

The Current State of Archaeology in the United Kingdom



First Report of the All-Party
Parliamentary Archaeology Group

PUBLISHED BY
THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP (APPAG)
David Morgan Evans, Administrator,
All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group,
Society of Antiquaries of London,
Burlington House,
Piccadilly,
London W1J 0BE

PRINTED BY
THE CAXTON & HOLMESDALE PRESS LTD
104, London Road, Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 1BB

January 2003

ISBN 0-9544433-0-6

*With grateful thanks to David and Molly Borthwick, without whose generous support
this Report could not have been published.*

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Members of the All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group	4
PART 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
PART 2 INTRODUCTION	9
PART 3 ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS	10
A. Government and National Agencies	10
B. Archaeology as a Career	14
C. The Voluntary/Amateur Sector	15
D. Community Archaeology and Tourism	17
E. Sites and Monuments Records	18
F. Planning Policy Guidance Notes	20
G. Permitted development and sites outside the planning process	21
H. Maritime and Industrial Archaeology	23
I. Portable Antiquities	24
J. Illicit trade in antiquities	26
K. Education and Research	28
L. Conservation	31
M. Museums, Archives and Collections	32
N. Publication and Communication	34
List of Abbreviations	36
Selected References	37

Members of the All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group

Chairman: Lord Renfrew of Kaimsthorn
Vice Chairman: Tam Dalyell MP
Vice Chairman: Lord Montagu of Beaulieu
Secretary: Lord Redesdale
Treasurer: Tim Loughton MP

Richard Allan MP
Candy Atherton MP
Peter Atkinson MP
John Austin MP
Tony Banks MP
John Baron MP
Annette Brooke MP
John Burnett MP
Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP
Hugh Bayley MP
Henry Bellingham MP
Tim Boswell MP
Peter Bottomley MP
Graham Brady MP
Alistair Carmichael MP
Sir Sydney Chapman MP
Paul Clark MP
Tony Colman MP
Frank Cook MP
Jeremy Corbyn MP
Sir Patrick Cormack MP
Brian Cotter MP
Jim Cunningham MP
David Curry MP
Andrew Dismore MP
Gwyneth Dunwoody MP
Nigel Evans MP
Michael Fallon MP
Mark Fisher MP
Edward Garnier MP
Sandra Gidley MP
Cheryl Gillan MP
Linda Gilroy MP
Tom Harris MP
Nick Hawkins MP
David Heath MP
Stephen Hepburn MP

Lady Sylvia Hermon MP
David Heyes MP
Paul Holmes MP
Simon Hughes MP
Joan Humble MP
Alan Hurst MP
Robert Jackson MP
Nigel Jones MP
Jon Owen Jones MP
Martyn Jones MP
Paul Keetch MP
Robert Key MP
Dr Stephen Ladyman MP
David Lepper MP
David Lidington MP
Tony Lloyd MP
Andrew Love MP
John McDonnell MP
Shona McIsaac MP
Kevin McNamara MP
John McWilliam MP
John Mann MP
Gordon Marsden MP
Austin Mitchell MP
Malcolm Moss MP
Jim Murphy MP
Edward O'Hara MP
Lembit Öpik MP
Diana Organ MP
Gordon Prentice MP
John Robertson MP
Andrew Rosindell MP
David Ruffley MP
Bob Russell MP
Debra Shipley MP
Mark Simmonds MP
Helen Southworth MP
Rachel Squire MP
Andrew Stunell MP
David Taylor MP
Gareth R Thomas MP
Simon Thomas MP
Viscount John Thurso MP

Dr Jenny Tonge MP
David Tredinnick MP
Tom Watson MP
Brian White MP
Betty Williams MP

Lord Allenby of Megiddo
Baroness Andrews
Baroness Anelay of St Johns
Lord Avebury
Lord Bridges
Lord Brett
Lord Carlisle of Bucklow
Baroness David
Lord Evans of Parkside
Baroness Falkender
Viscount Falkland
Baroness Fookes
Lord Freyburg
Baroness Gardner of Parkes
Baroness Golding
Lord Gordon of Strathblane
Baroness Hardy of Wath
Baroness Harris of Richmond
Lord Howie of Troon
Lord Hoyle
Baroness Hooper
Lord Inglewood
The Earl Jellicoe
Lord Judd
Lord Lea of Crondall
Lord Luke
Lord Mackenzie of Framwellgate
Lord Maclennan of Rogart
Lord McNally
Lord Methuen
Professor Lord Morgan
Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne
Baroness Northover
Lord Peston
Lord Phillips of Sudbury

Lord Quinton
Lord Rea
Lord Renton
Lord Roper
Lord Sandberg
Baroness Sharp of Guildford
Lord Sheldon
Lord Stewartby
Baroness Thomas of Walliswood
Lord Thomson of Monifieth
Lord Walpole
Baroness Whitaker

**Working Group members who attended
Committee sessions**

Lord Redesdale (*Chairman*)

Richard Allan MP
Lord Crathorne
Lord Faulkner
Mark Fisher MP
Robert Key MP
Tim Loughton MP
Lord Lea
Lord Luke
Shona McIsaac MP
Lord Methuen
Lord Renfrew

Working Party

Lord Redesdale (*Chairman*)

Jane Beaufoy
Roger Bland
Chris Catling
Ann Clark
David Morgan Evans (*Administrator*)
Helen Geake
Alison James
Tim Schadla-Hall

PART 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group (APPAG) was set up in July 2001 to act as a focus for Parliamentary interest in all matters relating to archaeology in the United Kingdom. It currently has 137 members in both Houses of Parliament. APPAG represents all shades of political opinion and has no affiliation to any other special interest groups. The Report aims to reflect the concerns of all those with an interest in archaeology, both professional and amateur. To this end in 2001 APPAG appealed for written submissions on the current state of archaeology in the UK and received 267 responses from a wide range of organisations and individuals. In addition representatives from a number of key bodies were invited to answer questions arising from the submissions in a series of committee sessions in June, July and October 2002 (see www.sal.org.uk/appag for a full transcript). Finally evidence was taken from an open meeting on 7 December 2002, enabling other archaeologists and members of the public to add their views.

The Group can confirm that archaeology is the subject of considerable and growing public interest. The Government, however, needs to make much greater acknowledgement that the remains of the past, both moveable and immovable and also including the intangible - the historic environment - should be protected and preserved for their own sake and for the benefit of future generations. **The past is a fragile and non-renewable resource and must be properly protected and preserved. The Government's priorities are expressed in terms of broadening access to and developing the educational potential of the cultural sector. These aims, while worthy in themselves, force Government-funded bodies with responsibilities for archaeology to divert attention away from what should be their core aims, to identify, protect and sustain the historic environment, towards these other goals. National agencies, national and regional museums find that their activities are increasingly skewed to those initiatives for which the Government is sometimes willing to provide funding, but which do not necessarily correspond to the wider priorities. Without the preservation of this fundamental resource, there will be nothing left to provide access to or to educate people about.**

In the report a total of 48 recommendations have been identified as having current priority. Ten of these have been selected as key recommendations:

(1) The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) should adopt a new high-level objective of defining, protecting and sustaining the historic environment for the benefit of our own and future generations and it should accept the full consequences of this both in its own spending plans and in the business plans of its sponsored bodies and the devolved administrations should be encouraged to do likewise. DCMS should also establish an inter-departmental committee on archaeology, at ministerial level, chaired by the DCMS and including the Office of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), the Department for Education and Science (DfES) and the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and representatives from the devolved administrations, whose remit should be to co-ordinate Government policy on archaeology. This committee should meet at least twice a year and minutes of its discussions should be published. This committee should be serviced by a strengthened team to provide policy advice at the DCMS, at least one of whom should be an expert on archaeology seconded to the Department.

(2) There is a need for a single non-governmental organisation to lobby for archaeology. The Council for British Archaeology (CBA), the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) (and possibly other umbrella organisations) should be encouraged to institute a review, under an independent chair, in order to clarify and re-define (or merge) their respective functions. APPAG stands ready to advise on this process.

(3) There is an urgent need to improve pay and conditions for employment in field archaeology so that they are commensurate with graduate entry level in allied professions such as local authority planning officers, civil engineers and university lecturers. The IFA, working with English Heritage (EH) and the other national heritage agencies and Prospect, should create a structure for training and qualifications related to career development that will set standards for best practice in archaeological work, one in which employers are obliged to support the continuing professional development of staff. Only those contractors that meet these standards should be eligible to bid for developer-funded work. In the longer term, the current fragmented commercial unit system which has resulted from competitive tendering should be replaced with a more stable regional, or more local framework of archaeological organisations.

(4) In support of Article 3 of the Valletta Convention, the Government should ensure that a voluntary Code of Conduct is implemented to cover archaeological investigations, with appropriate resources being made available as necessary, and monitored to assess its effectiveness. Any Code of Conduct should enable developer-funded evaluations, excavations, watching briefs and other fieldwork to make provision for volunteers to take part without undermining the position of the professionals.

(5) Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs) should be made statutory with additional funding from central Government to ensure that they meet a minimum standard of content and service delivery. Public accessibility should be improved, and recognition of the community and educational value of SMRs must be included in their development. The national, regional and local SMRs need to be reviewed to streamline the infrastructure. There is a need for increased access to SMRs through a single Internet portal.

(6) Urgent consideration should be given to replacing the present system of competitive tendering in developer-funded archaeological investigations by a more stable regional, or more local franchise system. Franchises should be offered after consultation with the relevant local and national authorities and would need to be reviewed at regular intervals. The mechanisms of who awards the franchises will need to be discussed taking into account local circumstances. Such a system would also ensure greater public accessibility to the past, and also improved protection of the archaeological resource.

(7) The system of class consents permitted by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, whereby Scheduled Ancient Monuments continue to be damaged by agricultural operations, should be abolished.

(8) The Government should give long-term support to the network of finds liaison officers which is to be established across the whole of England and Wales under the Portable Antiquities Scheme, since the current lottery funding will end in April 2006. Such a development needs to be seen in the context of both regional and local museums as well as inputs to SMRs. The Government should also provide resources for analogous schemes in Scotland and Northern Ireland, adapted to local conditions.

(9) There is an urgent need to boost the teaching of archaeology in schools. Teacher training courses should be made more accessible to those with a single honours degree in archaeology and national curricula should be reviewed to include the historic environment in all relevant courses. Prehistory should be part of all national curricula.

(10) The future of the *Renaissance in the Regions* project should be reviewed in the light of the Government's recent disappointing spending settlement. At the same time the role of national and local museums needs to be clarified and regularised. Every local authority should be given a statutory legal duty to provide adequate public museum provision to meet the reasonable needs of those whose residence or place of work is within the area of the authority,

or who are undergoing full-time education within that area, and for contributing to the costs of maintaining those services whether provided by the authority or not.

The full report, complete with all the appendices, is published on the Internet at www.sal.org.uk/appag and available from the Society of Antiquaries (£2.50). A new email discussion list will enable some of the issues raised to be taken forward and to be reviewed in the light of forthcoming and future changes. To join the list email appag-join@britarch.net and then send a message by posting to appag@britarch.net. A web-based archive of all messages sent to the list is available at www.britarch.ac.uk/lists/APPAG.

PART 2 INTRODUCTION

1. The All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group (APPAG) was set up in July 2001 to act as a focus for Parliamentary interest in all matters relating to archaeology in the UK. It currently has 137 members in both Houses of Parliament. APPAG represents all shades of political opinion and has no affiliation to any other special interest groups. The Report aims to reflect the concerns of all those with an interest in archaeology, both professional and amateur.

