



ADVICE NOTE for POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers

www.algao.org.uk

October 2015

Contents

1. Preface
2. Introduction
3. Background
4. Post-excavation assessment and the planning process
5. What is PXA?
6. When is a PXA needed?
7. Why is a PXA needed?
8. What are the objectives of a PXA?
9. What should a PXA contain?
10. The Role of the Specialist
11. Who is the PXA for?
12. Accompanying Strategies: the Updated Project Design
13. Conclusion
14. References

Annexe 1 Glossary

1 Preface

Following the completion of archaeological fieldwork, it is standard practice for a post-excavation assessment (PXA) to be undertaken. This work will assess the potential of the site archive to contribute significantly to archaeological knowledge. The statement of significance and the proposal for further analysis largely determine the nature of the final report, how it will be disseminated and, very importantly, the resources required for this. Post-excavation assessment (PXA) is therefore a vital stage in the archaeological process.

While there is some common ground regarding the objectives of a PXA, the experience of practitioners (contributors to PXAs and planning advisors) is that there is considerable disparity in how they are produced, the level of detail included, and their accuracy, particularly in scoping and resourcing the extent and type of analyses to meet the publication objectives. This is because post-excavation assessment is often a highly complex process reflecting the nature of the archaeological evidence itself and can be open to a range of interpretations.

Although existing guidance by Historic England and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists provide essential frameworks for post-excavation assessment (see below), further advice is needed to provide the necessary level of consistency and quality for both planning and professional requirements, and to provide a more 'level playing field' for contractors: to make the process of PXA easier and, crucially, less resource-intensive for both the producers of PXA reports and planning advisors.

Against this background, the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) has undertaken to provide an advice note which sets out the objectives and tasks that are necessary to achieve an effective post-excavation assessment, and the successful completion of archaeological projects generated by development controlled through the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012). We hope that this will guide and inform all those involved in PXA and promote constructive discussion and liaison between planning advisors, the producers of PXAs and other stakeholders (e.g. the academic community, special interest groups and local communities).

2 Introduction

ALGAO: England is the national body representing local government archaeology services which provide advice to nearly all Local Planning Authorities in the country. ALGAO members are senior professional archaeologists employed by local authorities to provide advice on archaeological conservation and management. This advice note has been prepared by ALGAO: England, with the assistance of East Anglian Archaeology Editorial Board, to complement existing guidance from Historic England and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, and to help practitioners conduct assessments that are able to shape the analytical work required for the production of effective, authoritative, synthetic reports of excavations and other projects.

An ALGAO East workshop held in 2003, *Re-engineering the Archaeological Process*, led to a Writers' Workshop on 'assessing significance' and 'research focus' post-fieldwork in 2006. A second Writers' Workshop in 2007 was dedicated to post-excavation assessment, and the request for guidance and advice on this subject came from delegates at the workshop. Post-excavation Assessment (PXA) had long been the subject of considerable discussion at conferences, workshops and in various archaeological organisations. While there is some common ground regarding the objectives of a PXA, there is great disparity in how they are produced, the amount of detail presented in them, successful resourcing and their accuracy. Furthermore, there seems to be some doubt as to how and when they should be undertaken, by whom, and what should be included.

The purpose of this advice note is to provide guidance in the first stage of post-excavation work: the assessment of newly-acquired fieldwork evidence. It provides a brief outline of the objectives and tasks that are considered necessary for the effective management of programmes of archaeological post-excavation work that will enable the selection of appropriate analytical methods and lead to the successful publication of intellectually robust results;

For the purposes of this advice note, ALGAO members are referred to as 'planning advisors', archaeological specialists and contractors as 'practitioners'.

