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**Project Name**

HERALD: Historic Environment Research Archives, Links and Data (6752).

The redevelopment of the OASIS form, Stage 1: User needs requirements and design specification.

**SHAPE Primary Aim**

SHAPE reference SHAPE 14162.110 (Information Management Innovation)

1. **Background & Introduction**

1.1 HERALD represents the next stage of development of OASIS: a collaborative venture between the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) and Historic England (EH) to provide information about archaeological events and access to unpublished archaeological fieldwork reports or ‘grey literature’, especially those produced as a result of planning/development control related fieldwork.

1.2 It has been recognised that, having grown incrementally over many years, OASIS is currently at a stage where it has outlived the system on which it is hosted and there is a need to move it to a new platform and re-engineer the underpinning system architecture. This provides the opportunity for an evaluation of the project to date and the development of a revised strategy which sets the future development of OASIS in the context of changed planning procedures, the need to minimise double handling of information and show public benefit alongside reduced resources within Local Authorities. The main driver for this stage of the project is the requirement to capture user needs and understand the workflows and processes that need to be supported by any redesigned OASIS system. Any redevelopment of the OASIS form will be defined by the outcome of this stage of the project.

The first stage of the project comprised of an online user needs survey and follow up telephone interviews with the historic environment community and Historic England staff. This was followed by two workshops with Historic England staff. Lastly, feedback was sought on a mock-up of the proposed new system from the whole user community. The online user needs survey and telephone interviews are discussed in Section 3; the outcomes of the focus group/online mock-up are described in Section 4; the workshops are covered in Section 5; the findings of the project in Section 6; the key recommendations in Section 7.

2. **Context**

2.1.1 The HERALD project nests within a broader initiative intended to secure an improved and more cost-effective approach to the handling of digital historic environment data (Historic England, 2014), namely the Heritage Information Access Strategy (HIAS).

2.1.2 It is envisaged that the redevelopment of OASIS will be a key work package in the delivery of the Heritage Information Access Strategy. Delivery of the HIAS in turn feeds into Historic England’s wider aspirations for the Historic Environment sector, outlined in the *Historic England Corporate...*

“With our partners, improve access to information through local Historic Environment Records and explore ways of moving towards a single means of accessing historic environment information nationally.”

(Historic England, 2015, p. 18)

2.1.3 The drivers for change laid out in the HIAS proposal document (Historic England, 2014) and latterly ‘Heritage Information Access Strategy: Business Process Mapping of Historic Environment Information’ (Oakleigh Consulting Ltd, 2015, pp. 39, Appendix 1), resonate with vision for the redevelopment of OASIS. In order to effect change, a number of long standing issues of complexity and duplication of effort in the management of, and access to, historic environment information need to be addressed. Principally, this report and the accompanying functional specification seek to identify and address some of the issues also identified in in the Oakleigh report (Oakleigh Consulting Ltd, 2015), namely:

“that there is currently a lack of clarity around process and data flows; the integration of OASIS into workflows, the purpose of systems and the lack of compatibility of IT systems and tools (Oakleigh Consulting Ltd, 2015, p. iv).”

The embedding of OASIS into Local Government information management workflows will facilitate a seamless multi-directional flow of information and realise the goal of faster and better decision making identified as one of Historic England’s key objectives, for itself and others (Historic England, 2015, p. 18, objective 2.6.1).

2.2 Delivery, synergies, dependencies

2.2.1 The HERALD project will be delivered within the broader framework of the Heritage Information Access Strategy. It is envisaged that the strategy will be delivered via a number of synergistic work packages. Aspects of other work packages therefore depend on, or will need to be informed by, HERALD development and delivery. Equally, HERALD may need to be informed by other work packages.

At present the suggested work package dependencies are summarised in Figure 1
2.2.3 Phase 2 of HIAS will run until December 2015. It is anticipated that a HERALD stage 2 Project Design will define the specific mechanisms and procedures required to deliver the key recommendations of this report. The stage 2 HERALD PD would be submitted in September 2015 in time for review and consolidation into other work packages (cf. Islands of Stability in Oakleigh Consulting Ltd, 2015).

3. Executive Summary

3.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. The understanding of OASIS functions and purpose. There is a variable level of understanding of OASIS, its function, purpose, products and outputs and their potential reuse. OASIS should be integrated into existing modes of communication to all groups within the sector and into other historic environment information portals so that existing users can seamlessly move between resources.

2. Engagement with digital technologies. There is still a large proportion of archaeologists in the sector who do not use OASIS at all, these users are generally disengaged from other digital technologies as well.

3. The Grey Literature Library. The long term archiving and dissemination of reports is seen as the primary purpose of OASIS by the majority of those currently engaged with the system.

4. Form Redevelopment

   a. Workflow disconnect. The current workflow in OASIS does not fit well with many Historic Environment Records (HERs) and leads to duplication of effort and
disengagement with the system by contractors and HERs. Some HERs would like to start OASIS records for contractors to complete. The contractors would like their reports to go into the Grey Literature Library even if the HER is not participating in OASIS.

b. **Import / export / synchronisation functions.** This is related to the previous finding. The current lack of simple import and export functionality between OASIS and HERs reduces the ability of HERs to incorporate OASIS into their workflows.

c. **OASIS as an information hub and project tracking tool.** Museum respondents felt that a system which provided access to local collection policies and tracked fieldwork projects from inception to the point of museum deposition would enable archives to plan for and accommodate archive deposition better. This would also create a link to the HER and report through the inclusion of accession codes.

d. **Expansion of the remit/scope of the form.** There was a general feeling that OASIS should be used to record more information but without being able to say what it might be used for. One suggested expansion was that research outcomes should be collected from development control projects and fed into the Research Frameworks. A further suggested expansion was that there should be further investigation of the needs of the historic building community to see if the form could accommodate historic building information more easily.

### 3.2 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

It is envisaged that these recommendations will be addressed as Stage 2 of the HERALD project which will form part of the larger Heritage Information Access Strategy (HIAS).

1. **Increase communication, promotion and training.** The responses throughout the survey highlighted the need for more communication, publicity and training on the OASIS system for all areas of the sector. Identified groups include Historic England staff, academics, community groups, and in particular those working in the built historic environment. This will require a post to provide ongoing and consistent support for the training and promotion of OASIS and the development of a communication strategy.

2. **Design of OASIS to include grey literature only options and backlog upload options.** The OASIS survey responses support the development of different levels of interaction with OASIS by contractors and HERs. To this end, a mechanism that allows OASIS to collect enough data to accompany a grey literature report, whilst not duplicating the whole HER event record, would be welcomed for situations where the HER does not want to participate in OASIS but the contractor would like their report to be archived and online.

3. **Importance of import / export / synchronisation functions.** HERs need to be able to transfer data automatically between the HER and OASIS. This would allow for HERs to contribute to, or benefit from, the data in OASIS at a point in the workflow that fits with them. HERs will need to tailor their different systems to interact with the OASIS Application Program Interface (API). It is recommended that a funding source available to help HERs develop the
necessary systems to do this. Stage 2 of the HERALD project would need to form partnerships with a number of HERs (both HBSMR users and non-users) willing to pilot the development of import / export functionality between the systems.

4. **The inclusion of the museums community.** The project should develop a ‘museums view’ in the new OASIS allowing museums to access OASIS records which fall within their collections area. This will enable them to see expected depositions and communicate with contractors during the deposition process.

5. **Redevelopment of the system to widen scope of recording.** As well as the form being designed to allow for the inclusion of additional modules to accommodate event specific recording (as with the current geophysics module) the main section of the new OASIS form should incorporate a new section for recording the research outcomes of projects in order to inform Research Frameworks and additions to aid recording of specialist techniques. The redevelopment should also enhance the current facility to record building survey work to include better links to terminology and a more detailed metadata schema. The further development of this section needs to be informed by more consultation with the sector.
4. The Surveys & Telephone Interviews

4.1 How the Surveys and Telephone Interviews Were Undertaken

4.1.1 There were two surveys produced: one for the main historic environment community (main survey) and one for Historic England staff (internal HE survey).

4.1.2 The main survey divided respondents into user groups according to how people described themselves from the following options:

- Local government – multi-role archaeologist
- Local government – HER Officer
- Local government – planning archaeologist
- Local government – county/city archaeologist
- Contracting archaeologist
- Archaeological consultant
- Specialist (post excavation analyses)
- Historic building specialist
- Local government – conservation officer
- Volunteer/community archaeologist (including local societies)
- Independent archaeologist/researcher
- Museum professional
- University staff
- University student

The survey was distributed to a number of websites, email lists, blog posts, via Twitter, Facebook and online newsletters:

- OASIS website and blog
- OASIS-users email list
- HER-forum email list
- FAME members email
- CIfA registered organisations email list and Twitter and Facebook
- CIfA Buildings Archaeology Group email
- Society of Museum Archaeologists members email
- Council for British Archaeology – Twitter, Facebook, CBA groups, LHEN, CBA Comm Arch placements
4.1.3 Historic England employees were surveyed separately for three reasons: the question set was
different to the main survey, the HE survey was an additional requirement arising from the outcome of
the first Historic England workshop and the HE survey was sent out by direct emails to employees
rather than to email lists.