2. APPAG has sought to determine the views and opinions of interested groups and people over the whole field of archaeology including organisations and people with a full-time, part-time and voluntary interest in the subject. To achieve this APPAG asked for submissions of no more than 250 words on the current state of archaeology in the UK, giving priority for up to five areas of concern.

3. The responses comprised 267 submissions (the full text is available on the Internet at www.sal.org.uk/appag) ranging from museums, major national and regional bodies and university departments to local and national societies, voluntary bodies and individuals with an interest. They have covered a vast range of issues including government policy relating to planning, portable antiquities, international standards and agreements, national agencies, the destruction of sites, the career structure of the profession, the fragmentation of the discipline, the effectiveness of the discipline, museums and conservation, sites and monuments records and historic environment centres, funding issues, voluntary and community archaeology, education at all levels both informal and formal, research, tourism, publication and dissemination.

4. In addition evidence was called for in a series of committee sessions in June, July and October 2002 (transcript available on the Internet at www.sal.org.uk/appag). Senior figures representing a number of key bodies were invited to answer questions arising from the submissions. These included the DCMS, national heritage agencies, representatives of other archaeological bodies, national museums and representatives of other museums through museum organisations, representatives in education, representatives of amateur organisations, county societies and archaeological units. Finally evidence was taken from an open meeting on 7 December 2002, enabling other archaeologists and members of the public to add their views.

5. This report, complete with all the appendices, is also published on the Internet at www.sal.org.uk/appag. The new email discussion list (appag-join@britarch.net and then send a message by posting to appag@britarch.net) will enable some of the issues raised to be taken forward and to be reviewed in the light of forthcoming and future changes. This initiative will not only broaden the basis for discussion but give ownership of aspects of policy review to all those who wish to have an involvement.

6. This report highlights some of the main issues brought before the Group and in particular the recommendations we wish to be brought forward. The context for these will be found in the submissions and in the evidence. APPAG is a Westminster-based group and evidence taken from the devolved assemblies has been incorporated where appropriate, but generally we have not commented on devolved matters.

PART 3 ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Government and National Agencies

7. Central Government plays a vital role in archaeology in the UK. It provides resources for central and local government agencies which have executive functions, sets the overall policy framework within which these agencies work and is responsible for ensuring that the legislative framework is in place. APPAG has identified four main problems relating to Government and national agencies: priorities, lack of co-ordination, lack of expertise and additional responsibilities without resources.

Priorities

8. The Government's priorities, as set out in the DCMS's *Annual Report 2002*, are expressed in terms of broadening access to and developing the educational potential of the cultural sector. The historic environment can also be seen as a significant economic resource through its importance for tourism. The DCMS's aims, while worthy in themselves, force the Department's bodies to divert attention away from what should be their core aims, to protect and sustain the historic environment, towards these other goals. National agencies, national and regional museums find that their activities are increasingly skewed to those initiatives for which the Government is sometimes willing to provide funding, but which do not necessarily match those wider priorities. Without the preservation of this core resource, there will be nothing left to provide access to or to educate people about.

9. For example, APPAG heard that the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) has only given a small proportion of its funds to archaeology. This is because it does not fund archaeology for its own sake, but only insofar as it contributes to the Fund's aims which mirror those of the Government. This similarly affects bodies such as English Heritage (EH) and the national museums which find that their activities are increasingly biased towards those initiatives for which the Government is willing to provide funding, which do not necessarily correspond to their own core priorities. English Heritage's review *Power of Place* (December 2000) contained only very limited references to archaeology while the Government's own policy statement, *The Historic Environment. A Force for Our Future* (January 2002) is extremely short on specific commitments.

Lack of co-ordination

10. The DCMS claims the lead role in archaeology in England and sponsors the principal bodies, such as, EH, Resource: the Council for Museums, Archives and Libraries and the British Museum. However, significant responsibilities also lie with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM, responsible for local government), the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA, responsible for agri-environment schemes). Other Government departments have a significant interest in archaeology, such as the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and the Department of Transport (DoT).

11. Responsibility for archaeology is devolved in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and different arrangements apply. In Scotland, Historic Scotland (an Executive Agency reporting to a Minister at Cabinet level), falls within the same Scottish Government department as tourism, culture and sport; in Wales and Northern Ireland, the equivalent bodies, Cadw and the Environment and Heritage Agency, come under their countries' environment departments. Both agencies report to ministers in their respective assemblies. Other bodies, such as the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland and the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales and national museums have different reporting lines within local administrations. Although all these bodies value their devolved status - and often, although not always, these arrangements are superior to those in England -

the differences between the countries of the UK can be confusing to the wider public. Since initiatives taken by Whitehall departments inevitably have an impact on the other home countries we recommend that the devolved administrations should be represented in the inter-departmental working committee proposed below to encourage cross-fertilisation of best practice between the home countries.

12. DCMS is not seen as a major player in Whitehall and its sponsored bodies have been progressively squeezed by recent Government spending settlements. This position has not been significantly improved in the settlement for 2003-06. Archaeology would appear to have a low priority within the DCMS (see, for example, the Department's *Annual Report 2002*).

13. There is an evident lack of co-ordination between Government departments in the field of archaeology, despite the fact that the recent Government policy statement, *A Force for our Future*, was co-sponsored by DCMS and the former Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (whose responsibilities in this area have now been taken over by ODPM). Local authority archaeological services, which maintain Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs), are the responsibility of local government, as are most local museums and so are ultimately the responsibility of the ODPM. The planning process, under which most archaeological investigations now take place, is also a local government responsibility and it is the ODPM that is leading on the revision of Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) 15 and 16 and is responsible for the recently published Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill. We are concerned that the revision of PPG 15 and 16, of crucial importance for the future organisation of archaeology in England, is taking place without significant input from DCMS; in addition the revision is being approached without considering the current state of archaeology in terms of organisational impact.

14. There can be no doubt that the failure to take action to improve SMRs by placing them on a statutory basis - recommended by the Government in 1996 in its Green Paper, *Protecting our Past* - is at least in part the result of confused lines of responsibility within Government. Responsibility for local government spending rests with the ODPM, while the policy responsibility rests with DCMS. It is symptomatic that the Government's consultation paper on SMRs, promised in *A Force for Our Future* for summer 2002, has not yet been published (see section E).

15. DCMS is the sponsoring department for EH and responsible for agreeing its strategic objectives and its business plan and yet many of EH's responsibilities relate more closely to ODPM and DEFRA. Better co-ordination is needed between the responsible Government departments as a matter of urgency.

16. One of the benefits of DCMS taking the lead role in archaeology should be that it can achieve closer co-ordination between archaeological bodies and museums. However, there is little evidence of this. The deep divide that exists between archaeological organisations, both national and local, on the one hand, and museums on the other is a theme that has kept recurring in the course of our enquiry. Failure to work more closely together is damaging to the interests of the historic environment: for example, one of the main reasons why the UK has been so slow to take action on the recording of portable antiquities is because responsibility has fallen into the gap between museums and archaeological bodies. DCMS should proactively take the lead in bringing together all the key players with an interest in archaeology. The continuing absence of a framework of museums at a regional and local level in which responsibility for the maintenance of archaeological material and information is included hinders sensible development. If local authorities had a statutory responsibility to support museums, as we recommend, this situation might be remedied (see section M).

Lack of expertise

17. From the evidence given to the Group, DCMS would seem to lack expertise in archaeology. It has hitherto relied heavily on EH for advice but the Department's officials should not need to rely exclusively on advice from just one of their sponsored bodies, whose responsibilities only cover one part of the wide spectrum of interests concerned with archaeology. The officials responsible for implementing Government policy must be able to take decisions on an informed basis and enjoy the respect of those with whom they deal. Some Government departments employ professional archaeological staff, such as DEFRA and MoD. In many other areas of the DCMS officials seconded from the Department's sponsored bodies have been able to provide such expertise; we believe that this is needed in the Architecture and Historic Environment Division and may be of value in other relevant Divisions of DCMS. It should be stressed that this expertise is needed to provide advice on matters of archaeological policy, not to second guess EH's advice on listing and scheduling.

Additional responsibilities without resources

18. All national heritage agencies, English Heritage, Historic Scotland, Cadw, the Environment and Heritage Agency Northern Ireland, the Royal Commissions and the national museums, have acquired additional responsibilities over time without any clear overriding strategy, so that there is no apparent logic to the organisations' range of responsibilities. A further problem is Government's tendency to give agencies new responsibilities without the additional funding to enable them to cope with the extra workload - a situation that has led to diminishing budgets being spread more thinly. Thus, for example, the National Heritage Act this year gave English Heritage responsibilities for maritime archaeology with totally inadequate additional funding (see section H); the Treasure Act has created work for an additional ten posts at the British Museum while the Museum's grant has been cut in real terms. English Heritage should review its functions in the light of the budget constraints and if they are not adequate to enable it to carry out all its present functions they should be handed back to DCMS.

19. Government needs to be clearer about the exact role of national heritage agencies and to agree in detail a strategic plan with clear objectives and meaningful performance indicators, backed by adequate funding. In England, *A Force for our Future*, published by DCMS (to be backed by annual Action Plans, the first of which was due to be published in December 2002, but has not yet appeared), may go part way to achieving this, although specific policies relating to archaeology are not mentioned. *The State of the Historic Environment Report* (SHER, November 2002) aimed to provide, for the first time ever, the statistical basis from which to measure the health of the historic environment, and for monitoring change. However, this is a flawed document. The statistical base is limited, and requires a much more rigorous approach both in terms of measurement and research. Several universities have the capacity to carry out independent research in this area. Furthermore, EH's vision of the sector excludes museums (as it did in *Power of Place*). No museum bodies are represented on the Historic Environment Review Steering Group and the table of DCMS-funded work on page 85 totally ignores museums. This is all the more surprising given the fact that the current Chairman and Chief Executive of EH both have a background in museums. The SHER should be a joint project between EH and Resource and should also take into account other areas of expertise if it is going to become widely accepted.

20. In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, similar strategic plans need to be developed where they do not yet exist, and all should include statements about what is distinctive about Welsh, Scottish, English or Irish heritage as well as what is common to the UK – on the one hand, regionalisation should be a distinctive feature of the strategic plans but on the other that should not act as a barrier to a joined-up approach between Westminster, Edinburgh, Cardiff and Belfast.

21. There is a risk that national heritage agencies can be viewed as inward looking and concerned more with their own agendas than those of the broader heritage sector. The agencies (especially EH) are taking steps to counter this perception with the creation of effective regional centres, whose staff are developing working partnerships with other relevant bodies in the region, including Regional Cultural Consortia. Nevertheless, the respective roles and funding of the regional and national centres are still not entirely clear, nor is it clear whether grant-giving regimes are flexible enough to reflect the increasing trend towards regionalisation. Whilst stronger regional offices should not be at the expense of a core/central team, it may be that co-operation and collaboration is currently more effective at a regional level than it is at national level.

22. There can be no doubt that one of the reasons why archaeological concerns have not been high on the political agenda is the absence of a single voice to make the public case for archaeology. There is in fact a plethora of bodies which take on this role such as, for example, CBA, IFA, IHBC, Historic Environment Forum (HEF) and Heritage Link. This has led to confusion as to the precise role of each body and there is consequently a need for a clarification of roles. Both the CBA and IFA are in receipt of major funding from EH (and CBA has core funding from the British Academy). CBA, IFA and IHBC (and possibly other umbrella organisations) should be encouraged to institute a review, under an independent chair, in order to clarify and re-define (or merge) their respective functions. APPAG stands ready to advise on this process.

