

Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation

Updated June 2020

- Changes made to the wording of the *Standard* and the definition of field evaluation

The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists is incorporated by Royal Charter.

Power Steele Building, Wessex Halls, Whiteknights Road, Earley, Reading, RG6
6DE

Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

STANDARD

The Standard

Definition of field evaluation

Purpose and context

Occurrence

Definition of field evaluation	4
Purpose of field evaluation	4
Occurrence	4
1 Introduction	5
2 Principles: The Code of conduct and other regulations of ClfA	5
3 Procedures	6
3.1 Project identification	6
3.2 Briefs, WSIs and project designs	7
3.3 Fieldwork	10
3.4 Post-fieldwork analyses and reports	12
3.5 Monitoring	155
3.6 Archives, ownership and deposition	166
3.7 Other considerations	177

INTRODUCTION

This guidance seeks to define good practice for the execution and reporting of archaeological field evaluation, in line with the regulations of ClfA; in particular the *Code of conduct*. It seeks to expand and explain general definitions in the Code.

The key section of this document is the Standard. It is only a few lines long, and deliberately lacks detail. In part this is because it is impossible to foresee every circumstance and prescribe for each an investigative method. Nor does the Institute seek to dictate to its members in detail the means by which projects are conducted, but to outline procedures by which outcomes or products can be attained and against which performance can be monitored. The historic environment expert is left free to make a considered selection of appropriate established techniques and to develop new methods.

If the project has failed to determine the nature of the archaeological resource within a specified area because of the way in which it was conducted, the Standard has not been met. It is a 'sub-standard' project. The caveat is as far as is reasonably possible, because there may be good reasons why a well-conducted evaluation stood no chance of success.

Defining 'reasonably possible' relies on shared professional judgement and values. This is where the Guidance section comes in. It is not binding per se, but advises on what the profession presently considers good practice. Departures from the guidance should be undertaken with caution, and it is advisable to document the reasons.

So the Standard defines a required outcome and the guidance advises in broad terms how the profession currently anticipates that the end product will be reached. This document contains more detailed guidance on the legal, policy and practice requirements of the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man, and complements government or practitioner guidance; but it applies to ClfA members' work universally and would benefit from additional sections from those able to draft them. Professional practitioners are likely to produce their own yet more detailed handbooks and procedures documents on how they interpret and implement ClfA guidance.

The Standard and guidance has many potential applications, but is principally used by those involved in commissioning archaeological work, be they developers and their agents, planning archaeologists, or archaeologists designing their independent research, to define the quality required by those undertaking the work, to assist in their own quality management and to show clients and peers that they are attaining a certain quality.

The Standard and guidance applies equally to paid or unpaid archaeologists. For ClfA members and Registered Organisations compliance with the Standard is an obligation of membership/Registration: failure to meet the standard may be judged to be in conflict with the regulations through the Institute's professional conduct or complaints procedures.

Professional practice is changing. New methods are being developed, and the circumstances in which archaeological work is commissioned and conducted are subject to changing legal, administrative and ideological perspectives. Comments and recommendations on this document are welcome at any time.

STANDARD

The Standard

An archaeological field evaluation will determine and report on, as far as is reasonably possible, the nature of the archaeological resource within a specified area using appropriate methods and practices. These will satisfy the stated aims on the project, and comply with the *Code of conduct* and other relevant regulations of ClfA.

Definition of field evaluation

The definition of archaeological field evaluation is a limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts and their research potential, within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, reports on them and enables an assessment of their significance in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate.

