

Social Science and Human Research Bulletin

ISSN(e): 3050-5542

ISSN(p): 3050-5534

Vol. 03(11): 1428-1435, November 2026

Home Page: http://sshrbjournal.org/

Managing Archaeological Sites during Urbanization: An Analytical Framework for Vietnam

Ho Thi Quynh

Queen Group Joint Stock Company, Hanoi, Vietnam

Article DOI: 10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-1109 **DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-1109**

KEYWORDS: archaeological heritage management, urbanization, preventive archaeology, cultural heritage law, Hà Nội, Vietnam.

ABSTRACT: Archaeological sites present a distinct urban-management challenge because buried deposits may be unknown before development and excavation irreversibly removes their contexts. This article develops an analytical framework for managing archaeological heritage under urbanization and examines its relevance to Vietnam. Using qualitative documentary analysis, it draws on international archaeological charters, Vietnamese legislation and planning instruments enacted in 2024-2025, scholarly literature, and published records concerning three sites in Hanoi: Vuon Chuoi, 18 Hoang Dieu and 36 Dien Bien Phu. Seven management components are identified, including three especially important for buried heritage: identifying archaeological potential, integrating archaeological assessment into project planning, and managing finds and records after excavation. The cases illustrate the risks of considering archaeology only after a road alignment or building location has been determined. The 2024 Law on Cultural Heritage and implementing decrees provide a clearer legal foundation for archaeological planning, discovery reporting and excavation; nevertheless, the effectiveness of early coordination with development procedures cannot be established from legislation alone. This article proposes indicators for subsequent evaluation using permits, spatial plans, excavation archives and interviews. It neither reports original field observations nor estimates the prevalence of implementation problems across Vietnam.

Corresponding Author
Ho Thi Quynh

Published: November 20, 2026

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

I. INTRODUCTION

Archaeological sites form a distinct category within cultural heritage. A temple or a communal house stands above ground, is used by a community and can be inspected by officials. An archaeological site is mostly invisible. Its value lies in stratified deposits, building foundations, burials and artefacts whose extent is known only approximately until someone surveys or excavates. Excavation itself is destructive: once a layer has been removed, what remains is the excavation record and the finds. These two characteristics mean that the main threat to an archaeological site is often not neglect but construction, and that the decisive moment for protection usually comes before any archaeologist is on site, when a road alignment is drawn or a building permit is issued.

International practice has recognised this for several decades. The comparative volume edited by Cleere (1989) treated archaeological heritage management as a field with its own legislation, institutions and professional standards rather than as a side activity of academic research. The Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage adopted by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS, 1990) stated that protection should be integrated into planning policies and that preservation in situ should be the preferred objective. The revised European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, known as the Valletta Convention, required states to bring archaeologists into planning procedures and to provide for archaeological costs in the budgets of public and private development projects (Council of Europe, 1992). Demoule (2012) describes how these rules, together with the growth of commercial archaeological units from the 1980s, changed excavation practice in Western Europe.

Vietnam faces the same tension between development and buried heritage, and Hà Nội is the clearest example. The city has 5,922 inventoried relics, including one World Heritage property, 21 special national relics, 1,160 national relics and 1,456 city-level relics (Đào, 2024). Many archaeological sites lie in districts that the Capital Planning for 2021 to 2030 identifies for urban expansion (Prime Minister of Vietnam, 2024). In the inner city, construction of basements and underground car parks has exposed deposits from before the founding of Thăng Long, as at 36 Điện Biên Phủ, where glazed ceramics of the seventh to ninth centuries were recovered (Nguyễn, Đ. B., 2022).

Vietnam's legal context changed with Law on Cultural Heritage No. 45/2024/QH15, effective on 1 July 2025, and Decrees No. 208/2025/ND-CP and 308/2025/ND-CP (National Assembly of Vietnam, 2024; Government of Vietnam, 2025a, 2025b). These instruments address archaeological planning, locations, exploration and excavation. Decree 308 also specifies procedures for reporting and temporarily protecting newly discovered archaeological evidence. Hanoi's 2025 administrative reorganisation created 126 commune-level units in a two-tier local-government structure (Standing Committee of the National Assembly, 2025), making practical coordination between commune and city authorities especially salient.

