



19th HERITAGE MANAGEMENT SYMPOSIUM

Development-led archaeology in Europe

Meeting the needs of archaeologists, developers and the public

Sofia, Bulgaria, 22-23 March 2018

ABSTRACTS

DAY 1 (Thursday 22nd March 2018) (11.30-17.30)

Session 1 – The archaeologists.

Lyudmil VAGALINSKI

National Archaeological Institute with Museum, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Development-led archaeology in Bulgaria during the last decade

A new Law of Heritage of Culture was introduced in 2009. Juridical and practical effects of its implementation regarding preventive archaeology in the country are presented.

Nadezhda KECHEVA

National Archaeological Institute with Museum, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Archaeological Map of Bulgaria – Transport and Pipeline Infrastructure Projects

Since the European programs financed a lot of transport and pipeline infrastructure constructions, large-scale development-led archaeological projects emerged. After 2011 many “polluter pays” projects were executed with the structured workflow conformable with Bulgarian legislation using defined price list:

1. Reports for preliminary design infrastructure projects buffer zones:
 - a. Environmental Impact Assessment Reports with Cultural and Archaeological Heritage, written by particular specialists.
 - b. Preliminary reports for registered archaeological sites using data from the national archaeological database “Archaeological Map of Bulgaria”.
2. Archaeological fieldwork in the buffer zones after a contract with the National Archaeological Institute with Museum, the national center and coordinator for all fieldwork investigations, controlling them both scientifically and methodologically:
 - a. Field surveys using application of GIS technologies for fully documenting purposes with resulting reports for further actions:

- i. Before construction work:
 - 1. Partial excavations /10 % of the archaeological scatter site area/ with an option of full archaeological excavations of a defined area.
 - 2. Full excavations /prescribed for the so called “visible above ground” archaeological sites, i.e. burial mounds/.
- ii. During construction work:
 - 1. Monitoring of registered archaeological scatters.
 - 2. Monitoring of the whole infrastructure bed.

The centralized structure controls the quality of the work. Field surveys being the first step of the fieldwork for development-led projects are an important part of the whole process. They are a process: preliminary data gathering – data from the national archaeological database “Archaeological Map of Bulgaria”, “grey” literature studies, analysis of remote sensing imagery, and information from regional and local museums. The surveys are executed using established and standardized methods for fully documenting field characteristics and archaeological materials using application of GIS technologies in the field and in the office. The presented examples show the field surveys process and results added to “Archaeological Map of Bulgaria”, an information system collecting data for both covered area and archaeological sites.

All the successful development-led projects show the efficiency of such structured and centralized approach that improves both scientific and methodological framework.

Eva SKYLLBERG

National Heritage Board, Sweden

Quality in development-led archaeology

Whether an archaeological site is to be excavated or preserved is determined by the assessment of the decision making authority as well as by the economic effect of the legislations polluter pays principle. As a result certain archaeological sites are deemed “profitable” to excavate and remove whilst others are not developed.

In Sweden the Historic Environment Act states that the quality of archaeological excavations should be good. The regional administrative board is the decision making authority responsible for commissioning archaeological excavations and for the quality assessment of archaeological reports. Which archaeological sites can be excavated and which ones are to be preserved is determined by the regional administrative board, but is also a result of the cost responsibility of the developer. These factors are not equally applicable over the whole country. In areas with low property prices the cost-impact is significant and land with archaeological sites is rarely developed. In urban areas with high property prices archaeological sites are given a price tag and development occurs in most cases. Thus the preservation of sites is the result of a combination of official decisions as well as the economic conditions of the development.

The quality requirements placed on an excavation is crucial for the quality of the outcome. The scientific questions and the available resources are equally important. Sufficient resources are necessary for carrying out the excavation, including post excavation work.