Purpose of field evaluation

The purpose of field evaluation is to gain information about the archaeological resource within a given area or site (including its presence or absence, character, extent, date, integrity, state of preservation and quality), in order to make an assessment of its merit in the appropriate context, leading to one or more of the following:

- a. The formulation of a strategy to ensure the recording, preservation or management of the resource
- b. The formulation of a strategy to mitigate a threat to the archaeological resource
- c. The formulation of a proposal for further archaeological investigation within a programme of research

Occurrence

A field evaluation may arise:

- a. In response to a proposed development which threatens the archaeological resource
- b. As part of the planning process (within the framework of appropriate national planning policy and/or development plan policy)
- c. As part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (see 3.1.7 below). Outside the planning process (e.g. ecclesiastical development, coastal erosion, agriculture, forestry and countryside management, works by public utilities and statutory undertakers)
- d. Within a programme of research not generated by a specific threat to the archaeological resource

- e. In connection with the preparation of management plans by private, local or national and international bodies

An archaeological field evaluation may therefore be instigated or commissioned by a number of different individuals or organisations, including local planning authorities, national advisory bodies, government agencies, private landowners, developers or their agents, archaeological researchers, etc.

GUIDANCE

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This guidance seeks to define best practise for the execution of field evaluation and concomitant reporting, in line with the regulations of ClfA; in particular the *Code of conduct*. It seeks to expand and explain general definitions in the Code for the practice of fieldwork and reporting.
- 1.2 The Standard and guidance apply to all types of preliminary field investigations (land-based, inter-tidal and underwater) whether generated by academic research, by local interest, through the planning process, by management proposals or by any other proposals which may affect the archaeological resource within a specified area.
- 1.3 In addition, the guidance seeks to amplify directions given in appropriate national planning policy (see Appendix 6), and be compatible with current guidelines issued by regulatory authorities.
- 1.4 This document provides guidance for work carried out within the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. Although general guidance is given, this document cannot be exhaustive, particularly in its treatment of legislative issues. Archaeologists must ensure they are familiar with the specific legislation and common law pertinent to the area in which they are working. Archaeologists, commissioning bodies and others may find it useful to consult the relevant documents listed in Appendix 6, and can obtain further guidance from the appropriate advisory bodies listed in Appendix 7.

2 Principles: The Code of conduct and other regulations of ClfA

An archaeologist undertaking a field evaluation must adhere to the five major principles enshrined in ClfA *Code of conduct*, and the rules governing those principles.

1. A member shall adhere to high standards of ethical and responsible behaviour in the conduct of archaeological affairs.
2. A member has a responsibility for the conservation of the historic environment.
3. A member shall conduct his or her work in such a way that reliable information about the past may be acquired, and shall ensure that the results be properly recorded.
4. A member has responsibility for making available the results of archaeological work with reasonable dispatch.

5. A member shall recognise the aspirations of employees, colleagues and helpers with regard to all matters relating to employment, including career development, health and safety, terms and conditions of employment and equality of opportunity.

3 Procedures

3.1 Project identification

- 3.1.1 Within the planning framework in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man the desirability of preservation of archaeological deposits is a material consideration, and consequently developers and local authorities should take into account archaeological considerations and deal with them from the beginning of the development control process.
- 3.1.2 As the desirability of preservation of archaeological remains is a material consideration in the planning process, local authorities can reasonably request an applicant to provide further information on archaeological matters so that 'an informed and reasonable planning decision can be taken'.
- 3.1.3 Within the planning framework an appraisal (Appendix 1 for definition) of the proposal area will be carried out to determine whether further information is required. This will normally have been undertaken by the planning archaeologist or curator, but may also have been carried out by the applicant or their agent.
- 3.1.4 On occasion it may be deemed sufficient to carry out desk-based assessment, in order to provide information to make an informed and reasonable decision; on other occasions it will not. Under this guidance, requests for field evaluation will generally be made by the planning archaeologist or curator.
- 3.1.5 A field evaluation may be commissioned in advance of submission of a planning application by the applicants or through their agents. It is appropriate in these circumstances for proposals for field evaluation to be agreed with the planning archaeologist in advance of intrusive work, so that the archaeological resource is not needlessly disturbed or damaged, or inappropriate or excessive cost incurred. In such circumstances matters of confidentiality will need to be carefully reviewed by all parties involved. The planning archaeologist may also be able to offer advice to applicants on project design, should the applicants be unfamiliar with archaeological matters.
- 3.1.6 Certain developments fall within special regulations or statute differing from the standard planning process (e.g. some projects initiated by public utilities, statutory undertakers, Crown Commissioners, Ministry of Defence etc). Certain of these organisations subscribe to codes of practise (eg water companies) or agreements (formal or informal) with the lead national archaeological bodies to take into consideration the effects of development proposals on the archaeological resource.
- 3.1.7 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) applies to projects potentially having significant environmental effect (as defined in EC Directive 85/337, and as implemented in the UK via the various Statutory Instruments etc). It requires a systematic analysis of such effects before a decision to permit the project is taken. Developers are required to provide information for the deciding agency to consider in the decision-making

