publication from a single project. Better standards or more detailed, shared specifications are necessary to enable inter-site comparison and to facilitate synthesis. Standards and quality issues apply also to the data in HERs; data structures in HERs, and backlogs resulting from lack of resources for updating can frustrate easy access to information. Standards is an issue that the profession ought to be able to address; it's about culture and ethos as well as standards creation and enforcement.

4.   Facilitating access to information

Data should be available on line in appropriate formats (*cf* 3 above) not just PDFs, to enable comparison and synthesis. Data from investigations and the grey literature report should be made available within a reasonable length of time after the completion of the project to facilitate synthesis.

It would be useful to have a better understanding of what online information is being used and by whom.

5.   Research-focused investigation

Regional Research Frameworks, and national thematic and period frameworks, are very useful but need to be updated regularly, especially where there is a high level of development and consequent archaeological investigation and where they can therefore become out of date quickly. They need to be used more actively and consistently in framing research questions in project designs and WSIs, that are then reviewed regularly during and at the end of each project. Could this process be integrated into the development of Oasis? There needs to be wide participation in the next round of RRFs.

6. Curatorial capacity

A lack of curatorial input can hamper the creation of appropriate research-orientated projects incorporating synthesis, and the adoption of a reflexive approach to maximise value and public benefit. Research objectives need to be set early in the development management process in WSIs; the latter can constrain, and work against innovation. Discussion, collaboration, negotiation is essential as a project develops.

Curatorial resources have diminished and curators are under pressure. The level of resource varies across the country, and there can be inconsistency in curatorial practice; where there are adequate numbers of staff the curator/contractor relationship can work well. The difficulties in addressing the local authority capacity issue were acknowledged, but there was some support for examining alternative models such as regional structures.

7. Developer attitudes

Developers are frequently portrayed by archaeologists as not interested in research, meaning or synthesis, or in wider public benefit, and only in dealing with the archaeology as quickly and cheaply

as possible, although there are exceptions. There seem to be tensions between creating research-driven archaeological projects delivering public benefit (which is what planning policy intends), and the pressures of time and money. Contracts are still general awarded on the basis of price, not design (*cf* Southport). 'The ideal is the informed, research driven, developer-funded intervention that delivers new knowledge'.

8. Articulating value and public benefit

We need to articulate the value of archaeology and the public benefit it delivers, including its relevance to other societal and environmental issues eg well-being, place and identity, climate change. We should involve the public more, but the community may have different views on what is important and what needs to be recorded.

9. Self-regulation

More self–regulation was considered as a response to diminishing local authority curatorial capacity but there was no enthusiasm for this, rather for improved regulation and standards and strong knowledgeable curatorial input.

10. The planning system

Most archaeological investigation is a consequence of proposed development, and the planning process is therefore extremely important. The specification of archaeological work – what can be required, and who is responsible for decision-making - was discussed. How is it possible to achieve synthesis across multiple projects? Some examples were identified of projects where synthesis across several sites, following excavation, had been specified in the WSI. A more strategic approach to the development of large areas was considered eg large infrastructure projects, extensive housing allocations, new settlements. Could existing knowledge be synthesised as part of initial desk-based work on large areas of proposed development, leading to an overarching research-led framework WSI covering many individual developments, that also required synthesis at the end of the development project? Such an approach might be possible in conjunction with Local Plan creation and decisions on Permission in Principle. An initial input of public funding might be necessary, and the possible role for Heritage Action Zones (or a derivative of them) here was suggested.

11. Funding

The difficulty of funding synthesis was discussed. Models from North America, and funding initiatives in England such as the Aggregates Levy, were considered. The importance of Historic England funding to pump prime and to develop projects that might then be suitable for other funding sources was stressed. Multiple funding partners may be necessary for larger projects.

Workshop 6

Challenges for archaeological publication in a digital age
Who are we writing this stuff for, anyway?

