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Background

• Accredited (CoreTrustSeal) digital repository for heritage data in the UK

• Founded in 1996 as part of the AHDS

• 24 years after our first collection was accessioned (RCAHMS!)
Challenges for Archaeology

Digital Data and Archaeology

- Archaeology is **destructive**
- Comprehensive records of field work are imperative
- Majority of data recorded in grey literature
- Traditionally, access to data has been problematic
Challenges for Us

Digital Data and Archaeology

• Some data is unchanging
• The observations and recordings done as ‘preservation by record’ form an immutable legacy
• “A ditch is 2m deep”
• Other data (or is it information + knowledge?) is always changing
Case Study: Dendrochronology Database
Vernacular Architecture Group 2000 (updated 2020)

https://doi.org/10.5284/1059006
Archaeological Site Index to Radiocarbon Dates from Great Britain and Ireland
Council for British Archaeology, 2000 (updated 2012)

https://doi.org/10.5284/1017767
Case Study: Roman Amphorae: a digital resource
University of Southampton, 2005 (updated 2014)

Almagro 54

Distinctive Features
A ‘cigar-shaped’ amphora, early (second to third century AD) examples are very wide bodied, thick-walled, with a broad sagging base (Peacock & Williams Class 48/Zemer 53). Fourth to mid fifth century AD vessels are also fairly short, but are thinner walled (Piétri, 2005: LRA 4A 2). Later fifth to early seventh century AD examples are longer and narrow-bodied, with corresponding smaller, more cone-shaped bases and steeper shoulders (Almagro 54/Peacock & Williams Class 49/Keay 54/Carthage Late Roman Amphora 4/Piétri LRA 4B). All have a short vertical band rim, early examples being tall and triangular, fourth century AD examples being more slanted and short, fifth century AD examples being small and square, and those of the late sixth and seventh centuries AD being more rounded. Looping handles are attached to the shoulders. There is a wide band of heavy ridging on the shoulder, where the handles are attached, and near the base. Sometimes there are painted horizontal bands on the shoulder and lower wall (particularly early versions). Some fifth century AD variants have a narrow combed band on the upper wall. The upper shoulder and rim generally bear clay accretions. Made in at least two sections, the upper part of the amphora was held in place on the wheel by wrapping a clay support around it. The same method was used to produce the other ‘classic’ Palestinian form, the ‘bag-shaped’ Late Roman Amphora 5.

Early examples, c. 40 cm high; Later examples 73 cm; (Butrint) But 4042.1: 81.5 cm. Late sixth century AD.
See characteristics

https://doi.org/10.5284/1028192
Questions for us

• Why not create a new archive?
• *People need to know what they are citing has changed*
• How do we manage change?
• *People don’t like ‘wrong data’ being there (cf above)*
• How do we manage this as a workflow
• *We’re not Github*
Current Collections Policy

• Identify at the outset the type of archive (updated vs static)*
• Establish how often it will be updated
• Establish the nature of the update: new data or changed data
• Establish rights management/licencing
Preservation Policy

• Each update is a new version of the archive
• Each version is given a new DOI.
• Old DOIs reference a landing page with a notification and details of how to access data
There’s always a problem!

- People who aren’t the Creator/Copyright holder ask/demand change.*
- Depositors don’t stick to the plan... “sorry I’ve just..”
- We’re not a traditional publishing service (e.g spell-checking)
There’s always solutions

- Increased emphasis on us helping the depositor with Data Management Plans = less reactive
- Increased emphasis on our community and education
Thanks!

tim.evans@york.ac.uk
http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/blog/
https://twitter.com/ADS_Update
help@archaeologydataservice.ac.uk