The literature on archaeological heritage management has moved in two directions that are relevant here. One direction is institutional. McManamon and Hatton (2000) collected studies from several continents that describe how laws, agencies and professional bodies deal with the destruction of sites by development, including chapters on the protection of archaeological resources in the United States, on the conflict between preservation and development in Japan, and on heritage management in Northern Ireland. Demoule (2011, 2012) followed the European experience after the Valletta Convention and showed that once developers were made to pay, the volume of excavation grew and the profession changed, with commercial units taking a large share of fieldwork. The other direction is critical. Smith (2006) argued that heritage practice is shaped by an authorized heritage discourse in which experts and state agencies decide what counts as heritage and how it should be treated, while local people are cast as audiences. For archaeological sites, which are often defined and interpreted only by specialists, this critique draws attention to who takes decisions and whose interests are weighed.

A third body of work concerns the city as a whole. Bandarin and van Oers (2012) set out the historic urban landscape approach, which treats a city as the result of historical layering of cultural and natural values rather than as a collection of separate monuments. Labadi and Logan (2016) brought together studies showing that international heritage frameworks are often weakened when they are applied by national and local governments, because planning offices and investors follow other rules and timetables. Together these works suggest that the protection of buried heritage in cities depends less on the existence of principles than on whether those principles are built into the ordinary procedures of planning and investment.

Vietnamese research on these issues is uneven. Archaeologists have documented individual sites in Hanoi, while broader heritage research has concentrated on standing relics, tourism, and public participation. Nguyen, T. H. (2012) noted the vulnerability of buried remains during urban construction in Ho Chi Minh City. A survey of sustainable tourism and conservation awareness in Hanoi identifies the relevance of local participation to the social stewardship of cultural heritage (Nguyen, T. P., 2025). Research on place attachment, heritage memory, cultural identity, and community engagement similarly situates conservation within residents' relationships to place (Vu & Nguyen, 2026). These two studies address the broader heritage-tourism context, not the administration of archaeological permits, but they clarify why decisions about excavated urban heritage should not be understood solely as technical decisions of experts. Studies focused on archaeology-specific planning and project approval remain comparatively limited.

The study asks: (1) Which management functions and indicators are especially relevant to archaeological sites undergoing urbanisation? (2) How do the 2024-2025 provisions and three documented Hanoi cases correspond to these functions? The contribution is a testable analytical framework and documentary comparison, rather than a national audit of compliance or new excavation research.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study applied qualitative document analysis in three sequential stages: source selection, thematic coding, and comparative interpretation.

2.1. Source selection

The documentary corpus comprised four groups: international archaeological instruments, Vietnamese legal and planning texts, archaeological and urban-heritage scholarship, and published records of the three Hanoi cases. The principal normative sources were the 1990 ICOMOS Charter, the 1992 Valletta Convention, Law No. 45/2024/QH15, Decrees No. 208/2025/ND-CP and No. 308/2025/ND-CP, Hanoi's administrative reorganisation, and the Capital Planning decision. Archaeological scholarship addressed preventive excavation, designation, conservation, and planning coordination (Cleere, 1989; McManamon & Hatton, 2000; Demoule, 2011, 2012; Smith, 2006; Bandarin & van Oers, 2012; Labadi & Logan, 2016). The case corpus contained excavation publications, designation reports, and contemporaneous accounts (Tong et al., 2006; Nguyen, D. B., 2022; Duong, 2024; Vietnam News Agency, 2025). Additional Vietnamese studies on public engagement, interpretation, and digital preservation (Nguyen, T. P., 2025, 2026; Vu & Nguyen, 2026; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2026; Ha et al., 2026) were considered only for contextual implications of participation and post-excavation access, not as empirical evidence about archaeological project approvals. Relevant English and Vietnamese

documents were retrieved through publisher, journal, government, and library sources. This was a purposive documentary synthesis rather than an exhaustive systematic search.