process, and further give bodies with relevant environmental responsibilities an opportunity to comment before consent is given. EIA is mandatory in relation to certain projects, and may be extended to others. Appraisal and desk-based assessments of the archaeological element must form part of EIA and field evaluation may also be required (see Appendix 1 for definitions).

- 3.1.8 In EIA projects field evaluation is usually initiated by the developers or through their advisors, rather than the local planning authority.
- 3.1.9 In a research context, the area for potential investigation or study for field evaluation will have been identified and selected by an archaeologist based on specific aspects or themes relating to their own defined research interests. This could include work undertaken through universities, central government agencies, local authorities, museums, independent trusts, private companies, groups or individuals.
- 3.1.10 Management proposals by private landowners or others may also result in field evaluation, to obtain information in order to enhance or protect the environmental or archaeological resource.
- 3.1.11 However it arises an archaeologist should only undertake a field evaluation which is governed by a Written Scheme of Investigation or project design (see Appendices 2 and 3), agreed by all relevant parties as this is the tool against which performance, fitness for purpose, and hence achievement of standards, can be measured. In Northern Ireland if an evaluation involves excavation a qualified archaeologist must obtain a licence to undertake work from the Northern Ireland Environment Agency.
- 3.1.12 The WSI or project design is therefore of critical importance.

3.2 Briefs, WSIs and project designs¹

- 3.2.1 The planning and preparation stage of any project is critical to its success. This section addresses the initial design stages of all forms of investigation.
- 3.2.2 A Brief is an outline of the circumstances to be addressed, with an indication of the scope of works that will be required. It does not provide sufficient detail to form the basis for a measurable standard; but it could form the basis for a Written Scheme or Investigation (WSI), project design or specification.
- 3.2.3 In a planning context, the applicant or their agent should provide a WSI in response to the brief. The WSI 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.
- 3.2.4 No investigation should take place on the basis of a brief alone, as it could not

¹ Terminology is not universal: the terms 'brief' 'WSI', 'project design' and 'specification' are sometimes used differently, and other terms may be employed locally to describe these documents

achieve the appropriate standard, there being insufficient detail against which to measure performance.