4.1.4 Respondents were asked if they would be willing to participate in a short telephone interview. 89
respondents (17%) agreed to participate but the spread of respondents willing was not even across
the user roles, with academics and archaeologists from community groups and historic buildings
specialists being less willing to be interviewed. These groups are infrequent or non-users of OASIS at
present and so this is not unexpected. Conversely museum professionals (also current non-users)
had a high proportion of respondents wanting to participate in a telephone interview.

4.2 SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User group</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Non-users</th>
<th>Phone interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGAO</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAME</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHBC – LG conservation officers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHBC – buildings specialists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums community</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH employees</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3: SURVEY AND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FIGURES
4.2.1 ALGAO SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

104 of the total 516 respondents came under the umbrella of local government (ALGAO members) i.e. multi-role archaeologists, HER Officers, planning archaeologists and city/county archaeologists.

1. There is still a large proportion of local government archaeologists who do not use OASIS at all, or do not use it regularly. There are two likely reasons for this. Firstly, those HERs that do not engage with OASIS demonstrate an equal lack of engagement with other digital technologies, including the Heritage Gateway, the FISH toolkit, DOIs and online access to Grey literature. This indicates a general avoidance rather than a specific issue with OASIS and could be due to personal preferences or to restrictions imposed by working within a local government IT environment.

![FIGURE 4: WORKFLOWS WITHIN LOCAL GOVERNMENT](image)

The second reason for the lack of engagement by part of the HER community is that the current OASIS system doesn’t fit well into their workflows. The OASIS record is created by contractors once the HER has already received the report and they have created their own HER record, leading to duplication of effort and disengagement from the contractors who do not see their records and reports validated and disseminated via the ADS Grey Literature Library.
2. The ADS Grey Literature Library (and other online libraries) are seen as an excellent resource. The long term archiving and dissemination of these reports is seen as a primary purpose of the OASIS system by the majority of HERs.

3. There is a high proportion of HERs who would like to upload their own data from the HER to start or update an OASIS record. The reason for this is because of the perceived high levels of inaccuracies in records uploaded by some contractors. Allowing the HER to upload information will reduce the resource burden on contractors by eliminating the duplication of effort in terms of data entry or recasting. In other words contractors may just need to make additions to the OASIS record started by the HER and upload the report. Equally, the resource burden on the HERs wishing to upload in this way would also be eased by reducing the number of ‘corrections’ deemed necessary to meet the OASIS standard.

4. A major omission from the current OASIS system is the inability to transfer data with ease from OASIS to HERs and vice versa. Many of the workflow problems and duplication issues could be alleviated if there was a simple yet intelligent data synchronisation system between HERs and OASIS. This would enable HERs to start OASIS records at the click of a button. It
would allow the exchange of identifiers to link an HER record with its corresponding OASIS record and report DOI. A synchronised system would allow the HERs to import OASIS fields such as intervention dates, which are often difficult to obtain through other means. It could also mean that large datasets created or updated by other projects (such as HLF projects) could be reintegrated into HERs via OASIS.

5. An additional survey was carried out with a subset of HERs and representatives from the NRHE and RCAHMS was carried out to see which fields within the OASIS form were used in which organisations. The conclusions were that all the fields currently collected by OASIS are used by at least one organisation but that no single field was used by all.
FIGURE 6: WHICH FIELDS IN OASIS ARE USED BY HERS AND NRHE/RCAHMS

The full findings and survey results are available in *HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - ALGAO* (Gilham, 2014a)

4.2.2 FAME SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

There was a good response from contractors with most respondents being users of the OASIS system.
1. Contractors use OASIS primarily because it is included in development control briefs as a requirement, with only a few thinking that they do it as good practice. Contractors want the form to be quick and easy to complete. They do not know where the data goes or how it is used and this impedes their engagement. This reflects the lack of training and promotion currently available for OASIS.

2. Most contractors upload reports to the OASIS system in order to make them available in the public domain via the ADS Grey Literature Library. When the contractors do not include a report it is primarily when there are issues of client confidentiality or because the work is a desk-based assessment (DBA). HERs generally request that DBAs are not submitted through OASIS. A major barrier to report upload and completion of the OASIS record is when the contractors find that the records they do complete are not validated by HERs (and there is no agreement with Historic England for them to undertake validation on the HERs behalf) so the reports are not archived or made available online.

3. The proposed improvements and additions to the form were generally well received but on the proviso that they will not impact on the flow of reports into the public domain and do not significantly add to the workload of contractors. There was some concern that additional sections would need to be cross-searchable with current records.

4. Training and communication is a major issue with this user group as the primary producers of OASIS data. There is confusion between OASIS and the ADS Grey Literature Library and answers to the survey showed that some respondents did not know how to use the form correctly.
The full findings and survey results are available in *HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - FAME* (Gilham, 2014b)

### 4.2.3 SPECIALISTS SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

The response rate for this user group was low and there was some overlap with people sharing roles with those covered by the FAME survey (some specialists defined themselves as archaeological consultants). Respondents included geophysicists, illustrators, archivists as well as artefact and environmental specialists.

Whilst many of the general questions reflected a similar spread of views to the FAME survey there were also some specific specialist issues raised:

1. Specialists would like to be able to upload their complete reports to OASIS for inclusion in the ADS Grey Literature Library. This is for two main reasons: the entire reports they produce are not always included in the main project report and it would make it easier to locate and access artefact or ecofact specific reports which are not usually easily available.

2. A desire for environmental sampling to be added to the OASIS form was identified. Environmental archaeologists would like the OASIS form to record whether environmental sampling has been carried out on a site. This would aid resource discovery of relevant reports.

The full findings and survey results are available in *HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - Specialists* (Gilham, 2014c)

### 4.2.4 IHBC SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

This survey covered the responses of both historic building specialists and local government conservation officers.

1. OASIS is currently used for some building recording but its uptake is not high. This is reflected by the low response of building recording specialists to the survey. There was a good response from conservation officers from England.
FIGURE 8: IF CONSERVATION OFFICERS AND HISTORIC BUILDING SPECIALISTS HAVE HEARD OF OASIS

2. Conservation officers were generally positive about the theory behind the OASIS system, but many had not heard of it before the survey. They thought it should be better publicised. In general, the links between planning departments and conservation officers are more established than between HER officers and conservation officers. Conservation officers would also appear to have a less obvious relationship with the receipt of reports, so it is unclear what their role would be in the OASIS system. They might benefit from greater promotion of the resources available.

3. Most of the small number of building specialists to respond seemed to think that OASIS was generally useful although there was some concern that there was more of a focus on subterranean archaeology. However some seemed keen that buildings recording should not be separated from other events in OASIS as it would be more difficult to locate if it was not integrated. They thought that the ADS Grey Literature Library was a good resource.

The full findings and survey results are available in HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - IHBC (Gilham, 2014d)

4.2.5 COMMUNITY SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS
This survey returned a relatively modest sample. In addition there were distinct divisions within this sample between those identifying themselves as volunteers/community archaeologists and independent archaeologists/researchers. There was an approximate 50:50 split between these two groups.

1. Over half the sample were not users of OASIS and showed a low level of awareness of recent technological advances that support research. It is likely that the community group volunteers made up a significant proportion of the non-users of OASIS.
2. The survey results show that there is a good level of interest in further engagement with OASIS and other technological advances. In addition there is a clear appreciation and interest in the opportunities that are available.

3. Important archaeological research and investigation is being undertaken by community archaeology groups (including local societies) and independent archaeologists/researchers and it is important that they are encouraged to upload material to OASIS in the future.

The full findings and survey results are available HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - Community Groups and Period Societies (Heyworth & Howard, 2014).

4.2.6 MUSEUM SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

While the number of survey respondents was low (a small community), there was an overwhelmingly positive view of OASIS and its potential for the community. In particular the museums seem to want to use the system for two main purposes:

1. **As a hub for deposition information and guidance.** Museum and archive collections policies and deposition information are currently available in different formats and different locations depending on the geographic area. The survey responses showed the museums would like to have this information available to OASIS users through the OASIS system to improve discovery and access to the information and reduce problems associated with unfamiliarity of local procedures, since these can differ greatly across the country.

2. **In order to ‘track’ archaeological deposition and associate accession codes.** Deposition of archaeological archives does not always follow a uniform route and can take a long time. Museum respondents felt that a system which tracked fieldwork projects through to the final deposition of an archive would enable them to plan for and accommodate archive deposition better. Tracking could be facilitated by creating a link to the HER and to the report through the inclusion of accession codes. It would also allow for the state of archive deposition across participating areas to be quantified.

As a new ‘partner’ in the OASIS user community it will be necessary to engage more fully with the wider museum community to better define their requirements.

The full findings and survey results are available in the HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - Museums (Gilham, 2014e)

4.2.7 ACADEMICS SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

The respondents were well distributed between academic staff and students, users and non-users of the OASIS system.
1. Academic awareness of the system is not high, most of the non-users said they had never heard of it.

2. Academics seem to proportionally attach fewer reports than other user groups, and the main reason for this appears to be that their projects are awaiting traditional publication. A side effect of this is that a smaller number of the academic’s records are being validated as some HERs focus on only validating records with reports attached. Historic England also does this when proxy validating.

3. There appears to be a correlation between people being non-users of OASIS and having less knowledge of other online tools and services such as the FISH toolkit, DOIs and other online databases.

4. Some individuals within the academic community think that OASIS is meant for commercial or planning related archaeological projects. This is reinforced by data collected by the OASIS form which is felt to be more relevant to commercial archaeology.