2.2. Analytical coding

In the second step, the author coded the international and scholarly sources for management functions, that is, for what an authority must do to protect archaeological sites when land is developed. Functions that appeared in at least two independent sources were retained and grouped into components. For each component, a guiding question and a set of measurable indicators were drafted. Indicators were limited to those that a researcher could compute from official records or from interviews with officials and developers.

The coding was done manually on the full texts of the international instruments and on the relevant chapters of the books and articles. Each passage that described an action by an authority, a developer or an archaeologist in relation to land development was assigned a provisional code, such as inventory, predictive mapping, designation, zoning, planning consultation, developer funding, permit, supervision, report deposit, archive, publication or in situ conservation. Codes were then merged where sources used different words for the same function, for example rescue, salvage and preventive excavation, which differ in timing but share the function of recording remains before destruction. The decision whether a component was specific to archaeology rested on one test: whether the function would be needed for a standing monument whose location and extent are already known. Functions that would not be needed in that situation were classed as archaeology-specific.

2.3. Legal and case comparison

In the third step, the Vietnamese legal texts and the three cases were read against the components. For the legal texts, the analysis covered the article headings of the 2024 Law, Chapter II of Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP and the definitions in Chapter I of Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP, and recorded whether each component had an explicit legal basis. For the cases, it recorded the sequence of decisions on discovery, excavation, designation and development, and noted at which component the sequence broke down.

For each case, five items were recorded where the sources allowed: the date of discovery, the dates and scale of excavation, the date and level of designation, the development decision that triggered or accompanied excavation, and the outcome for the remains, whether preserved in situ, removed or still undecided. The cases were chosen to represent three situations: a prehistoric site on the urban fringe affected by a new road (Vườn Chuối), a major site discovered during preparation of a state building in the centre (18 Hoàng Diệu), and finds exposed by underground construction in the inner city (36 Điện Biên Phủ).

The study has limits that follow from its design. It used published records only and did not collect interviews or survey data. Dates and outcomes for the cases are therefore those reported in publications and in the press, and internal administrative steps that were not published could not be observed. No statistical analysis was performed because the data are documentary.

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1. Components of the analytical framework

The coding yielded seven components, each paired with a guiding question and examples of observable administrative indicators (Table 1).

Table 1. Seven components of archaeological-site management under urbanisation

Component	Guiding question	Examples of indicators
1. Rules and enforcement	Do the rules cover archaeological sites, and are breaches sanctioned?	Provisions specific to archaeological locations, number of inspections, cases of works stopped after chance finds
2. Organisation and capacity	Which authority is responsible at each level, and does it have specialist staff?	Documented reporting chain; archaeologically trained staff per responsible authority
3. Knowledge of buried potential*	Does the authority know where remains are likely before development is proposed?	Share of territory covered by a map of archaeological potential, share of published sites included in the inventory
4. Designation and zoning	Are known sites designated, bounded and marked?	Discovery-to-designation time; share of sites with mapped boundaries
5. Integration into planning and project approval*	Does archaeological information reach planners and investors before decisions are fixed?	Share of projects assessed before approval; archaeology reflected in plans and budgets

Component	Guiding question	Examples of indicators
6. Excavation permitting and supervision	Are surveys and excavations authorised, supervised and matched to the threat?	Number of permits by type, share of emergency excavations, time allowed for fieldwork
7. Post-excavation management*	Are results analysed, deposited, conserved and made public?	Report and deposit dates; archive access; protection of in situ remains

Note: Components 3, 5 and 7 are particularly specific to buried archaeological evidence. Source: Author's synthesis of cited literature.