- 3.2.5 In the case of EIA, the brief or WSI will usually be prepared by the developers or their agents, discussed with the planning archaeologist/curator and issued to tenderers. This may also apply to management proposals.
- 3.2.6 Proposals for archaeological investigation not prompted by a threat to potential archaeological remains will normally take the form of a project design prepared by the researching archaeologist, and agreed with any commissioning body. If there is no external commissioner there must nevertheless be a written design so that the validity of any models or questions posed can be properly assessed, and to comply with any relevant consent procedures.
- 3.2.8 Howsoever they occur, briefs and WSIs should be prepared and implemented by suitably accredited and competent persons, using specialist advice where necessary. The WSI should outline the competencies and any relevant professional accreditation of members or organisations of the project team. The author and/or manager should preferably be a full Member of ClfA. ClfA Registered Organisations have undertaken to comply with the *Code of conduct*, have been quality assured by ClfA within the last two years and are subject to a complaints process. Because of the complexity and sensitivity of most commercial work, those commissioning or specifying such work are recommended to seek to ensure it is undertaken by a ClfA Registered Organisation. The WSI should specify how the project team meets ClfA standards. It should set out how individual and corporate competences will be maintained and enhanced through training and CPD built into the project where appropriate.
- 3.2.9 A WSI should set out the research objectives of the project. It should include where appropriate and possible explicit reference to existing research frameworks, and draw upon advice from appropriate specialists from within the proposed project team to ensure that the investigation will appropriately address national, regional and local objectives. The proposed project team should be able to show relevant expertise or access to suitable expertise to assess the significance of remains with regard to research frameworks or other guidance.
- 3.2.10 In preparing a WSI the archaeologist should give full consideration to all available practicable methods of investigation, and decide upon the most appropriate and best available to meet the purpose of the work, seeking specialist advice where necessary. An archaeologist preparing a WSI should examine all appropriate sources and be fully apprised of all relevant legislation and professional obligations.
- 3.2.11 The WSI should be suited to the project under consideration; any methods advocated should reflect the nature of archaeological remains likely to be found and should not become inflexible irrespective of site conditions or context. Standard templates should therefore be used with care. Other factors to be considered will include 'reasonableness' and proportionality in relation to the significance of the asset and the scale of threat to it.
- 3.2.12 The WSI should set out measurable data on which the assumptions of cost are based, and thus allow for justifiable post-tender re-quantification. When preparing a WSI, consideration should be given to the inclusion of appropriate contingency

arrangements so that the project may deal appropriately with archaeological remains of a scale or nature different from those used for the basis of estimation, and to provisions for varying methods or the scale of resources. It may not be possible to meet the project objectives without a reasonable degree of flexibility to apply professional judgement during the course of the investigation. Commissioning bodies and monitors should be advised that overly rigid requirements might unavoidably result in a failure to meet archaeological and non-archaeological objectives. Equally, contingency arrangements should not be open-ended but should be properly specified in their own right and reflect prior knowledge of the site, its physical context and the objectives of the investigation. A WSI should be clear about what is and is not included in the scope and attendant costs with particular attention to transparent presentation of post-investigation analysis and dissemination aspects of the project. It should be made clear that post-investigation analyses, publications and potentially the archive will be tailored to the significance and research potential of the assets.

- 3.2.13 The WSI should identify relevant data standards for record organisation and content that will be used in information recording systems employed by the project.
- 3.2.14 A WSI should set out how public benefits may be achieved by means of engagement, participation and/or dissemination of the results both during and after the project, as appropriate to the scale, nature and circumstances of the work. Health and safety issues, public liability and commercial confidentiality, while important considerations, should not be used as a barrier to public engagement without clear justification for doing so.
- 3.2.15 The WSI should set out where and how it is proposed that the answers to the project's research questions will be disseminated to both professionals and to the general public, during and after implementation. In addition to conventional publication, innovative forms of public engagement should be considered. Dissemination proposals should include a process for review and should identify those individuals and organisations responsible for tasks proposed.
- 3.2.16 The WSI should make suitable provision for archive deposition, and include an appropriate retention and disposal policy for digital, photographic and paper archival materials, as well as artefacts and ecofacts. The WSI should make clear that the proposed project team has access to appropriate specialists to assess the archive's significance.
- 3.2.17 In summary, a WSI should normally contain or cover, as a minimum, the following elements:
- a) a statement on the technical, research and ethical competences of the project team, including relevant professional accreditation
 - b) non-technical summary
 - c) site location (including map) and descriptions
 - d) context of the project
 - e) geological and topographical background
 - f) archaeological and historical background
 - g) general and specific research aims of the project
 - h) methods
 - i) collection and disposal strategy for artefacts, ecofacts, and all paper, graphic

