Challenges for 21st Century Archaeology. Archaeological Standards and Guidance: what are they for and who sets them?

Project members participating

Duncan McCallum: Policy Director at Historic England

Edmund Lee: Knowledge Transfer Manager at HE. (Also PAO for this project).

Jan Wills: Freelance Historic Environment Consultant, Chair of CIfA Board of Directors.

Robin Page: Digital Coordinator, Research Group, HE (Group owner/Moderator).

Discussion participants

Michael Heaton: Proprietor at Michael Heaton Heritage Consultants.

Kate Geary: Head of professional Development and Practice at CIfA.

Theodora Anastasiadou: Senior Archaeological Archivist at MOLA Northampton. (Also CIfA Archives group).

Duncan Brown: Head of Archaeological Archives at Historic England.

Jonathan Webster: Assistant Project Officer at Wardell Armstrong Archaeology.

Mike Heyworth : Director at CBA.

Nick Shepherd: Managing Director at NSP Consulting.

Gillian King: Senior Planner Archaeology at Southwark Council.

Nicholas Boldrini: HER officer, Durham County Council.

Paul Belford, Director/ CEO at Clwyd-Powys Archaeology Trust.

Stewart Bryant: Archaeologist/ Head of Historic Environment at Hertfordshire CC.

Introduction and setting out the questions

We are now starting the second discussion in the "21st century challenges for Archaeology" Series. Today 10th May and tomorrow 11th May we invite you to join us in focusing on the future of Archaeological Standards and Guidance and to debate "What are they for and who sets them?" along with the following questions:

1. A new vision for 2017 and beyond? Notwithstanding the changes in planning policy, is the Southport vision is still relevant? Can we construct a new vision for 2017 and beyond? What outcomes do we want to achieve and what should standards therefore contain?

2. Roles and responsibilities – who sets standards?

3. How are standards implemented and enforced?

4. New thinking on methodology and standards - how do we capitalise on the lessons of synthesis projects, and translate them into professional practice?

5. How much should we be prescribing methods as opposed to seeking outcomes?

6. Should improving standards make our work more cost-effective or will they add cost?

General background to the project can be found on the Historic England website: https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/research/21st-century-challenges-archaeology/

More details on those six questions are available on the CIfA website: http://www.archaeologists.net/archaeological-standards-and-guidance-what-are-they-and-who-sets-them-online-discussion-10%E2%80%9311-may

If you have an interest in Archaeology, please do join in and have your say! I'll now hand over to Jan Wills of CIfA , Duncan McCallum of Historic England and others to open the discussion.

Main online discussion

Jan Wills Thanks, Robin. This is the second online discussion hosted by Historic England and CIfA in the 21st-century challenges in archaeology series. We had a very good discussion a few weeks ago on archaeological archives. From that discussion and the subsequent workshop we are producing a shortlist of proposals that we will be circulating to participants (and then wider) shortly.

We hope to do the same with today's topic.

We work within a framework of legislation, policy, government and sector guidance, and professional standards and guidance. At the time of the Southport report (2011) we seemed to be moving forward with a degree of confidence in our evolving professional standards and our ability to regulate our profession through them. Since then much has changed - certainly the political context has, and with it the overarching policy framework - so how do we feel now in 2017 about the way our profession and the rest of the sector sets and monitors standards in archaeology?

Michael Heaton Professional and technical guidance should be prepared, disseminated and cyclically reviewed by the professional and trade/technical organisations, as is the case in the rest of the economy. that is their primary role. Whilst none of us would dispute the technical competence - in some cases

superiority - of our government-employed colleagues, they do not operate in a commercial environment or in a professional one (as understood by the law). The government does not tell architects how to design buildings, so why should it have to tell us how to do archaeology ?. Until we - archaeologists - produce our own best practice guidance and specifications, we will continue to be viewed as agents of the state.

Edmund Lee Ok Michael I'll take the bait ... You've set up the discussion of who should provide standards and guidance – point 2 in today's intro. I'd like to broaden this a little to bring in point 6 - what a standard is for? which I think is closely associated. If we know what we are trying to do with a standard, it makes it clearer who and how it should be developed and used. We're not alone in thinking about this. I like the British Standards approach "Standards are knowledge. They are powerful tools that can help drive innovation and productivity. They can make organisations successful and peoples everyday lives easier, safer and healthier." https://www.bsigroup.com/en-GB/standards/Information-about-standards/what-is-a-standard/ If that's what we think a standard is for, who would not want to be involved in setting them and using them?