In Sweden the regional administrative board controls how ambitious the excavation needs to be and also determines the requirements for reports, communication and conservation of artefacts. In the projects plan the excavator describes the methods, scientific questions, schedules and budget. In their evaluation of the excavator’s project plan the regional administrative board assesses the quality of the planned excavation. For large excavations, when a tender process is carried out, competing project plans are assessed according to the criteria: relevance of scientific questions, methods, relevance of reporting and publication, fieldwork and the archaeologists’ competence. Assessing these criteria is complex and difficult and always runs the risk that the lowest price and not the tender with the best quality wins the bidding process. Considerable resources are used administering the process, both by

the regional administrative boards and the excavators. During the excavation the regional administrative board has a monitoring function and after the excavation the board assesses the quality of the results. But, the regional administrative boards are often burdened by work and have difficulties finding time to carry out time-consuming quality assessments.

Corina BORS & Paul DAMIAN

National History Museum of Romania

15 years of development-led archaeology in Romania. The archaeologists' perspective

More than 15 years ago a new reality emerged in Romania: the development-led archaeology – a new direction for and old discipline, being determined by large-scale rescue/preventive archaeological excavations occasioned by a series of industrial projects, as well as by the construction of the motorway networks developed along the Pan-European corridors. The National History Museum of Romania is one of the largest institution acting in the field of archaeology in Romania and was involved since the beginning in coordinating the archaeological projects set in these circumstances, such as “Alburnus Maior” National Research Programme (2001 – 2006), “Autostrada Transilvania” Project (2004 – 2008) and “Autostrada” National Research Programme (2011 – 2014).

As a result, was possible to gather and analyse significant set of relevant data for the topic. The presentation will be focused on a series of key aspects: the challenges of the most important archaeological projects undertaken in this framework, the changes in the national legislation for archaeology, the opportunities and the threats concerning the archaeological profession and examples of current practice concerning the archaeological heritage management in connection to development-led archaeology. Also an overview will be given for the most important archaeological discoveries made in this context in various geographical areas of Romania and for different historic periods. Last but not least will be discussed the necessary improvements still required to be implemented for achieving a better archaeological management strategy in order to safeguard the heritage when development-led archaeology is needed.

Rudina ZOTO, Mariglen MESHINI & Ilira ÇELA

Archeological Service Agency, Albania

Project of natural gas Trans Adriatic Pipeline (TAP) in Albania - A potential opportunity for archeology

The Trans Adriatic Pipeline (TAP) is one of the major developments in Albania for the transportation of natural gas from the Caspian region to Western Europe through Albania and Adriatic Sea. The line has a length of 215 km in Albanian territory and passes near the rich areas with cultural monuments, archaeological sites and antique streets.

The study, design and implementation of TAP project works has been a complex process, its progress has gone through several phases.

The archaeological heritage study process has gone through:

- **Study of the cultural heritage factor/component** - as a preliminary data to the potential of cultural heritage, leading the study and determination of the pipeline route.
- **Archaeological observation** for potential areas.
- **Archaeological surveys**
- **Archaeological monitoring** during the works completion/execution.
- **Casual findings observation** during the works completion/execution
- **Archaeological supervision** by state authority

TAP as a major development and archaeological heritage support each other by enabling progress through the preservation and promotion of its values. This cooperation has led to:

- **Implementation of scientific criteria** in archaeological processes.
- **Information enhancement in the field of archeology**, enabling in-depth studies in interaction with other disciplines.
- **Discovered archaeological material**, significant potential of exposure/disclosure.
- **Discovering new archaeological sites**, - information about different historical periods.
- **A new dimension in defining cultural heritage.**
- **Labor market expansion for local archaeologists.**
- **Mutual development cooperation with archeology**, coordinated by state authority.
- **Archeology - an important factor in decision-making.**
- **Quality increase in archaeological processes** by private companies and implementation of legislation by the developer, - supervision outcome by the state authority.

Filipa NETO & João MARQUES

Portuguese Directorate-General for Cultural Heritage

Archaeology and archeologists: the beauty and the beast

The impact of development-led archaeology transformed completely the general view of archaeology and archeologists in the civil society. Once considered as a scholar and relevant scientific discipline, and as a pioneering work for the knowledge of human societies archaeology in the 21st century is mostly viewed as merely technical work.

La Valleta Convention fostered the importance of preventive archaeology, introducing new ways of management and safeguarding policies, and the professionalization of the archaeological graduates. However, this process was not framed by a system to accredit professionals led by a self-regulation entity, allowing the practitioners without the necessary scientific and technical capacity to proliferate, due to different qualifications and experiences.