Four of the components appear in most heritage management systems and apply to standing monuments as well. Component 1 covers the rules and their enforcement. Component 2 covers the organisations that apply the rules, the division of tasks between levels of government and the specialist staff available. Component 4 covers designation and the drawing of protected zones with boundary markers. Component 6 covers the permit system for exploration and excavation and the supervision of fieldwork.

These four components are not trivial in an urban setting. Under Component 1, the question is not only whether rules exist but whether breaches lead to sanctions and whether works are stopped when remains appear. Under Component 2, decentralisation determines which official is closest to a construction site and whether that official has the knowledge to recognise an archaeological deposit. Under Component 4, designation gives a site a legal boundary and makes it visible in land records, which is often the only way it enters the files that a planning office consults. Under Component 6, the distinction between regular excavation for research and emergency excavation at a site under threat matters, because emergency excavation is usually shorter, has less room for analysis and is more often funded and scheduled by the development project.

The other three components are specific to archaeology, and they carry most of the weight in an urbanizing setting.

Component 3, knowledge of buried potential, follows from the fact that most archaeological remains have not yet been found. An authority that relies only on a list of known and designated sites will learn of new sites only when machines expose them. Cleere (1989) and the contributors to McManamon and Hatton (2000) describe inventories and predictive maps as the base of national systems. The relevant indicator is not the number of designated sites but the share of the territory for which there is a reasoned estimate of archaeological potential.

Component 5, integration into planning and project approval, concerns the moment at which archaeological information reaches the people who decide where to build. The ICOMOS charter (1990) and the Valletta Convention (Council of Europe, 1992) both place this integration at the centre of protection. The Valletta Convention also ties it to money by requiring that archaeological work be provided for in development budgets. Demoule (2012) shows that this requirement created a regular demand for preventive excavation in Europe and changed who carried it out. The indicator here is timing: the share of projects in areas of archaeological potential that were assessed before approval rather than after work had begun.

Component 7, post-excavation management, covers what happens after fieldwork: analysis, the excavation report, deposit of finds and archives, conservation of exposed remains, publication and public access. Demoule (2011) warns that preventive excavation can produce large quantities of unpublished material if this stage is not funded and supervised. Where remains are preserved in situ, as recommended by ICOMOS (1990), post-excavation management also includes long-term conservation of an open site.

3.2. Legal basis and institutional responsibilities in Vietnam

Table 2 links the seven components to the legislation examined; it does not assess implementation rates.

Table 2. Legislative references for the seven management components

Component	Main legal basis identified	Observation
1. Rules and enforcement	Law on Cultural Heritage No. 45/2024/QH15	General basis in place from 1 July 2025
2. Organisation and capacity	Law No. 45/2024/QH15; Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP; Resolution No. 1656/NQ-UBTVQH15	Commune-level discovery reporting is specified in Article 14; staffing and practical coordination require assessment.
3. Knowledge of buried potential	Article 37 of the Law, Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP	Archaeological plans require site information, boundaries and maps
4. Designation and zoning	Article 38 of the Law	Archaeological locations and areas have a separate article

Component	Main legal basis identified	Observation
5. Integration into planning and project approval	Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP, Chapter II	Archaeological planning is regulated; its operational connection to project screening requires examination across procedures.
6. Excavation permitting and supervision	Article 39 of the Law, Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP	Regular and emergency excavation defined
7. Post-excavation management	Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP	Excavation documentation is recognised; archival access and follow-up performance were not assessed.

Source: Author's document comparison of the 2024 Law and the 2025 decrees.

The 2024 Law gives each archaeology-specific component some legal footing. Archaeological planning, the subject of Article 37 and Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP, is a tool for Component 3 and Component 5 because it requires the authority to identify archaeological locations and areas and to set out how they will be studied and protected. Article 38 on archaeological locations and areas supports Component 4. Article 39 and Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP support Component 6. Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP defines emergency excavation as excavation carried out to study and recover remains at a location that is being destroyed or is at risk of destruction, and defines the excavation dossier as the full set of written records, drawings, rubbings, photographs and audiovisual materials produced during research, exploration and excavation. These definitions give Component 7 a starting point, because they make the dossier a legal object.