Jan Wills Hi Michael: regulation does however form the framework in which architects' buildings are designed - they have to obtain planning permission and other consents - and so an interesting aspect of this issue in archaeology is the relationship of legislation and policy to professional standards and guidance.

Kate Geary As well as thinking about what standards are for, we also need to think about how they are used and the mechanisms by which they are a) adopted voluntarily or b) enforced. Frameworks exist for enforcement through, for example, the planning process, consent regimes, professional conduct process and through contracts. We may have views on how effective they are, whether they're understood and whether they're used appropriately, but at least they exist. But what about all the technical good practice guidance and advice that's produced without any mechanism for enforcement? How does that find it's way into practice?

Duncan Brown I am joining this discussion from an HE funded, free to attend training workshop in Leicester, centred on the recently produced guidance documents on on residue analysis and pottery production sites. I don't think anyone among the 40 people here think the government is telling them what to do. One key word here is guidelines. HE produces guidelines to good practice and has funded organisations such as the pottery study groups to produce standards, which are more than guidance. The recent CIfA project, also funded by HE, that reviews the quality of finds reporting shows that most find reports fail to meet 60% of the criteria the CIfA Finds Group compiled to measure the quality of finds reports content. There is a clear need for standards, most of which come from professional organisations such as CIfA or specialist groups. What seems to be missing is the teaching of these to undergraduates and other learners, as well as a willingness to support professional self-regulation.

Jonathan Webster From a very blinkered view which is almost academic in its formation, surely we should strive for a set standard to allow for a baseline in the

quality of a site archive, report etc that allows for the reinterpretation of the data set and worthwhile comparison between sites. Without a set standard you risk the rise of 'smash and grab' archaeology with little thought or time given to methodologies used or archive produced. If this becomes the case we might as well let developers bull doze sites and not bother for the quality of data recovered.

Given the reduction in funding and cuts in the local government heritage sector this is more important now than ever, in districts where no planning archaeologist is present we need an internal check that makes sure that any archaeology is dealt with appropriately.

Edmund Lee And we all visibly benefit from that regulation of architecture in terms of safe buildings which don't (usually) fall down, burst into flames etc. Standards aren't scary - they are there to help. The comparable public benefit of archaeological endeavours is highlighted in the National Planning Policy Framework https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/12-conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment . So how can we best organise our practice, our process and our end results in a way that will provide that public benefit?

Mike Heyworth I'm particularly interested in the language used in both standards and guidance - how far it is fixed and controlling and encourages 'archaeology by numbers' which potentially discourages creativity and innovation in approach, and also how far the documents set out to distinguish between 'baseline' standards (what must be done) to 'aspirational' standards (what could be done) which introduces an appropriate element of proportionality and professional judgement ...

Robin Page I'm posting up some comments from Nicholas Boldrini who is unfortunately experiencing some LinkedIn gremlins this morning:
Taking the six questions as a basis for discussion 1. Not really sure enough about this to comment 2. I think the present set up works reasonably well. Most people ask for (that I am aware of) CiFA standards to be followed (whether members or not) , as well as MoRPHE and other relevant guidelines to be followed - so the setting of them isn't too problematic imo 3. This is the key one - through Planning in theory this is possible, but actually difficult to get Planners to care about, and also hard to do from a simple resource capacity point of view. 4. This is also a difficult one. Its hard to keep up to speed with all the changes and recommendations (two that spring to mind are the Rural Roman recommendations and also Paleolithic ones) - and again this comes down to capacity (in the Planning context at least)

Robin Page also from Nicholas Boldrini:
5. I think this may be a slight red herring in terms of standards, as regardless of which you go for - method or outcome - you still need standard to measure against, though it is useful to ponder as sometimes, as a curator, I might suggest something a bit "old hat" as technology, techniques change rapidly 6. Improving standards will probably add cost, so there is a real question about adding to them. However, the problem at the moment seems to me more about getting everyone to play at the same level so its more about undercutting best practice. That means we should concentrate on that issue before raising the bar I think - ie everyone is adhering to current standards (enforcement).

Jan Wills From the types of projects that Duncan mentions (which have looked at how far particular standards have been complied with) it would seem that we're not complying very well with the standards we do have at the moment. Meanwhile, the syntheses projects like Roman Rural Settlement have produced the first broad reviews of how the information that we have been collecting can be used - or not - to write new narratives. Time for reflection on whether our standards are fit for purpose. Do we have the confidence to change?