The full findings and survey results are available in HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - Academics (Gilham, 2014f)

4.2.8 HISTORIC ENGLAND SURVEY & TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

1. There is a poor understanding of OASIS products and outputs and their potential value by Historic England staff, either with reference to their own work or indeed the work of others in the sector.

2. There is a particularly poor understanding of how OASIS should, or could, be used internally within the organisation.

3. There is a general feeling that more data (and types of information) should be recorded via the redeveloped OASIS system, but little detail about what the application of this information should be.
The full findings and survey results are available in HERALD - OASIS user needs survey report - English Heritage Staff (Gilham, 2014g)

5. Focus Group / System Mock-up Results

5.1.1 Following the survey and telephone interview research, the focus group task was modified with the aim of reaching as many heritage professionals and volunteers as possible. The consultation took the form of an online mock-up of a new OASIS form with a comments facility. It would not have been possible to engage as many people and their individual opinions through a traditional focus group.

The online mock-up was available at: http://oasis.ac.uk/form/redev_demo/

5.1.2 There were three main perspectives included in the mock-ups. They showed how the form would appear to these three user groups:

i. **Contractors** covers archaeological contractors, building specialists, community groups and other heritage professionals who undertake projects that should be reported to the local HERs or might produce a report they wish to archive and make available online.

ii. **HERs** covers Historic Environment Records or similar organisations which are responsible for overseeing archaeological work undertaken in their area.

iii. **Museums** covers archive, museum or records offices which are responsible for holding archives from archaeological fieldwork and building surveys.

5.1.3 The mock-up was made up of six different scenarios:

- Contractor view
  - Contractor starts a record
  - HER starts a record
- HERs view
  - OASIS STANDARD (contractor starts a record)
  - HER uploads records from HER
  - OASIS LITE
- Museum view
  - How a museum would see OASIS

5.1.4 There were a total of 233 separate comments made on the online mock-up by 65 separate contributors. To give an impression of the frequency of comments there were four contributors who submitted over 15 comments each and 25 people who only commented on a single page. A number of comments were also received by email.

The comments can be grouped into sections:

- Workflow issues
- Form functionality
- Interface adjustments
5.2 WORKFLOW

5.2.1 General comments: respondents expressed overall approval of the mock-up highlighting that it was clearly laid out and seemed to be a more user friendly system. Some of the comments were checking that current functionality would still exist in the new system: for example whether users will be able to start records at different points in the project lifecycle and to return to a record to update it.

5.2.2 Record validation: would all records still be validated by HERs? Contractors were keen that the new system would have a method to allow records and reports into the public domain for areas where an HER was not validating. The new system may have a mechanism for showing records as reviewed rather than validated. Another issue raised was whether the validation of an archive deposit would be independent of the traditional validation of record and report.

5.2.3 Terminology for contractors: community groups and volunteers had one particular comment concerning terminology: they did not identify with the word ‘Contractor’ and felt that an alternative would need to be found which was more inclusive. The inference being that anything labelled ‘Contractor’ would not apply to them.

5.2.4 Archive section and museum involvement: comments were mixed on this with some people thinking that OASIS would be a good medium for including museums and uploading archive notification forms, whereas there were some points which would need to be addressed before the system would work well:

- Respondents asked if museums would use the system and if it is trying to replace a reporting system that already works without adding any sufficient advantages.
- There was concern that contractors might ignore the archive section because it required them to return to the system more than once. Some contractors complete the form in one go but this is dependent on there being good HER involvement in OASIS and the contractors using the system as they are advised to. Contractors tend to complete the forms better where they can see that the information is used, either in the HER or in the ADS Grey Literature Library.
- OASIS would need a mechanism for a contractor to choose a museum which was not currently collecting, if there was no alternative museum, so the system was able to record these requirements in areas where there were gaps in provision. It would also need to record the actual temporary location of such an archive.

5.2.5 Duplication of effort: Some HERs did not like the possibility of uploading records from the HER to start an OASIS record, however other HERs have requested this. Other HERs said that this functionality answered their previous comments about duplication of effort elsewhere in the mock-up. A pilot project, designed to test the OASIS upload functionality, is being proposed for testing by the Welsh Trust HERs.

5.2.6 Event specific recording: One scenario contained an example of event specific recording details for a photogrammetric survey. This was seen as unnecessarily complex. However, there were
no such comments attached to a geophysical survey specific recording page which would suggest that in some cases event specific recording details would be appropriate.

5.2.7 **OASIS LITE:** an HER user asked if the subset of fields which would make up an OASIS LITE (enhanced bibliographic) record would be HER coverage area specific and how the fields had been decided. The theory behind the OASIS LITE record is that there will be enough metadata to allow the report to be catalogued and discovered via the ADS Grey Literature Library. OASIS LITE would be used where an HER is not using the data from OASIS, or is supplying the data and report themselves.

**5.3 FORM FUNCTIONALITY**

There were numerous comments on the functionality of the new OASIS system.

5.3.1 **Individual logins:** The issue that generated the most comments was the move to individual logins in a new OASIS system. People felt that having an organisational login meant that records did not get lost through staff turnover and other factors. The envisaged system would allow for an organisational overview as well as the improved security considerations enabled by having individual logins. All users would belong to an organisation and would be able to see all projects for that organisation. There would be admin/super users within an organisation who would be able to see all the other users belonging to that organisation and carry out administrative tasks. There was also concern that a single user being associated with multiple organisations might have confidentiality issues. A user would have to be approved as a member of both organisations and that would be at the discretion of the admin/super users.

5.3.2 **Notifications:** A periodic summary of notifications was thought to be much better than the current system of individual emails, it should be noted that that a user can opt out of receiving update emails. Local authorities with shared HERs and archives hoped that their notifications could be combined.

5.3.3 **Additional functionality:** the additional functionality on the mock-up of the form was generally well received. Popular examples were the ability to verify project locations on a map and the ability to associate a project with others in the vicinity. People still wanted the choice of uploading a boundary GIS file as well as being able to mark the project boundary on a map. HERs liked having access to the form completion statistics for contractors working in their area and they wanted to retain the current record export options, as well as being able to link directly to the system. There was support for the automatic extraction of keywords from the report but only if it works well enough. HERs and museums felt that it might be beneficial for the archive notes section to be viewable by all levels of user as archive discussions can involve all groups. They also felt that the archive checklists used in the current form should be retained as they give an early indication of the content before the final list is submitted.

5.3.4 There were some more suggestions for additional form functionality:

1. It should be possible to pull in geological data using BGS OpenData polygon layers
2. The project summary/list pages should include a visual indication of the completeness of a record and perhaps there should be a left-hand dashboard for ease of navigation
3. There should be links from the archive section to museum notification forms
4. Historic Scotland would like OASIS to be better integrated with the Discovery and Excavation in Scotland systems

Finally there was a request that the report ‘sent by other means’ option should be retained. However this option should be unavailable for OASIS LITE records as the record is purely there to describe the report.

5.4 Interface adjustments

5.4.1 There was some valuable feedback on the interface that can be incorporated into the design of the new form. Suggestions included small but important elements such as the project list being sortable by the column headings, that all icons should be well labelled and that the current word lists for event types and identifiers should be updated. Museums would find a project list tab ‘Projects awaiting deposition’ useful. The HER/archive location page should say if the museum had approved the deposit.

6. Workshops

6.1 HISTORIC ENGLAND WORKSHOP 1 - JANUARY 2014

6.1.1 A workshop was held in Waterhouse Square, London, on 21st January 2014. The main reason for this workshop was to garner information from Historic England staff in different parts of the organisation. It was noted that both the Investigation Teams and the Inspectors should be involved in future discussions within Historic England. The suggestions and discussion surrounding this topic were wide ranging but focused on the vision for OASIS and its use by the sector rather than its use within Historic England itself.

6.1.2 Historic England staff said they would use OASIS to record investigations of historic assets. OASIS use would be mandated in commissioned project work and in work on heritage assets where HE have a curatorial responsibility (i.e. scheduled monuments, Listed Buildings I and II*, protected wrecks and Historic England properties). Historic England also hope that it will be used internally to demonstrate and promote good practice.

6.2 HISTORIC ENGLAND WORKSHOP 2 - NOVEMBER 2014

6.2.1 Two workshops were held in Swindon on 25th and 26th November 2014. Each participant was asked to answer the following questions as part of a three minute presentation:

1. What is your current interaction with data about events in your job?
2. How does OASIS data currently play a part in that?
3. What data (about events) do you currently want but cannot get?
4. What three things relating to events would make your job easier?
These themes were drawn from the presentations:

- OASIS should produce a comprehensive record of events
  - Geographically – with all HERs or contractors being encouraged to participate
  - Additional user groups should be accommodated in OASIS: building specialists, post-excavation specialists, academics, volunteers
  - Better quality data should be encouraged at the data entry stage
- OASIS should be a single system or linked systems which enables import and export from key parties especially HERs
- Improved promotion and guidance – there was an acknowledgement that OASIS was not currently well publicised and there was confusion concerning its purpose and role
  - There was definite support for an ongoing communications and support role associated with the OASIS system
- The interface should be improved
- OASIS should have a tracking role and should record the location of archives

7. Summary of Findings

The following comprises a summary of the key findings from all aspects of Stage 1 of the HERALD project.