3 Background

Archaeology was formally recognised as a material consideration of the planning process following the Government's publication of Policy Planning Note 16: *Archaeology and Planning* in 1990, commencing an intense period of consolidation of the methods, practice and behaviours among newly emerging commercial archaeological organisations and specialist experts, and curatorial and SMR staff based mainly in local authorities. English Heritage (now Historic England) had just published *Management of Archaeological Projects* (1989): a model for archaeological project management based on the requirements of large-scale archaeological projects undertaken or funded by them. Revised two years later (and becoming colloquially known as MAP2), it developed as detailed guidance to assist practitioners through all stages of planning, implementing, analysing, disseminating and archiving archaeological investigation projects. Central to the post-excavation section of the MAP 2 guidance was the data and artefact review, in order that an assessment of the potential for analyses of various kinds could be determined, or, if none was merited, to indicate this. This time limited assessment would assist with the process of redefining the project's research objectives, while the focus of analysis would be led by the technical or academic experts appointed to a) assess the data/remains, b) to synthesise the analyses, and c) to conserve unstable remains. The use of experienced, accredited specialist project advisors, either based in-house or sub-contracted, was clear in the guidance.

MAP 2 was replaced by MoRPHE (Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment) in 2006, which was developed to assist with the delivery of English Heritage's research strategy for 2005-2010 and was complemented by a series of detailed Project

Planning Notes and Technical Guides. Setting out models of best practice in project management, decision making and research work, MoRPHE principles were prepared so that they could be applied across a range of project types within any aspect of historic environment research. Of relevance here, Planning Policy Note 3: Archaeological Excavation (PPN 3: 2008) expanded on procedures set out in previous guidance documents, reiterating the focus on the quality of the research strategy and the experts who should be identified as part of the project team, as well as the all-important review stages integral to every project. Described within the document as a *technique*, PPN 3 is a fulsome guide to archaeological assessment and should be used to guide the management of all archaeological investigations.

Professional standards and guidance documents were also prepared by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (now the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) during this period, first producing the *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation* in 1995 with a section on procedures for post-excavation processes and management, and later the *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (2001). With self-explanatory titles, these strategy documents were governed by the professional ethical codes published in the early days of professional institution: the *Code of Conduct* in 1985 seeking to define and underscore professionalism within the discipline, and the *Code of approved practice for the regulation of contractual arrangements in archaeology* in 1990, corresponding to the changes in the UK planning system and the commercialisation of archaeological work. The codes and Standards and guidance documents have been routinely revisited and updated since their initial creation.

4 PXA and the planning process

The majority of archaeological projects undertaken in the UK are initiated through the planning process, and it is therefore essential that the link with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is properly maintained throughout the life of the project. The archaeological planning advisor provides advice to the LPA on programme requirements and the efficacy of written schemes of investigation put forward by practitioners or consultants on behalf of their clients.

All archaeological schemes regulated through the planning process need to be tracked by the planning advisor, who will inform the LPA of progress on the scheme. They will also advise the LPA of any problems that may arise during its implementation, either in the field or during the post-excavation stage, which might prevent the planning condition securing the archaeological work from being discharged.

The example planning condition in paragraph 37 of the Historic England *Good Practice Advice Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment* makes specific reference (in bold below) to the requirement for a PXA to have been fulfilled before a planning condition is discharged:

No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been [submitted to and] approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives; and:

- *The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works*
- ***The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI'***

The PXA is, therefore, a crucial reporting stage of the project as it enables the planning advisor to see how the future analytical phase is shaped by the materials and stratigraphic assessments and to understand what impact the work has had and will have upon the archaeological record at local, regional and/or national levels. As part of the regulatory process, it will also be used by the planning advisor to check the compliance of the scheme with the project's aims and research objectives originally stated in the brief and the corresponding Written Scheme of Investigation. If there is a divergence from the aims and objectives, the PXA report should explain the reasons why a change is necessary. Such reasons should not be cost-related, describing an under-resourcing of the stated aims due to underestimation made at the WSI preparation stage. The report should explain instead why the pursuit of certain assessment trajectories would not provide valuable return in terms of information quality and, therefore, impact. If no explanation is given, the work undertaken may be considered ill-conceived or sub-standard and possibly incur enforcement action.

It is an essential part of the planning advisor's role to monitor the quality of development-led archaeological programmes (see section 11 of *Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services*, ClfA 2014), to inform and update the LPA on progress and to verify that it is on target for completion within the duration of the planning condition. Good communication between the practitioner and the planning advisor, who mainly acts in a supporting role, is crucial to the success of the scheme. Where a problem has arisen, the planning advisor will work in partnership with the LPA to move towards resolving the matter, where appropriate to do so. As a last resort this could involve the use of enforcement action against the developer, since it is ultimately their responsibility to ensure the successful implementation of the approved Written Scheme of Investigation, a binding planning document.