Chapter II of Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP (Articles 4 to 12) shows how archaeological planning is meant to work. The provincial culture agency prepares the plan, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism appraises it, and the chair of the provincial People's Committee approves it. The plan must state the scientific information on the site, its boundaries and area, a programme of research and excavation, and protection measures, with boundary maps at scales of 1:500 to 1:2,000. Communities and affected parties must be consulted, and the approved plan must be published within 15 working days (Government of Vietnam, 2025a). Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP also counts chance finds as archaeological artefacts when they have historical, cultural and scientific value (Government of Vietnam, 2025b).

One correction is important for understanding institutional responsibilities. Article 14 of Decree 308 already requires the commune-level People's Committee, when notified of an archaeological find, to receive the relevant objects and report to provincial authorities within 24 hours. The task is therefore not legally unassigned. The remaining empirical question is whether reporting, specialist advice, archaeological planning and investment approval are connected and adequately resourced in practice. Similarly, a definition of an excavation dossier does not by itself demonstrate the quality, accessibility or long-term management of excavation archives (Government of Vietnam, 2025b).

3.3. Documentary comparison of three Hanoi cases

Vuon Chuoi, a prehistoric site identified in 1969, underwent 11 excavation campaigns covering more than 7,500 square metres by 2025. A major campaign in its western sector covered approximately 6,000 square metres between March 2024 and March 2025 (Vietnam News Agency, 2025). Contemporary reporting links the work to the Ring Road 3.5 alignment and an imposed land-handover timetable (Duong, 2024). Hanoi designated the site as a city-level relic on 23 June 2025. The long interval between initial discovery and designation indicates vulnerability under Component 4; the documented road timetable indicates pressures on Components 5 and 6. Available publications do not reveal every earlier planning consultation, so the precise sequence of official assessments requires further archival verification.

At 18 Hoang Dieu, substantial remains were exposed in 2002 during preparation for a proposed National Assembly building, prompting large-scale investigation (Tong et al., 2006). A major portion was retained in situ; the Central Sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2010. The case illustrates the possibility of protecting exceptional discoveries despite late recognition of their archaeological extent. It also shows why a planning process relying on discovery during site preparation carries significant risk.

At 36 Dien Bien Phu, underground car-park and tunnel construction exposed seventh- to ninth-century glazed ceramics (Nguyen, D. B., 2022). Their publication demonstrates that research dissemination occurred, although the source does not establish the timing of all archival steps or the final conservation outcome. The case illustrates the potential value of sensitivity assessment before deep construction in the historic core.

Table 3 summarises the published sequences and the associated management questions, without assuming that unpublished administrative actions did not occur.

Table 3. Documented development-archaeology sequences in Hanoi

Case	Documented sequence	Components where divergence occurred
Vuon Chuoi (former Hoai Duc district)	Discovered in 1969; 11 campaigns; major western excavation in March 2024-March 2025; road project; city-level designation on 23 June 2025.	4: long designation delay; 5-6: development timetable constrained archaeological response.
18 Hoang Dieu (Ba Dinh)	Remains exposed during 2002 government-building preparation; large-scale excavations; substantial preservation in situ; UNESCO inscription in 2010.	5: discovery followed location selection; subsequent conservation response was unusually favourable.
36 Dien Bien Phu (Ba Dinh)	Seventh- to ninth-century glazed ceramics exposed during underground construction; published in 2022.	3: relevance of predictive assessment; 7: publication documented, later archive pathway unclear.

Source: Author's comparison of Tong et al. (2006), Nguyen, D. B. (2022), Duong (2024) and Vietnam News Agency (2025).