Edmund Lee Good points from Nick (thanks Robin for posting them). I do feel on point 6 that although following and improving standards *may* add cost to a particular *project*, at the strategic / sector level they are a cost saving. Standards are the 'level playing field' They avoid the cost to individual projects of 'reinventing the wheel' which is a saving for all. We just need to make sure we apply standardisation in the right places at the right time and with appropriate oversight to avoid Mikes 'archaeology by numbers'. Standards are (to quote BSI again) "a reliable basis for people to share the same expectations about a product or service".

Kate Geary The debate around outcomes vs. methodologies is an interesting one. Monitoring compliance with standards which describe the required outcomes but allow for professional judgement and innovation in achieving them requires a level of professional confidence that we don't always seem to possess. Measuring achievement of quantitative targets is much easier (but far less satisfying, professionally). The 'Southport' vision isn't based on greater levels of prescription - it's based on 'a culture of confident professionalism'. What can CIfA do to help support the profession towards that vision...?

Jan Wills I think that reviewing standards against outcomes is a part of this - we need to know what our standards are delivering, and whether they are still appropriate. This is relevant too to the cost issue and to whether we are delivering public benefit : are we doing things in a particular way just because we've always done it like that?

Edmund Lee In my personal opinion I think the process of standardisation in the profession should be viewed positively as supporting that 'confident professionalism' we aspire to. Once we have in place a) standards covering the right points to make a real difference without constraining innovation b) standards which are sufficiently detailed and objective for work to be assessed c) an open and blame-free process of assessment (a tall order admittedly), then we can present our work with confidence, knowing that we've covered the bases, and won't be judged against 'hidden' criteria we weren't aware of. Debate and discussion can then rightly focus on the methodology and the significance of our discoveries.

Duncan McCallum Looking at the value of standards and guidance from a wider heritage perspective, what I sometimes hear from developers is that they are looking for certainty and consistency. They accept their responsibilities in heritage as much as they do about fire safety but they want fair treatment and for the archaeological or other work to genuinely help answer the questions about what is important about a site. Standards and guidance are in my view extremely helpful in setting out a level playing field and they help speed up that part of the development process.

As to who should produce them, in my experience the most effective guidance is usually produced collaboratively and although I'm much less involved in the production of standards I think people want to be reassured that standards are reasonable in what they are asking for - and joint working; professional bodies, HE, developer interests and so on help to ensure their credibility.

Duncan McCallum I can't resist adding a quick comment on Michael Heaton's stimulating comment earlier today - accepting that as I work for HE I am an agent of the state! The government may not define acceptable colours for the bricks and the tiles on my house but they have a huge influence on the many aspects of the construction from defining what a habitable building can be made of through to how far a piece of timber can span so that it is a safe place to live in. For me the same applies to standards in archaeology, or heritage more generally - they set the basic framework to ensure the end product is fit for purpose but don't need to go the 'n'th degree to cover every conceivable issue. Goverment backed certification gives me reassurance that the house I live in is reasonably safe but the professionals who drafted into the building regulations have the deailed knowledge and are best placed to apply the standards flexibly and appropriately to respond to each site's unique circumstances.

Nick Shepherd First off there needs to be clarity in the profession about what standards are for - to reassure the public that they can TRUST us to deliver an appropriate, reasonable and consistent level of quality. This is what sets professionals apart. Standards, if not immutable, should change relatively rarely. Guidance, on the other hand, which is the current best practice to achieve the standard, can change whenever there are improvements, for instance in technology or process. We are a sector awash in standards (and guidance), and quite good ones in my opinion, but there are conflicting perceptions that (a) standards are not applied or enforced consistently, and (b) standards are applied too mechanically, suffocating innovation. Both are true depending on where you work. So my position is that we are good at producing standards and guidance, but could do better at implementation, and fostering innovation (quicker, cheaper AND better). Get those two things right =massive step forward.

Gillian King I feel one of the challenges for us archaeologists is that we need to be more integrated with the planning system, and really be expert at understanding the role of our work within that system. I still feel there is a strange disconnection between the two disciplines - which you don't see with some other construction related experts. I think more training in planning compliance would make our industry more valued, perhaps.