Recommendations

23. DCMS should adopt a new high-level objective of defining, protecting and sustaining the historic environment for the benefit of our own and future generations (*A Force for Our Future*, para. 9) and it should accept the full consequences of this in its own spending plans and in the business plans of its sponsored bodies. The devolved administrations should be encouraged to do likewise. It should ensure that its sponsored bodies with archaeological responsibilities have sufficient resources to carry out their core functions. In addition, the grant-giving bodies for which it has responsibility, such as the Heritage Lottery Fund should also focus on this key objective.

24. DCMS should establish an inter-departmental committee on archaeology, at Ministerial level, including ODPM, DfES and DEFRA and representatives from the devolved administrations, whose remit should be to co-ordinate Government policy on archaeology. This Committee should meet at least twice a year and minutes of its discussions should be published. This committee should be serviced by a strengthened team to provide policy advice at the DCMS, at least one member of which should be an expert on archaeology seconded to the Department.

25. DCMS should ensure closer co-ordination between its Architecture and Historic Environment divisions and its Museums, Libraries and Archives division and Cultural Property Unit in issues relating to archaeology and should play an enabling role in bringing together representatives from its sponsored bodies, particularly English Heritage, Resource and the national museums, for this purpose. It should also second an expert or experts on archaeology to its Architecture and Historic Environment Division.

26. English Heritage should review its functions in the light of the budget constraints and if they are not adequate to enable it to carry out all its present functions, they should be handed back to the DCMS.

27. There is a need for a single non-governmental organisation to lobby for archaeology. The Council for British Archaeology, the Institute of Field Archaeology and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (and possibly other umbrella organisations) should be

encouraged to institute a review, under an independent chair, in order to clarify and re-define (or merge) their respective functions. The All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group stands ready to advise on this process.

B. Archaeology as a Career

28. The submissions emphasised the plight of archaeologists as insecurely employed, poorly paid and generally itinerant, as demonstrated by Aitchison's report *Profiling the Profession* (1999). This is in large part due to the effects of the system of competitive tendering introduced by PPG 16 (see section F). A mobile casual workforce is inevitably excluded from training opportunities where they do exist. The absence of proper training prohibits promotion to more secure senior posts. There is no clear career development path and, in most cases, neither universities (see section K) nor employers appear to consider it their role to prepare archaeologists for professional practice. This is largely due to external financial pressures, with developer funding dominating and contributing sums approaching £75 million per annum; but it is also because archaeology only has a weak professional structure.

29. Although archaeology is a graduate profession this is neither reflected in the career opportunities nor in remuneration. Often those who work in excavation units are treated as site technicians who simply record archaeological deposits rather than as archaeologists who are capable of interpreting them. The current fragmentation of the profession is already exacerbating these problems. There is also a serious skills shortage in expertise in archaeological artefacts, a subject that is now largely neglected in universities (see section K).

30. There is a perception that a training need bears witness to a personal defect – competence is simply assumed. The profile of the profession could be enhanced by promoting the transferable skills which are as diverse as is the discipline, ranging from work with detailed datasets to team working and problem solving. Already since the PPGs archaeologists are having to make judgements about matters which have economic implications. This has precipitated the definition of National Occupational Standards (by the IFA and the Cultural Heritage National Training Organisation).

31. Attempts have been made to redress these problems endemic in the profession for some time: the Archaeological Training Forum (ATF) was founded in 1998 and in 1999 the IFA launched a series of training initiatives; some of those initiatives are now coming to fruition. The IFA is to insist that membership is contingent on evidence for continuing professional development with personal development plans. In September 2002 the ATF launched a consultation period for discussion 'about the future of archaeology training and career development'. Training is vital if archaeology is to achieve high professional standards and it needs to be linked to career development, providing benchmarks for salaries which reflect the true worth of the multifarious skills of the profession.

Recommendation

32. There is an urgent need to improve pay and conditions for employment in field archaeology so that they are commensurate with graduate entry level in allied professions such as local authority planning officers, civil engineers and university lecturers. The Institute of Field Archaeology, working with English Heritage and the other national heritage agencies and Prospect, should create a structure for training and qualifications related to career development that will set standards for best practice in archaeological work, one in which employers are obliged to support the continuing professional development of staff. Only those contractors who meet these standards should be eligible to bid for developer-funded work. In the longer term, the current fragmented commercial unit system which has resulted from competitive tendering should be replaced with a more stable regional, or more local framework of archaeological organisations.

C. The Voluntary/Amateur Sector

33. The submissions reflect the concerns of a large number of individuals and local archaeological societies from across the country about the current position of the amateur or volunteer in British archaeology. Our knowledge of Britain's material past has its foundations in the activities of the independent local enthusiast, but today people who are, or wish to be part of that tradition feel actively excluded from it. One of the major challenges facing archaeology is to address the tension that now exists between the professional and amateur sectors so that interested members of the public are not disenfranchised from the heritage that belongs to them. Frequently the best protectors and monitors of archaeology are those at a local level.

34. Amateurs are increasingly detached from archaeology as it becomes 'professionalised'. The current state of archaeology has arisen in a relatively short time (mainly since the implementation of PPG 16) and it is not too late to reverse the more worrying trends towards excluding amateurs. The situation is also not the same in all areas of the country; in some counties, archaeological societies have good links with units, museums and agencies and also have their own longstanding programmes of fieldwork (for example, Sussex, Kent and Leicestershire). The ideal situation would be that amateurs and professionals come together to learn from each other. Whilst professionals will do the bulk, if not all, of the developer-related work, it is critical that local communities are kept informed, and that amateurs receive support to operate outside the commercial sphere. Local franchises would give greater continuity and enable the sharing of expertise and equipment between professionals and volunteers, as would the development of community archaeology and archaeologists as exemplified by Leicestershire. Franchise contracts should include some obligation for ensuring local community involvement. The CBA are undertaking a survey of 'Public Participation in Archaeology', the results of which will be published in 2003.

35. Contract agreements implicitly make it difficult for volunteers to be used in fieldwork. When volunteers are used it can be perceived as an abuse of the system because contractors are seen to be making up a shortfall in labour with unpaid enthusiastic individuals. On site, they may need greater supervision which time and resources often do not permit and professionals sometimes consider that their position has been undercut. Health and safety considerations also make it increasingly difficult for volunteers to be involved in developer-funded excavations.

36. The local dimension to the work is lost when people from local communities are not involved in the archaeology; valuable local specialist knowledge is overlooked and opportunities to share findings are rare when a unit is brought in from outside the area. Communication is generally poor between the professional units and between them and the amateur groups.

37. There are at present limited opportunities for training in practical aspects of the discipline. Amateur groups with good local knowledge are ideally placed to run training excavations, and in the past, the voluntary sector was well equipped to train the archaeologists of the future. Now, there is very little expertise left. Many professional archaeologists were given their first opportunities to gain practical experience through amateur excavations. However, as well as being fewer opportunities now that PPG 16 dominates the archaeological agenda, there is also little funding or professional support for training digs run by amateur groups; under the current rules the HLF does not award grants to them. The HLF should also consider funding professional support for amateur excavation and fieldwork. In addition if universities were to show more flexibility on training excavations run by them, this could boost the number of volunteers taking part and encourage the continuing professional development of amateurs into academic study, starting with foundation courses, and ending up in distance-learning courses. Some smaller projects such as watching briefs (which currently take a disproportionate amount of the professional resource) could be most appropriately serviced by local amateur/voluntary groups.

38. Local archaeological societies perform a valuable social function and promote a sense of identity in a local area. They enable the wider community to find out more about the history of their local area and augment the store of knowledge by their activities. In an increasingly commercial world they can act independently and have the enthusiasm to work for no financial gain. However, if local societies are excluded from actively taking part in fieldwork, post-excavation work and recording buildings they become sterile interest groups. This is a waste of a resource that archaeology can ill afford to lose.

39. The proven popularity of archaeology in the media shows that there are millions of interested individuals who would like to know more about archaeology and would like to take part. Most archaeological societies have failed to capitalise on this and have difficulty attracting younger members. The danger is that when its popularity wanes, archaeology will be the loser unless people can be given the opportunity to take an active role.

40. To enable greater involvement a pilot scheme of a network of volunteer parish archaeologists should be set up on the pattern of Leicestershire, which already has a network of parish wardens which supplements an amateur-based fieldwalking programme, supported by one professional archaeologist. This would help to mitigate the problem of the lack of staff to carry out surveys and the monitoring of sites in rural areas. The system could be developed along the lines of the parish recorder system run by local history councils, and the volunteer monitoring system of the National Trust. Similar ideas around the country which could be developed include Shorewatch for coastal archaeology and some local adopt-a-monument schemes.

41. However, there is a need to ensure that amateur fieldwork, especially if it involves invasive excavation, is properly reported to the relevant local authority archaeologist so that it can be fed into the SMR. This has not always happened in the past. Article 3 of the Valletta Convention makes it a duty of signatories to 'ensure that excavations and other potentially destructive techniques are carried out only by qualified, specially authorised persons'. This article has been widely interpreted as an attack on amateur/voluntary involvement in archaeology. APPAG supports the Government position that a licensing system is not necessary to fulfil Article 3 as existing mechanisms control archaeological work, but believes that there should be a voluntary Code of Conduct to cover archaeological investigations, with appropriate resources being made available as necessary, and monitored to assess its effectiveness. APPAG believes that it is only the operators/managers/directors of the work who need to be 'qualified (and) specially authorised'.

Recommendations

42. In support of Article 3 of the Valletta Convention, the Government should ensure that a voluntary Code of Conduct is implemented to cover archaeological investigations, with appropriate resources being made available as necessary, and monitored to assess its effectiveness. Any Code of Conduct should enable developer-funded evaluations, excavations, watching briefs and other fieldwork to make provision for volunteers to take part without undermining the position of the professionals.

43. Closer links need to be formed between amateur societies, local authority archaeologists, English Heritage and contracting units. Analogous links need to be made in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The Council for British Archaeology, Institute of Field Archaeology and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation should be encouraged to have a more active role in representing the interests of amateur groups. Ways of actively involving amateurs should be explored by all agencies, not just in excavation but in other forms of fieldwork and post-excavation, including recording buildings.

44. The regulations governing the access to Heritage Lottery Fund funding for local archaeological projects and training excavations should be eased.

D. Community Archaeology and Tourism

45. Community archaeology can encourage social inclusion and active citizenship and help to reinforce a sense of community by applauding cultural diversity. It contributes to local sense of place and local distinctiveness as well as tourism. The importance of historic sites, monuments, landscapes and buildings should be given much more prominence for all communities. This would encourage public stewardship of the historic environment and be one of the most effective ways of protecting heritage and ensuring sustainability. Communities could be encouraged to do such things as monitor archaeological sites and 'adopt a monument'. The Group welcomes strategies from Resource to encourage lifelong learning by improving the services provided by museums, archives and libraries. The Group believes that archaeology should be an integral and vital part of the process and hopes that adequate funding will underpin such laudable aims.

46. The public's perception of the purpose and practice of archaeology, however, is too narrowly focused on excavation. The fact that archaeology can and should deliver a social and economic value has only recently been recognised. Much greater emphasis needs to be placed upon the role of local communities in the development, implementation and publication of archaeology in order to realise the social value of archaeology.