5 What is Post-excavation assessment?

Post-excavation assessment is a distinct stage of archaeological project management that:

- Quantifies recovered data and evidence from all stages of work at a site, describing its range, character and date;
- Indicates those areas of the recovered data/ remains that provide no further information that would change understanding beyond the assessment stage;
- Provides statements of the potential for relevant aspects of the evidence to continue forward to a stage(s) of detailed analysis, providing appropriate justification for this;
- Identifies appropriate analytical techniques to be used in further analysis;
- Provides a statement of the combined potential of all areas of analysis and indicates the significance of the research as assessed against the appropriate regional research agenda
- Provides a retention strategy and quantified description of the future physical archive;
- Sets out how the full archive report for the site will be prepared, delivered and stored, and
- How the results will be disseminated.

The PXA is an appraisal of the character and significance of information and material evidence acquired through archaeological projects. Typically a stage of work related to excavation, it takes place after the fieldwork phase(s) has been completed – whether this is in the form of landscape or historic building survey, detailed archaeological excavation (often following evaluation), or some combination of the three. The results of PXA are usually presented in a report undertaken by the principal investigating practitioner, supported by specialist contributors on, for example, individual artefact categories, environmental and scientific assessments, cartographic or historic documentary appraisals, GIS/survey data, or other thematic studies.

All excavations should be subject to post excavation assessment. It is a crucial stage, serving as the critical point at which the resources necessary to fulfil the agreed programme of works can be appraised. It enables:

1. Project tracking – so that the programme can be delivered within the previously-agreed budget and timeframe;
2. Renewed project scoping – to refine the type of analysis required to develop an understanding of the material and stratigraphic remains. If unplanned methods of analysis are identified and justified at this stage, additional resources can be renegotiated with the project sponsor or funding agent, and a new scope of work approved by the archaeological advisor before the commencement of an agreed programme of detailed analytical work.

The post-excavation assessment should result in a written statement of intention. This may take one of two forms that will be dependent on the character and complexity of the recovered remains: either as a PXA report or as a PXA statement (see below). The sites for which a PXA statement can be produced are usually self-evident during fieldwork, for instance sites that have produced small assemblages and/or from dispersed or low-density feature evidence with little stratigraphic distinction. However, formal agreement to by-pass the compilation of a PXA report needs to be made by the planning advisor as soon as the nature of the archaeological evidence is understood.

- **PXA Report**

This is the default requirement of the archaeological investigation programme, and involves the delivery of a clearly-organised, suitably illustrated PXA report containing a summary site narrative, descriptions of the evidence acquired through excavation, and statements of potential produced by accredited specialists on the various material and environmental remains that have been subject to preliminary assessment. This report should be accompanied by an updated project design (UPD), articulating how the final archive report will be produced, in what time frame, what it will comprise (including comparative work and synthesis of the current data) and stating its research objectives (see section 8 below). It will provide details of further analysis required for specific material or biological remains; how the analyses will be presented and disseminated; the publication and/or media method; how the archive will be prepared for deposition with an approved facility and will importantly include the transfer of title document. A PXA report is expected to be produced for most archaeological investigations, and must be proportionate to the site's significance.

or

- **PXA Statement**

Where archaeological evidence is uncomplicated and limited in scale and significance, a short, simple statement can be prepared by the Project Manager/report author, providing tabulated data to support a summary site narrative and relevant site plan(s). It should indicate that general post-excavation methods outlined in the Written Scheme of Investigation are sufficient to enable a full archive report to be prepared for deposition with the local Historic Environment Record within an agreed time period, followed by the preparation of a relevant publication text, as necessary, and the completion/deposition of the project archive in accordance with the transfer of title document embedded within the PX statement. There may be a requirement to obtain absolute dates or other evidence either to support or expand upon the site narrative, and this should be acknowledged, and the necessary, perhaps additional, resources confirmed at this stage.