Duncan McCallum I absolutely agree with your points about the importance of implementing standards and the need to encourage innovation to deliver quicker, cheaper and better ways of doing things. We all have a part to play in finding innovative ways of delivering better understanding of this nation's heritage - money will always be tight - and governments of whatever political persuasion will need to be convinced that environmental costs incurred in the delivery of sustainable development really are necessary. My view is that professional bodies can and

should play a sector-leading role in showing how it can be done in a lean and effective way. That is likely to mean slightly higher levels of risk on occasions.

[Jan Wills](#) Nick - I'm interested in your points about innovation (and they link to Duncan's on costs and risk) , and I know there's a FAME conference coming up on that. Gill Hey gave a paper at the CIfA conference on Terminal 5, the innovations in practice there, and what's happened since. From your perspective is there innovation in field techniques, say, or are we locked into a mechanistic approach?

[Kate Geary](#) A view that came over quite strongly in the WSI workshops CIfA ran (with ALGAO and HE support) was that professional standards and good practice are aspirational and ability/willingness to comply with them is based on the availability of resource. Surely we need to turn this around so that the need to comply with professional standards underpins the resourcing of archaeological work? Otherwise, how can we possibly be delivering public benefit?

[Jan Wills](#) Kate - was this a view that went across the various parts of the sector i.e. curators/consultants/contractors? I'm thinking about both what curators feel they can require and also what we should all be committed to achieving though our professional responsibilities.

[Edmund Lee](#) I think I'm with Kate on this one. Compliance to standards should underpin resourcing decisions. But I think we need to address the issue of compliance in more ways and more creatively. What motivates compliance with standards (or indeed any professional activity)? Getting paid or getting permission / grant is one motivation, clearly a strong one. But it isn't the only one. In scholarly publication, for example, the quality test applied is peer review, with the benefit to the researcher being enhanced reputation among their peers. The Roman Rural Settlement project has, looked at in one way, 'peer reviewed' a huge body of literature that hasn't previously had that attention. Going forward, can we harness the power of peer review to the need for assessing compliance?

[Nicholas Boldrini](#) This discussion seems to be focussing on compliance, because I think this is the issue which there is less clarity/certainty about. Without wishing to sound like a one-trick pony, in Local Government the ability to check Compliance is largely dictated by capacity, resources, and access to information. We don't usually have access to academic articles which might help us assess a report more critically - that is something that needs addressing across the sector. But chiefly - its time. So if the GL report looks ok then we'll approve it. Yes we will try and make sure it complies with best practice/guidance/standards, but that is actually fairly difficult to enforce in planning, unless you have support of Planners who are subject to their own pressures. So perhaps examples of this in that context need circulation - eg how Compliance has been enforced

[Kate Geary](#) It was primarily expressed by the contractors but supported (as in they agreed that it happened, not that it was right that it should) by LPA advisors. I agree with Gillian that a better understanding of the planning system and the various roles archaeologists have within it is important. But Edmund's point is key - compliance shouldn't just be about getting permission or getting paid. Any system of professional

self-regulation is dependent on individuals (and organisations) voluntarily making a commitment to uphold professional standards, which is what all accredited CIfA members and Registered Organisations, IHBC members, RICS, RIBA, RTPI etc etc members have done. Accepting that professional obligation doesn't mean that we can't find different/better/innovative ways of doing things that deliver better public benefit and better value to the client but it does mean that professional standards should be central to project design.

[Nicholas Boldrini](#) But also widening the debate a little, we haven't discussed how you would ensure compliance in eg Community archaeology? For standards to be meaningful, they need to apply across the board.

[Nicholas Boldrini](#) Also I like Ed's idea of peer review, but am not sure how that would work in practice. And it wouldn't work in all cases, but I think its worth considering more

[Edmund Lee](#) To pick up on one of Nicks points (and Mike from yesterday): Nick - you say that the sector is awash with standards. This may just be my way of thinking, but I feel that the genuine meaningful standards are actually few and far between. That's because I see a standard as being written in a way clear enough to unambiguously assess whether a piece of work or service meets a standard. That means attention to the language used (Mikes point). It's literally the difference between 'Must' or 'Shall', and 'Should' or 'May' used in the text. The first pair provide a standard, and assume that you accept the work / burden of complying, the second are guidance or advice: it's up to you whether or not you do it.

