



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Preface

Kamermans, H.; Leusen, M. van; Verhagen, P.; Kamermans, H; Leusen, M van; Verhagen, Ph

Citation

Kamermans, H., Leusen, M. van, & Verhagen, P. (2009). Preface. In H. Kamermans, M. van Leusen, & P. Verhagen (Eds.), *Archaeological Prediction and Risk Management. Alternatives to current practice* (p. 7). Leiden: Leiden University Press. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/17629>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/17629>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Archaeological Prediction and Risk Management



Leiden University Press

Archaeological Studies Leiden University
is published by Leiden University Press, the Netherlands

Series editors: C.C. Bakels and H. Kamermans

Cover Design: Medy Oberendorff
Layout: Hans Kamermans and Medy Oberendorff
Illustrations: Joanne Porck and Medy Oberendorff

ISBN 978 90 8728 067 3
e-ISBN 978 90 4851 063 4
NUR 682

© Faculty of Archaeology/ Leiden University Press, 2009

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES LEIDEN UNIVERSITY 17

Archaeological Prediction and Risk Management

Alternatives to Current Practice

Edited by

Hans Kamermans

Martijn van Leusen

Philip Verhagen

Contents

Preface	7
I PREDICTIVE MODELLING AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	
1. Archaeological prediction and risk management <i>Hans Kamermans, Martijn van Leusen and Philip Verhagen</i>	9
2. The future of archaeological predictive modelling <i>Philip Verhagen, Hans Kamermans and Martijn van Leusen</i>	19
3. On costs and benefits in archaeological prospection <i>Marten Verbruggen</i>	27
4. The high price or the first prize for the archaeological predictive model <i>Martin Meffert</i>	33
5. Archaeology as a risk in spatial planning: manoeuvring between objectivity and subjectivity <i>René Isarin, Philip Verhagen and Boudewijn Goudswaard</i>	41
6. Archaeological predictions contested: the role of the Dutch Indicative Map of Archaeological Values (IKAW) in local planning procedures <i>Martijn van Leusen</i>	49
II NEW METHODS	
7. Testing archaeological predictive models: a rough guide <i>Philip Verhagen</i>	63
8. Predictive models put to the test <i>Philip Verhagen</i>	71
9. Dealing with uncertainty in archaeological prediction <i>Martijn van Leusen, Andrew R. Millard and Benjamin Ducke</i>	123

Preface

This is the second and final edited volume of publications of a project called ‘Strategic research into, and development of best practice for, predictive modelling on behalf of Dutch cultural resource management’. The stated goals of the project, *to conduct strategic research into predictive modelling on behalf of Dutch cultural resource management, and to develop best practice for it*, were first approached broadly in order to set the international research agenda, and then by targeting specific topics and questions of practical interest to the main stakeholders in the management of the Dutch archaeological heritage.

This volume accordingly combines pure research into methods for predictive modelling of the distribution of archaeological remains in the Dutch soil, with an effort at interdisciplinary ‘action research’ into the use of such models by stakeholders in Dutch cultural heritage management. This latter approach, which lies at the heart of the BBO programme, brings with it a particular set of problems to do with learning to work with people who have very different goals, approaches, and languages from those in the safe academic environment. We would like to acknowledge here their often enthusiastic interest and participation, the insight they have given us both in their interests and in the limitations within which they must work - as well as our own. In particular, we want to thank the participants in the ‘uncertainty meeting’ of January 2005 and the 2nd project workshop of March 2006. We are grateful to RAAP Archeologisch Adviesbureau (directed by Marten Verbruggen) for hosting the 2005 meeting, to Leiden University for hosting the 2006 meeting and to NWO Geesteswetenschappen for providing the funding which made it all possible (grant no’s 014-18-800 and 240-60-007). Last but not least we like to thank Kelly Fennema, Medy Oberendorff and Joanne Porck for their help with the production of this volume.

Who should read this book? The main beneficiaries, we believe, will be those who are involved in making and evaluating policies for the management of our archaeological heritage: local and regional government planning officers, and external consultants. We hope that the State Service for Archaeology, Cultural Landscapes and Built Heritage (RACM)¹, which despite recent changes in the Dutch Monument and Historic Buildings Act is still very influential in promoting the use of predictive models in planning procedures, will respond to the issues raised in this volume. For easy reading, this volume is split into two parts, separating the material regarding the handling of risks associated with the presence of unknown archaeological remains in the realm of spatial planning and heritage management (Part I), from the more technical work on improvements to predictive modelling methodology (Part II).

By ‘risk’ we mean two types of risk. First the financial risk to the developer: the economic risk. Second the risk of having archaeology destroyed unnoticed: the scientific risk. Apparently the economic risk is not a big problem. Most of the time the costs of archaeological research are small compared with the overall development costs. Most developers do not worry about these costs. The second type of risk is in the perception of archaeologists very important. Missing archaeological information during the course of a project, either by missing the sites or by destruction of find spots, is one of the main reasons why predictive modelling has such a bad name. After all, the most important use of predictive modelling in Dutch cultural heritage management is as an instrument for selection.

The Editors: Hans Kamermans, Martijn van Leusen and Philip Verhagen

¹ Since 2006 the Dutch National Service for Archaeological Heritage (ROB) merged into the RACM, de Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten, the National Service for Archaeology, Cultural Landscape and Built Heritage. Throughout this book we will use the name National Service for Archaeology, Cultural Landscape and Built Heritage and the abbreviation RACM.