ALGAO briefs typically require that a PXA report be prepared for all full investigation schemes and be presented to the planning advisor within six months of completing the fieldwork unless there are justifiable grounds for delay on the advice of the practitioners or their specialists. If so, a change in the timescale for delivery should be agreed with the advisor in advance.

6 When is a PXA needed?

Not all excavation schemes warrant a separate, detailed phase of post-excavation assessment, the production of which would unnecessarily consume resources. For instance, where only small artefact assemblages have been recovered from sites with uncomplicated contexts and stratigraphic evidence and there is limited potential for environmental or scientific research, the production of a PXA report would exceed reporting requirements. In such cases, a PXA Statement should be presented to the planning advisor requesting their agreement to waive the need for a stand-alone PXA report.

This formal agreement is a necessary requirement, as the change from the intended detailed audit and the delivery of the PXA report constitutes a **departure** from the approved Written Scheme of Investigation, which is a binding document within the planning process. Moreover, as changes to the WSI usually have financial and resource implications, these changes need to be transparent within the planning process to safeguard against appeals by planning applicants or their successors in title, or enforcement by the LPA. To by-pass the PXA stage the LPA archaeological advisor will need an outline of the planned methods and scope of works that will enable the full archive report to be produced for deposition with the Historic Environment Record.

In most cases, PXA reports are not required for historic building recording programmes, unless it is apparent that further specialist documentary, social history or map-based research will form key elements of the archive report. Information flow between the archaeological project manager, in some cases a specialist sub-contractor, and the planning advisor will enable an agreement to be made in this regard so long as it is proportionate to the significance of the evidence and justifiable in planning terms.

7 Why is a PXA needed?

A PXA has three principal aims:

1. to be a critical audit of all of the recovered evidence from a site area;
2. to shape future detailed analytical procedures subject to approval by the planning advisor on behalf of the LPA, taking advice where appropriate from Historic England's Science Advisors or other specialist advisors, including those from the intended archive repository;
3. for on-going project management purposes: to refine the resource requirements (finance, in-house staff and external specialists, specialist methods) for the completion of analyses through to publication (including editing stages) and display (where appropriate), to formulate a retention/discard strategy, and to allocate sufficient task and staff time to achieve the outcomes.

8 What are the Objectives of the PXA?

The PXA should provide a report that acts as a critically-assessed audit of all archaeological evidence recovered from a site. It should be commensurate with the significance of the evidence, and provide further understanding of the archaeological evidence within a broader research context.

9 What should a PXA should contain?

The report should include:

- i. an interim statement on the circumstances of the project acknowledging the project sponsor and relevant agents and advisors,

- ii. an outline of what the site is and how it fits into the local archaeological landscape;
- iii. a summary of the excavation methodology, indicating whether this differed from the original proposals set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation;
- iv. a summary of the nature of the features/deposits that were investigated, with supporting tabulated evidence in appendices;
- v. a description of any avoidance strategies or re-burial methods used to preserve unexcavated archaeological remains *in situ*, indicating whether or not these will be subject to a monitoring scheme and, if so, providing a description of it or references to supporting relevant documentation;
- vi. key illustrations (site plans, principal sections and artefacts, high quality photographs [with scales] of site areas, important contexts or artefact groups);
- vii. an outline of immediate and future conservation needs of the artefact groups;
- viii. an assessment of the character, range, date, nature, condition and significance of all recovered artefact groups and material remains, environmental samples, contexts and stratigraphic phasing groups, and the character of the contextual background. It should **not** include detailed analysis of these components;
- ix. statements by accredited specialists on the research potential of individual artefact and environments categories, those relating to the geographical, economic, stratigraphic and depositional sequence of the site, or those pertaining to ritual practices. If no further work beyond assessment is considered necessary by the recognised specialist, this should be clearly indicated in the relevant statement of potential;

The report should also:

- x. indicate applied studies that will be necessary for further analytical work. These might include, for example, comparative analysis, documentary and/or cartographic research, refined GIS modelling and intra and inter-site spatial analyses, site morphology studies, absolute dating methods, scientific techniques not covered by the standard suite of applications (eg specific chemical analyses, thin sectioning for soils or ceramic research, isotope studies, scanning electron microscopy, specific biological analyses etc);
- xi. provide an informed strategy for the detailed analysis of some or all anthropogenic or environmental materials groups as recommended by relevant specialists to enable a reconstruction of the history and use of the site to be developed. This strategy must include provision to incorporate the results of any earlier phases of archaeological work on a specific site, reappraising materials and artefacts recovered during evaluation or desk-based phases (eg air photograph rectifications, geophysical survey data, etc) and, where appropriate, earlier excavation results - including, where possible, from neighbouring sites;
- xii. present an Updated Project Design (UPD) with a clearly-signposted timetable for monitoring purposes and, upon approval by the planning advisor, provide the client with an accurately-costed programme for project completion. The UPD will indicate the contents of the archive report - the analytical report of collated evidence - and importantly indicate what will be taken forward to publication;
- xiii. provide a statement of significance for the retention of material and propose a fully-justified discard strategy for low/nil value assemblages, as agreed with the relevant specialists and the planning advisor and the intended archive repository, following appropriate recording in the archive report;
- xiv. indicate the estimated contents of the archive - including digital data;
- xv. propose in brief, the type(s) of publication appropriate for the dissemination of the archaeological record. For example:
 - short illustrated paper of principal site evidence in journal (overview paper),
 - thematic paper on a specific research theme?
 - fully illustrated site monograph
 - section/chapter in edited monograph
 - internet publishing through journal or proprietary website (stating whether all catalogues will be available and interactive)

- popular booklet
 - other output;
- xvi. propose where relevant other outputs for public benefit, e.g. named exhibitions, websites, DVDs, talks;
 - xvii. determine the quantity and types of illustrations and digital graphics required for publication;
 - xviii. indicate the estimation of the scale and the agreed destination of the site archive, stating if any conditions have been imposed by the repository to enable deposition of the archive;
 - xix. include the title of transfer agreement for the archive depository;
 - xx. include a suitable bibliography;
 - xxi. include a completed OASIS data collection form, downloaded from the ADS website, to indicate that the record is being routinely updated;
 - xxii. Include a copy of the original Written Scheme of Investigation.

10 The Role of the Specialist

Each organisation undertaking PXA programmes and advisors reviewing them may take different approaches to their delivery or organisation. There is no ‘one size fits all’ production model for PXAs, and flexibility in approach is usually acceptable. It is not the place of this Advice Note to provide a proscriptive method statement as to how such programmes should be implemented since other advice exists that covers PXA procedures (see MoRPHE 2015). It is, however, important to stress the need for good communication between specialist advisors (particularly if these are external sub-contractors) and the project manager or archaeological investigation team. Good communication with the archaeological planning advisor and project sponsor will ensure that all relevant parties involved in the investigation programme are kept suitably informed. Without continued dialogue between these groups it will be hard to steer the PXA programme to a swift, successful conclusion - in time and on budget. The assessment process should itself be a relatively rapid process, and the time period for its production should be agreed in advance, and monitored.

Specialist involvement

Early communication with specialists and finds officers is vital to the production of a successful PXA in order to determine the need or otherwise for a formal PXA report or to limit this to a short statement, as outlined above. The outcome of this appraisal should be shared, in brief, with the advisor for project-tracking purposes and to avoid future resource or scoping problems.

Expert specialist advice is not always sought early enough in the project planning and design stages, either to determine costs, suitable time allocations, selection of appropriate sampling or analytical methods, or even just to secure their availability. Their in-put to some fieldwork programmes is essential at the project design stage to inform the adequate resourcing of key tasks (eg detailed environmental sampling programmes or the bulk sampling/test-pitting surveys of relict occupation surfaces to enable spatial analysis studies). Lack of communication can lead to a compromised programme of work, often at key points in the timetable, or compromised budgets due to an underestimation of funding required for the delivery of key tasks. Failure formally to commission sub-contracted specialists can lead to unwanted programme delays and/or a specialist's misunderstanding of their engagement with a project. Though informal approaches may have been made to determine a specialist's interest in undertaking work, only through the formal commissioning of specialist sub-contractors will a project benefit from their timely input to all relevant stages of the programme.