- and digital materials
- j) arrangements for immediate conservation of artefacts
- k) post-fieldwork assessment and analysis of project data
- l) report preparation (method)
- m) publication and dissemination proposals, detailing how the needs of different relevant audiences will be met
- n) copyright
- o) archive deposition, including wherever possible identification of a recipient museum or other repository and its requirements
- p) timetable
- q) staffing
- r) a statement on the training and CPD built into the project, where appropriate
- s) a statement on compliance with relevant professional ethical and technical standards (including data standards)
- t) a statement on public engagement and participation tailored to the project
- u) a statement on the research value of the results, referencing the success of the project in achieving its initial or other research aims with reference to published research frameworks or agenda where available
- v) a statement on public benefits for the client or commissioner, if appropriate, and in the context of developer-led investigation a statement on adding value to the scheme from the heritage asset or its investigation by archaeology
- w) a statement on the potential public relations and/or corporate social responsibility benefits for the commissioning body arising from the project should be considered
- x) Health and Safety considerations
- y) environmental protection considerations
- z) monitoring procedures
- aa) contingency arrangements (if appropriate)
- bb) licence eligibility (where required)

3.3 Fieldwork

- 3.3.1 The WSI or project design must be agreed by all relevant parties before work commences. All work must conform to the agreed WSI or project design. Any variations must be agreed in writing by all relevant parties.
- 3.3.2 Sufficient and appropriate resources (staff, equipment, accommodation etc) must be used to enable the project to be completed successfully, within the timetable, to an acceptable standard, and comply with all statutory requirements. Any contingency elements must be clearly identified and justified. It is the role of the archaeologist undertaking the work to define appropriate staff levels.
- 3.3.3 All techniques used must comply with relevant legislation and be demonstrably fit for the defined purpose(s).
- 3.3.4 All staff, including subcontractors, must be suitably qualified and experienced for their project roles, and employed in line with relevant legislation and CIfA regulations (see Appendix 6). The site director and/or manager should preferably be an accredited member of CIfA.
- 3.3.5 All staff, including subcontractors, must be fully briefed and aware of the work required under the WSI, and must understand the aims and methodologies of the project.

- 3.3.6 All equipment must be suitable for its designated purpose and in sound condition, complying with Health and Safety Executive regulations and recommendations. It should be noted that some items of equipment are subject to specific statutory controls (diving equipment in particular is subject to the Diving Operations at Work Regulations (see Appendix 6)).
- 3.3.7 Full and proper records (written, graphic, electronic, and photographic as appropriate) should be made for all work using pro forma record forms and sheets as applicable. Digital records created as part of the project should comply with specified data standards. An archaeologist must ensure that digital information, paper and photographic records should be stored in a secure and appropriate environment, and be regularly copied or backed up, and copies stored in a separate location.
- 3.3.8 Artefact and environmental data collection and discard policies, strategies and techniques must be fit for the defined purpose, and understood by all staff and subcontractors (see also ClfA Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials, ClfA Finds Group 1992, Historic Scotland 1994).
- 3.3.9 Health and Safety regulations and requirements cannot be ignored no matter how imperative the need to record archaeological information; hence Health and Safety will take priority over archaeological matters. All archaeologists undertaking fieldwork must do so under a defined Health and Safety Policy. Archaeologists undertaking fieldwork must observe safe working practices; the Health and Safety arrangements must be agreed and understood by all relevant parties before work commences. Risk assessments must be carried out and documented for every field project, in accordance with the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1992. Archaeologists should determine whether field projects are covered by Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007, and ensure that they meet all the requirements under the regulations. In addition they must liaise closely with the principal contractor and comply with specified site rules. Archaeologists are advised to note the specific duties of the various roles defined by the CDM regulations and should not undertake roles for which they are not appropriately qualified and resourced. For further guidance refer to the bibliography (Appendix 6).
- 3.3.10 The archaeologist undertaking a field evaluation must ensure that he or she has adequate insurance policies, public and employer's liability, and some relevant form of civil liability indemnity or professional liability.
- 3.3.11 There is a wide range of archaeological techniques available for field evaluation. In many instances several techniques may be valid for the requirements of the brief/project outline, and it will be necessary to explain the selection criteria. Wherever possible the first considered option should be for non-destructive survey, though in most instances this will probably not produce the necessary level of confidence in the information gained, nor result in data which can be verified at, for example public inquiry or court of law. The methods selected must be fit for the purpose defined. This Standard covers the following methods of field evaluation