47. Successive governments appear ignorant of the enormous value of the historic environment in providing identity and sense of place, although documents such as SHER are at last attempting to quantify this. There is real concern in the submissions that a significant opportunity is being missed to exploit the historic environment in the most positive and favourable way. The past is not a profession, it is an experience common to all. Archaeology needs to foster and harness its current popularity if this is to continue to be of benefit in the future. The Young Archaeologists Club provides an excellent example of how this can be done, but it is dependent on the effectiveness of local co-ordinators and so is rather patchy in its activities nationwide. The present framework for developer-funded investigations (PPG 16) only contains poor provision for public access and involvement in archaeology, and no provision for synthesis and non-technical dissemination (see section N). From the evidence submitted we heard of plans from EH to put officers into regional offices with the task of establishing partnerships with local groups. Consideration might also be given to promoting the role of community archaeology across the country on a local basis.

48. Tourism is a major industry in the UK contributing £12.8 billion to the economy and being the largest employer. The historic environment is a significant component of the industry, as has been detailed recently in SHER, and it is one of the principal factors attracting visitors to the UK, but the full extent of the nature of the resource is not understood or utilised by the tourist industry. This has led to an over concentration on a few sites; the exceptional asset of this historic environment lies not just in the 'honeypot' sites but in its cultural diversity. There are concerns about over-concentration of visitors in a limited number of sites including all aspects of sustainability. The unexpected success of Sutton Hoo as a tourist destination shows that a demanding and scholarly exhibition of a relatively obscure period in a rather remote location can be very popular. Industrial sites are often in or near towns and are prime sources for increasing tourism (see section H). Many rural areas contain a range of less tangible remains which are normally unpromoted and accessible only to the few.

Recommendations

49. Consideration should be given to making the provision of information about archaeological developments to local communities a statutory obligation under the planning process and for the results to be published. The historic environment should be incorporated in Local Cultural Strategies.

50. **There should be a greater role for local archaeologists to play in enhancing community projects. To this end EH should continue to play a lead role in appointing staff in each region to liaise and promote the historic environment, and local authorities should consider developing community archaeology officers. There should be analogous arrangements in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.**

51. **There is a need to identify and manage new sites and areas as tourist attractions to give added breadth to those already in existence and assist in their sustainability. An audit is needed on the value of archaeology as a proportion of the tourist spend in the UK.**

E. Sites and Monuments Records

52. Although Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs) cover the whole of England and Wales, they are excessively fragmented and seriously under-resourced (SHER notes that there are now more than 100 SMRs in England, an increase of 20 in the last four years). Several Scottish regions lack SMRs completely. Originating from data supplied by the National Monuments Record, SMRs have developed piecemeal at county level since the 1970s. The SMR has now become an essential and integral part of the planning system with an ever-increasing demand on its resource from both public and private sectors. Both PPG 16 and increasingly the Portable Antiquities Scheme (see section I) and have led to a dramatic increase in SMR data. The uncoordinated approach has led to the present system being inconsistent and under-resourced both locally and nationally, leading to a significant loss of unrecorded sites and landscapes and a lack of public access. SMRs have over recent years made strides to become more consistent across the country, but there remains a lack of national co-ordination.

53. The provision of accurate and up-to-date SMR information is an essential requirement for any planning development. But the Government have not taken the step of reflecting that responsibility in standard spending assessments. Government declared its intention of making SMRs statutory in the 1996 Green Paper, *Protecting our Past*, but six years later has failed to implement this. Indeed the fact that the provision was omitted from the Government's Culture and Recreation Bill (which in fact failed to pass through Parliament in 2001) suggests that the Government has since changed its mind. In *A Force for our Future* the Government welcomed the recommendation in EH's paper, *Power of Place*, that the service offered by SMRs should be enhanced so that they become comprehensive Historic Environment Record Centres and it made a commitment to produce a consultation paper with a range of options for SMRs by summer 2002. This had not appeared by December 2002. There is now a real need to resolve issues surrounding the better protection of, and access to, the SMRs. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill provides an opportunity for a provision to put SMRs on a statutory basis.

54. The submissions have shown very strong support for the urgent need to make SMRs a statutory provision for county and unitary authorities. In the main, problems stem from the ambiguous status of SMRs being maintained by local authorities. At present, because there is no statutory requirement, SMRs are always vulnerable to local authority budget cuts. Furthermore implicit in some 'Best Value' exercises is the need for a 2 per cent cut. Archaeology (including SMRs and local museums) has been and continues to be the victim of such cuts; that is a critical failing of the governmental process. The Government has been quite willing to place responsibility for maintaining SMRs on local authorities and to include them in various pieces of secondary legislation. A comprehensive and reliable record is fundamental to informing planning policies and ensuring proper protection of all aspects of the archaeological and historic heritage (including, for example, coastal, maritime and industrial sites). It should be a statutory responsibility for local authorities to maintain or have access to appropriately resourced records of sites and monuments. Statutory status will require the framing of a definition of an SMR, but this can be dealt with by secondary legislation. In

addition it is noted that Article 2 of the Valletta Convention requires provision for the maintenance of an inventory of 'archaeological heritage'.

55. The recent reorganisation in local government led to the creation of more SMRs, some with no support structure at all. Some unitary authorities have made no adequate arrangements for this service. It is in fact difficult to obtain a definitive list of SMRs because they have become too fragmented. It is through local authorities that the majority of the data is provided, and it is of concern that there is no reference to the archaeological and historic environment data and its range of uses in the Regional Government White Paper. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill, published in December 2002, proposes stripping planning functions from counties, where most SMRs are based, and giving them to regional assemblies. Regional assemblies should be given a statutory duty to protect the historic environment.

56. All SMRs apply standards for data entry and phraseology (MIDAS), but this must extend from data capture through to interactive data curation if full access to the SMR is to be achieved. There is a problem with the baseline quality standard of individual SMRs; not all SMRs are up to this basic standard and there is little interoperability between hardware and software platforms. As a consequence of their fragmented state SMRs are less likely to fit into a national picture. Some submissions have called for more co-ordination and guidance from the lead national organisation.

57. Some SMRs have developed beyond a basic record and now encompass elements of the historic environment such as listed building data, historic landscape characterisation data and the underwater cultural heritage and they may better be called Historic Environment Records (HERs). These HERs are to be encouraged and should be extended to include other aspects such as palaeoenvironmental deposits (including peat) and industrial archaeology, but resources should initially be targeted towards baseline standards for SMRs across all counties.

58. The 1999 Baker reports on SMRs in England and Scotland showed very variable provision for access across the country and little progress has been made since publication. Many submissions noted that SMRs were often difficult to access for anyone outside the local planning department.

59. For four years the HLF have had a programme for giving grants to SMRs to allow them to become more accessible, in particular by publishing them on the Internet. Only those SMRs that meet a certain standard are eligible for such funding, but many authorities do not have the resources to bring SMRs even up to a baseline standard. Fragmentation of SMRs will be exacerbated unless there is a single point of Internet access to SMRs. The Historic Environment Information Resources Network and its associated portal, HEIRPORT, is a first step in this direction.

60. SMRs could be used to broaden public access to the past and develop important community values. Priority should be given to allowing greater access (via the Internet) to SMRs, enabling greater social inclusion and enhancing education and lifelong learning programmes. In this way they could become portals for discovery and learning linked to initiatives such as Culture Online with further links to archives, reports and archaeological collections. Data on the Internet should be easily accessible through a single Internet gateway.

Recommendation

61. Sites and Monuments Records should be made statutory with additional funding from central Government to ensure that they meet a minimum standard of content and service delivery. Public accessibility should be improved, and recognition of their community and educational value must be included in their development. The national, regional and local SMRs need to be reviewed to streamline the infrastructure. There is a need for increased access to SMRs through a single Internet portal.

F. Planning Policy Guidance Notes

62. While PPGs 15 and 16 relate directly to England, there is analogous guidance in other parts of the UK. Originally released in 1990, Planning Policy Guidance note 16 (PPG 16) is the second oldest PPG in existence. PPG 15 was released in 1994. These PPGs are currently under review. ODPM was due to publish the new Planning Policy Statement (PPS 16), which combines PPG 15 and 16, in December 2002 for a 3 month consultation period.

63. Because the PPGs are merely guidance, not legislation, their implementation is patchy, leading to wide variations across the country. Archaeology is covered by both PPGs 15 and 16: the former broadly covers standing buildings and the latter more conventional forms of archaeological deposit. This leads to a division of policy and practice between building conservation officers (working in most cases for district councils) and archaeological officers (working in most cases for county councils). For example, in planning law there is a general system for requiring more information from the developer prior to the determination of the planning application. Despite this, in the case of historic buildings this power is rarely used, leading to losses where the archaeological importance of the building is not immediately apparent.

64. The whole question of who is responsible for long-term curation of finds and public access to knowledge gained from the PPG-instigated investigations is not covered within the planning process and indeed is not adequately resourced at present (see sections L and M). Most crucially PPG 16 does not fund the long-term deposition of the archive in a museum, even though this is the means by which 'preservation by record' is enabled.

65. There is an unclear division of responsibilities between EH and local authorities. The local authority curatorial service should be retained and strengthened so that, for example, several can combine together to provide services jointly. The local authority service should be augmented by the formal link of each authority or group of authorities to a university department with current or potential research interests in the area (see section K).

66. Many other problems with PPGs 15 and 16 lie not with their content, but with their implementation. The perceived unfairness of the present system is problematic. A developer in one place may have no planning constraint, whereas an identical development next door which happens to affect an archaeological site may have a prohibitively expensive constraint. Constant competition for every job, no matter how small, results in great inefficiencies and unnecessarily large overheads to cover pre-emptive research and preparation for failed tenders. Monitoring on a job-by-job basis is expensive, and researchers or fieldworkers in competition for work do not readily exchange information or ideas. As units now compete across England, the local expertise of those who carry out archaeological work is decreasing. Competition on cost tends to drive down the quality of work, impair morale and career structure, and to remove costs that have long-term benefit such as training. In addition local communities are cut off from knowledge derived from archaeological activity.

67. Museums are increasingly unable to find space or funding to maintain long term storage space for archaeological archives. Any revised PPS must consider the long term archiving of excavation results (see Section M).

68. Many submissions have suggested a developer tax which could form a small part of the 'standardised tariff' recommended in the recent Planning Green Paper. Developers would thus become sponsors of archaeological work, rather than clients who are being forced to pay for a product that they rarely have an interest in. This proposal could have a potentially radical impact on the way in which archaeological work could be carried out and commissioned and would

need to be carefully considered. Care should be taken not to undermine the benefits of developer sponsorship which have been nurtured in some areas.

69. There is a growing divide between ‘research’ and ‘rescue’ archaeology, with universities on the one hand becoming divorced from fieldwork and field units on the other hand suffering from a lack of research aims. An increase in the ‘research dividend’ of developer-funded archaeological work is needed, and a re-structuring of priorities so that more of the sites that can contribute to current research agenda are investigated rather than preserved (see section K).

Recommendations

70. The proposed Planning Policy Statement 16 should state that funding for archaeology in mitigation of development projects should always include full provision for assessing, recording, analysing, publishing and archiving the archaeological data in such a way that it is easily accessible to the public. This should form part of the core statement of policy principles and not just be contained in the annexe that recommends best practice. The principle behind such work should be public benefit.