Proposed actions

	Topic (*cf* summary below)	**Proposed actions**	**Possible owners**
1	Audience/user needs	• Undertake rapid review of the recommendations of PUNS, CBA 2003, as background to scoping new survey • Undertake new publication audience and user needs survey (PAUNS) to determine current usage and future needs. Use to inform development of 2 below	• HE to commission
2	A new framework for archaeological publishing: digital archiving and dissemination	• Review draft framework discussed at workshop (informed by 1 above and 3 below) • Review costs model for digital archiving • Draft proposal and consult with sector • Embed agreed framework within CIfA Standards and Guidance, and HE policies/guidance	• CIfA/HE

3	Value and public benefit	• Facilitate further work on value and public benefit by:
		  o Reviewing work undertaken to date
		  o Instigating further discussion within the profession
		  o Researching what activities and outputs the public value eg engagement during investigation and analysis as well as at the formal reporting and dissemination stage
		  o Commissioning appropriate projects as determined by outcomes from this work
			• HE/CIfA, with sector partners

4	The planning process: policy, guidance, conditions and WSIs	• Seek to maintain appropriate policy and guidance content covering the archaeological process (including publication), with links to the substantive appropriate professional standards and guidance • Linked to actions 1 and 2 above liaise with national and local government archaeological advisers on publication obligations and options, and ways to improve the specification of publication and archiving in WSIs and project designs	• HE, CIfA , ALGAO
5	Standards and guidance	• Review and revise where necessary CIfA	CIfA, ADS, specialist

		standards on publication and archiving, linking to: - Develop detailed specification for the digital archive and link into CIfA and HE standards and guidance. - Revise project management guidance eg MoRPHE in accordance with above - Promote the development and use of standardised terminology for use within specialist analysis and reporting - Encourage compliance with standards and guidance, and enforcement where appropriate: *cf* Workshop 2 proposed actions, where this is articulated in more detail	groups
6	Archaeological publishers and editors	• Establish a forum for archaeological publishers and editors, perhaps through a CIfA special interest group	• CIfA
7	Archive storage and curation	• Seek advice and establish a policy on the retention or discard of paper archive material	• AAF
8	Training	• Invest in training for the profession on archiving, publication options and associated issues/skills	• HE/CIfA
9	Oasis	• Address issues on the use of Oasis through HIAS work streams	• HE, ALGAO
10	Grey literature	• Address identified problems with reporting through clearer standards (but see comments re role of grey literature in Summary, issue 1, below)	• CIfA
11	The curatorial role	• Curatorial capacity issue with reference to publication links to the general capacity issue addressed in Workshop 4 – see proposed actions	
12	The role and status of formal hard copy publication in monographs and journals	• Explore future role as part of PAUNS – see 3 above	
13	Evaluation reports	• Where evaluation reports (and desk-based assessments) are a part of a sequence of archaeological work leading on to detailed investigation ensure that they are a part of the new publication framework (1 above) • Where they do not lead to further investigation ensure that they are made available through the HER and ADS	• ALGAO

Summary of main issues discussed

1. Audience/user needs

A rapid review by the workshop of the recommendations of '*From the ground up. The publication of archaeological projects: a user needs survey*' (PUNS, CBA 2003) suggested that, although there had been some progress, many of the recommendations had been implemented only partially or not at all (some of the context has of course changed since this survey). It was felt that we have a poor understanding of the level and nature of usage of all forms of publication; quantitative information is available from individual publishers and organisations (especially from internet publishing) but needs collating; qualitative information is missing. A more detailed assessment of progress since the 2003 survey was suggested, but a new survey should focus on interacting directly with diverse audiences to ascertain their views and needs, as well as archaeologists.

2. A new framework for archaeological publishing

The publishing framework set out in the introductory session was much discussed and generally supported, though with unresolved concerns about terminology, costs and funding. The framework envisages a **primary publication** (a professional obligation) to publish online digital data comprising the primary site archive, data sets derived from it (eg pottery quantification), analytical reports, a narrative synthesis and a summary, and a **secondary publication** (not necessarily an obligation) which would take a form determined by the significance of, and the public interest in, the site. Standardisation in the primary publication was deemed critical but would enable diversity and innovation in the secondary. There is increasing scope to be creative in the form that the secondary publication could take, but options are likely to include hard copy monographs and journal articles for the foreseeable future, alongside wholly digital dissemination. Everything should also be available online. In the new framework 'grey literature' would disappear.