[Nicholas Boldrini](#) Unfortunately your right Ed language is key, and it is my understanding that "should" in some contexts means "must". But more the point I was trying to make is that its not the production of standards and guidance which is an issue. We've got plenty - its implementation and Compliance that is the issue, and I think the 21st Challenge for archaeology is to address that, not the production of guidance/standards

[Edmund Lee](#) I agree Nick - encouraging compliance and monitoring compliance openly is key as you say. There's multiple challenges: getting the right standards, applying them in the right place and at the right time, and finding resources to assess work.

[Edmund Lee](#) Responding to Nick's point on community archaeology: yes that's really important. We've demonstrated the potential research value of community archaeology https://historicengland.org.uk/research/support-and-collaboration/research-resources...

[Jan Wills](#) Nick has spoken of compliance, and the difficulties for local authority curators to have the time to undertaken detailed monitoring of compliance. Resourcing in local government is unlikely to improve, and yet so much of our current system depends on local authority staff (HERs, planning and other advice, and at the other end of the process our colleagues in museums who receive the archive). So what about the general professional responsibility to comply with

standards and guidance just because we have signed up to this as part of being a member of a professional institute? Are we taking on this responsibility or are we leaving it all to our local authority colleagues to monitor and check??

Paul Belford Sorry to come in late to this discussion but I think a lot of useful points have been made. Most important for me is Kate's comment that we need to turn the whole thing around so that 'the need to comply with professional standards underpins the resourcing of archaeological work' rather than compliance with standards being seen as a function of resources. The issue is that the curatorial resource is being eroded; to my mind there is scope for a level of 'standards' that comes in at a technical level (endorsed by CIfA even if not actually written by them) that can provide additional resilience to curatorial monitoring at all stages of the process and in all contexts. That is to say it is something concrete that curators can point their planning colleagues to, as well as being used to level up the playing field amongst contractors.

Paul Belford Edmund's recent comments on community archaeology - or as he puts it 'work that takes place outside the planning system' - are also important. In my experience most community archaeology projects have a degree of professional involvement. This is because such involvement is usually a requirement of funding bodies such as HLF or Cadw or whoever. For me the biggest headache in terms of 'work that takes place outside the planning system' are projects undertaken by our academic colleagues who are often not CIfA members and are not working to CIfA standards - certainly in terms of process, such as consulting/depositing with the regional HER, for example.

Michael Heaton I feel we are conflating professional 'standards' and technical specifications. The government does produce the latter for architects etc., (Building Regs etc.)but not the former. A professional institution, however, exists primarily to advise its members on how to conduct their professional affairs so as to avoid being sued, i.e the former. If a member conducts his/her affairs in accordance with the guidance of the relevant professional institution (RIBA, RICS, ICE etc.) he/she is less likely to be sued in the event of things going awry. That is what I understand 'professional standards' to be. Technical specifications are a completely different matter. I have lots in my office and most are EH/HE publications, which are excellent: I just believe that they should be produced by, or with, the 'trade' bodies such as FAME, AAIS, AEA etc. I think it is immature of us to leave this to the state.

Michael Heaton LinkedIn is restricting how much I say at one go, which probably isn't a bad thing. My main concern about the 'standards' issue is that the IFAs S&Gs (and the Technical Guidance Notes as well, actually) haven't been properly overhauled EVER, despite several major changes in legislation (PPG16 anybody?) and, more significantly, our venturing into professional realms not anticipated in the 1980s and 90s - such as contract consultancy and the dreaded 'setting' issue . The word 'client' does not appear in any of them.

Paul Belford I agree with Michael on the separation of technical specifications and professional standards. They are two very different things, operating at different levels. I am however less concerned with who produces technical standards. For

example 'Recording Historic Buildings' is actually a very useful technical document and everyone in the sector understands what is meant by a Level 1, Level 2 etc. survey. In an ideal world of course such a thing would be produced under the aegis of the CIfA BAG by a consortium of professionals, rather than the state heritage service, but we are where we are. Your second comment, Michael, about the updating of CIfA S&G and Techical Guidance, is fair up to a point - they do need an upgrade, certainly - but it is not right to say they have never been overhauled.

Kate Geary So, we need to 1) make sure we understand the difference between Standards, good practice guidance and technical specifications, 2) make sure we understand the various regulatory processes (ie the mechanisms for enforcing compliance) and when and where they are appropriate/effective and 3) commit (and promote the importance of that commitment) to upholding professional standards through professional accreditation. It's easy when you write it down!