Specialists must undertake their assessments in line with pertinent published guidance such as that prepared for period-based ceramic research, lithic research, ceramic building materials, or follow accepted scientific methodologies for the assessment and study of, for example, absolute dating, faunal/human remains, pollen, soils, food residues or petrology. A project manager may

understand this, but not be sufficiently conversant with specialist methods of research to appropriately cost specialist work for their overall budget. Underestimation of costs can lead to budgetary shortfalls, putting an unnecessary strain on the archaeological programme. Such miscalculation cannot be supported by archaeological advisors when programmes of analysis are being renegotiated with the project sponsor.

Specialist involvement at the design stage, asking them to scope and cost the fieldwork methods needed for their work, and to estimate the resources required for post-excavation assessment, and detailed analysis, is imperative for a successful outcome. Furthermore, the engagement of recognised specialists, either to conduct work or to mentor trainee specialists, ensures that quality standards will be maintained and accurate records and interpretation of the data will result. Recommendations by specialists regarding, for example, relevant illustrations, photography, conservation, or the use of complementary analytical techniques, is essential if the optimum understanding of the site evidence is to remain at the heart of the project design.

Specialist or expert advisors will be based in various locations, as freelance workers, university-based researchers or within the same or another archaeological practice, and as a sub-contractor they will be acting in an individual capacity for the overall good of the project. Their collaborative networks with other colleagues in the same field should not be underestimated, and cannot be replicated by inappropriately-appointed unskilled in-house staff.

11 Who is the PXA report for?

One common question in the earlier EAA workshops was ‘Who are we writing this document for?’ Put simply: for everyone engaged with the creation of the whole archive of the investigated archaeological remains, the project sponsor and/or their agent, the LPA’s archaeological advisor and future researchers.

Advisors see it as a critical point in the overall programme, assuring them that

- the significance of the recently-excavated evidence has been fully understood by the project team,
- elements being taken forward to detailed analysis have been appropriately scoped and justified, and that
- the reasons given for omitting aspects of the evidence from further analysis are defensible.

They can then commend the analytical stage of work to the applicant and the LPA as a reasonable, proportionate programme of work that will lead to the production of the relevant report(s), ensuring that the planning condition remains undischarged in order for this to progress smoothly within the planning process.

12 Accompanying strategies: the Updated Project Design

The end result of the PXA is the production of an Updated Project Design (UPD), in which the original project objectives are reappraised by all authors contributing to the reconstruction and interpretation of the site’s evidence (eg section 3.5 of MoRPHE, PPN3). The UPD sets out strategies that will be used in the analysis of those aspects of evidence that will further inform on the character and significance of the site, responding to questions set out in regional or national research agendas. It will also put forward a retention policy to enable the value of the archive to be described and quantified, helping to define space and conditions necessary for its long-term storage and future use. The PXA will be used to quantify the resources necessary to undertake all this work, and these will be set out in tables and charts within the UPD.

Task/analytical costs should not be included.

Central to the work of East Anglian Archaeology editorial board, the originator of this advice note, is the consideration of how a site’s results will be published and in what format. Historic

England's MoRPHE Project Planning Note 3 contains the following important advice regarding publication:

3.5.5 When establishing the resources needed for analysis therefore, allowance must be made for the costs of producing a report for publication and archive deposition. The scope of the report will have been defined in the Updated Project Design as a publication synopsis. Preparation of a report to publication standard requires the performance of a wide range of related tasks which can be easily overlooked when planning for analysis: it is most important that these are identified at an early stage. Contact should be established at this stage with the proposed publication outlet to establish cost implications of editorial or reprographic requirements.

3.5.6 It must also be borne in mind that transfer of the report draft to an editor for publication is not the end of the process. Consideration must be given to the need for provisions once the editorial processes are underway, of time for team members to answer queries, correct proofs and act as general liaison in the period between delivery to the publishing body and the eventual appearance of a printed report. The timescale on which this will be done will depend on priorities established by the publishing body, which should be consulted about the likely timescale and editing needs. It is however sensible to assume a cost for an Editorial Project Design (see below) at this stage. A copy of the publication synopsis should be sent to the appropriate editor to ensure that it conforms to requirements.