71. Applying the ‘polluter pays’ principle at a strategic rather than an individual level would remove the unfairness of the present system. As noted in many submissions this could be achieved by an increase in the planning application fee to include a levy for environmental mitigation.

72. Urgent consideration should be given to replacing the present system of competitive tendering in developer-funded archaeological investigations by a local franchise system. Franchises should be offered after consultation with the relevant local and national authorities and would need to be reviewed at regular intervals. The mechanisms of who awards the franchises will need to be discussed taking into account local circumstances. Such a system would also ensure greater public accessibility to the past, and also improved protection of the archaeological resource.

73. The local authority curatorial service should be retained and strengthened. Authorities should be able to combine to provide services jointly. The local authority service should be augmented by the formal link of each authority or group of authorities to a university department, with current or potential research interests in the area, who will act as research leader. In addition recognition of the role and importance of museums in preserving the product of archaeology should be considered.

G. Permitted development and sites outside the planning process

74. There is a pressing need to improve the protection of archaeological sites threatened by permitted developments that fall outside the planning process. Agriculture is one of the most destructive (seen, for example, at Verulamium). This includes the problems of class consents relating to monuments statutorily protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Amongst the other areas that have permitted developments are: forestry; military works (the Defence Estate is rich in archaeology, but there is no requirement for any survey or impact assessment prior to the demolition, disposal or removal of structures; however there is a recent history of good practice from the MoD); ecclesiastical works; works by the statutory undertakers; minerals extraction on land and off shore; permitted developments of, for example, the building of small extensions; drainage; dredging; wind farm construction.

75. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill contains proposals to take major infrastructure projects out of the planning system. These include airports and housing currently under consideration.

76. Outside the planning system, agricultural and forestry activities are the most significant threat to archaeology. EH's *Monuments at Risk Survey* (MARS) showed that at least 22,500 monuments have been wholly destroyed since 1945 – a rate of just over one per day over that period. It also showed that approximately 27 per cent of all monuments are in arable cultivation and this continues to be one of the major destructive factors affecting the resource. MARS provides a baseline for regular monitoring of the long-term state of archaeological sites. EH's *Survey of Wetland Monuments at Risk 2002* showed that 11,600 wetland ancient monuments have suffered desiccation and partial destruction in last 50 years, mainly because of drainage and ploughing for agriculture. Twenty per cent of all listed buildings in England are connected with agriculture and in 1992 over 40 per cent of these were 'at risk' or 'vulnerable'.

77. There is poor support for the maintenance of hedges (33 per cent of hedges in England and Wales were lost between 1984-1993) and other traditional field boundaries (for example, only 13 per cent of drystone walls are in good condition). The principles of the scheme introduced to require permission for the removal of hedgerows should be extended to cover other defined changes to the use of land. Other loopholes such as the habitual use as a bridleway creating a binding precedent, regardless of the damage that is being done to archaeological sites, should be closed.

78. At present, the limited mitigation that is possible on agricultural land or in forests is carried out through agri-environment schemes, many of which have the conservation of the natural, rather than the historic, environment as a priority. In addition to Environmentally Sensitive Area and Countryside Stewardship Schemes there are several other environmental incentive mechanisms. In January 2002 DEFRA instigated an Agri-environment Schemes Review which is due to be completed in December 2003, with the implicit intention of streamlining the current schemes. The Curry Commission on Farming and Food (2002) supports a switch from food production subsidies to more environmentally friendly farming practices. There is a need for a comprehensive framework within which these schemes should operate. The conservation of the historic environment operates under different principles from the natural environment and can be equally fragile but without the opportunity for regeneration.

79. There is a danger that there will be insufficient resources either within DEFRA or within the local authorities that advise it to administer the schemes effectively. DEFRA has fewer archaeological advisors than ecologists and has done much less agri-environment related research on the historical environment than on biodiversity. DEFRA should be encouraged to increase research into the archaeological effects of agricultural regimes. All agri-environment schemes should have archaeological input into their operations. Specialist input into such schemes is already in practice in Scotland and Wales.

80. There is an urgent need for a clear definition of what constitutes good farming practice for conservation (of both the natural and historic environment). Such a definition must make reference to all relevant legislation and international treaties. It should apply to all farming activities and should be a pre-requisite for all whole farm support payments.

81. The current payment rates for agri-environment schemes do not encourage take-up either because they do not compensate for the loss of high value crops, or because they are not as widely available as they should be or because insufficient funds are available. There is an urgent need to redress this imbalance.

82. A high priority for change is the removal of the class consent system for Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under this system, a site which had a particular agricultural regime during the five years before scheduling is allowed to continue this regime, however damaging it may be. The recognition by scheduling of the national importance of a monument is incompatible with an agricultural regime which continues to cause its destruction. This is a

significant problem: the *State of the Historic Environment Report 2002* (SHER) notes that 790 Scheduled Monument Consent cases were logged by EH in 2001-02.

83. The provision for archaeological protection and promotion within the Forestry Commission is particularly inadequate. The Forestry Commission holds around 388,000 hectares in England and Wales (and 665,000 hectares in Scotland), and currently has one permanent archaeological post. By comparison, the National Trust holds around 250,000 hectares in England and Wales and currently has 14 permanent archaeological posts. The Forestry Commission also administers woodland agri-environment schemes which, if designed without archaeological input, can actively damage the historic environment.

84. There is a lack of resources including staff and volunteers to carry out surveys and site monitoring in rural areas. This significantly affects our ability to increase our knowledge of new sites or quantify the damage to known sites.

Recommendations

85. Those elements of the historic environment identified as of particular importance, whatever the nature of the development, should be brought within the planning system. Permitted development exemptions should be removed.

86. A comprehensive framework for agri-environment schemes, giving proper recognition to the historical environment is needed. Improving agri-environment schemes will necessitate more resources for survey and site monitoring.

87. The system of class consents permitted by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, whereby Scheduled Ancient Monuments continue to be damaged by agricultural operations, should be abolished.

H. Maritime and Industrial Heritage

Maritime heritage

88. We have a rich resource for maritime archaeology including submerged historical landscapes. Since the passing of the National Heritage Act 2002 the management of England's marine cultural heritage passed from DCMS to EH but the Government did not transfer adequate resources to EH to enable it adequately to fulfil its responsibilities. In Wales Cadw is responsible and in Scotland Historic Scotland, while the Welsh and Scottish Royal Commissions are responsible for the maritime record. Greater public and government awareness is needed to appreciate the value of coastal and marine archaeology as a resource to aid understanding of coastal erosion and climate change.

89. It is vital that development in the marine and coastal environment is subject to systems and procedures for the protection and management of our coastal and underwater cultural heritage. The principles affecting the practice on land (see section F) would be beneficial to development in marine areas. The Aggregates Levy, which is due to be reviewed, must include provision for environmental mitigation.

90. The legislative framework is inadequate, as demonstrated by the Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee's (JNAPC) proposals *Heritage Law at Sea*. Generally for the UK there has only been limited archaeological survey of marine and coastal areas, where it has been carried out it shows a high density of sites. Of the identified sites and historic wrecks only a few are formally recognised. Such protection as there is for wrecks does not cover all the threats to which they are subject.

Industrial heritage

91. Britain played a leading part in the Industrial Revolution. Industry has had a major impact on the landscape and environment and often the land can be contaminated. Industrial archaeology is the extant archaeology, much of which falls within the built heritage (it also includes mining sites). Industrial archaeology has developed over the last 40 years as a successful partnership between professional archaeologists and volunteers. Nevertheless the approach lacks overall co-ordination.

92. The evidence of industrial archaeology is concerned with a recent and often memorable past and can often be highly relevant to local communities. It is not simply the extant sites themselves that are important but also the communities which are associated with them. The industrial past needs to be assessed in any Local Cultural Strategies and there needs to be a greater awareness of industrial archaeology to result in stricter planning guidance, with industrial archaeology specialists being involved in the statutory consultation process for important planning cases.

93. Despite the obvious potential industrial archaeology has for attracting tourism (see section D), which in some places is being realised, at a local level remains of industrial heritage are often perceived as a threat to regeneration where communities wish to sweep away evidence of a recent and ugly past. Industrial sites need to be recorded in SMRs.

94. Hitherto industrial archaeology has hardly gained recognition on undergraduate archaeology courses and there is a lack of appreciation amongst many mainstream archaeologists of the specialist skills required in this field. There is an urgent need to establish centres of excellence in universities for industrial archaeology.

Recommendations

95. Improve the legislative framework for marine archaeology.

96. The new statutory status for Sites and Monuments Records should include coastal, marine and industrial records.

97. Encourage a joined-up approach between various coastal agencies including Crown Estate, Harbour Authorities, Association of British Ports (in addition to the ministerial inter-departmental government committee, as proposed in section A) to secure best practice for protection.

98. Industrial archaeology should be a material consideration in urban and other regeneration areas, enabling a more holistic approach.

99. Ensure industrial archaeology is not neglected in higher education and that appropriate skills are taught in undergraduate archaeology courses.

I. Portable Antiquities

100. Two recent initiatives, the Treasure Act 1996 and the Portable Antiquities Scheme, have begun to transform our understanding of the moveable archaeological heritage. However, there are problems. The former is very limited in scope and is under-resourced, while the latter rests on very insecure foundations. There is also a need to take further measures to inhibit the looting of archaeological sites and the sale of illegally-removed objects. The Treasure Act provides statutory protection for all finds classed as treasure (currently gold and silver objects more than 300 years old and groups of coins from the same find and from 1 January 2003 deposits of prehistoric base-metal objects) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. (In Scotland, all

ownerless objects are the property of the Crown under the legal principle of *bona vacantia*, although the Crown only claims some finds.) Treasure finds are the property of the Crown and are offered to museums. Finders and landowners receive a reward fixed at the full market value of the find, as determined by an independent committee. The Treasure Act has been criticised because the payment of rewards set at the full market value is said to encourage treasure hunting. While this remains a risk, the alternative - to pay a reduced reward or none at all - would contravene the Human Rights Act and would undoubtedly lead to a great reduction in the numbers of finds being reported. However, some finders and landowners waive their rights to a reward at present and more could be done to encourage such responsible behaviour.

101. The great majority of archaeological objects found by the public (over 95 per cent) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland fall outside the scope of the Act and have no statutory protection. The Portable Antiquities Scheme complements the Treasure Act by encouraging members of public to voluntarily report all archaeological objects to finds liaison officers. The objects are returned after recording.

102. Currently most of the finders are metal-detector users. Ninety per cent of all objects recorded by the Portable Antiquities Scheme come from cultivated land. Metal-detecting is in most cases the only investigation method to cover such land that is vulnerable to agricultural damage. In cases where such land is under threat of erosion the accurate and precise recording of finds can be an effective monitor of damage.

103. The Portable Antiquities Scheme currently consists of eleven pilots funded by the DCMS, covering rather less than half of England and Wales. The work of the finds liaison officers has been greatly welcomed by finders and has generally been acknowledged as very successful (also as endorsed by the submissions). In four years over 100,000 objects have been recorded and many new archaeological sites have been revealed (in Norfolk alone metal-detecting has led to the discovery of 40 new Anglo-Saxon cemeteries). The data is published on the Scheme's website (www.finds.org.uk) and is being passed on to SMRs.

104. The initiative has generally been acknowledged to be one of the most important current advances in public archaeology. It monitors agricultural damage, improves community involvement in archaeology (see section D), fosters social inclusion, and educates the less responsible metal-detectorists who may be motivated by profit.