7.1 FINDING 1: THERE IS A POOR UNDERSTANDING OF OASIS FUNCTIONS AND PURPOSE

Misunderstanding of OASIS functions and purpose is most notable within those parts of the sector not yet using OASIS fully (notably the built environment and specialists). However it is more worrying that this lack of understanding extends to Historic England staff, some contracting staff (where there is a high staff turnover) and the academic community who do use the system. The results of the survey, the telephone interviews and an initial workshop with Historic England lead to the conclusion that many in the sector feel that OASIS 'isn't really to do with them’ or that it is used exclusively in the development control process. However, important archaeological research and investigation is being undertaken by community archaeology groups (including local societies) and independent archaeologists/researchers and it is important that they are encouraged to upload material to OASIS in the future.

In addition to confusion about who should use the system and what it does, the most common misconception is that OASIS and the ADS Grey Literature Library are one and the same system.

Promotion needs to be tailored to both groups and individuals (and consideration needs to be given to how to make contact with individuals or maybe encourage them to become affiliated with regional groups). OASIS should be integrated into existing modes of communication to all sectors and should be integrated into other historic environment information portals so that existing users can seamlessly move between resources.
7.2 FINDING 2: ENGAGEMENT WITH DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES.
There is still a large number of archaeologists in the sector who do not use OASIS at all. In this group, which is cross-sector, there is a lack of engagement with digital technologies in general, as well as OASIS. This group rarely provides online access to their grey literature and neither uses nor engages with the Heritage Gateway or other online services.

7.3 FINDING 3: THE GREY LITERATURE LIBRARY.
The ADS Grey Literature Library is seen as an excellent resource. The long term archiving and dissemination of these reports is seen as the primary purpose of OASIS by the majority of those currently engaged with the system. The exception is in the academic community who, while appreciating access to the Grey Literature Library, tend not to contribute as they focus on traditional means of publication. It should be noted however, that with the inclusion of DOIs for reports, the line between traditional publication and grey literature is starting to blur. However, a major barrier to report upload and completion of the OASIS record by producers occurs when the contractors find that the records they do complete are not validated by HERs (and there is no agreement with Historic England for them to undertake validation on the HER’s behalf). In these cases the reports are not archived or made available online as they have not been ‘signed off’.

It was also thought that an extension of the OASIS form to enable the upload of specialist reports, and thereby the inclusion of these reports in the ADS Grey Literature Library, would be a positive step. This is for two main reasons: the reports they produce are not always included in full in the main project report and it would make it easier to locate artefact or eco-fact specific reports which are not usually in the public domain (see Appendix 2: Mock-up 7: Specialist View for more information on how this might be addressed).

![FIGURE 10: OASIS PLUS SPECIALIST BUSINESS PROCESS MODEL](image-url)
7.4 FINDING 4A: FORM REDEVELOPMENT - WORKFLOW DISCONNECT.

The original design of OASIS assumed that curators would adapt their workflows to use the form. However, this did not happen and the current OASIS system does not fit well into a significant proportion of curator’s workflows. For example, in some cases the OASIS record is created by contractors once the HER has already received the report and have created their own HER record, leading to duplication of effort and disengagement from the contractors who do not see their records and reports validated and disseminated via the ADS Grey Literature Library. There is a high proportion of HERs who would like to upload their own data from the HER in order to initiate or update an OASIS record even though this seems to contradict the original purpose of OASIS. The reasons for this appear to be that some HERs require a skeleton record at the beginning of a project or that, in some cases, the levels of inaccuracies in records uploaded by some contractors are perceived as too high. Allowing the HER to upload directly may remove the duplication in recording and the burden on contractors who could just make additions to an OASIS record if required, and then upload the report if appropriate.

7.5 FINDING 4B: FORM REDEVELOPMENT - IMPORT/EXPORT/SYNCHRONISATION FUNCTIONS.

A major omission from the current OASIS system is the inability to exchange data easily between OASIS and HER records. Many of the workflow problems and duplication issues could be alleviated if there was a simple yet intelligent data synchronisation system between HERs and OASIS. This would allow HERs to start OASIS records at the click of a button, it would allow the exchange of ID numbers to link HER record with OASIS record and report DOI. It could also mean that large datasets created or updated by other projects (such as HLF projects) could be reintegrated into HERs via OASIS.
7.6 FINDING 4C: FORM REDEVELOPMENT - OASIS AS AN INFORMATION HUB AND PROJECT TRACKING TOOL.

Museum and archive collection policies and deposition information are currently available in different forms and different locations depending on the geographic area. The survey responses showed that the museums would like to have this information available to OASIS users through the OASIS system. This would improve access to the information and reduce problems associated with unfamiliarity with local procedures as these can differ greatly across the country. Deposition of archaeological archives does not always follow a uniform route and can take a long time. Museum respondents felt that a system which enabled archives to plan for and accommodate archive deposition would be beneficial. Use of OASIS would also create a link to the HER and report through the inclusion of accession codes. It would also give a quantified picture of the state of archive deposition across participating areas. The collection of identifiers associated with a project would benefit all users of the data from OASIS, even if the actual data in OASIS was not always of the same detail.

7.7 FINDING 4D: FORM REDEVELOPMENT - EXPANSION OF THE REMIT/SCOPE OF THE FORM.

Most respondents tend to agree that ‘more data’ should be recorded, but there is little clear idea about why, by whom, and how that additional data could be used. OASIS is currently used for some building recording but its uptake is not high, as reflected by the low response of building recording specialists to the survey. Conservation officers were generally positive about the theory behind the OASIS system, but many had not heard of it before the survey. They thought it should be better publicised. In general, there seems to be a greater link between planning departments and conservation officers than there is between conservation officers and HER officers. Nonetheless, conservation officers would also appear to have a less obvious relationship with the receipt of reports, so it is unclear what their role would be in the OASIS system. It seems the main need is for more promotion of the Grey Literature Library.

The survey found that many HERs refer to research frameworks when setting briefs or in written schemes of investigation. However, there is no structured method for the collection of this information currently. OASIS records might provide a mechanism for collecting research outcomes from fieldwork arising from the development control process and community projects.

8. Key Recommendations

It is envisaged that these recommendations will be addressed as Stage 2 of the HERALD project which will form part of the larger Heritage Information Access Strategy (HIAS). Additionally, some of aspects of the recommendations will need to exist for the lifetime of the OASIS system, e.g. support and promotion will need to be ongoing.

8.1 RECOMMENDATION 1: INCREASE COMMUNICATION, PROMOTION AND TRAINING.
The responses throughout the survey highlighted the need for more communication, promotion and training on the OASIS system for all areas of the sector, in particular for those working in the built historic environment. This survey (as in the Pye-Tait survey (Smith et al 2012)) highlights that misunderstandings about the purpose and function of the system remain high. Training would need to cover all aspects of the system: training for the data producers completing the form, training for data consumers and general promotion for end users who mostly access the information collected by OASIS through the public facing outlets: i.e. HERs, the ADS Grey Literature Library, the Historic England Excavation Index etc.

1. The system will always require some level of training as the complexity of the information being collected is more akin to a tax return than booking train tickets. The training will need to focus on the processes and requirements of the curators within an area. This will ensure that participants can make informed choices on how and when to use OASIS. It is envisaged that instructions on the form itself can be provided in a user friendly and timely fashion.

2. Another aspect of training and promotion will be to build good relationships with HERs, archives and national heritage organisations to ensure they are aware of the different options they have for interacting with OASIS and how they might encourage data producers to complete records and upload reports. There will also need to be help with what to include in local guidance documentation. The intention is that OASIS will be a time saving device resulting in efficiency savings for curators. The initial embedding of the system into existing workflows will require an input of effort in order to realise these efficiencies. Some of that initial assistance will need to be provided centrally rather than coming from the local authorities.

3. Promotion is also needed to make users aware of where OASIS data goes, what it is used for, why it is collected and how people can access it. Promotion should include exemplars of what HERs are able to do with the data, the functionality available to HBSMR users and non-users, how to access help and guidance from Historic England and what other support is available.

4. Stage 2 of the project should involve a dedicated training and promotion role to cover the production of online training materials as well as a suite of training and information resources which can be used at workshops and provided to stakeholders on request. The role will need to respond to helpdesk enquiries, arrange and run workshops and generally manage the transition to the new OASIS system within the historic environment community. Although aspects of this role will be specific to the redevelopment of OASIS there is a necessity for ongoing and consistent support for the training and promotion of the system. One of the main problems of the current system has been this lack of sustained promotion and a technological solution alone cannot answer this need. A communication strategy will need to be developed.
which will make use of existing communication structures including ALGAO, FAME, CBA regional groups and HE Local Engagement Officers.

8.2 RECOMMENDATION 2: DESIGN OF OASIS TO INCLUDE GREY LITERATURE ONLY OPTIONS AND BACKLOG UPLOAD OPTIONS

The OASIS survey responses support the development of different levels of interaction with OASIS by contractors and HERs. There is a significant minority of HERs who, while they do not wish to interact with OASIS, do value access to grey literature reports online, with the added benefit of an archiving solution. If the HER for an area does not require data from OASIS, as it does not fit into their workflow and its use creates duplication of effort, they could choose to be part of a very minimal version of the OASIS form. This would allow the upload of a grey literature report and an enhanced bibliographic record. This record would aid resource discovery (i.e. allow users to find the report more easily) whilst omitting much of the information needed for a full event record in OASIS. The report and record would go into the ADS Grey Literature Library for dissemination and archiving. This record could either be submitted by the fieldworker or by the receiving HER on an area by area basis. Other HERs who do use OASIS in their workflows could continue to collect and use the full event record. There may be additional sections of the new OASIS system which would be required regardless of the HER engagement such as the completion of the research outcomes to populate research frameworks. Another strong theme that came out of the survey was that OASIS should have the facility to upload ‘backlog’ grey literature, i.e. grey literature reports on non-current archaeological work. This grey literature may include digitised (scanned) reports.