Such a publication scheme for a project would need to be specified and appropriately costed, and there was concern that the terms 'primary' and 'secondary' could lead to an assumption that the latter is optional/unnecessary and that it would not therefore be funded.

2. Value and public benefit

Our objective is to create new narratives about the past, often multiple narratives from the same site that will be relevant to many different, wider agendas: environmental, medical, economic etc. These products have value and deliver public benefit (one of our professional responsibilities), and we need to articulate and demonstrate this. We must interact with the public – throughout the lifetime of a project if possible, both on site and during analysis, possibly with the staged release of data for the primary publication as work progresses. The public interest and appetite for 'discovery' in the field is manifest and this should be further promoted as well as greater public involvement in the analysis of important projects. The re-imagined framework for publication (2 above) should enable the archaeological archive to be presented as a valuable resource (*cf* Workshop 1). A new audience survey (1 above) would assist with furthering this public engagement.

4. The planning process: policy, guidance, conditions and WSIs

Most archaeological investigation arises out of proposed development and the planning process. Archaeological standards need to be linked into government or Historic England planning guidance with appropriate hooks in government policy where possible. Publication and archiving needs to be properly considered and specified in the WSI that governs the archaeological investigation, and appropriately costed. Adequate resources are not always allocated for these elements of a project. Curators have an important role to play in this, both in agreeing the WSI and monitoring its implementation through the completion of publication and archive deposition. Training on publication options would be helpful, using new standards and guidance and moving away from specifying simply publication in a journal.

5. Standards and guidance

Standards creation

The need for improved standards and guidance was a strong theme throughout the workshop:

- Standards/specifications for specialist analysis and reports, so that specialists use the same terms for the same things, facilitating comparison between sites, and multiple site synthesis.
- Standards/specifications for creating the digital archive (*cf* primary publication above). We need to specify what should be in it and in what form, and we should design the archive for a digital format, not just replicate what we have traditionally done in written and printed form. We need to agree where it should be deposited. It needs specialist curation and must be easily accessible.
- We also need to ensure that the archive requirements and publication options are embedded within all project documentation, including project designs and WSIs; project management guidance such as MoRPHE needs to be revised accordingly.

Standards compliance

Ensuring compliance with standards is as important as creating them, and compliance with many of the existing standards and guidance is poor; the professional institute has a central role through its Code of Conduct and Standards and Guidance, and through facilitating training and professional development but many practising archaeologists are not CIfA members.

Curatorial archaeologists in Historic England and local government also have key roles in specifying standards through the planning and other statutory processes, and enforcing compliance where necessary.

6. Archaeological publishers and editors

A forum or network for archaeological editors and publishers to share experience was proposed; this might also investigate further how other disciplines, especially the sciences, both publish complex research results and also engage successfully with the public. The need to support county journals - which remain an important publication vehicle - and their editors (often unpaid) was recognised.

7. Archive storage and curation

The storage and curation of, and access to, digital archives was felt to be inconsistent and often very unsatisfactory. It was accepted that a trusted digital repository was the right location, and there was support for the nomination of accredited providers such as ADS. The current cost of digital archiving was identified as an issue. Does this derive from a lack of standardisation and templates and consequent reinvention of the wheel? Or the cost of innovation/early entry? Will costs fall?

As digital and digitised records become the desired end product we asked what should happen to paper records? Should these be retained against digital catastrophe? It was agreed that advice should be sought from, for example, the National Archives/British Library so that a policy could be established.

8. Training
Investment in training was identified as a need in archiving, publication options, and report writing to assist in compliance with new standards and to encourage sharing of experience and good practice. Universities have a role here.

9. Oasis
The use of Oasis should be compulsory from the inception of the project in order to ensure that projects and reports are discoverable. Both curators and archaeological practices need to be engaged to support this.