105. Yet the funding of the Scheme has been very uncertain. From 2003 to 31st March 2006, thanks to a successful bid to the HLF, the Scheme will be expanded to cover the whole of England and Wales. However, the Government has not yet made any commitment about the future of the Scheme. The Government will need to ensure that all the goodwill and change in attitudes that has been achieved through the Scheme is not allowed to be dissipated when lottery funding ceases. The consequences of ceasing to fund the Portable Antiquities Scheme after that date would be disastrous for our understanding of our heritage. The Minister's statement in the House of Lords on 10 October 2002 that the Government will 'give active thought to the question of the long-term sustainability of the Scheme' is welcome, but it will be essential that this statement of good intent is translated into action.

106. The policy of providing statutory protection to only a limited number of finds, while having a voluntary scheme to record all the others, is not paralleled elsewhere in Europe. It has evolved to suit the conditions in England and Wales and APPAG believes that this approach provides the best way forward. Compulsory reporting of all archaeological finds would be bureaucratic, very expensive to operate and impossible to enforce. Metal-detecting and other forms of amateur fieldwork cannot effectively carry out surveys and monitoring without professional help, and the Portable Antiquities Scheme is ideally placed to offer such help. Investment in a permanent Scheme would unlock an enormous voluntary resource. The Scheme

also has implications for both museums and SMRs, as well as community archaeology developments (see sections D and M).

107. There is a concern regarding metal-detecting rallies. While many of these are small-scale and limited to members of a particular club, others can be major events, attracting hundreds of participants from all over the country and abroad. Such rallies are totally unregulated and recording finds at them - where the organisers have invited archaeologists to be present - presents great difficulties. We urge the National Council for Metal Detecting to introduce a Code of Practice for metal-detecting rallies, which whilst not legally enforceable, would stand as an example of good practice.

108. The Treasure Act has already led to a tenfold increase in reported finds and it will be extended from 2003 to include deposits of prehistoric base-metal objects. However, the success of the Act has placed substantial strains on the system. The British Museum, for example, has estimated that the Treasure Act and the Portable Antiquities Scheme have between them taken the time of ten additional posts, for which the Museum has not been funded at all. Although the purpose of the Act is to enable museums to acquire treasure finds for public benefit, museums have to raise the money to pay for rewards. Some areas of England, such as some districts of Cambridgeshire, Kent and Northamptonshire, fall outside the collecting areas of any regional museum. Although there are funds that provide grants to museums for acquisitions, none provides full funding and not all museums have the resources or expertise to apply for grants. Important finds have recently had to be returned because museums have been unable to raise the money. If museums are unable to acquire treasure finds when they would like to do so, the Treasure Act is failing in its purpose. The total value of treasure finds found in 2000 that went before the Treasure Valuation Committee was just under £1 million.

Recommendations

109. The Government should give long-term support (i.e. beyond April 2006 when Heritage Lottery Fund funding ceases) to the network of finds liaison officers which is to be established across the whole of England and Wales under the Portable Antiquities Scheme. Such a development needs to be seen in the context of both regional and local museums as well as inputs to Sites and Monuments Records. The Government should also provide resources for analogous schemes in Scotland and Northern Ireland, adapted to local conditions.

110. The Government should ensure that the British Museum and other bodies should be fully funded for the additional burdens placed on them by the Treasure Act.

111. Resources should be provided from the Heritage Lottery Fund and the V&A/Resource Purchase Grant Fund for treasure finds. Greater help is required for small museums on how to apply for funding. An urgent review of museum collecting areas is needed. A similarly funded system is needed to provide rewards for Treasure Trove finds in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

J. Illicit trade in antiquities

112. Recent reports have identified the damage caused by the looting of sites to recover antiquities for sale in the international market as one of the major causes of destruction of the archaeological resource in the world today. Although the damage principally affects sites abroad, there is also a significant problem of looting of archaeological sites within the UK and there is undoubtedly a significant trade in such looted antiquities. London is one of the biggest centres of the art and antiquities market. Criminal metal-detecting and other forms of vandalism to archaeological sites remain a problem, despite the educational work of the pilot Portable Antiquities Scheme so far.

113. The interest taken by the present Government in this issue is welcomed, including the establishment of the Advisory Panel on the Illicit Trade which is acting as a catalyst for change. The Panel published its report in December 2000 and this was warmly welcomed by the Minister and also by interested parties. However, the Group is very concerned that only one of the sixteen recommendations in the Report - accession to the 1970 UNESCO Convention - has so far been implemented.

114. Although this is in itself a very positive step, as it makes a very clear signal to the international community that the UK Government is serious in its desire to tackle the problem of the illicit trade in antiquities, it needs to be remembered that the Government has acceded to the Convention on the basis that no new legislative measures are needed. However, the Panel's report also recommended that there should be a new criminal offence of dishonestly importing, dealing in or being in possession of any cultural object illegally excavated, or removed from any monument or wreck contrary to local law. This recommendation is being brought forward by Richard Allan, MP, as a Private Member's Bill in the current session of Parliament. Such an offence, with a proposed maximum penalty of 7 years' imprisonment, would send out a much stronger signal to those who may be tempted to deal in illicit antiquities than accession to the UNESCO Convention and would have a major impact on curbing the illicit trade. It should also help to reduce the looting of sites in the UK. This bill will have effect in England, Wales and Northern Ireland but not Scotland. This will create a potential loophole whereby illegally removed objects could be imported into the UK via Scotland. It is important that a parallel measure is passed through the Scottish Parliament without delay.

115. Objects looted from abroad regularly appear on the market in this country and are then exported. Objects that have been in this country for less than 50 years are not normally referred to the expert advisers. The latter are mostly the staff of the national museums who can be expected to have some knowledge of the market and be alert to objects that may be illegally exported. Clearly most looted objects will fall into this category. It is a matter of concern if the Government is granting export licences for objects that have been stolen or illegally removed and then illegally exported from their countries of origin. Furthermore, all objects found in the soil or the territorial waters of the UK that are more than 50 years old require a licence, regardless of their value. However many archaeological objects from the UK are offered for sale on the Internet in currencies which make it clear that they are likely to be sold abroad. The Report of the Illicit Trade Advisory Panel recommended that checks should be carried out on cultural goods imported into the UK within the last 50 years and that the Export Licensing Unit at the DCMS should be strengthened. Despite the fact that it is now two years since the Report was published, these have still not been carried out in full.

Recommendations

116. The Government should implement the recommendations of its own Advisory Panel on Illicit Trade in full. It should give priority to having more experts in cultural objects to advise on export licences and to establishing databases of stolen cultural objects.

117. The Government should ensure that the proposed criminal offence of dealing in illegally removed cultural objects passes through Parliament in the current session and the Scottish Parliament should pass a parallel measure.

118. The Government (especially the DCMS) needs to be much more proactive into warning potential exporters of illegally removed objects of their legal obligation to obtain licences. The law should be properly implemented and monitored.

K. Education and Research

119. Archaeology has for much of its history been the preserve of the dedicated amateur and, more recently, of academia; many of the issues raised in the submissions and evidence seek to broaden the base of archaeological education. The archaeological record cannot be claimed by any particular section of the community and is therefore the property and responsibility of all. The general public have been educated to value their natural environment, and should be encouraged to place equal value on their historic environment. Every schoolchild knows that taking birds' eggs or smuggling endangered species is wrong, and heavy sentences are meted out to offenders. Destroying habitats or hunting wild animals is deplored by many; yet few place the same value on the historic environment (which, unlike the natural, cannot be regenerated). Vandalism and looting of archaeological sites or the smuggling of archaeological objects are often seen as victimless crimes and punished accordingly. Education has an important role to play in raising awareness of archaeological vandalism and looting as a serious matter so that all those in key positions - the police, Crown Prosecution Service and judiciary - recognise such activities as a crime against society as well as against individual site owners. Early enactment of the proposed criminal offence is an urgent priority.

120. Archaeology offers intellectual, physical, social and interpersonal skills. Improvements to the education system in respect of archaeology should take place at all levels. The Government has recognised the cultural importance of archaeology and the historic environment (*A Force for Our Future*). The provision of an adequate educational basis is essential to build on our understanding and presentation of the past. For example, prehistory does not feature in the national curriculum in England. Over 99 per cent of the period of man's presence in Britain took place before the arrival of the Romans and the UK is the only European state to neglect prehistory in this way. The study of archaeology at GCSE, AS and A-level promotes a wide variety of skills relevant to other aspects of the curriculum from science through to geography, but in 2002 only 2,000 students sat archaeology at GCSE, AS or A-level. Certain periods of history are largely neglected in the present syllabus such as the medieval period which is rich in archaeological material. Archaeology as an exam subject should be promoted in a wider number of schools and heritage should be a module in the new citizenship syllabus; many organisations have useful experience to contribute. The Group heard evidence that it is difficult to gain entry to teacher training colleges with a single honours degree in archaeology. This is highly damaging to the current and future practice of archaeology in the UK. Archaeology is a mixture of the arts and science and should be considered as an acceptable entry degree.

121. All schools that teach either history or archaeology rely on the teaching resources of museums or historic sites. The need to ensure adequate funding of local museums has been recognised by the Government in *Renaissance in the Regions* but the spending settlement of £70 million for this Project announced by the Government in October falls far short of what is needed to have an impact (see section M). School education would be assisted by provision of museum outreach officers.

122. Provision of archaeological education has largely rested within the universities with some 56 currently providing archaeology courses and 5,425 students taking degrees in archaeology in 2000-01. There has been an overall increase from 1996-2001 in the total numbers of students studying archaeology, full or part-time, under- or post-graduate with some evidence for a slight decrease in 2001-02. Of these it is estimated that approximately 10 or 15 per cent will emerge with a serious interest in archaeology as a career; this number greatly exceeds the number of opportunities for employment in the sector.

123. While most graduates do not intend to use their degree in a professional capacity, there are skills shortages on graduation which have not been adequately addressed by undergraduate

courses. These include, for example, fieldwork and the handling of finds, both of which are vital to a full appreciation of the subject.

124. A number of submissions focused on the cost of a university degree and associated training, in a job market that was extremely poorly paid. The lack of secure career progression and a reduction in the posts that are available in museums and conservation has forced many highly qualified archaeologists to abandon the discipline altogether. The future consequences of the loss of some of the brightest in the discipline will have long term effects, with a skills crisis in some areas being almost inevitable.

125. Whilst further education courses, through accreditation, have an important role in providing an entry into archaeology, archaeology is also a very popular subject for pleasure/leisure learning, but the Higher Education Funding Council for England will not fund courses unless they lead to accreditation.

126. Thanks to large amount of time devoted to the subject on television and the radio, archaeology has become a popular subject and these programmes play an increasingly important role in educating the public about archaeology. It is therefore important that the subject should be promoted in a responsible way to emphasise the threat faced by the historic environment and the role the public has in its protection.

127. None of the laudable aims of protection, conservation, education and access can be achieved without knowledge of the past. Such knowledge is the outcome of research without which we do not know what data to collect or what to record. Millions of pounds are spent on archaeology each year in Britain, yet only about 5 per cent of this is dedicated to research and development. Adequate resources must be found for a programme of funding excavations of sites of high research interest. Such a programme could assist in placing the results of evaluations carried out in a development context into an adequate academic framework.