Michael Heaton Agreed. I'll expand on your example: The old RCHME Spec. is a very useful document for specifying and managing 'building recording' contracts, but a lot of my buildings work is not 'recording' per se, it is 'assessment' concerned with identifying significance etc. I am not alone. How that is done is not easily specified because it requires tiered value judgments, but a professional institution should be able to produce guidance on what is reasonable for a competent professional to do. This is a recurrent theme on the IHBC LinkedIn site. The same issue applies to, for instance, scoping an archaeological evaluation or excavation, or even a watching brief: we have S&Gs that tell how to go about doing those types of work, but little that offers us help in judging how much to do.

Robin Page Earlier on in the discussion it was noted that new guidance or updated guidance can often be necessitated by changes to best practice. An example of this is the "Preserving Archaeological Remains" guidance note published last November. Here is an article that takes a look at the thinking behind producing that specific piece of guidance:
https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/research/preserving-archaeological-remains/

Duncan McCallum Picking up on Michael's/Kate's exchange of views, and the idea of producing on what is reasonable to expect professionals to carry out by way of assessment or recording, I'm interested in thinking how it can be expressed in a way that avoids criticism that it is adding to 'regulatory burden'. Even if there is no new burden and what is asked for by curators would generally be seen to be reasonable, it might not always feel that like when one is on the receiving end eg a developer working on a site with narrow margins.

Jan Wills I'm not sure that we are always very good at articulating the public benefit or knowledge gain from development-led projects. The spectacular ones generally find good publicity but the enormous overall gain in knowledge from the last 25 years of more modest work is still not widely enough understood. Its a demonstration of how archaeological investigation has been successfully integrated into the land management system (well, mainly).

Jan Wills Robin and I are both signing out now. Thank you all very much for your comments today. Robin will be collating these so we can feed them into the workshop next week that some of you are attending.
We'll leave the discussion open until tomorrow morning for any last thoughts this evening.
Thanks again.

Final thoughts and later comments

Nick Shepherd As this is all about the next 25 years here are my suggestions for change. 1. Better coordination between those who Produce S&G to ensure work is focussed where it is needed. 2. A single location for all S&G documents. 3. A better system of enforcement not just reliant on over stretched local authorities. 4. Ensure there is space to be innovative and develop new ways of working. If we are clear on what we must/should do we will understand better where there is room to do things differently. In addition to good S&G, there is a lot of accepted practice, assumed to deliver quality, that needs to be challenged (e.g. hand excavation/sampling percentages) - this partly goes to Mikes point about guidance on how much we do. Perhaps this is not the space for more guidance but for innovators to be creative. How do we encourage this? Come to this years FAME forum on innovation and be part of the discussion https://www.eventbrite.com/e/the-2017-fame-forum-tickets-33578669705.

Stewart Bryant Thinking about the point made earlier in the day by Kate and Jan about reviewing standards and outcomes: I think it is important to consider how the outcomes might be measured as part of any review process. Although we know that S & G have had a big positive impact there isn't very much empirical evidence to support this. Looking to the future: being able to measure the positive impact of changes to S&G is likely to improve support for them in the sector including compliance, and should also have a positive feedback in terms of future reviews.

Theodora Anastasiadou I was trying to post this yesterday but it kept saying 'there is an error, try later'.
Likewise in the previous e-discussion (end of March) I would like to hear the success stories and the mechanisms which enabled the smooth running of a project from fieldwork to museum deposition (where S&G were adhered to).
However, I also feel despite the S&G there is the personal element of the project manager, the DC archaeologist and the museum curator. In the current system under which we conduct our fieldwork the 'quality control' falls mainly under the DC and later on the museum curator.
I would also like to say that it is good timing with this e-discussion, as in the post-recession era it is more noticeable that the level of our colleagues which was affected harder are the experienced field supervisors and officers.

Robin Page Thank you Theodora Anastasiadou for your persistence - and apologies for the disruption to your genuine and useful posting. For reasons best known to

itself, LinkedIn is placing your posts into a moderation queue- its Site Wide Automatic Moderation can be something of a blunt instrument.

[Theodora Anastasiadou](#) We are seeing more junior staff at these posts nowadays being promoted faster due to the large infrastructure projects so it is also necessary that we do not repeat mistakes of the past - especially in this context of economies and staff. As said previously by a number of participants, I am also keen to see more collaboration from across the board if it comes to reviews of S&G.
Lack of resources in this era together with a growing competitive market is not an ideal 'recipe' but this is where the RAO status , at least speaking from a contractor's point of view, is being checked in a space of a few years.