IV. DISCUSSION AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The comparison gives particular weight to archaeological sensitivity mapping, early project assessment and management after excavation. Published evidence on Vuon Chuoi and 18 Hoang Dieu indicates that major archaeological responses followed development-related decisions or site preparation. This is consistent with a reactive pattern, but published sources cannot establish how every project-screening step was carried out.

International comparison clarifies the alternative. The Valletta Convention integrates archaeology into the planning stage and places associated costs within development budgets (Council of Europe, 1992). McManamon and Hatton (2000) document the tensions among development, heritage protection and professional capacity in several jurisdictions. Demoule (2011, 2012) shows that preventive archaeology can expand excavation activity while also generating problems of supervision, research quality and delayed publication. Adopting these principles in Vietnam would require adaptations to local administrative procedures and archaeological capacity rather than direct transplantation of European institutions.

Hanoi's two-tier local-government structure creates a practical coordination challenge, not an absence of legal reporting duties. Article 14 of Decree 308 gives commune authorities a specified initial role following discovery (Government of Vietnam, 2025b). Whether staff can recognise archaeological evidence, contact specialists and transmit location information promptly is an operational question requiring training data and observation. Predictive mapping could make this role easier by flagging sensitive areas before construction starts.

Money is the second issue that the comparison raises. In the European model, the developer pays for archaeological assessment and excavation as part of project costs (Council of Europe, 1992). This rule gives developers a reason to seek archaeological information early, since an assessment before land purchase or design is cheaper than an excavation that halts work on a site. In the Vườn Chuối case, by contrast, excavation was organised under a deadline set by a road project (Dương, 2024). When archaeology enters a project only as a cost imposed at the end, both the developer and the archaeologists work under pressure, and the scope for analysis and publication shrinks. The framework therefore treats developer responsibility not as a separate component but as a condition that links Component 5 to Component 6 and Component 7: if projects in areas of potential are assessed before approval, the cost of any later excavation and post-excavation work can be planned and agreed in advance.

The third issue is the quality and subsequent use of excavation results. The 36 Dien Bien Phu finds were published in an archaeological journal (Nguyen, D. B., 2022), as were the results of research at 18 Hoang Dieu in an edited volume (Tong et al., 2006). These publications demonstrate research dissemination, but the documentary evidence reviewed here cannot establish how long all excavation reports take to complete, how consistently records are deposited, or whether planners can retrieve them. Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP legally recognises an excavation dossier (Government of Vietnam, 2025b), creating an important foundation for custodianship and traceability. In a broader Vietnamese heritage context, Nguyen, T. P. (2026) discusses digital preservation strategies such as descriptive metadata and the long-term stewardship of digital collections. Those principles could inform the management of excavation photographs, plans, spatial files, and object registers. They do not establish that such a repository is already operating at any of the three Hanoi sites. Adequate post-excavation management therefore requires not just fieldwork but documented retention, discoverability, professional access, and conservation of remains retained in situ.

The framework has a second use beyond diagnosis. Labadi and Logan (2016) show that heritage principles can lose effect when they are not embedded in planning procedures, while Bandarin and van Oers (2012) treat historic cities as overlapping layers of value. Making each component measurable can translate these broad principles into questions for departments and developers. The public-value dimension should also extend beyond the archaeological archive. Vietnamese research on participatory storytelling finds links between visitor involvement, digital interaction, and heritage experiences (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2026). Research at the

Imperial Citadel of Hue associates the quality of architectural-heritage interpretation with visitors' reported responsible behaviour (Ha et al., 2026). These tourism-focused studies cannot establish whether archaeological planning controls are effective; they instead suggest possible criteria for evaluating the interpretation of excavated remains once scientifically documented. An urban archaeology programme should accordingly distinguish the primary duty to safeguard buried evidence from the subsequent, separately assessable duty to make credible knowledge publicly accessible.