1. Non-destructive

- i. geophysical survey
- ii. remote sensing
- iii. geochemical survey
- iv. earthwork survey
- v. field scanning (i.e. observation and mapping of artefact and other distributions, but not collection of artefacts)
- vi. standard building survey

2. Destructive Methods (of varying destructive potential)

- i. augering
- ii. hand-excavated test pits
- iii. hand-excavated trenches
- iv. machine-stripped and manually excavated test pits
- v. machine-stripped and manually excavated trenches
- vi. strip, map and sample/record
- vii. probing (frequently used underwater)
- viii. surface artefact collection: fieldwalking for collection as opposed to scanning

This method is destructive as it removes part or all of the archaeological resource, although that resource has generally moved from its depositional context. Selective collection will bias both the remaining resource and the collected data and is not recommended.

- ix. Methods such as prop wash and explosives (used occasionally for underwater exploration) are not generally acceptable.

3.4 Post-fieldwork analyses and reports

3.4.1 All assessment and analytical work must be carried out by suitably qualified and experienced staff, who must be appraised of the project design before commencing work.

3.4.2 Artefacts and ecofacts should be assessed in accordance with CifA *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*. The level of recording and analysis should be appropriate to the aims and purpose of the project and should take account of the potential of

artefacts and ecofacts to contribute to the understanding of the character, extent, quality and preservation of a site.

- 3.4.3 All data generated as a result of assessment and/or analysis should be included in the project archive.
- 3.4.5 All reports must address the aims and purposes of the project design and/or WSI.
- 3.4.6 All reports should be written in a clear, concise and logical style and technical terms should be explained. Consideration should be given during the preparation of the report to the requirements of public inquiries or courts of law if appropriate.
- 3.4.7 As a minimum, a site summary or data structure report should be submitted to the appropriate Historic Environment Record, the National Archaeological Record and, where appropriate, the central government conservation organisation or its nominee within six months of completion of the fieldwork or earlier, as may be specified by contractual or grant conditions. In Scotland, a summary interim report must be published in an annual, regional or national digest of fieldwork (Historic Scotland 1996f, 2). For the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man as a whole, it is considered that fuller publication of the majority of projects is required. Consideration should be given to the on-line availability of the digital report to ensure that the results of the project are widely available for future researchers and for Local Authority advisers.
- 3.4.8 Where it is possible to submit a record to an appropriate online index², a record should be completed and supplied within an agreed timeframe to ensure that other practitioners are aware of work in progress.
- 3.4.9 In Scotland the primary product of fieldwork is the data structure report (see Appendix 1 and Historic Scotland 1996b) with a costed assessment or project design for further fieldwork and/or post-excavation and publication. This report does not have a precise equivalent elsewhere in the United Kingdom (see Appendix 1). Copies of the data structure report should be lodged with the local archaeological curator.
- 3.4.10 Reports should not include recommendations unless required by the planning archaeologist or the WSI and/or project design. However, it would be reasonable for a client to seek independently the opinion of archaeological contractors. Contractors should have regard as to whether the provision of such advice is a contractual requirement and the legal implications thereof.
- 3.4.11 The specific requirements of any report will necessarily vary according to the scope of works, the nature of the results or other factors. However, the following sections will occur in most reports:
1. **Non-technical summary**
This should outline in plain, non-technical language the principal reason for the work, its objectives and main results. It should include reference to authorship and commissioning body.
 2. **Introductory statements**

² to say OASIS or its successor or equivalent

These could include acknowledgements, circumstances of the project such as planning background, the archaeological background, an outline nature of work, the site description (including size, geology and topography, location), when the project was undertaken and by whom.

