



Development-led archaeology in Europe. Meeting the needs of archaeologists, developers and the public.

EAC Symposium, Sofia, Bulgaria, 22-23 March, 2018

EAC wants to make a contribution to the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018, by organizing its annual Symposium on a topic which is closely related to the objectives of this initiative. It is appropriate to gather in Bulgaria, the country which is chairing the European Union in the first half of 2018.

Development-led archaeology (preventive archaeology) has taken over almost all archaeological excavations in Europe. It is estimated, that in many European countries, as much as 80-90% of excavations are now development-led and in some countries close to 100%.

In 2015 the EAC Symposium concentrated on development led archaeology under the title *When Valletta meets Faro. The reality of European archaeology in the 21st century*. The symposium's three sessions presented the different legal and organisational models across Europe, analysed the practical outcomes of different rescue archaeology solutions and the final session focused on how to assure quality of research and ensure lasting public benefit.

The 2017 symposium was also in part linked to development-led archaeology. The title of the symposium was *Dare to Choose: Making Choices in Archaeological Heritage Management* and it concentrated on the decision making mechanisms and actions from mainly the heritage management viewpoint.

One of the subthemes of the Amersfoort Agenda published after the EAC Symposium in 2014 (Theme 1. The Spirit of the Faro Convention: embedding archaeology in society) was: *Know the public: analyse the wants, interests and expectations of stakeholders in society regarding their involvement in archaeology, preferably through interactions with these stakeholders*.

In the 2018 Heritage Management Symposium, the idea is therefore to look at the topic of development-led archaeology from a different angle and open up a discussion between the heritage management officials, the developers, the archaeologists working in the field and the public. How can we meet the needs of these very different stakeholders and do we always need to? How do politics affect the archaeological heritage management and the different stakeholders? How can they in turn affect politics and politicians?

This topic is also relevant in view of the decision of the European Parliament and the Council to make 2018 the European Year of Cultural Heritage with the aim of raising awareness as well as drawing attention to the opportunities offered by cultural heritage. In other words to reflect on the place that cultural heritage occupies in all our lives.

The Symposium will last one and a half days (22 and 23 March) and will consist of three presentation sessions followed by discussions – including questions and comments from the floor. Each presenter will propose actions as part of their presentation/paper.



Thursday 22nd March 2018 (11.30-17.30)

Session 1 – The archaeologists.

The impact of development-led archaeology on archaeology as a profession, are we seeing lower wages for archaeologists because of market dumping? Is the science poorer? Has archaeology turned into a mechanical profession, with all the excitement and wonder gone? Or maybe there wasn't so much excitement and wonder before, except in exceptional cases.

More jobs, more archaeologists = more power, leverage over decision making? Who is really in charge and making decisions on what and how to excavate?

How do we make sure that the quality of work is sufficient? Should there be a centralized (state) agency or is a regional office better? Or can we leave it to the „market“?

Friday 23rd March 2018 (9.00-17.00)

Session 2 – The developers.

The polluter pays principle vs. other models of funding development-led archaeology

It seems there are at least three types of developers:

- those who try to avoid the costs – try to get away with doing (paying) nothing
- those who pay but that's it – want the cheapest/fastest archaeological firm possible
- those who use the material found as part of their project – do they want to pay more for professionalism? Or take the cheapest/fastest firm available as well?

The difference between large-scale and small-scale developers under the polluter pays principle. Is it fair? (Road constructions – few “unimportant sites” – relatively low costs vs. extension to a farm house – an important site is found – relatively high costs).

How can we make archaeological research a natural part of the construction cost – and is it natural?

Is one method of cost estimations better than another (percentage of construction costs, the excavation itself never exceeds that vs. a percentage of all construction costs goes to a fund that pays for archaeological research, nationally, regionally ...).

Utilization of relics in or as part of new buildings (in situ preservation) - increases value?

Session 3 – The public.

How can we justify that public funds are used to pay for archaeological excavations? Is the research for the archaeologists' benefit and their scientific endeavours, or should we always be able to demonstrate that they are something that benefits the public as well?

Can we use the media to a greater extent to shape public opinion - since they are responsible for informing society about both archaeology and development.

Amateur associations.

Has there been any research into the impact of various promotional campaigns ... does anybody care?