![Figure 12: Enhanced Bibliographic Record](image-url)
The focus group and other respondents to the proposed grey literature-only upload (OASIS LITE) have suggested that this option might lead to contractors downgrading their input into OASIS. It should be stressed that OASIS LITE would only be an option for contractors working in an area where the HER was collecting the full event data by another means. The hope is that a streamlined process for populating the ADS Grey Literature Library would increase engagement with OASIS overall. The model shown in Figure 14 has the report details being input into the ADS Grey Literature Library as soon as the minimum level of OASIS record is completed and the report uploaded. The report could be made available with the record as soon as it has been archived, reviewed by the HER (if participating) and there is no embargo period set. This way, the OASIS user would see an immediate product from filling in the OASIS form and even if the report is not yet linked to the record, a DOI could be made available for use at this point.
8.3 RECOMMENDATION 3: IMPORTANCE OF IMPORT / EXPORT / SYNCHRONISATION FUNCTIONS

HERs need to be able to transfer data automatically between HER and OASIS to allow for HERs to contribute to or benefit from the data which is in OASIS at the point in the workflow that fits with them. The ability to transfer data with ease between systems is core to the ‘COPE’ Capture Once Publish Everywhere ethos which underpins the vision of the redeveloped OASIS system. OASIS will be developed with this in mind and an API, web services and OAI-PMH targets will be developed in order that automated data transfer will be possible. HERs will need to tailor their differing systems to interact with the OASIS API and the recommendation is that a funding source be provided to help HERs develop the necessary systems to do this. This connection between systems would allow for data exchange, concordance of identifiers and accommodation of different workflows. It will also reduce duplication of effort whilst also allowing the import of large datasets from large area projects such as those funded by the HLF.

Stage 2 of the HERALD project would need to form partnerships with a small number of HERs (both HBSMR users and non-users) willing to pilot the development of import / export / synchronisation functionality between the systems.

8.4 RECOMMENDATION 4: THE INCLUSION OF THE MUSEUMS COMMUNITY

It is recommended that the project develops a ‘museum view’ in the new OASIS system allowing museums to access OASIS records which fall within their collections area. Museum and archive managers would be able to log in to the OASIS system and see the fieldwork projects which have
happened in their collection area. This could include information on the expected archive contents and the expected date of deposition which would allow museums to plan for future space requirements.

The systems should allow museums to communicate with contractors in OASIS, provide accession numbers and be notified of archive section completion, if appropriate. This communication could be recorded through the OASIS system, giving a project-centred view of the archive deposition and accommodating issues which can arise through delays and staff changes. The notification of archive completion can also be fed through the OASIS system to planning departments and HERs, if required.

OASIS redevelopment should also investigate the integration of the SMA collections areas map with the new OASIS system and include links to collections policies within OASIS. This could work in a similar way to how HERs currently claim administrative areas in OASIS and would make the SMA collections areas map and database into a live and integrated system, giving up to date information on the archive deposition possibilities for areas around the country.

FIGURE 15: OASIS MUSEUM BUSINESS PROCESS MODEL

See Appendix 2: Mock-up 6: Museum View for more information on how the museums community could use OASIS.

8.5 Recommendation 5: Redevelopment of the System to Widen Scope of Recording

New technology should allow for the form to collect information in a more efficient way allowing users to input more information without increasing the time spent on data entry. This will enable the form to collect information on the research outcomes of a project in accordance with the research frameworks referred to by many HERs in briefs or written schemes of investigation. The information can then be fed back into the research frameworks in an automated fashion and other research strategies, such
as the National Heritage Science Strategy could also benefit if desired. The specialist survey findings suggest that there should be a field to record the presence/absence of environmental sampling and other specialist techniques.

The redevelopment of the system should enhance the current facility to record building survey work, include better links to terminology and include a more detailed metadata schema. However, the workflow for this element of record creation and delivery should remain very flexible until the wide variation in the elements of the sector involved with historic buildings recording can be better identified. A more tailored enhancement may need to be created in the future.

FIGURE 16: OASIS BUILDING SPECIALIST BUSINESS PROCESS MODEL

Stage 2 of the HERALD project should address this as part of the communication strategy discussed in recommendation 1.
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Appendix 1: Draft Functional Specification

See separate file - OASIS_redevelopement_functional_spec_v1.2
Appendix 2: Mock-up Scenarios

Mock-up 1: Contractor view (contractor starts the record)

OASIS – Contractor view

How new OASIS might look for a contractor

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s).
A user ‘owns’ a project and that project is associated with an organisation. Everyone from the same organisation can see and potentially edit all the organisation’s projects. A user can belong to more than one organisation and projects can be shared with more than one organisation where appropriate.

Tabs display different lists of projects:

- Your projects – Joe Bloggs
- Projects for An example Archaeology Unit
- Needs attention
- Recent projects
- Your other projects
- All your organisation’s projects

**Projects:**
- GEOPHYSICS AT 1002 ROAD, WATERBEACH, SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE, OCT 2014
- BRD 226: 80 LONDON ROAD, BRANDON, BRANDON, FOREST HEATH, JUL 2013
- LAND SOUTH OF BOURNE ROAD, SPALDING, SOUTH HOLLAND, OCT 2011

**Add a new OASIS record as a contractor**

New records will be started by entering the location. Location can be defined by Grid reference, place name or postcode. It will also be able to accommodate large area projects which span multiple districts, counties or even whole countries.

**Location**

SE60045219

- Grid reference
- Place name
- Postcode

Find

You have selected:

KING’S MANOR, YORK, NORTH YORKSHIRE

Please define the project boundary on the map and then store the project location by clicking on the button below.

Store location

The project location can then be pin pointed on map and a boundary drawn. The map would be able to be zoomed and panned to allow the area to be defined. If it was a large project covering a whole county or counties the boundary could be generated according to the county boundary. How would you find it easiest to define large area projects?
The project location would indicate which HER(s) and Museum could receive the information from the OASIS form. There will be indicators to show their level of interaction with OASIS and links to their collections policies and other information useful to an OASIS user when filling in the form. The HER and Museum pages will be wiki style so that they can edit them and keep them up-to-date.

From this point the OASIS record exists and can be saved and edited.

Projects nearby - abcd1-123456
Select other events related to this project which already exists in OASIS. The OASIS id will be linked to this project.

Linked events:
- yorkuni-123456

It could be possible to link nearby events interactively. Nearby events would be highlighted on the map with enough information to distinguish between them. Which events are visible could depend on the embargo period set later in the form.

Report details - abcd1-123456
Grey literature report

Use this as the project title

Title
Photogrammetric Survey at King's Manor York

Author
J. Bloggs

Date
2004

Publisher

Embargo period
None

Not all fields are shown here.

The embargo period could not only say when the report would go into the Grey literature library but also when the event was visible in the 'Projects nearby' page.

Event types would be selected from the EH event type thesaurus. This would be done using a look up from the centralised vocabulary at heritagedata.org. It would also include the fields methods, techniques and prompt.
It may be possible to import the information from the PDF report and check it against the information entered in the form. In time it may be possible to extract this information direct from an uploaded report.

The report has been processed and the following information confirmed:

- **Title:** Photogrammetric Survey at King’s Manor York  
- **Author:** J. Bloggs  
- **Grid reference:** SE 6004 5219  
- **Location:** KING’S MANOR, YORK, NORTH YORKSHIRE  
- **Report No:** AERU-1243

It is possible to extract thesaurus terms from the uploaded PDF report to make it easier to include them in the OASIS record.

The following thesaurus terms were found in the report:

- abbey  5  
- chapel  3  
- church  1  
- stables  2  
- furniture  1  
- courtyard  2  
- gatehouse  1  
- gallery  2  
- gatehouse roofs  1  
- bakehouse  1  
- brewhouse  1  
- plaster frieze  1  
- brick arches  1  
- roof  1  
- chambers  1  
- church  1  
- cloister  1  
- furniture  1  
- gatehouse roofs  1  
- granary  1  
- hall  1  
- roof  1  
- royal palace  1  
- stairs  1  
- cellar  1  
- stone  1  

There will be the facility to add monument types, artefacts, ecofacts and period via a thesaurus look up using the centralised thesauri at heritagedata.org

Associated Identifiers - abcd1-123456

Select the type of identifier, enter the identifier and then click the button to add it to the list. Please include as many identifiers as are available.

- OASIS id: yorkuni
- Sitecode: FB1234

Associated Identifiers - this was easily missed in the last version of the form and is key to linking records in different systems. More than one identifier can be included.
Photogrammetric Survey at King’s Manor York

Other details would be added here. Different fields would be mandatory dependent on the HER requirements in order to avoid collecting duplicate data as much as possible.