Some measures have been adopted to minimize this situation by the central state, nonetheless are insufficient to guarantee the quality of archeological record and archives.

The development of policies to define precise job roles in relation with the type of work, to keep archaeologists up to date with the best archaeological practices, and to create cooperation schemes between universities, public and private sector will promote a common archaeological heritage governance framework necessary to the enhancement of scientific knowledge.

The new challenges of 21st archaeology should aim to a greater commitment of professionals and authorities to improve data consistency and disclosure of information in a more consistent, standardized and efficient way.

Petri Halinen, Marianna Niukkanen, Sirkka-Liisa Seppälä and Helena Taskinen

The Finnish Heritage Agency

Development-led archaeology in Finland: free competition – lessons learnt

Our presentation will review the current situation in Finland, where developers have been able to freely tender development-led archaeological projects since 2010. The presentation will introduce some positive and negative experiences.

Finland applies a centralised, state-led system. The Finnish Heritage Agency (FHA) is responsible for the conservation of ancient monuments. All ancient monuments and archaeological sites are automatically protected under the provisions of the Antiquities Act. The current Act dates back to 1963.

The Act is based on the principle that the FHA is responsible for all the archaeological investigations required for land use projects, since free competition was not in the lawmakers' minds over 50 years ago. Due to this, it is essential that the outdated legislation is reformed to better suit the current situation, but there has been no progress so far. As there is no up-to-date legislation, the practices and methods related to commercial archaeology have needed to be changed due to complaints and claims filed by the operators that have taken part in the tenders, mostly archaeology companies, based on the statements issued by competition authorities and other authorities.

At the moment, the heritage management officials do not have good enough tools to control competition. The plans of land use projects go through an extensive statement round with heritage management authorities (Land Use and Building Act 2000), which gives them an opportunity to present conservation and research needs. After this, the developer will commission the required research work, although the developer usually lacks the competence to evaluate the tenders received from the perspective of archaeological research. The contractor carrying out the research will draft a research plan, apply for a research permit from the FHA and commit to following the field work quality instructions and ethical rules of archaeology compiled by the archaeologist community. The FHA will assess the adequacy of the research plan (quality, extent) from the perspective of the required research actions. All archaeological research reports are archived centrally in the FHA after their quality has been approved, and they are electronically available through an online register. All archaeological finds are also delivered to the FHA at the same time as the reports. However, field work data cannot be stored comprehensively at the moment.

The general opinion is that the archaeological field work related to land use projects can also be carried out by other operators than the FHA. In addition to authorities, commercial archaeology is executed by cooperatives and private companies. There are about ten active operators in the field. In practice, however, the archaeological market in Finland is very small, and does not provide secure subsistence to very many operators. Surveys are work that can be carried out by many different operators, but large excavations require more extensive investments. Because the developers usually choose the most affordable tender, there are no prerequisites for long-term development of practices and methods or communication to the public. With regard to archaeology, the public sector in Finland lacks resources. The question is, if actual competition is even possible in the field of archaeology, and what consequences would follow, if development-led archaeology was only executed by private sector.

DAY 2 (Friday 23rd March 2018) (9.00-17.15)

Session 2 – The developers.

Jon SELIGMAN

Israel Antiquities Authority

Archaeology vs. Development – The Israeli Experience

The paper will outline shortly the development of salvage archaeology in Israel during the past thirty years, showing the growth of such excavations since the founding of the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) in 1990. This salvage work is based largely on the accepted interpretation of the colonial-British 'Antiquities Ordinance', which finds its present form in the Law of Antiquities legislated in 1978. The result is a highly centralised archaeological field controlled by the governmental IAA, which throughout the 1990s used the 'polluter pays' principle as its basis for funding of excavation after central government reduced state budget for archaeology. Following a series of legal challenges to this understanding of the law, various changes were instituted by government and the IAA, that enabled other organisations to participate in salvage excavations, though strictly controlled through academic supervision and central licensing. Furthermore, the principle of the 'polluter pays' was legally challenged, leading government to set a series of graded license fees that set the costs for excavation according to the area of archaeological disturbance. In conclusion the paper will assess the level of success of this change in its archaeological, financial and public spheres, relating to why the legal and financial changes have not changed the reality of Israeli salvage archaeology and why the IAA still conducts over 95% of the salvage work.