Important limitations remain. The selected cases are prominent sites with relatively substantial documentation; smaller unreported finds may follow different administrative pathways. Published accounts may omit internal reviews, negotiations, or consultations. Community and developer perspectives were not collected directly (Smith, 2006), and the wider heritage-participation and visitor-experience studies are not substitute data from archaeological governance. The seven-component framework has not been tested using linked permit records or field interviews. It therefore cannot estimate the frequency of late assessment, the completeness of archaeological archives, or the effect of specific community-engagement measures.

The framework can be tested in Hà Nội with a design that uses the indicators in Table 1. A first data set would come from official records: the list of inventoried and designated archaeological sites held by the city culture department, the archaeological plans prepared under Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP, the excavation permits issued since the 2024 Law took effect, and the investment approvals and construction permits for projects located within mapped archaeological areas. Linking these records would show, for each project, whether archaeological information existed before approval and whether an assessment was made. A second data set would come from semi-structured interviews with city and commune officials, archaeologists who directed excavations, planning staff and developers. The interviews would establish how information actually moved between these actors, which the records cannot show. A third data set would come from a questionnaire for commune officials and developers on their knowledge of the rules on archaeological locations and chance finds. Comparing the three data sets would allow the hypothesis drawn from the cases, that timing rather than the absence of rules is the main source of loss, to be confirmed or rejected.

For practice, three steps follow from the analysis. The first is to prepare a map of archaeological potential for Hà Nội, based on known sites, geomorphology and historical records, and to make it available to commune staff and to planning offices. The second is to require that projects within mapped areas include an archaeological assessment before investment approval, with the cost borne by the project, in line with the principle already accepted in Europe. The third is to set time limits and storage arrangements for excavation reports and finds, so that emergency excavations produce usable records.

V. CONCLUSION

This article proposes seven linked components for managing archaeological sites during urbanisation. Three are especially relevant to buried heritage: anticipating archaeological potential, incorporating archaeological information into project planning and managing evidence after excavation. The comparison of three documented Hanoi cases shows how late discovery and fixed development timetables can narrow preservation choices. Vietnam's 2024 Law on Cultural Heritage and the 2025 decrees establish relevant procedures, including a 24-hour commune-level reporting duty for finds under Article 14 of Decree 308. What remains to be tested is how reliably planning, reporting, excavation and archiving functions operate together. The framework provides questions and indicators for that institutional assessment; no national compliance estimate is claimed.

REFERENCES

1. Bandarin, F., & van Oers, R. (2012). The historic urban landscape: Managing heritage in an urban century. Wiley-Blackwell.
2. Cleere, H. (Ed.). (1989). Archaeological heritage management in the modern world. Unwin Hyman.
3. Council of Europe. (1992). European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) (European Treaty Series No. 143). Council of Europe.
4. Đào, N. T. (2024, November 14). Bảo tồn và phát huy giá trị di tích quốc gia đặc biệt trên địa bàn thành phố Hà Nội [Preservation and promotion of special national relics in Hà Nội]. Tạp chí Quản lý nhà nước. https://www.quanlynhanuoc.vn/2024/11/14/bao-ton-va-phat-huy-gia-tri-di-tich-quoc-gia-dac-biet-tren-dia-ban-thanh-pho-ha-noi/
5. Demoule, J.-P. (2011). We still have to excavate - but not at any price. Archaeological Dialogues, 18(1), 5-10. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203811000043
6. Demoule, J.-P. (2012). Rescue archaeology: A European view. Annual Review of Anthropology, 41, 611-626. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145854
7. Dương, T. Q. (2024, November 15). Vừa mừng vừa tiếc [Glad and regretful at the same time]. Báo Văn Hóa. https://baovanhoa.vn/van-hoa-va-thoi-luan/vua-mung-vua-tiec-111705.html
8. Government of Vietnam. (2025a). Decree No. 208/2025/ND-CP on the preparation, appraisal and approval of archaeological plans and related heritage projects [In Vietnamese]. https://chinhphu.vn/?classid=0&docid=214676&pageid=27160