**Project details**

- **Project title**: Photogrammetric Survey at King’s Manor York
- **Description**
- **Project dates**
- **Study area**

**People involved**

- **Name of Organisation**
- **Project brief originator**
- **Project design originator**
- **Project director/manager**

Event specific recording: photogrammetry

- **Intended accuracy or scale**: 1-2 centimeter for image block.
- **Camera specifics**: Nikon D200 DSLR camera body with Nikkor 50mm f/1.4 fixed lens
- **Array dimensions in pixels**: 3872 x 2592
- **Array dimensions in mm**: 23.6 x 15.8

Event specific details – there is already an event specific recording form for geophysical surveys – this could be extended for other sorts of events. Photogrammetry is just an example.

**Archive details**

- **Archive Component 1**
  - **Archive Component**: Total archive
  - **Current location**: Contractor headquarters
  - **Future location**: Yorkshire Museum
  - **Date of deposition**: 01.06.2015

ARCHIVE PAGES WOULD ALLOW USERS TO ENTER DETAILS AND LOCATION OF DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE ARCHIVE AND UPLOAD AN ARCHIVE CONTENTS LIST OR BOX LIST AS REQUESTED BY A PARTICIPATING MUSEUM. THE MUSEUM WOULD ALSO BE ABLE TO ENTER THE ACCESSION NUMBER AND INDICATE THAT THE PROJECT ARCHIVE HAD BEEN DEPOSITED. THERE COULD BE NOTES AREA WHICH WAS VISIBLE TO BOTH MUSEUM AND CONTRACTOR IN WHICH THEY COULD LOG COMMUNICATION ABOUT A PLANNED DEPOSITION.

28 May 2015
Project summary page for contractors

- Location ✓
- Projects nearby ✓
- Event type(s) ✓
- Report details ✓
- Associated Identifiers ✓
- Evidence ✓
- Project details ✓
- People involved ✓
- Event specific details ✓
- Archive details ✓

Icons indicate updates and completeness

Project Summary Page – this lists the pages for the oasis record and their status. There would be indicators to show where files had been uploaded or items had been changed by another user since the last login. There would be also indicators to say where the project is in its lifecycle.

User profile page for contractors

- Current Organisations:
  - An Example Archaeology Unit
  - View completion statistics
  - Add another organisation
  - Update your details
  - Change you password
  - View project tracking

User profile – Joe Bloggs

- Notifications
  - Daily digest updates
  - Record updates: on
  - HER messages: on
  - Museum messages: on
  - Grey literature library additions: on
  - Archive release notifications: on
  - Record downloads: on

User profile page – this would allow a user to control their notifications and view their project completion statistics as well as changing name, address and password details. Completion rates could be introduced to indicate the number of completed projects and archive deposited with active museums.
Mock-up 2: Contractor view (HER starts the record)

OASIS HER upload – contractor view

How new OASIS might look for a contractor if the HER starts OASIS records

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s).
A user ‘owns’ a project and that project is associated with an organisation. Everyone from the same organisation can see and potentially edit all the organisation’s projects. A user can belong to more than one organisation and projects can be shared with more than one organisation where appropriate.

Tabs display different lists of projects:

- Your projects
- Projects for An example Archaeology Unit
- Needs
- Recent projects
- Your other projects
- All your organisation’s projects

The first part of starting a record or finding a record look very similar for the contractor. It is only once the location has been entered and the HER selected that the views change.

Find your project by location or identifier:

Location: TL 3188 9783
Identifier: Planning appl no.

Find your project

First the contractor enters the location where they have been working in order to find existing records that they can claim. Location can be defined by Grid reference, place name or postcode.

The project location can then be pin pointed on map. The map would be able to be zoomed and panned to allow the area to be defined.
The project location would indicate which HER(s) and Museum could receive the information from the OASIS form. There will be indicators to show their level of interaction with OASIS and links to their collections policies and other information useful to an OASIS user when filling in the form. The HER and Museum pages will be wiki style so that they can edit them and keep them up-to-date.

Here Cambridgeshire HER are uploading records to the system for contractors to add to (this is just an example).

The HER did not upload a project boundary: please define the boundary on the map and then store the project location by clicking on the button below.

The project boundary can be drawn on the map. The map would be able to be zoomed and panned to allow the area to be defined. If it was a large project covering a whole county or counties the boundary could be generated according to the county boundary.

How would you find it easiest to define large area projects?
Event types would be selected from the EH event type thesaurus. This would be done using a look up from the centralised vocabulary at heritagedata.org. It would also include the fields methods, techniques and prompt.

Event type: Geophysical Survey

Techniques: Magnetometry

Development type: Rural commercial

Prompt: Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

Position in the planning process: After full determination (eg. As a condition)

Report details will be added as normal and the report uploaded at the same time. This could either be done by the contractor or by the HER import process. Not all fields are shown here.

The embargo period could not only say when the report would go into the Grey literature library but also when the event was visible in the 'Projects nearby' page.

It may be possible to import the information from the PDF report and check it against the information entered in the form. In time it may be possible to extract this information direct from an uploaded report without having to enter it by hand but as reports come in all shapes and sizes it is not yet possible.
There will be the facility to add monument types, artefacts, ecofacts and period terms via a thesaurus look up using the centralised thesauri at heritagedata.org.

Additional subject and period terms - cambridg2-324343

Monument type

- boundary

The limit line of a field.

There will be the facility to add monument types, artefacts, ecofacts and period terms via a thesaurus look up using the centralised thesauri at heritagedata.org.

Associated Identifiers - cambridg2-324343

- HER event no.
- ECB3543

Add identifier

Associated Identifiers - this was easily missed in the last version of the form and is key to linking records in different systems. More than one identifier can be included. The HER number would already be there but other contractor identifiers could be added.

Other details would be added here. Different fields would be mandatory dependent on the HER requirements in order to avoid collecting duplicate data as much as possible. Some fields would be pre-filled by the HER and the contractor can complete others.

People involved - cambridg2-324343

- Name of Organisation
- Project brief originator
- Project design originator
- Project director/manager

People involved in the project can be added.
Event specific details – there is already an event specific recording form for geophysical surveys – this could be extended for other sorts of events.

Event specific recording: geophysics - cambridg2-324343

Solid geology
- OXFORD CLAY AND KELLAWAYS BEDS

Drift geology
- GLACIAL SAND AND GRAVEL

Instrumentation

Size of survey area

Archive details - cambridg2-324343

Archive Component 1

Archive Status: Awaiting deposition

Contact Museum

Archive Component
- Total archive

Current location
- Contractor headquarters

Future location
- Peterborough Museum

Date of deposition
- 01-06-2015

Upload contents list:
- Contents_list.xlsx

Contact Museum

Archives pages would allow users to enter details and location of different components of the archive and upload an archive contents list or box list as requested by a participating museum. The museum would also be able to enter the accession number and indicate that the project archive had been deposited. There could be a notes area which was visible to both museum and contractor in which they could log communication about a planned deposition.

Mock-up 3: HER View (contractor starts the record)

OASIS STANDARD - HER

How new OASIS might look for an HER

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s). Linking to an HER or other validating organisation would be moderated by the OASIS team.
The HER would be able to see their projects in different ways:
A category view with different tabs showing new records, recently updated records, records needing attention, ongoing and completed projects. There would also be a search facility and a detailed daily/weekly update as required.

How an HER would see their projects

The HER user sees all the projects which have happened in their area. There can be multiple individual logins associated with an HER. Projects can be shared with more than one HER if they cross a boundary. Tabs would display different lists of projects.

Search for projects

As well as records being grouped by categories it will also be possible to search the OASIS records in the HER area.

Search

Results:

bcddef - 23490 TRINITY COURT, ROMAN WAY, CORBRIDGE, BLANKSHIRE, Oct 2014
zxygd - 23456 TREDINNICK FARM, NEWQUAY, ST NEWLYN EAST, BLANKSHIRE, Jul 2013
blahs - 98545 INGLEBOROUGH HILLFORT, INGLETON, INGLETON, BLANKSHIRE, Oct 2011

Project summary - abced1-123456

A historic building photographic survey, The East Pavillon, Leesthorpe Hall

Location ✓ View
Projects nearby ✓ View
Event type(s) ✓ View
Report details ✓ View
Associated Identifiers ✓ View
Evidence ✓ View
Project details ✓ View
People involved ✓ View
Archive details ✓ View

Contractor information: (82/154) An Example Archaeological Unit
Museum information: participating Blankshire Museum
Fieldwork completed: yes
HER core fields: completed
Archive deposited: no
Accession code: yes
HER number: yes

The whole record could be viewed (and checked) at once or section by section.

Project Summary Page – this lists the pages for the oasis record and their status. There would be indicators to show where files had been uploaded or items had been changed by another user since the last login. There would be also indicators to say where the project is in its lifecycle and links to more detailed information about the contractor and museum.
Each item listed on the summary page would link to a page of information. An HER can either look at each individual page or they can look at the whole record on one page. The following are the pages we currently see being included in the new OASIS system.

How each section would appear to a HER

The project location is shown on the map with the project boundary. The project boundary could be downloaded in different formats for import into GIS software. If it was a large project covering a whole county or counties the boundary could be generated according to the county boundary. How would you find it easiest to deal with large area projects?

The HER for the project is selected when the data is entered, this page would allow the HER to be changed if necessary and also has links to the HER and Museum pages. The HER and Museum pages will be wiki style so that they can edit them and keep them up-to-date.