128. At present there are seven research councils, covering the sciences, economic and social research, and the natural environment. All seven are established under Royal Charters, and their central role is to define the overall strategic framework for research, training and knowledge transfer within their subject area, as well as providing funding for research and acting collectively as a source of independent research policy advice to government. The lack of any research council for arts and humanities researchers, who constitute 23 per cent of staff in the UK higher education sector, has long been an anomaly. APPAG believes the government should accept the advice of its own steering group report (commissioned by the DfES) which recommends that the Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB) should become a formally constituted research council for the arts and humanities (which includes archaeology, conservation and museums studies).

129. Poor communication between specialists, and between specialists and non-specialists, has impeded research. In addition, the AHRB is geared to providing funding for individual scholars, and does not consider collaborative teamwork proposals. Moreover, in the practice of professional fieldwork and post-excavation analysis, it is true to say that much of the work is done in relative isolation; it is rare for two organisations to cooperate to any great extent. This is in part due to the current competitiveness.

130. There is a clear role for university departments to carry out research on the effects and effectiveness of many of the matters raised in this report, especially bearing in mind the impact of archaeological activity in the public sphere.

131. Many submissions have drawn attention to the shrinking numbers of experts in particular fields; there is a need to maintain a basic national minimum of practical knowledge which is in

danger of being lost. English Heritage have for many years funded a network of regional scientific advisors within universities, who provide free advice on scientific techniques for all archaeologists in the region. This pattern could usefully be followed for other experts, notably on pottery and other artefacts.

132. Many of the submissions draw attention to a crisis in training within archaeology. Because of the way in which research is assessed within universities, it is not in their interests to carry out research and development with a direct link to field training; the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) has positively discriminated against links with the wider discipline. Vocational research is penalised, leading to low RAE scores. Whatever replaces the RAE should be more inclusive, and should acknowledge the fact that archaeology has an independent existence outside universities. Those who monitor research should include those who have an interest in using it, particularly within national agencies which have a strategic role.

133. Recently there has been an emphasis on research of 'international significance' at the expense of research which merely has 'national significance'. This, combined with cheaper accommodation and equipment costs, has led to an increasing amount of university fieldwork being undertaken outside Britain, with a consequent further decrease in the cohesion of the discipline within the UK.

134. Work on integrating and synthesising basic or specific research has been undervalued in RAEs. University researchers are therefore not only isolated from primary data collection in the field, but their expertise is also often excluded from the ultimate product of the discipline: an increased understanding and interest in the past for all of us.

135. The management of the in situ resource needs to be tied in more closely to research. This can nurture identity, whether local, regional or national, and can encourage collaboration and partnership between increasingly divergent groups.

Recommendations

136. National curricula should be reviewed to include archaeology in all relevant courses with special consideration given to regional relevance and devolved countries. Prehistory should be part of all national curricula.

137. The success of archaeology in schools depends on adequate numbers of specialist teachers. Teacher training courses should be made more accessible to those with a single honours degree in archaeology.

138. UK fieldwork and research should be given equal weight with international research in the Research Assessment Exercise, as should research into other aspects of archaeology in terms of society, identity and economics.

139. Research and development should be integrated into all archaeological fieldwork by establishing partnerships between fieldworkers and university departments.

140. The Arts and Humanities Research Board should become a formally constituted research council for the arts and humanities.

141. Funding is needed for archaeology courses in further education for which Higher Education Funding Council for England does not provide.

L. Conservation

142. Conservation techniques used for archaeological artefacts are complex and specialised. Conservation has an impact in three areas: (i) extracting information and preparing publication, (ii) maintaining stability of finds for an indefinite period, (iii) preparing items for display. The lack of funding for conservation, including the closure of laboratories and loss of jobs, most recently in EH and the British Museum, but also in most regional museums, where conservation has been marginalised in many cases, has coincided with an increase in the numbers of objects coming out of the ground and therefore requiring conservation (due to PPG 16). For some archaeological material the conservation process starts as soon as material is encountered in the ground. The conservation crisis has been further underlined by improvements in the provision for wetland and maritime archaeology and the encouragement of amateurs to report finds under the Portable Antiquities Scheme, all of which require higher levels of conservation resource than 'traditional' archaeology. There is a great lack of practical conservation advice which is desperately needed by many small regional museums.

143. Without conservation, heritage remains inaccessible which is counter to all the current efforts towards increased accessibility. 'Best Value' and other 'efficiency' drives have tended to force buying in conservation on a consultancy basis, but this neglects the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the condition of objects. There are no conservation guidelines on what the 'shelf life' of an object is and there is an underlying assumption that it is indefinite.

144. Conservation has become increasingly sophisticated and requires specialised training for which funding is lacking, because conservation falls between arts and sciences. Furthermore conservation is excluded from the European 6th Framework Programme of Research.

145. There is an urgent need for regional conservation centres which would enable good practices to be developed and expertise to be pooled. *Renaissance in the Regions*, if adequately funded, could provide a framework for these. Good practice as exemplified by the Southampton Textile Research centre under the aegis of a university department could be used as a model.

146. VAT at 17.5 per cent on Listed Building repairs is a tax on buildings maintenance. It discourages the routine maintenance that is essential to a building's long term sustainability. It encourages a black market in building services as owners seek to evade VAT and it leads to such distortions as the building of a new roof (zero rated) rather than the repair of an existing one (taxed at 17.5 per cent). The UK is the only country in the European Union that taxes Listed Building repairs at this rate.

Recommendations

147. Regional conservation centres would enable good practices to be developed and expertise to be pooled. The decline in permanent conservation posts across the UK should be monitored and checked. More resources are required for training conservators to meet the skills shortages.

148. It is essential that conservation is integrated into the archaeological process, for example, into the PPS 16 tendering process and into research excavations, with a contingency for the unforeseen circumstance.

149. Harmonise UK rates of VAT on Listed Building maintenance at the same level as other European Union member countries.

M. Museums, Archives and Collections

150. To a large extent museums represent the public face of archaeology. Often it is during visits to museums that children first start to learn about the lives of their ancestors. It is the museums that engage the public's interest, maintain that interest through temporary and permanent displays and serve it through the preservation of the artefacts and archives. Although there is a dearth of accurate statistics on museum activity there are over 80 million visits to the 2000 or so museums in the UK and about half of these contain archaeological collections.

151. Several recent reports, most notably *Renaissance in the Regions*, have recognised a crisis in our regional museums. These include closure of or cuts to regional museums, the continued haemorrhaging of experienced staff, especially those trained in the management of archaeological collections, inadequate leadership and low staff morale. National museums are also facing severe difficulties, most notably the British Museum which is facing a £6.5 million deficit and is having to lose up to 150 staff. There are many other problems, such as the lack of budgets for new acquisitions and in some areas gaps in archaeological collecting areas; for example, certain districts in Cambridgeshire, Kent and Northamptonshire with no museums which have a policy of collecting archaeological objects from their localities. In these areas, there can be no sustainable implementation of 'preservation by record' in the planning process, as outlined in PPG 16. Much fundamental work has to be done to make archaeological archives both accessible and usable. At the same time there has been disproportionate emphasis on marketing at the expense of research, cataloguing and rationalisation. Information technology facilities are often out of date, with the average age of computer equipment being three times the industrial average; half of all museums are not able to update their own websites, and there are inadequate education programmes.

152. Local authorities already have a statutory obligation to run a public library service and it is proposed above that they should have a statutory obligation to maintain SMRs (see section E). There is an equally strong case for giving every local authority a legal duty to provide adequate public museum provision to meet the reasonable needs of those whose residence or place of work is within the area of the authority, or who are undergoing full-time education within that area. The statutory obligation should extend to contributing to the costs of maintaining those services whether provided by the authority or not. Such a provision should, in addition, give the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport the responsibility for promoting the improvement of public museums (where 'public museum' is a museum provided or maintained under an Act of Parliament, or by a local authority, or by a body that is charitable in law). This would make it clear that the DCMS has a responsibility for all museums in England, not just the national museums and Resource.

153. The museums sector does not just include national and local authority museums: university and independent museums also have a major role to play and they have difficulties of their own. For example, although the Government recently ensured that national museums which ceased charging for admission could continue to reclaim VAT, they did not make this same concession available to university museums. In addition university museums are very small players in the higher education sector as a whole which means that they can be accorded a low priority. Under the proposal for a statutory duty set out above, local authorities could discharge their responsibilities by giving grants to university and independent museums where appropriate.

154. A statutory duty on all local authorities to maintain a museums service would also solve the problem of the gaps in collecting areas noted above. Many 'Best Value' exercises, which all local authorities have to undertake, are based on the need for a 2 per cent cut. Museums, for which there is no statutory requirement, fall prey to this and resources for museum staff are given towards answering 'Best Value' scheme needs.

155. Resource's report, *Renaissance in the Regions*, published in October 2001, cogently argued the case for sustained central Government investment in regional museums. This report contained a plan for a programme of investment costed at £267 million over five years in order to bring regional museums to an acceptable standard, through a network of regional 'hubs', museums that would receive significant Government funding (up to five in each of the nine regions of England). The report was welcomed by the Government and there was hope that it would herald a new era for our hard-pressed regional museums (including some university museums). The Government's announcement on 22 October 2002 that *Renaissance* would receive £70 million during the period 2003-06, of which only £30 million is actually new money, was deeply disappointing and indeed puts the whole credibility of the plan to create regional hubs into doubt. It is understood that Resource intends to roll out *Renaissance* to only three of the nine regions in the first instance and the Government has given no guarantees that it will fund the project in full from 2006. We recommend that in the light of this disappointing settlement the Government should review its whole strategy of support for regional museums: it may well be that there is a better method of distributing this much reduced sum. It needs to be stressed that *Renaissance* only applies to England.

156. National museums are supposed to be integrated into the *Renaissance* model as equal partners and the Government has made it clear that it wishes them to expand their links with regional museums. No funding, however, has yet been made available to the national museums to enable them to do this. The relationship between the different national museums and between national and regional museums needs to be clarified and the partnership schemes that are being developed between national and regional museums need to be properly funded and placed on a more regular basis.

157. The problems of storing archaeological archives in our museums have reached critical levels, with 60 per cent of museum stores being severely or badly overcrowded. In many cases museums are having to turn archaeological archives away due to lack of space. In some cases archives have been split for the purposes of 'cherry picking' and archaeological records relating to excavations have sometimes been separated from the finds. Regional resource centres acting also as repositories, modelled on the London Archaeological Archives Research Centre, with all the benefits of research facilities, expert assistance and centralised access to information are universally seen as highly desirable. Much of the increase in archaeological archives is from developer-funded excavations, where no provision is made in the process for developer-funding of the long-term storage costs. Swain's 1999 report provided a baseline survey. There is an urgent need for a coherent policy on disposal and rationalisation of collections, formulated by Resource after broad consultation within the profession. Provision for storage costs should be built into all project designs for developer-funded excavations.

158. In addition there is a severe shortage of staff concomitant with an erosion of scholarship to curate such collections. Without this knowledge, the displays in museums will become static and the experience of the public greatly diminished. There is an urgent need to ensure that there are specialist archaeological curators in each region.

Recommendations

159. The future of the *Renaissance in the Regions* project should be reviewed in the light of the Government's recent disappointing spending settlement.

160. Every local authority should be given a statutory legal duty to provide an adequate public museum service to meet the reasonable needs of those whose residence or place of work is within the area of the authority, or who are undergoing full-time education within that area. The statutory duty should extend to contributing to the costs of maintaining those services whether provided by the authority or not. The partnership schemes that are being developed between national and regional museums need to be properly funded and placed on a more regular basis.