9. Government of Vietnam. (2025b). Decree No. 308/2025/ND-CP detailing provisions and implementation of the Law on Cultural Heritage [In Vietnamese]. https://vanban.chinhphu.vn/?classid=1&docid=216075&pageid=27160
10. Ha, D. H., Vu, V. T., & Pham, T. H. (2026). The impact of architectural heritage interpretation quality at the Imperial Citadel of Hue on responsible tourist behavior in sustainable tourism: The mediating role of personal norms. Heritage and Sustainable Development, 8(2), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.37868/hsd.v8i2.2035
11. ICOMOS. (1990). Charter for the protection and management of the archaeological heritage. International Council on Monuments and Sites.
12. Labadi, S., & Logan, W. (Eds.). (2016). Urban heritage, development and sustainability: International frameworks, national and local governance. Routledge.
13. McManamon, F. P., & Hatton, A. (Eds.). (2000). Cultural resource management in contemporary society: Perspectives on managing and presenting the past. Routledge.
14. National Assembly of Vietnam. (2024). Law on Cultural Heritage No. 45/2024/QH15 [In Vietnamese]. https://chinhphu.vn/?classid=1&docid=212473&orggroupid=1&pageid=27160
15. Nguyễn, Đ. B. (2022). Vietnamese glazed ceramics from seventh - ninth centuries at the tunnel and underground car park site at 36 Điện Biên Phủ, Ba Đình, Hà Nội. Khảo cổ học, (2), 39-55.
16. Nguyen, D. T., & Nguyen, T. P. (2026). Storytelling in heritage tourism for sustainable development: Enriching visitor experiences in Vietnam's heritage destinations. Heritage and Sustainable Development, 8(2), 21-42. https://doi.org/10.37868/hsd.v8i2.1950
17. Nguyễn, T. H. (2012). Bảo tồn di sản văn hóa trong quá trình đô thị hóa (Trường hợp Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh) [Heritage conservation in the process of urbanization: The case of Hồ Chí Minh City]. Tạp chí Khoa học xã hội Việt Nam, (2), 72-77.
18. Nguyen, T. P. (2025). The impact of sustainable tourism on local community cultural heritage conservation awareness in Hanoi. Heritage and Sustainable Development, 7(2), 675-690. https://doi.org/10.37868/hsd.v7i2.1233
19. Nguyen, T. P. (2026). Digital preservation of Vietnamese cultural heritage: Opportunities and limitations in the age of smart technology. Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture, 55(2), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.1515/pdtc-2025-0035
20. Prime Minister of Vietnam. (2024). Quyết định số 1569/QĐ-TTg ngày 12/12/2024 phê duyệt Quy hoạch Thủ đô Hà Nội thời kỳ 2021 - 2030, tầm nhìn đến năm 2050 [Decision No. 1569/QD-TTg approving the Capital Planning of Hà Nội for 2021-2030 with a vision to 2050].
21. Smith, L. (2006). Uses of heritage. Routledge.
22. Standing Committee of the National Assembly. (2025). Resolution No. 1656/NQ-UBTVQH15 on the reorganisation of commune-level administrative units in Hanoi [In Vietnamese]. https://chinhphu.vn/?classid=2&docid=214008&pageid=27160
23. Tống, T. T., Bùi, M. T., & Đỗ, V. N. (Eds.). (2006). Hoàng thành Thăng Long [Thăng Long Imperial Citadel]. Nhà xuất bản Văn hóa - Thông tin.
24. Vietnam News Agency. (2025, November 24). Vườn Chuối: Tracing 4,000 years of life in ancient Hà Nội. Việt Nam News. https://vietnamnews.vn/life-style/1730284/vuo-n-chuo-i-tracing-4-000-years-of-life-in-ancient-ha-no-i.html
25. Vu, V. T., & Nguyen, T. P. (2026). Heritage memory and identity in Vietnam with a focus on residents' topophilia for sustainable cultural tourism development. Heritage and Sustainable Development, 8(1), 55-76. https://doi.org/10.37868/hsd.v8i1.1758