Projects nearby - abcde1-123456

There are no projects nearby

It could be possible to link nearby events interactively. Nearby events would be highlighted on the map with enough information to distinguish between them. Which events are visible could depend on the embargo period set later in the form.
Event types would be selected from the EH event type thesaurus. This would be done using a look up from the centralised vocabulary at heritagedata.org. It would also include the fields methods, techniques and prompt.

Event type: Building Survey
Techniques: Photographic Survey
Prompt: Listed Building Consent
Site Status: Listed Building

Report details will be added as normal and the report uploaded at the same time. Not all fields are shown here.

The embargo period could not only say when the report would go into the Grey literature library but also when the event was visible in the ‘Projects nearby’ page.

The green tick by the report name indicates that the grid reference, title, author etc have been extracted from the report and match the data on the form.

Associated Identifiers: Select the type of identifier, enter the identifier and then click the button to add it to the list. Please include as many identifiers as are available.

Associated Identifiers - abcede1-123456

Monuments, artefacts and ecofacts would be on this page and can be added to or updated by the HER.
Other details would have been added here by the contractor. Different fields would have been mandatory dependent on the HER requirements in order to avoid collecting duplicate data as much as possible.

**Project title**: An Historic Building Photographic Survey of the East Pavilion, Leesthorpe Hall

**Description**: A photographic survey was undertaken by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) at Leesthorpe Hall, Leicestershire. The survey studied the garage block officially recorded as the eastern pavilion under its grade II listed status.


**Project title**: An Historic Building Photographic Survey of the East Pavilion, Leesthorpe Hall

**Description**: A photographic survey was undertaken by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) at Leesthorpe Hall, Leicestershire. The survey studied the garage block officially recorded as the eastern pavilion under its grade II listed status.


**Archive Component 1**

**Archive Component**: Total archive

**Current location**: Contractor headquarters

**Future location**: Blankshire Museum

**Date of deposition**: 01-06-2015

The HER would be able to see the Archive pages and therefore what stage the archive planning and deposition had reached.

People involved in the project can be added.

**Name of Organisation**: University of Leicester Archaeological Services

**Project brief originator**: Local Planning Authority (with/without advice from County/District Archaeologist)

**Project design originator**: Patrick Clay

**Project director/manager**: Patrick Clay

The HER would be able to see the Archive pages and therefore what stage the archive planning and deposition had reached.
User profile page – this would allow a user to control their notifications as well as changing name, address and password details. There would be the possibility of viewing completion and statistics for contractors working in the organisation’s area.

Organisation profile – Blankshire HER

Areas covered by Blankshire HER:
Blankshire

Members
An admin user can add members to an organisation

Anne Hero – admin user
Valerie Volunteer – normal user

OASIS participation Level
Change the detail of the OASIS record you receive

OASIS LITE OASIS STANDARD

More information on participation levels

Projects in your area – Anne Hero - Blankshire Historic Environment Record

This week’s activities in your area:
3 new records have been started
3 records are ready for you to download
22 reports have been added to the ADS Grey Literature Library
1 archive has been released on ADS

Older activities

How a update page or email might look to an HER

This example shows how updates to HERs could be structured so that they receive information in a concise and useful fashion. This information could be sent daily, weekly or just be available when the HER user logged into the system online.
OASIS exists as a transit lounge to temporarily hold data as it is passed from user to user. Importing data to OASIS allows HERs more options on how to interact with OASIS. If HERs start a record during fieldwork but the contractor doesn’t complete an OASIS record until the report is complete it might be easier for the HER to start the OASIS record by uploading data to OASIS which the contractor can then add to rather than validating a duplicated contractor created record later in the process (See examples page for more information). Equally records can be exported from OASIS.

Importing and exporting records

**Import**

You can upload a spreadsheet to OASIS with data to start or add to OASIS records.

Example:

Add your HER numbers to OASIS records.

**Export**

Exporting records is a 3 step process:

Step 1: Choose records to export

Examples:
- all records between dates
- all completed records

Step 2: Choose which parts of a record to export

Examples:
- all fields
- just the bibliographic details

Step 3: Choose the format to download results in

Example:
- text file
- MIDAS or OASIS XML
- direct to HER database

See the HER upload scenario for more details on direct import and export methods.

Mock-up 4: HER View (HER uploads the record)

OASIS – HER upload

How new OASIS might look for an HER who starts OASIS records from the HER

The HER would upload event data to start an OASIS record

1. Select records in HER database to upload
2. Click an upload to OASIS button
3. Receive a confirmation message
4. Records would be visible in OASIS

N.B. This would require an initial set up to allow transfer from HER to OASIS

The HER can set up an upload script to OASIS – this would upload a predefined set of fields from an HER record to start an OASIS record that a contractor can then add to. This would bypass the need for HER validation as the data would originate with the HER. This data would then go on to populate other systems such as the grey literature library.
Then log into the system:

Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s). Linking to an HER or other validating organisation would be moderated by the OASIS team.

An HER user sees all the projects which have happened in their area. This is where the projects uploaded from the HER would appear. Tabs would display different lists of projects according to the users preferences.

As well as records being grouped by categories it will also be possible to search the OASIS records in the HER area.

There would be indicators to show where files had been uploaded or items had been changed by another user since the last login. There would be also indicators to say where the project is in its lifecycle and links to more detailed information about the contractor and museum.
If the HER has been set up to allow imports directly to OASIS from the HER then it would also be possible to export additional information to the HER from OASIS.

Exporting OASIS records to HER

It would be possible to export additional data to the HER if required. The HER would map OASIS fields to the HER database and then be able to update records. There would be a screen to check the incoming data before it is saved to the HER. This would require resource from the HER for integration.

Export / synchronise projects

Selected projects:

- **TRINITY COURT, ROMAN WAY, CORBRIDGE, BLANKSHIRE**, Oct 2014
- **TREDINNICK FARM, NEWQUAY, ST NEWLYN EAST, BLANKSHIRE**, Jul 2013
- **INGLEBOROUGH HILLFORT, INGLETON, NORTH YORKSHIRE, INGLETON, BLANKSHIRE**, Oct 2011

Export to HER

It would be possible to export additional data to the HER if required. The HER would map OASIS fields to the HER database and then be able to update records. There would be a screen to check the incoming data before it is saved to the HER. This would require resource from the HER for integration.

User profile page for HER user and organisation

User profile – Anne Hero

**Current Organisations:**
- Blankshire HER

**Notifications**
- Daily digest updates
- Record updates: on
- Contractor messages: on
- Museum messages: on
- Grey literature library additions: on
- Archive release notifications: on

**[+] Change notification settings**

**[+] Update HER settings**

**[+] Update your details**

**[+] Change your password**

**[+] View project tracking**

User profile page – this would allow a user to control their notifications as well as changing name, address and password details. There would be the possibility of viewing completion and statistics for contractors working in the organisation’s area.
This profile page would allow a user to change the organisation details. This is where users could be associated with the HER and the level of authorisation defined. This is also where the HER could set what type of OASIS records they are currently requesting (LITE or STANDARD) and the area they cover.

Members
- Anne Hero – admin user
- Valerie Volunteer – normal user

[+] add / change members

Organisation profile – Blankshire HER

Areas covered by Blankshire HER:
Blankshire

[+] add / change area

OASIS participation Level
Change the detail of the OASIS record you receive
OASIS LITE OASIS STANDARD

[+] add / change members
[+] Update HER requirements (wiki page)
[+] View project tracking

How a update page or email might look to an HER

This example shows how updates to HERs could be structured so that they receive information in a concise and useful format. This information could be sent daily, weekly or just be available when the HER user logged into the system online.

This week's activities in your area:

4 new records have been started by you
1 new record has been started by a contractor
3 records have been claimed by a contractor and updated

abcd-341234 Watching brief on 15 Lower Lane
abcd-563378 Survey at land next to Tesco
abcd-341298 Building survey at 24 Main Street

3 records have been downloaded/modified by Blankshire Museum service

Projects in your area – Anne Hero - Blankshire Historic Environment Record

Also
22 reports have been added to the ADS Grey Literature Library
1 archive has been released on ADS

Older activities

More information on the record and other aspects of a HER's view of OASIS is available on the scenarios menu page.
OASIS LITE - HER

How new OASIS might look for an HER who doesn’t really use OASIS

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s). Linking to an HER or other validating organisation would be moderated by the OASIS team.

The HER would be able to see their projects in different ways:
A category view with different tabs showing new records, recently updated records, records needing attention, ongoing and completed projects. There would also be a search facility and a detailed daily/weekly update as required.

An HER user sees all the projects which have happened in their area. There can be multiple individual logins associated with an HER. Projects can be shared with more than one HER if they cross a boundary. Tabs would display different lists of projects.
As well as records being grouped by categories it will also be possible to search the OASIS records in the HER area.

Project Summary Page – this lists the pages for the oasis record and their status. There would be indicators to show where files had been uploaded or items had been changed by another user since the last login. There would be also indicators to say where the project is in its lifecycle and links to more detailed information about the contractor and museum.
User profile – Anne Hero

Current Organisations:
Blankshire HER

| ![+] Add another organisation |
| ![+] Update HER settings |
| ![+] Update your details |
| ![+] Change you password |
| ![+] View project tracking |

Notifications
- Daily digest updates
- Record updates: on
- Contractor messages: on
- Museum messages: on
- Grey literature library additions: on
- Archive release notifications: on

[+Change notification settings]

How a update page or email might look to an HER

Organisation profile – Blankshire HER

Areas covered by Blankshire HER:
Blankshire

![+] add / change area

Members
An admin user can add members to an organisation

- Anne Hero – admin user
- Valerie Volunteer – normal user

OASIS participation Level

- OASIS LITE
- OASIS STANDARD

![+] Update HER requirements (wiki page)

Hold records until checked

- Yes
- No

[+] Update HER requirements (wiki page)

Members
This is where users could be associated with the HER and the level of authorisation defined.