In addition, attention will be paid to the requirement that all archaeological remains should be fully excavated and whether or not there is archaeological and public value in this adopted maximalist approach to salvage archaeology. Indeed there are signs that in the long term this approach may be deemed untenable, which may lead to externally imposed limiting of archaeological research if archaeologists do not apply value judgments.

Kate GEARY

Head of professional Development and Practice, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

Archaeology adding value to development

'Do they want to pay more for professionalism?' asks the concept note. There are some assumptions in that question!

The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) has produced a guide for clients commissioning archaeological work (www.archaeologists.net/clientguide). It makes the case that professional work can be cheaper than employing 'cowboys'. More importantly, it shows how good quality, professional archaeology brings benefits to the client, by adding value and helping in the making of profitable places. It also assures clients that the archaeology will meet the needs of the public.

Of course, not all developers are happy about paying for archaeology. But most members of the public have an interest, and developers are the public too. We have an unfortunate habit of downplaying the value of archaeology ('we'll clear your site quickly and cheaply'; 'we'll manage your risk'), and we tend to express a low opinion of developers ('you want to decontaminate your site of archaeology'; 'if you could, you would destroy this without record').

How can we ensure good developer-funded archaeology if we undersell what we can offer, and if we describe our clients as environmentally irresponsible? This paper will build on the ClfA client guide, and summarise some Historic England-funded research into client attitudes to a wide range of heritage skills. It will argue for unashamedly positive marketing of archaeology to developers, and will suggest some actions that will help developers recognise that they want good, professional archaeology.

Máté STIBRÁNYI & Eszter KREITER

Budavári NKft., Hungary

Half full or half empty? Current approaches to development-led archaeology in Hungary

In the recent years it was well-observable how fast the developers' and the museums' lobbying power can change the rules of archaeological legislation in Hungary. The archaeological profession was more passive than proactive during these changes and far from unified in that regard.

The reason for that lies in the past: the traditional backbone of Hungarian archaeology had been the network of county museums, and its successors are still playing crucial role today. Initially the tasks of preventive archaeology were given to the county museums exclusively within their own county. Since their funding came (and still comes) from development-led archaeology, most of their resources are used for these excavations, therefore the public engagement of archaeology becomes invisible.

Due to this state, every claim of centralisation for more effective performance of development-led archaeology is perceived by many archaeologists as a fatal blow against archaeology as their profession, even though it is a wrong principle when the developers must pay for maintaining these regional museums. Moreover, no government will take the responsibility of changing (or mopping-up) the whole rural museum structure for obvious political reasons.

In spite of this, a centralized structure is also present in Hungarian archaeology. From 2013 a Preliminary Archaeological Evaluations is a mandatory part of the permitting process of large-scale constructions. These evaluations consist of collecting data from archives as well as field data with a maximum cost of 0,35% of the total construction budget. The goal is to make a precise archaeological project plan and assess the optimal mitigation process by an independent third party.

It seems that currently there is an agreement about the important role of Preliminary Archaeological Documentation within the archaeological works of the development, and that can be a baseline for change: when the archaeological tasks of a large-scale construction are clearly specified, could easily be tendered. This could be considered a step toward a (more) free market system that would change the present one, at the moment archaeological works can only be carried out by the museums).

The authors intend to present the current state of development-led archaeology in Hungary: the management and the operational level as well, and try to seek solutions to the following problems:

- How the needs of different stakeholders can be met?
- What can be considered as good practice in the management of development-led archaeology?
- How does politics and unstable legal environment affect heritage management?
- What are the expectations towards archaeological excavations?