Some further issues considered in the online discussion and not fully covered above:

10. Grey literature report standards
Non-compliance with existing standards – omissions, incorrect information, and inconsistency in analyses and terminology - in grey literature reports, as highlighted especially by recent synthesis projects, was identified as a problem. A lack of clear standards and a lack of curatorial resource to monitor and enforce hinder solving this problem.

11. The curatorial role
The importance of the curatorial role in ensuring the specification of publication in WSIs and in monitoring delivery, and the lack of curatorial capacity to undertake this work, echoes issues raised in previous workshops.

12. The role and status of formal hard copy publication in monographs and journals
 These are estimated to be produced for around 5-10% of investigations and are still perceived to be more academically prestigious despite the costs of production and purchase and, as noted for example in the Southport report 2011, their small print runs.

13. Evaluation reports
Evaluation reports may contain information not available elsewhere, ie not replicated in later publication, and for sites which do not progress to excavation they may provide valuable evidence of significance. This has implications for the CIfA standard, which presently envisages them purely as informing decisions.

4. Conference discussion

The outputs from the project – the issues discussed, the proposed actions, and those areas of implementation already underway - were reported to the annual CIfA conference at Brighton, April 2018, (CIfA2018 - *Pulling Together: collaboration, synthesis, innovation*) in the conference session *Pulling together policies for archaeology in the 21st-century.* A summary of the delegate feedback following the presentations follows.

Conference session 1

Introduction and background to the project, Steve Trow, Historic England

***21st-century Challenges for Archaeology*: issues discussed and emerging overarching themes,** Jan Wills, CIfA

General feedback
- There was a strong feeling from the workshops that a national advocacy role is needed – the advocacy role of The National Archives staff was mentioned as a comparison. It was suggested that the Historic England restructuring should place emphasis on advocacy.
- Historic England staff in the Heritage Information Partnerships team already provide support for HERs when there are problems.
- The planning and designation workshop saw views from both pragmatists and 'blue sky thinkers' but these are not mutually exclusive; we need to think about both short and long term solutions.
- The workshops were well run with a clear focus on the issues. Although there is a different political framework broadly the same challenges exist north of the border in Scotland.
- Surprised by the relative lack of enthusiasm for radical change in the planning system and local authority services. Perhaps the 'threats' need more radical solutions and 'opportunities' a more progressive approach?

Feedback on specific workshops

Workshop 1 Archaeological archives: new models for archive creation, deposition, storage, access and research
- There has been an opportunity for progress because of the government review of museums.
- There are overlapping structures and a lack of joined up thinking in this area.
- We need to think of archives at the start of the archaeological process.

Workshop 2 Standards and Guidance: what are they for and who sets them?
- There is a need for a tiered framework / hierarchy of standards and guidance so that the weighting of each is clear (eg there is a lack of clarity in where pottery recording standards would fit), with different tiers/products badged and enforced by appropriate entities
- Public value/ benefit and research value need to be a high priority in crafting future standards and guidance.

- We need to stress the reasons for doing it at all – archaeology is about understanding the past, enhancing knowledge and producing new narratives. Regional Research Frameworks are brilliant in this context.
- We must bring together theory and commercial archaeology to help design projects to get the best benefit from fieldwork (eg HS2).
- Delivery and the enforcement of standards needs resources, and commercial archaeology needs realistic costings; undercutting is an issue in competition.
- Compliance with standards and guidance is needed to drive out bad practice.
- Enforcement by HERs of standards in reports takes time.

Workshop 3 Designation and management of the archaeological resource in the context of a changing planning system
- Scale: we need to operate on a higher level than just the immediate local level.
- There are unhelpful changes in the proposed NPPF revisions eg the demotion of paragraph 139 (referring to non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments) to a footnote and the loss of the policy on HERs.
- Scheduling does not get the same publicity as Listing. Is it working?
- The scheduling legislation is too restrictive and the staff resources are limited. We need to beef up the concept of 'national Importance'.
- Resources for delivery are an important issue. There is a need for advocacy with politicians. Buried remains are not as evident to 'the general public' as the built historic environment.
- The direction of travel is that things have got worse since the workshops took place. A high priority must be a need for advocacy from the combined sector.