3. Aims and objectives

These should reflect or reiterate the aims set out in the project design or WSI.

4. Methodology

The methods used, including the detail of any variation to the agreed project design or WSI should be set out carefully, and explained as appropriate.

5. Results

These should be set out as a series of summary objective statements, organised clearly in relation to the methods used, and describing both structural data and associated finds and/or environmental data recovered. Descriptive material should be clearly separated from interpretative statements. Technical terminology (including dating or period references) should be explained where necessary if the report is aimed at a largely non-archaeological audience. The results should be amplified by the use of drawings and photographs; and by supporting data contained in appendices (see below).

6. Conclusions

It is appropriate to include a section which sums up and interprets the results and puts them into context (local, national or otherwise). Other elements should include a confidence rating on techniques used, or on limitations imposed by particular factors (e.g. weather or problems of access). Recommendations on further work may also be required, but in most circumstances within the planning framework this will be the responsibility of the relevant planning archaeologist or curator.

7. Archive location

The final destination of the archive (records and finds) should be noted in the report.

8. Appendices

These should contain essential technical and supporting detail, including for example lists of artefacts and contexts or details of measurements, gazetteers etc.

9. Illustrations

Most reports will need the inclusion of one or more illustrations for clarity; as a minimum a location plan should be included. Any plans or sections should be clearly numbered, easily referenced to the National Grid and related to the specified area.

10. References and bibliography

A list of all sources used should be appended to the report, including electronic sources.

11. Other

Contents list, disclaimers.

3.4.12 Where the project is carried out within the planning process, the report must contain sufficient objective data to enable an informed and reasonable decision to be made.

3.4.13 Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, copies of the report must be submitted to the appropriate Historic Environment Record within six months of completion of the report.

3.5 Monitoring

3.5.1 All work must be monitored by the archaeological organisation undertaking the project and if appropriate by the national conservation agencies, planning archaeologist and commissioning body, or their nominated representatives. The guidance below is directed in general at monitors from outside the organisation undertaking the work, but many of the points apply equally to internal monitors or managers.

3.5.2 A monitor should be suitably experienced and qualified, or have access to appropriate specialist advice.

3.5.3 Monitoring must be undertaken against the written WSI and/or project design.

3.5.4 Monitors, where they are not representing the commissioning body, should bear in mind the need for flexibility, within the stated parameters, in contractual matters such as staff numbers, budgets or timetable.

3.5.5 All monitoring visits must be documented, and agreed by each party.

3.5.6 Non-compliance with the agreed WSI or project design must be pointed out by the monitor to the archaeologist undertaking the work, and their client if appropriate, at the earliest opportunity.

3.5.7 Monitors should be aware of their professional duties regarding Health and Safety, in particular advising against and reporting on bad or unsafe practice.

3.5.8 All monitoring arrangements must be agreed at the outset of the project; the archaeologist undertaking fieldwork must inform the planning archaeologist or other monitor of the commencement of work with reasonable notice.

3.5.9 Although monitors may choose to visit at any time, they should normally inform the archaeologist undertaking the work of any intended visits in advance. Monitors must respect reasonable requests from the client commissioning the work to attend only at prearranged times and, if necessary, in the company of the client's representative.

3.5.10 Any costs for monitoring to be charged by the planning archaeologist or other monitor must be agreed in writing at the outset of the project.