Anu KIVIRÜÜT & Ulla KADAKAS

National Heritage Board of Estonia

How much should the polluter pay? Examples from Estonia

The Estonian heritage protection system is based on the polluter pays principle. In addition to the National Heritage Board (NHB), there are 18 private companies, 4 museums/societies and 2 universities

with the licence to conduct archaeological survey. Private companies only work in preventive or rescue archaeology while museums and universities engage on research projects. For the developers, archaeology usually comes as a surprise, even when it is in the public registry.

NHB coordinates the plans and projects concerning monuments and decides whether it is reasonable to conserve and preserve the archaeological monument in situ or to carry out salvage excavations. When decided that survey is necessary, the “polluter” asks for cost proposals from archaeological companies and usually chooses the cheapest and/or quickest one. NHB is only able to accept or decline the research design, to monitor the process of fieldwork and its correspondence to the research design but has no possibility to question the budget or timeline.

For small-scale excavations on “insignificant” sites, sometimes, all of the archaeological companies either decline doing the survey or the price is too high for the household. In these cases, NHB has tried to help these owners by doing the preliminary survey or a watching brief or offering partial funding.

A few developers do see old constructions or other finds as a possibility to advertise and use the findings to give some additional value to their project. The trend is rising compared to the 1990s and 2000s. In the presentation, a few positive and negative examples will be provide to illustrate the situation.

Another question is to which extent the polluter should pay. We have a regulation about the requirements for field study of monuments, describing, among others, general aims of archaeological field research, lists the obligatory parts of research design and fieldwork report. Nevertheless, there are no stately standards for surveying different archaeological objects.

We have started with compiling standards for osteological fieldwork and trying to determine what is the amount of work that has to be financed by the developer and what is „further scientific interest“. Unfortunately, this is something that is hard to decide among archaeologists as the differences between generations, interests and viewpoints are surprisingly big.

Neil HOLBROOK

Cotswold Archaeology, UK

Client expectations from commercial archaeology in the UK

The free market for archaeology in the UK means that government agencies responsible for the construction of infrastructure schemes pay the market price for archaeological investigations associated with them. As the precise nature, importance and extent of the archaeology to be affected by a road or railway is rarely known in detail before construction starts, it is often impossible at that stage to accurately predict the final archaeological cost. Clients naturally crave cost certainty, however, and the prevailing ethos is to push risk down the supply chain. In the case of archaeology, the tender process is thus not just necessarily about a comparison of the costs of mobilising a team, but the amount of risk different archaeological organisations are willing to take on (for instance their appetite to fix certain elements of their price at tender stage).

Clients also increasingly see archaeologists as just another part of their supply chain, and as we are on site early in the construction programme there can be an expectation that archaeologists will take on the management of tasks which we might otherwise expect a civil engineering contractor to undertake. This talk will examine these issues from a UK perspective, and address the general expectations for professionalism and contract awareness which clients now expect from professional archaeologists. The skills required to meet these demands often extend well beyond traditional archaeological competencies.

Henny GROENENDIJK

Groningen Institute of Archaeology, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Farmers and archaeologists: any shared interests? Best practice from the Dutch countryside'

Farming in a country like the Netherlands, which has a limited surface area, high land value and critical customers, is like walking a tightrope: a farmer is always the scapegoat when it comes to the societal consequences of his job. Archaeologists, for example, have problems with modern cultivation techniques, because they demonstrably harm archaeological sites. The farming community is reluctant to accede to the archaeologists requests, since it has many more (larger) issues to overcome.

Predictive modelling as part of the development-led Dutch archaeology did not contribute to the desired mutual understanding. Yet there is a growing willingness to listen to each other's needs, paralleled by developments in the environmental sector and the management of natural resources.

Tentative projects to create a win-win situation for both farmers and archaeologists have been launched and even successfully carried out, but that does not suffice. Archaeological heritage management requires permanent provisions, because the loss of information from the 'soil archive' is irreversible. Attempts are made to re-open the dialogue between farmers and archaeologists and bring about a more positive attitude on both sides. It is argued that severe actions are not effective in the Dutch polder.

Session 3 – The public.