This is also where the HER could set what type of OASIS records they are currently requesting (LITE or STANDARD) and the area they cover and whether they are approving records or not.

Projects in your area – Anne Hero - Blankshire Historic Environment Record

This week's activities in your area:

- 3 new records have been started
- 3 records are ready for you to download
- 3 records have been downloaded/modified by Blankshire Museum service
- 22 reports have been added to the ADS Grey Literature Library
- 1 archive has been released on ADS

How a update page or email might look to an HER

This example shows how updates to HERs could be structured so that they receive information in a concise and useful fashion. This information could be sent daily, weekly or just be available when the HER user logged into the system online.
Mock-up 6: Museum View

OASIS MUSEUMS

How new OASIS might look for a museum or archive*

* The term museum in this demonstration is used as an umbrella term for organisations accepting archives

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s). Linking to an HER or museum would be moderated by the OASIS team.

The museum would be able to see their projects in different ways:
A category view with different tabs showing new records, recently updated records, records needing attention, ongoing and completed projects. There would also be a search facility and a detailed daily/weekly update as required.

Projects in your area – Anne Curator
Blankshire Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs attention</th>
<th>New projects</th>
<th>Recently viewed projects</th>
<th>Validated projects</th>
<th>All projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOFLYTHYS AT CODY ROAD, WATERBEACH, BLANKSHIRE, Oct 2014</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRD 22: 80 LONDON ROAD, BRANDON. BRANDON, BLANKSHIRE, Jul 2013</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND SOUTH OF BOURNE ROAD, SPALDING, BLANKSHIRE, Oct 2011</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
<td>🌍</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A museum user sees all the projects which have happened in their area. There can be multiple individual logins associated with a museum. Projects can be shared with more than one museum if they cross a boundary. Tabs would display different lists of projects.
As well as records being grouped by categories it will also be possible to search the OASIS records in the Museum area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Summary Page</th>
<th>Associated Identifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abcde1-123456</td>
<td>her_event_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning_application_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>museum_accession_id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nhle_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nmr_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oasis_form_id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning_application_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related_her_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sm_no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sitecode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ukho_reference_number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The museum for the project is selected when the data is entered, this page would allow the museum to be changed if necessary and also has links to the HER and Museum pages. The HER and Museum pages will be wiki style so that they can be edited and kept up-to-date.
The museum would be able to see what the contractor had added for the archive including multiple locations if the archive is not all together. There would also be the ability to upload a spreadsheet of the expected archive contents and the museum would be able to specify the format of this in their archive deposition requirements wiki page.

The museum and contractor would be able to communicate about the archive deposition. These notes and messages will be stored here so that they will still be available even if there is a change of personnel during the lifecycle of the project.

The museum and contractor would be able to communicate about the archive deposition. These notes and messages will be stored here so that they will still be available even if there is a change of personnel during the lifecycle of the project.

The museum and contractor would be able to communicate about the archive deposition. These notes and messages will be stored here so that they will still be available even if there is a change of personnel during the lifecycle of the project.
Organisation profile – Blankshire Museum

Areas covered by Blankshire Museum: Blankshire

[+] add / change area

OASIS participation status
Are you accepting information about archive depositions via OASIS?

No ☐ Yes ☑

Members
An admin user can add members to an organisation

Anne Curator – admin user
Valerie Volunteer – normal user

[+] add / change members

More information on participation status (?)

Museum profile page – this would allow a user to change the organisation details.
This is where users could be associated with the Museum and the level of authorisation defined.
This is also where the Museum could set whether they are participating in OASIS and the area they cover. The coverage information could also be integrated with the SMA Map of archaeological collection areas.

Projects in your area – Anne Curator - Blankshire Museum

This week's activities in your area:

2 new requests for Museum Accession Ids
3 records are ready for you to download

- abcde-341234 Watching brief on 25 Lower Lane [wiki] [download]
- abcde-563378 Survey at land next to Tesco [wiki] [download]
- abcde-341298 Building survey at 24 Main Street [wiki] [download]

2 records have new archive notes to view and answer
5 records have been downloaded/modified by Blankshire HER

ALSO

22 reports have been added to the ADS Grey Literature Library [wiki] [download DOIs]
1 archive has been released on ADS [wiki] [download DOIs]

Older activities [+]
Import: ideally it would be possible for museums to click an ‘upload to OASIS’ button in their museum system but that requires resource from the museum as well as OASIS. In the meantime it will be possible to upload records to OASIS from a spreadsheet.

Export: there is already an export facility in OASIS and this will be updated to reflect the process above. It would also be possible to export records direct to a museum system from OASIS using the API.

---

Mock-up 7: Specialist View

OASIS Specialist view

How new OASIS might look for a specialist adding their report to an existing record

Log in to new OASIS or register your details as a new user of the system. Each user has their own username which is then linked with their associated organisation(s).
A user ‘owns’ a project and that project is associated with an organisation. Everyone from the same organisation can see and potentially edit all the organisation’s projects. A user can belong to more than one organisation and projects can be shared with more than one organisation where appropriate.

A specialist could either be part of their own organisation or affiliated with a larger contractor and they would see the projects which they have added information and/or a report to.

Tabs display different lists of projects

Your projects – Keith Potts

Projects for Potts Ceramics Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs attention</th>
<th>Recent projects</th>
<th>Your other projects</th>
<th>All your organisation’s projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCAVATION AT CODY ROAD, WATERHEADS, SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE, Oct 2014</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRD 226: 80 LONDON ROAD, BRANDON, BRANDON, FOREST HEATH, Jul 2013</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND SOUTH OF BOURNE ROAD, SPALDING, SOUTH HOLLAND, Oct 2011</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specialist will be able to find a project in OASIS and then add information and/or a report to it.

Find an existing OASIS record as a specialist

The specialist can use a number of different ways of locating the project they are looking for, the most simple would be the OASIS Id but any of the above would narrow down the results in order to select the one they need.

Find your project by location or identifier

Location

- Grid reference
- Place name
- Postcode

Identifier

- OASIS Id
- HER number
- Planning appl no.

Find your project

Three possible outcomes to this search

1. The project selected in the system and has visible OASIS record
2. The project is in the system but has an embargo placed on it (hidden)
3. The project is not in the system

Depending on the type of search one or more records will be returned – open records will show the OASIS id, title, contractor date and location, embargoed records will just show an OASIS Id. The third option is if there are no records found. This might be due to typos in the search – OASIS Id being incorrect or that the project has yet to be entered in OASIS.
1. The project selected in the system and has a visible OASIS record

You have selected:

anexamp1-232349

Excavations at 23 March Road, Eldernell, Coates, Blankshire by An Example Archaeology Unit in June 2014

Claim project

The OASIS Id, project name, location, organisation and date is displayed for identification purposes. If there is more than one project identified from the search their will be the ability to select the correct one and claim it.

2. The project is in the system but has an embargo placed on it

You have selected:

anexamp1-232349

This is an embargoed project and access to it needs to be requested from the contractor / HER. Please send the request opposite, edit it if required.

In this example the OASIS record has an embargo on it delaying the release of the report into the public domain. If the specialist needed to upload the report during the embargo period they would be able to but would need to be granted access to the record by the HER or contractor. This would be a straightforward process for the contractor/HER – clicking on a link in an email, for instance.

3. The project is not in the system

You have searched for: anexamp1-232349

There is no project matching this OASIS Id in the system please search again or contact the contractor/HER for the project

In this example there is no record matching the OASIS Id the Specialist is searching for. They can either search again if it is a typo or search using different criteria – i.e. location. Or they can find and contact the contractor or HER for the project.
The specialist could then click on the report details section to add another report.

The specialist will enter the report details for their specialist report here (in addition to the project report which may or may not have already been added). They can also upload the report itself to this page.

It may be possible to import the information from the PDF report and check it against the information entered in the form. In time it may be possible to extract this information directly from an uploaded report without having to enter it by hand but as reports come in all shapes and sizes it is not yet possible.

The following thesaurus terms were found in the report:

- sherds: 54
- potteries: 54
- graywares: 6
- flanged rim: 4
- bowl: 22
- shelly ware: 4
- everted rim: 22
- flaring rim: 4
- Potterspury ware: 15
- beaded rim: 4
- jugs: 13
- Brill/Boarstall ware: 3
- sherd: 13
- Stamford ware: 3
- vessel: 7
- cooking pots: 7
- settlement: 7
- Pit: 3
- cooking pots: 3
- Potterspury fabrics: 3
- rim: 5
- Cistercian ware: 2
It will be possible for the specialist to add extra monument types, artefacts, ecofacts and period terms via a thesaurus look up using the centralised thesauri at heritagedata.org.

The specialist will also be able to add any other identifiers to help identify the project.

Event specific details – there could be additional fields for recording pottery reports. This may be recorded here rather than in the broader subject area shown previously. Above is just an example.

The project summary page now reflects the updates the specialist has added and notifications would be sent to the HER / contractor for the record to say it has been updated.