Good communication with the archaeological advisor is recommended here – perhaps even to seek approval to publish in principle. To expedite the publication process, the publication format/outlet may be agreed with the archaeological planning advisor prior to submission of the document to the prospective publisher, in case there are any areas of research or synthesis that may have been overlooked.

13 Conclusion

The post-excavation assessment stage of archaeological programmes provides a major opportunity to critically assess the masses of archaeological data accumulated by an individual project and to determine the potential significance of its various elements. Its contribution is, therefore, crucial to the successful completion of the approved scheme.

Some evidence will need no further analysis beyond assessment, as this would add little to overall understanding. Where no further work is required, this should be clearly stated and justified in the PXA Statement or Report. Equally, those elements that require further study or depiction should be amplified in the supporting Updated Project Design, where the future programme of work leading to the delivery of archive and publication reports, and the deposition of the archive, will be set out.

As procedural documents PXA reports should be concise, functional audits of the site's investigated remains. They do not require lengthy analytical or interpretive sections, which are best placed in the ensuing archive report. The main areas of further research should be prioritised, and realistic timescales for delivery indicated. A risk appraisal indicating foreseeable delivery issues (eg. specialist availability, cost of technique, etc) can be included.

The format of PXA reports should be clear. Tabulation of large bodies of data (feature concordance, finds/environmental remains, fill descriptions/feature dimensions and contents) is more useful than pages of detailed feature descriptions.

The PXA is a working document - a stage required to assure the advisor on behalf of the LPA and the sponsor that the fieldwork evidence has been successfully appraised, the shape of the final analytical report determined, the archive preparation and deposition arranged and

adequately resourced. It crucially includes a timescale for the completion of the overall archaeological programme that enables a sponsor to know when they can expect to see the discharge of the archaeological condition from their planning consent.

- END -

14 References

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 *Code of conduct*

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 *Code of approved practice for the regulation of contractual arrangements in archaeology*

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 *Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services*

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation*

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*

DCLG, 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*.

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

English Heritage, 1989 *Management of Archaeological Projects*. London: English Heritage

English Heritage, 1991 *Management of Archaeological Projects* ('MAP2'), 2 edn. London: English Heritage

Historic England, 2015 *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking*.

(<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/gpa2.pdf/>)

Historic England, 2015 (rev) *The Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE Project Manager's Guide* London: Historic England

(<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-managers-guide/HEAG024-MoRPHE-Managers-Guide.pdf/>)

Historic England, 2015 (rev) *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation* London: Historic England

(<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-planning-note-3/morpheprojectplanningnote3.pdf/>)

ODPM, 1990 Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: *Archaeology and Planning*

Annexe 1 Glossary

ADVICE NOTE for POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT

Annexe 1 Glossary

Archaeological advisor: In this context, an appropriately qualified and experienced individual or organisation providing archaeological planning advice and information on the designated and undesignated terrestrial and marine historic environment. An advisor may be employed by or contracted to a local authority, national heritage body or regulator, charitable trust, national park, or other public body.

Archaeological Contractor: (see Practitioner). In this context, competent person or company appointed by the promoter of a scheme to deliver the approved scheme of field-based investigative, analytical or specialist work on archaeological sites or historic buildings.

Analytical report: see Archive report

Approved scheme: (see WSI). The scheme agreed with the archaeological advisor by which the archaeological programme is delivered, compliance with which allows the investigator to satisfy the planning condition on behalf of the applicant.

Archaeological investigation team: In development-led work this is the commissioned archaeological contractor and their appointed specialists.

Archive repository: The approved and agreed receiving museum or archive facility.

Archive report: The final site report that combines the full suite of analyses undertaken on the assemblages recovered from a site with stratigraphic analysis; a Level III report as described by Frere — the processed complete archive report with full illustration and description of structural, stratigraphic and artefactual/environmental data (Frere, S.S. 1975 *Principles of Publication in Rescue Archaeology: Report by a Working Party of the Ancient Monuments Board for England*, Committee for Rescue Archaeology, London).

Brief: A document prepared by the archaeological advisor on behalf of a local planning authority or other decision-making body setting out the broad requirements for work that should be specified in a Written Scheme of Investigation and undertaken in support of a planning application.