Marjolein VERSCHUUR

Policy advisor, Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands

Whose business is it anyway? Survey on the relationship between archaeology, the public and the national government

How is public outreach arranged in Dutch archaeology on the level of the national government and how does this relate to the way public outreach is arranged in other European countries? This was the main question of a survey conducted on behalf of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands. Up until now public outreach in archaeology has not been considered a task of the national government. Article 9 of the Valletta Convention has not been translated into regulation or national policy and public archaeology is thought best in place at the level of municipalities. But is this right, and if not, what should the national involvement be? The international survey was meant to get a grip on how other European countries view their responsibility on a national level. In this session we will present the outcomes of the survey and reflect on the way the Cultural Heritage Agency could arrange public participation in the process of monument designation.

Gábor VIRÁGOS

Archaeologist – FAVEO CONSULTING Ltd., Hungary

The Magic Triangle

Needs and interests are two different concepts. Talking about needs we focus on what would be necessary or ideal to have. This is idealism. Talking about the interest of somebody or a group or a legal entity we discuss what will happen. This is realism. The two approaches go hand in hand and fighting with each other, but the surrounding world only understands what is communicated about all these.

Communicating archaeological heritage is a complex procedure, equally and simultaneously involving the professionals, the developers and the public in addition to other stakeholders. Their goals, tools, target audiences, messages etc. are different, but the original subject – the archaeological site and finds – are the same. I will go around an example (one excavation project from Hungary) from all such aspects to give an overview of the communication problems and its complexity in general. I will also use other cultural heritage sites to present the contradictions and conflicts in meeting the needs and interests of the stakeholders.

Rebecca JONES & Kirsty OWEN

Head of Archaeology and World Heritage, Historic Environment Scotland; Senior Archaeology Manager, Historic Environment Scotland

Presenting an Archaeology for Everyone: Changing our Approach to Publicly Funded Archaeological Investigation in Scotland

This paper will explore the idea of the ‘public benefit’ of archaeology and argue that our definition of what this means needs to be broadened, so that those that fund and consume archaeological information, and those that currently do not, can better understand the full breadth of its importance and significance.

Archaeological information is relevant to, and in many cases actively contributes, to climate change, the promotion of diversity, the construction of sustainable communities and the appreciation and understanding of place. We will present and discuss some of the range of projects that are currently being supported through Historic Environment Scotland's Archaeology Programme, which is now focused on the delivery of Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. Many of these projects bring together professional archaeologists and members of the public, but how do we get a greater variety of people interested? It will be argued that one of the key roles of a national body is to bridge the gap between people's day to day lives, and archaeology, making it clearer why is it important to everyone. There are clearly challenges inherent in this approach, and we will present these to EAC members for discussion.

It will be argued that different forms of media can be used to amplify the relevance of archaeological information, and that this could be done more effectively. At present, archaeological information is largely consumed as an academic text-based narrative, hard to understand by the general public, and its relevance to everyday life is rarely clearly conveyed. We are seeking to improve this is through better, more relevant, stories and imagery. The scientific endeavours of archaeologists, varying from landscape reconstruction to analysis of ancient diet are often relevant to contemporary issues – this could be better explored and promoted.

Zdeněk ŠÁMAL

Director of New Desk, Czech TV, Czech Republic

Archeology in media: Does anyone care?

Archeological information and topics in Czech TV News, possibilities and effectivity of their presentation in the context of media convergence. Comparison of output efficiency in linear TV broadcasting and online platforms – quantitative data analysis of audience rating and the Internet traffic for five specific archeological topics created and produced by public service television News. View from the other side.

Sigrid PETER

Board member, Archaeo Publica, Austria

A citizen's view on public archaeology and heritage in Austria

This paper shows a citizen's view and experiences on public archaeology and heritage in Austria. Firstly, I will introduce a charity named „Archaeo Publica“, which aims to enable greater public participation in archaeology in Austria. I will present its structure, aims, working progress and some examples how the charity is collaborating with nonprofessionals and professionals alike.

Then, I will present Austrian laws regulations affecting public participation in archaeology. Naturally, there are also some problems with funding, which complicate progressing to a more participatory approach considerably.

Finally, I will conclude with some ideas how to enable and improve collaboration between the public, non-professionals and professionals in archaeology and archaeological heritage management in Austria.