Workshop 4 New models for advisory services: potential future roles for local authority archaeology services and Historic England
- Structures within local authorities vary but in some areas there are critically low levels of support for archaeology. Use Regional Research Frameworks structures to help with support? And link with regional museums/archives?
- There is a need for training to make Historic England staff more confident in advocacy for archaeology in the planning process to support local authority colleagues on the front line. There is limited understanding of the planning and development process. Academic training by and large does not prepare people for the real world issues of archaeology in the planning system.
- Historic England needs to work with local authority staff in a more complementary way to avoid duplication of effort

Workshop 5 Synthesis of information from developer-funded investigation to create new historical narratives
- HIAS aims to create a collaborative environment and access to information for synthesis.
- The Roman Rural Settlement Project set a good precedent for synthesis.
- The Roman Rural Settlement Project has also been useful in highlighting data quality issues.
- We need more emphasis on solving the challenges of funding synthesis, and we need to integrate the academic sector into the process.

- Funding for synthesis is rarely an obligation for developers.
- We need to cater to a wider range of audiences with different outputs.
- EngLaid was a further useful pioneer project, and also identified issues with data quality/consistency.
- Good data standards aid good access. We then need to integrate with the academic sector to promote synthesis through PhDs.
- Research Frameworks need to be more fleet of foot and dynamic to respond rapidly to new knowledge.

Workshop 6 Challenges for archaeological publication in a digital age - who are we writing this stuff for, anyway?
- The strong feeling from this workshop was that we need to understand audiences better, and therefore to repeat the user needs survey.

Conference session 2

What do we need to do and when? Prioritisation and implementation, Barney Sloane, Historic England

Feedback on specific workshop topics

Workshop 1 Archaeological archives: new models for archive creation, deposition, storage, access and research

- There is a long list of recommendations for improvement here.
- In Wales a similar exercise produced 30 recommendations, split between legacy issues and future proofing.
- We need to get advocacy for archives right (including their purpose and value) and then the situation may improve

Workshop 2 Standards and Guidance: what are they for and who sets them?
- The mapping of standards and guidance could ideally be across all UK countries.
- There is a HEF initiative on this issue. We need a hierarchy of guidance - perhaps an 'approved specification' below a 'standard'.
- Regional hubs/ regional CIfA groups could have role in promoting guidance at that level.
- We need to think though the consequences of the recommendations for archives guidance eg retention or not.
- We have to think about value of retaining bulk archives in the first place.

Workshop 3 Designation and management of the archaeological resource in the context of a changing planning system
- We can achieve things! There was a huge degree of consensus in the workshops even on difficult issues. We must think both pragmatically and longer term and not be daunted if goals are not attainable in short term. We need to prepare our agendas for implementation when the right moment comes.
- Agree we need to do this to drive strategic points forward.

Workshop 4 New models for advisory services: potential future roles for local authority archaeology services and Historic England

- Hubs: sharing services or using regional hubs may work for some areas but possibly not all.
- Use of hubs or the agglomeration of services has to be a willing process, not imposed.
- We need to continue to make the case for local authority services. Materials exist: the CIfA/ALGAO Standard describes what they need to do (the briefing for the Howell/Redesdale call for evidence explains why)

Workshop 5 Synthesis of information from developer-funded investigation to create new historical narratives

- We need to further a 'virtuous research cycle' with value/understanding at its heart.
- There is CIfA involvement in a project to look at case studies of good/bad outcomes for synthesis arising from development-led archaeology and the planning system.
- We should be working together with the academic sector to see what they can contribute to new narratives.

Workshop 6 Challenges for archaeological publication in a digital age - who are we writing this stuff for, anyway?

- There is strong consensus that most data and interpretations should be made available digitally in future. We should aim towards the digital equivalent of the monograph.
- There is still a role for hard copy books and some 'popular' products.

Further general thoughts on priorities

- The overarching recommendations seem to chime in with the audience reaction here at conference.
- We must do what we can now but be prepared in advance to seize opportunities when the time is right.
- We must improve advocacy but also need to press for firm requirements for protecting our heritage.