161. **Ensure suitable environmentally controlled storage space is available, to suit the great diversity of archaeological material. One possible solution could be regional repositories (one for each of the nine English regions and one each for Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland), run by trusts with a Heritage Lottery Fund endowment.**

162. **University museums, like others, need to be able to claim back VAT.**

N. Publication and Communication

163. Communication is an essential outcome of any archaeological intervention. Some interventions may produce ephemeral or negative evidence for which extensive publication would not be appropriate. Nevertheless, access to small reports is important to those living in the immediate vicinity. Others may warrant a range of publications from the highly specialised report to the popular book.

164. Some archaeological excavation projects can lead to reports which are highly complex products – the tangible outcome of archaeological interventions. They comprise increasingly specialised contributions which may cover several millennia. The main author is often the excavation/project director (not a period specialist) who is having to work to a very tight brief both in terms of time and budget due to project funding constraints.

165. Despite several formal attempts at policy setting the archaeological report still largely follows the layout established in the 19th century by Pitt-Rivers: summary, description of features, discussion and specialist catalogues/appendices. It is a model that appears to be very robust despite burgeoning specialisation within the discipline and an increasing amount of data. In fact it accommodates the increasing diversity and specialisation of the discipline by enabling a modular approach whereby an apparently unlimited number of contributions can be appended to archaeological reports.

166. The Publication User Needs Survey (PUNS) incorporates a valuable summary on the position of archaeological publication to date and is an excellent baseline survey of user needs. Its recommendations need urgent implementation lest current bad practice becomes so fossilised as to become the starting point for the formulation of future policies.

167. There is wide recognition of the need to produce syntheses of archaeological reports both because of the cost of their reproduction and because of their lack of appeal to most readers. In recognition of this PUNS has suggested a multimedia approach and reiterated a call for more integrated (not defined) publication with the term publication being used to describe dissemination in its broadest sense. One solution to this problem that is increasingly used, for example, by APPAG is that the full data should be published on the Internet and that only a summary account and the conclusions should be published in hard copy. The Archaeology Data Service has an important role to play in setting standards for digital publication and in archiving this material (good examples being the archives of the excavations at Royal Opera House, Covent Garden and Eynsham Abbey which are both available via the ADS website, www.ahds.ac.uk).

168. Despite the attempt at introducing rigorous standards for the management and monitoring of archaeological projects (MAP2), there is a widespread and unquantified backlog of reports awaiting publication. Competitive tendering has encouraged secrecy over the extent of this problem. The PPGs are not specific about post-excavation or publication requirements and often budgets for this work are not forthcoming (see section F). There are no agreed standards for post-excavation work or publication.

169. Much published work languishes in diverse outlets as 'grey literature'. Some synthesis of the 'grey literature' is in hand. Other initiatives such as OASIS aim to provide an online index to the mass of archaeological 'grey literature'.

170. There are several problems with the production of archaeological reports: the writing is poor; the reports are produced at speed to fulfil contract or RAE needs. Many authors would like guidance but generally there is no framework for this in the management of the project. Training in report writing should be a standard part of professional development. The pivotal role that could be played by professional editors (for example, in acting as arbiters between authors and specialists or making judgements about the scale and form of publication) needs formal recognition.

171. Many journals refuse to take reports because they are both too long and expensive to produce and not popular with their readership. Most county journal editors are honorary and do not have the time to advise or do detailed editorial work on extremely complex excavation reports.

172. Publication represents a small fragment of the total cost of an archaeological project. Often commercial criteria are applied to this part of the process so that it is frequently required that such publications should be self-funding, although no other part of an archaeological project meets this criterion. The cost of fieldwork or excavation projects frequently amounts to hundreds of thousands of pounds, and even if modest subsidies for publication were included, these would be dwarfed by the project costs, and yet would make literature far cheaper and available for public consumption. EH subsidises a high proportion of the cost of publication for projects they support, creating problems for those organisations that have no sources of subsidy. In other words the funding source has too much influence on the publication strategy. Together these factors have led to a crisis in the dissemination of archaeological work. The revised PPS or the environmental levy should include provision for both full scholarly publication (in an appropriate medium) and a summary or more popular account as appropriate.

173. Whilst many museums have received substantial funding for individual documentation projects through Designation Challenge Funding, there are still no links between the individual databases. Standards for archives or standard format for recording/documentation (FISH) need to be set as well as standards on what is acceptable in terms of how museums receive archaeological archives. There should be a requirement for all archives to be digitised (as, for example, is done by the ADS and the Cornucopia project).

Recommendations

174. There is an urgent need to reach an agreement on what constitutes an acceptable publication and how it should be disseminated.

175. Post-excavation and publication costs need to be added to development costs to ensure that the developer's duty is not discharged until the information is in the public domain.

176. An urgent survey of the location and extent of 'grey literature' is required together with a national study of the problems of report production.

177. The work of the Archaeology Data Service in making available excavation archives online and in archiving this materially digitally needs to be supported.

List of Abbreviations

AAF	Archaeological Archives Forum
ADS	Archaeology Data Service
AHRB	Arts and Humanities Research Board
ALGAO	Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers
APPAG	All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group
ATF	Archaeological Training Forum (includes the following bodies: ALGAO, CBA, IFA, SCACE, SCAUM, SCFA, IHBC and SMA)
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DEFRA	Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DoT	Department of Transport
EH	English Heritage
FISH	Forum for Information Standards in Heritage
HEF IHBC,	Historic Environment Forum (includes the following bodies: ALGAO, CBA, IFA, Rescue, NT, Society of Antiquaries of London, SCAUM and Heritage Link)
HER	Historic Environment Record
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
IFA	Institute of Field Archaeologists
IHBC	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
JNAPC	Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee
MAP2	<i>Management of Archaeological Projects 2</i> (see References)
MARS	<i>Monuments At Risk Survey</i> (see References)
MIDAS	Monument Inventory Data Standard
MoD	Ministry of Defence
NT	National Trust
OASIS	Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations
ODPM	Office of Deputy Prime Minister
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PUNS	<i>Publication User Needs Survey</i> (see References)
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
SCACE	Standing Conference on Archaeology in Continuing Education
SCAUM	Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers
SCFA	Standing Committee for Archaeology
SHER	<i>State of Historic Environment Report</i> (see References)
SMA	Society of Museum Archaeologists
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record

Selected References

- Aitchison, K 1999 *Profiling the Profession: A Survey of Archaeological Jobs and Job Profiles in the UK*, CBA, EH and IFA
- Aitchison, K 2000 'The funding of archaeological practice in England', *Cultural Trends* 39, 2-32
- ATF 2002 *The Future of Archaeological Training and Career Development: A Major Consultancy*
- Baker, D 1999 *An Assessment of English Sites and Monuments Records for the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers*
- Carter, S and Robertson, A 2002 *Project to Define the Professional Functions and Standards in Archaeological Practice Final Report*, Q West for ATF
- Carver, M et al 1992. *Archaeological Publication, Archives and Collections: towards a National Policy* (British Archaeological News Supplement 7(2)). York: CBA
- CBA 2002 *Comments to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, May 2002 on DEFRA review of agri-environment schemes in England: initial consultation*, <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/conserve/agrischemes.html>
- CBA 2002 *Comments to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, August 2002 DEFRA Policy Review of Woodland Creation in England under the Woodland Grant Scheme and the Farm Woodland Premium Scheme*, <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/conserve/woodland.html>
- Chitty, G 1999 *Rapid Preliminary Review of Archaeological Training*, Hawkshead Archaeology and Conservation
- Cunliffe, BW 1983. *The Publication of Archaeological Excavations. Report of the Joint Working Party of the Council for British Archaeology and the Department of the Environment*, Department of the Environment, London
- Curry Commission Report 2002, *Farming and Food: a sustainable future*
- DCMS 2000, *Report of the Ministerial Advisory Panel on Illicit Trade*
- DCMS 2002 *The Historic Environment, A Force for Our Future*
- DCMS 2002 *Annual Report 2002*
- DCMS 2002 *Portable Antiquities Annual Report 2000-2001*
- DCMS 2002 *Treasure Annual Report 2000*
- DCMS 2002 *The Treasure Act 1996. Code of Practice (Revised) (England and Wales)*
- DNH and Welsh Office 1996, *Protecting our Past*
- DEFRA BD1701 on *The Management of Archaeological Sites in Arable Landscapes*
- English Heritage 2001 *Power of Place: the Future of the Historic Environment*
- English Heritage 2002 *Archaeological Archives: Documentation, Access and Deposition. A Way Forward*
- English Heritage 2002 *State of the Historic Environment Report*
- English Heritage 2002 *Taking to the Water: English Heritage's Initial Policy for The Management of Maritime Archaeology in England*
- Frere, SS 1975 *Principles of Publication in Rescue Archaeology*, Ancient Monuments Board (England), London: DoE
- ICOMOS 2000 *Heritage at Risk*. ICOMOS world report 2000 on monuments and sites in danger, International Council on Monuments and Sites

- Isle of Man. *Policy and Guidance Notes for the Conservation of the Historic Environment of the Isle of Man*, Planning Policy Statement 1/01, Department of Local Government and Environment
- JNAPC's *Heritage Law at Sea: Proposals for Change*
- MAP 2 1991. *The Management of Archaeology Projects*, 2nd edn, London: English Heritage
- MARS Darvill, T, and Fulton, A, 1998, *MARS: The Monuments at Risk Survey of England, 1995: Main Report*, Bournemouth University and English Heritage
- National Assembly for Wales. 2002. *Planning Policy Wales*, March 2002
- Northern Ireland Executive. *Planning Archaeology and the Built Heritage*, Planning Policy Statement 6, Department of the Environment and Planning
- PPG 15 1994 *Planning Policy Guidance Note 15. Planning and the Historic Environment*, Department of the Environment, Department for National Heritage
- PPG 16 1990 *Planning Policy Guidance Note 16. Archaeology and Planning*, Department of the Environment
- PUNS Jones, S, MacSween, A, Jeffrey, S, Morris, R, Heyworth, M 2001 *From the Ground Up, The Publication of Archaeological Projects: a User Needs Survey*, CBA
- Resource 2001 *Using Museums, Archives and Libraries to Develop a Learning Community. A Strategic Plan for Action*
- Resource 2001 *Renaissance in the Regions: A New Vision for England's Museums*
- Resource 2002 *UK Museum Needs Assessment*
- Resource 2002 *Benchmarks in Collection Care for Museums, Archives and Libraries Preserving the Past for the Future: Towards a National Framework for Collections Management*
- Scottish Executive. National Planning Policy Guideline 18, *Planning and the Historic Environment*, April 1999
- Scottish Office. National Planning Policy Guideline 5, *Archaeology and Planning*
- Selwood, S (ed.) 2001 *The UK Cultural Sector: Profile and Policy Issues* London: Policy Studies Institute
- Stephenson, P *Archaeological Training: Fieldwork Skills and Training Excavations*
- Swain, H, Rennie, A, Suenson-Taylor, K 1998 *A Survey of Archaeological Archives in England*, EH and Museums and Galleries Commission
- Swain, H and Suenson-Taylor, K 1999 *Models for the Curation of Archaeological Archives in England*, Museum of London
- Valletta Convention 1992 *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Revised), Valletta 16.1.1992