Client: person or company that commissions the archaeological work.

Conservation (for heritage policy): The Planning Practice Guidance that supports the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012) explains this as the process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance (<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>).

Consultant/External sub-contractor/specialist sub-contractor: see Specialist advisor.

Final report: see Archive report.

Historic environment: All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.

Historic Environment Record: A comprehensive and dynamic resource relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.

MoRPHE: *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment* (2015), Historic England's guidance for those planning research and research and development projects in the historic environment. The guide is supported by a useful series of Project Planning Notes (PPNs). See <https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-managers-guide/HEAG024-MoRPHE-Managers-Guide.pdf/>

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): *The National Planning Policy Framework* (DCLG 2012) sets out the Government's planning policies for following legislation (The Town and Country Planning Acts) and how these are expected to be applied. It is supported by Planning Practice Guidance: see <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>

OASIS (Online AccesS to the Index of archaeological investigationS): an on line index to the mass of archaeological grey literature resulting from large-scale developer funded fieldwork and a similar increase in fieldwork undertaken by volunteers (<http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main>). The index has been designed to help in the flow of information from data producers to users. Reports are passed on to the Archaeology Data Service for inclusion in its online catalogue, ArchSearch.

Planning advisor: In this context, the Archaeological Advisor, an ALGAO member employed by a local authority or National Park to deliver planning advice in respect of archaeology in the planning process.

Planning condition: A condition imposed on a grant of planning permission (in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) or a condition included in a Local Development Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Planning consent: Permission to develop land in accordance with planning conditions as shown on a Decision Notice issued by the Planning Authority.

Practitioner: (see also Archaeological Contractor). In this context, competent person or organisation appointed by the promoter of a scheme to deliver the approved scheme of field-based investigative, analytical or specialist work on an archaeological site or historic building.

Project manager: A competent archaeologist responsible for the resourcing, scoping, day to day management and delivery of a scheme of works.

Project sponsor: The funding body or promoter of a development-led archaeological programme or scheme.

Publication report: illustrated report of relevant contextual information, data analysis and synthesis of recovered archaeological evidence. The form and scale of a published report should be commensurate with the significance of the recovered evidence.

Retention/discard strategy or policy: Recorded and/or studied artefacts recovered from a site that are to be retained or discarded from the overall site archive in line with the policies of the archive repository.

Significance (for heritage policy): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

Specialist advisor/accredited expert/recognised specialist: Person or company expert in a particular science or analytical study hired by the archaeological contractor to deliver a particular specialised aspect of the works.

Statement of potential/of significance: as defined in MoRPHE (HE 2015:16) 'Consideration of the research subject's known or suspected potential to advance knowledge and understanding, as an aid in formulating project Aims and Objectives'. See also HE 2015:11, table 1.

Updated project design (UPD): As defined in MoRPHE, PPN3, this is a plan of identified analytical methods required to conclude relevant analysis, following a review and revision, as necessary, of the original project aims and objectives. Morphe guidance indicates that where planned additional work exceeds the agreed budget or time Tolerance (see [MoRPHE's] Glossary), the projects sponsors are informed with a view to revising costs, in justified cases.

Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), or project design, or specification: The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists defines a WSI thus: 'In a planning context, the applicant or their agent should provide a WSI in response to the brief. It must be prepared by a competent archaeologist and set out the proposed scheme of investigation in sufficient detail to satisfy the planning archaeologist or monitor that it is an appropriate response to the brief and that works will be appropriate and proportionate to the known/potential remains and the level of impact. It should also contain sufficient detail to provide a benchmark against which the results of the work may be measured and must be agreed by all relevant parties before work can commence.' (CIfA 2014: *Standard and guidance: for archaeological excavation*)

Note

The terminology used follows PPG 15, PPG 16, NPPG 5, NPPG 18, PG (Wales) as amended, WO circular 60/96, WO circular 61/96, PPS 6, NPPF and guidance issued by the Association of County Archaeological Officers (ACAO 1993, now Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers — ALGAO UK), and English Heritage (1991, 2006) and Historic Scotland (1996a and b).