3.6 Archives, ownership and deposition

- 3.6.1 The requirements for archive preparation and deposition must be addressed at the outset of the project. In Scotland, all fieldwork archives must be deposited in the National Monuments Record for Scotland, which will arrange to copy material to local museums etc.
- 3.6.2 The proposed recipient museum or other repository must be contacted at the project planning stage, and arrangements for the deposition of the project archive should be detailed in the WSI and/or project design.
- 3.6.3 The archive, including all retained artefacts and ecofacts, must be treated and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the recipient museum/repository and national guidelines. The treatment of human remains is governed by the relevant legislation and government regulations (see Historic Scotland 1997a).
- 3.6.4 In England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man ownership of objects rests with the landowner, except where other law overrides this (e.g. Treasure Act 1996, Burial Act 1857). The archaeologist undertaking the fieldwork or the planning archaeologist must make this clear at the inception of the project (in the brief, WSI or project design).
- 3.6.5 It should be noted that different countries have, inter alia, differing reporting procedures for Treasure and differing requirements for finds deposition. Material cannot be exported from the Isle of Man without a licence. In Scotland all finds of archaeological objects must be reported to the Crown, normally via the Treasure Trove Advisory Panel or the Finds Disposal Panel. Archaeologists are advised to seek specific advice on excavation and export procedures as in some instances licences are required (see Appendix 7).
- 3.6.6 Except in Scotland, it is the responsibility of the archaeologist undertaking the fieldwork to endeavour to obtain the written consent of the landowner for finds donation and deposition with the recipient museum.
- 3.6.7 Except in Scotland, in the event that the landowner is unwilling, for whatever reason, to donate the finds to the appropriate recipient museum, the archaeologist undertaking the fieldwork must endeavour to ensure all artefacts are recorded, safely packaged and conserved where appropriate before transfer to the owner, and that their location and ownership are stated in the site archive and public record. It should be noted that the owner's explicit (written) permission is required before entering such personal information in the public record (see inter alia the Data Protection Act 1984).
- 3.6.8 In Scotland all archaeological artefacts, irrespective of raw material, may be claimed on behalf of the Crown under common law. This applies no matter where, or on whose property, artefacts are found. As noted in paragraph 3.5.3 of ClfA Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials, all finds must be reported to the Treasure Trove Advisory Panel or, in the case of artefacts from fieldwork funded by Historic Scotland, to the Finds Disposal Panel. Ownership in either case is passed to the museum which receives the finds at the end of the allocation process.

- 3.6.9 The rules of ownership applicable to material which has come from a vessel (i.e. all those classified as 'wreck') are dealt with under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 (see Appendix 6). In cases of wreck material the Receiver of Wreck, in the Maritime and Coastguard Agency should be contacted.
- 3.6.10 Subject to confidentiality arrangements specified for the project, the archaeologist, either during fieldwork or as soon as possible after its conclusion, should prepare a structured description of the project suitable for publication or inclusion in national and local data archives.

3.7 Other considerations

- 3.7.1 It is advisable for field evaluation projects to be governed by a written contract or agreement to which the WSI or project design may be attached. Such contracts or agreements should include reference to the defined area of study outlined on a map; to the brief, WSI or project design (see 3.2); to conditions for access; programme, method and timetable for payment (including any retentions); copyright arrangements; and be signed and dated by all parties.
- 3.7.2 It is normal practice for both the copyright and ownership of the paper and digital archive from the archaeological work to rest with the originating body (the archaeological organisation undertaking the work). The originating body deposits the material with the recipient museum or repository on completion of the contracted works, and normally transfers title and/or licences the use of the records at this stage. These arrangements may be varied by contract, and for the avoidance of doubt it is advisable to include statements on ownership and copyright in a written contract or agreement.
- 3.7.3 Material copied or cited in reports should be duly acknowledged, and all copyright conditions (such as those for Ordnance Survey maps and the National Grid) observed.
- 3.7.4 All aspects of publicity must be agreed at the outset of the project between the commissioning body and the archaeological organisation or individual undertaking the project.
- 3.7.5 The archaeologist undertaking the work must respect the requirements of the client or commissioning body concerning confidentiality, but the archaeologist must emphasise his or her professional obligation to make the results of archaeological work available to the wider archaeological community within a reasonable time.