Reflections and looking to the future, Ian Morrison, Historic England

Summary of presentation:

- Our real customer is the public; we need to engage the public more in the excitement and importance of discovery.
- As a sector we need to be better at campaigning, reconnecting ourselves and the public with the sense of discovery.
- Politicians are more persuaded by the voting public than by experts. We need to mobilise public demand for protecting archaeology.
- We need outputs beyond traditional monographs for public understanding and enjoyment.
- Although there are difficult issues things were much worse pre-PPG16.
- Standards have improved.
- We recognise the significant pressures in local authorities.

- We must look at the respective roles of Historic England and local authorities; councils can regard Historic England as a safety net if services are to be cut.
- We need to engage with local councils to enable them to see the benefit of local archaeology services.
- Historic England needs a public value framework.
- In general we need to win hearts and minds in central/ local government.
- We need to look at the future of archaeology for new generations impacted by:
  - o Academic course fees
  - o Low wages in the sector
  - o Lack of a clear career structure
- The role of the professional institute and standards are very important.

Feedback /questions to IM

- Encourage diversity and alternatives to the academic degree routes into archaeology
- Our relationship with developers can make us look like just the facilitators of development; we need to be more nuanced, and stress the value of the archaeological interventions.
- IM: We shouldn't be seen as against development and we need to hone our skills in engaging public enthusiasm for archaeology. We need to demonstrate that there are good careers in archaeology.

Wrap up and concluding remarks, Vicky Hunns, Hon Chair, CIfA

- We all need to keep engaging with each other and the public.
- Audience feedback today confirms many of the priorities and recommendations from the workshop discussions.
- There has already been progress on some issues eg archives.
- We need to be responsive and dynamic as situations change.
- We must remember public benefit.
- One final word to sum up from JW? Collaboration; we need to keep on breaking down silos in the sector and work together.

5. Overarching themes

Given the diversity of themes covered in the project there was not a great deal of overlap between the workshops or online discussions in matters of detail. However, certain broad or overarching themes recurred in more than one; others were a common feature of all of the discussions. These can be summarised as follows:

1. Politics and the importance of advocacy: developments in national and European politics formed an important backdrop to Workshops 3 and 4 in particular, as they affect both the legislative and policy context and also public service capacity. Clear and coherent sector advocacy was seen as a high priority.

2. A expressed need for **strong sectoral leadership** was linked with 1 above.

3. The importance of local authority services in delivering our current model of archaeological practice: local authorities provide information and advice on non-designated heritage assets in particular, through the planning and other regulatory systems, and also curate the end products of archaeological investigation through archives managed in local authority museums. The decline in capacity of these services was identified as a threat to many aspects of the current system. The subject of Workshop 4, this issue was also raised in all other workshops.

4. Professional standards and guidance: the need for updated and enhanced standards and guidance (and compliance with them) as an essential underpinning for a largely deregulated system formed the subject matter for Workshop 2 but also surfaced as an important issue in respect of archaeological archives, local authority services, and throughout the synthesis and publication workshops.

5. The planning system: the vulnerability of our main method of managing the impact of development on the archaeological resource - through the planning system. Recent changes in the scope of permitted development, methods of obtaining planning permission (eg Permission in Principle), and in the use of conditions all have the potential to undermine the current system, as have the current draft proposed changes to the NPPF. While this topic was a focus in Workshop 3 it was also discussed in all other workshops.

6. Public value/benefit: the need for a better articulation of the purpose and public value of archaeology was identified frequently in discussion; delivering public value should be at the heart of what we do. We need to engage better with the public, and better explain and demonstrate the value of both the historic environment and the archaeological processes through which we engage with it.

7. The structure of the sector: the current structure of the profession was identified as contributing to poor communication and a lack of cross sector collaboration across curatorial, consultant, contractor, academic, museum and other silos.

8. The digital world: adapting to the challenges and opportunities of digital technologies: the existing impact and the future potential of digital technologies across information management and access, synthesis, publication and archiving.

9. Devolution and divergence across the UK: although the project focused on England invitees from Scotland and Wales were present at most of the workshops. The gradual divergence of legislation and public policy across the UK countries was evident, as was the potential to learn from sharing different experiences, successes and failures.

6. Implementation

6.1 Progress to date

During the course of the project opportunities have arisen to take forward some of the proposed actions from the workshops, as follows:

Archaeological Archives, Workshop 1

In the context of the government review of museums (*The Mendoza Review: an independent review of museums in England, 2017)* further discussion has taken place on many of the recommendations on archives. The review report asked Historic England (*inter alia*) to:

> 26. *Work with key stakeholders to produce recommendations for DCMS early in 2018, which will improve the long-term sustainability of the archaeological archives generated by developer-funded excavations.*

With the assistance of a small group of sector representatives Historic England has responded with advice making six recommendations for inclusion in the proposed Mendoza Review Action Plan, and setting out a 12 point action plan for the sector. The former includes recommendations on the storage and curation of archaeological archives, the issue of ownership, museum charging policies, and work to understand the public and research use of archaeological archives. The latter addresses standards and guidance, best practice in the planning process, selection and retention, and other issues that may be resolvable by the sector itself. The advice has been endorsed by ACE, CIfA, SMA, ALGAO, HS2 and FAME. The full text of the advice, and the government response can be seen at https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/news/new-plan-englands-archaeology-archives-challenge.

Professional Standards and Guidance, Workshop 2

CIfA has committed to reviewing several of its Standards and Guidance to ensure that they are up to date for their currently envisaged purpose, and is being supported in that endeavour by grants from Historic Environment Scotland and Historic England. At present they are stronger on UK and particularly English practice, and in some cases still refer to prevailing (or past) UK law and policy, a level of guidance incompatible with an international institute and arguably unnecessary for professional practitioners. Learning from the Roman Rural Settlement Project and others, it is recognised that grey literature reports from field evaluations, which are conceived as exercises to inform planning and development decisions, have the potential to be a valuable research tool – with changed practices. A joint HE/CIfA initiative at the CIfA 2018 conference began to recast the field evaluation Standard and Guidance through a collaborative writing exercise. Whether the end-product becomes an amended Standard and Guidance applicable only in England or enables the production of an approved specification to underpin a globally relevant Standard is unclear at this stage, but it is interesting that a version of the latter model would provide a useful resolution in Northern Ireland, where the Department for Communities is leading workshops aimed at linking, *inter alia*, professional standards with detailed specifications it recommends as advisor to planning

authorities. CIfA is also about to map gaps, overlaps – and any identified conflicts – between its standards and those prescribed by the Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland.

A small working group of the English Historic Environment Forum has identified the benefits of a strategic review of standards and advice provided by various English, UK and wider institutions that impact on heritage practice in England. They include efficiencies (tackling overlaps) and influence (some organisations have a high profile while others can enforce; for each area of activity the art is to find the best regime and the most relevant institution to get most purchase on practice). Historic England is drafting for the group an outline proposal for a review of guidance <u>needs</u> in the sector, which will complement a recent review of current <u>provision</u> of advice by Historic England and the CIfA reviews.

CIfA work to promote synthesis of results from separately occasioned fieldwork programmes is presently limited to seeking good practice examples of planning-led work, and revision of its guidance to encourage greater comparability of results.

Other CIfA priorities relate to the enhancement and development of accreditations (including a standard and petition for Chartered Archaeologist), qualifications (NVQs), apprenticeships, defined career pathways, recognition of CPD and university courses. The workshops did not focus on skills and capacity (other than in local authorities), though the topics were ever-present, but initiatives such as these are essential if we to are ensure that the best talent and abilities are identified, developed and applied to archaeological practice, and the maximum public value is derived.

6.2 Next steps

At the completion of the project in May 2018 the project partners CIfA and Historic England are proposing a project implementation phase which, through discussion with wider sector representatives, will review the outputs from the workshops, agree priorities from the recommendations that can be implemented, and seek partners for delivery.