

LINK Members' Congress, 21 November 2016 at Jurys Inn Glasgow

Scotland, UK international: Keeping the environment on the political agenda during the Brexit years - Report on the discussions.

Helen Todd, LINK Chair, welcomed everybody and outlined the aims of the day:

- to inform ourselves further about international structures, relationships and commitments which the UK and Scotland have, beyond the EU
- Assess how Scotland can engage with and influence these, in whatever exit scenario we find ourselves
- Consider common ground and collaborative approaches between the environment and areas of health, social justice, economics, participative democracy

Congress is an opportunity for the environment sector to reach out to other sectors. Originally we intended this event to focus on the linkages between the environment and social justice. LINK responded to the Fairer Scotland consultation, showing how environmental issues and social justice issues are related. This topic was overtaken by Brexit. Today is not just about Brexit, it is also about how we can engage across partnerships better.

Joyce McMillan introduced the panel session, noting there was no other possible subject to be discussing at this point. Most of us did not expect to be facing this challenge which could completely change the regulatory landscape. Today we would focus on 3 main questions:

1. What are the international structures, out of the EU?
2. The deal. What could that mean for environment?
3. What should Scotland's stakeholders be doing and where should we be focussing our lobbying efforts?

Mark Ruskell MSP was here to learn as well as to contribute. When a councillor, much of his work was on local issues. When previously an MSP he had been on the Environment Committee and was now on the Environment Climate Change and Land Reform Committee. The driving factor of EU legislation has been the background. Trump and Brexit throws it all up in the air. It is a good time to step back and look at how we might redesign some aspects.

Mark Lazarovicz as an MP had spent a lot of time on Environmental Audit Committee, responsible for looking in an overarching way at legislation and more; it covered all sorts of issues. Much of its time was spent on monitoring how the UK complied with EU legislation, and on trying to influence EU policy, via the UK Government. There are many international agreements which are behind EU policies. Even after Brexit we will still be signed up to much of it. Having returned to work as a lawyer, he is very much aware how the EU is at the heart of our laws. There will be very damaging repercussions unless efforts are made to ameliorate.

Lloyd Austin is head of conservation policy at RSPB Scotland, and convener of LINK's Governance Group. Within RSPB he is chair of its policy and strategy board, coordinating the work across UK and internationally, and on its Brexit subgroup. He is in touch with lots of these issues but does not know the answers. There is much to find out. The 4 big issues for RSPB are Regulation of legislation - how will it be as good if not better; Land and sea management - what will follow the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy; How will biodiversity work be maintained; and what will replace the EU's funding regimes for the environment. We should engage in the wider

discussions, as so far the environment not got a loud enough voice in the debate. All discussion relates to trade or migration. We need to use every opportunity we have to get environment onto the agenda.

Annalisa Savaresi has lived in Scotland for 11 years. She is an environmental lawyer and to a lesser extent an EU specialist, and has been called by all sorts of people looking at what will happen now. The Scottish University network of Lawyers for Europe (SULNE) has been established to help deal with these calls, and was in the process of preparing a report on the implications of Brexit on environmental law in Scotland, taking the Scottish perspective.

Paal Frisvold is Norwegian, based in Brussels for 20 years, working variously for the Norwegian government, and as a speechwriter for the head of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). He has headed an eNGO in Norway, to dismantle a nuclear installation. His report [Brexit the way forward or backwards](#), goes through the 4 models proposed for the UK's future relationship with the EU, looking at 8 areas of policy, and what will happen to each when you apply the models. He has also written a book, the story of Norway reluctant to join the EU, how it got into the EEA and has thrived in many ways.

Discussion

Does the panel have a view on the Council of Europe, which preceded the EU, and on its interest in scenic and cultural heritage, and how this will survive Brexit?

For nature conservation the various agreements that precede the EU, eg the Berne Convention seemed relatively toothless. Is that right or can we use them?

Is there a role for wider voluntary standards like the FSC, to which 80% of the forestry trade have signed up?

Annalisa - The Council of Europe is one of many organisations that work regionally. All of these will continue to operate, regulations will continue to apply, nothing will change. On Climate, for example, we have global treaties but UK was always represented there through the EU after having forged a common position with EU countries. The question is how effective these others will be to put pressure on the UK Government to apply high international standards.

Paal - this is the core of discussion. The EU is unique in that it has supra-national institutions. Norway is scared of Brexit because the UK Government is trying to reduce its obligations on air quality emissions which create acid rain which falls on Norway. The situation improved when the UK entered the single market. The EU can impose high fines. Norway had tried to use the UN Gothenburg protocol. It was said we did not need the EU emissions regulations because it is the same as the UN and about 80% of the EU regulation is built on the UN protocol. The difference is the UN has no means of sanctioning breaches of it. There is no way that it will. The only reason Poland is at the climate table is because of EU's enforcement regulations. No teeth, no whip. We can all be part of very nice conventions and nothing will change, but there will be a very big change when the UK is not under EU regulation.

Mark L - at the moment EU law is our law. If it is not part of EU law, it will not be our law unless it is passed in Scotland or UK. Courts have developed the principle that the UK, in legislating internally, is not contravening international agreements. There would not be an automatic right to depend on EU law as we currently do. The way Government intends to proceed is through the Great Repeal Act, to move from EU to the UK and to change laws over time. There are two other qualifications. If the eventual agreement goes along the EEA model, there are certain environmental obligations the UK will have to take on. We will still be signed up to the EU Human Rights Convention.

Mark R – it is obviously important to keep as much as we can. The Habitats Directive underpins planning too. There is a question of whether we can enshrine other UN agreements into law. It was argued there was no need to enshrine the Ramsar Convention because of EU protections. The current Cabinet Secretary, Roseanna Cunningham, is positive, as this is what we would be doing anyway. If the evidence is there on air quality etc, we will be reflecting that in domestic policy. Hopefully we can improve a lot of it. The major threats are partly from Brexit and partly from neoliberal trade agreements to challenge environmental regulations and social protections too. Still going to be the backstop of the neoliberal viewpoint in that environmental regulations can be challenged, eg if the ban on fracking went through, the developer could open a Canadian office and take the Scottish Government to court.

Lloyd – On Council of Europe, the EU convention on landscape has same status as others which up till now are implemented through EU law, which the UK and Scotland have relied upon. The big question is on enforcement. They are toothless in comparison to the EU Court of Justice. He was in Iceland on Berne convention business to investigate Iceland's compliance, and reported back to it. It is a very long winded process, with small teeth, and is reliant on the diplomatic embarrassment factor. We will need to investigate and use these mechanisms more. On the ECHR, we will find out how many human rights we can create, the right to a clean environment, which can extend how environmental rights encompass human rights, a new area. Scotland often is not complying with its own laws, not to mention those of the EU. We need better enforcement of domestic law. On 14 December LINK has a meeting about how to set up an environmental law centre here, so that eNGOs may be better equipped to ensure there is better enforcement of law domestically. The Forest Stewardship Council is supported by RSPB and other eNGOs. There are other comparable schemes which are very good but which are voluntary. With enforcement being the word we are using, the more trade bodies and others can do to give these codes more teeth, the better. In future governments could look at linking incentives to such compliance codes.

Annalisa – international obligations do not provide the solution to problems. Yes, exploit the ECHR as far as possible, and she is happy to share information on what has been used successfully so far. It is important to test the boundaries of the law, putting pressure on all involved. This is what we need to think about, getting new means of pressurising government.

Paal - suggested we do not confuse situation by bringing in trade agreements, we have to focus on environmental law and the ability to enforce it. Talking about opportunities to make it more ambitious is deluded. There are immense pressures for less stringent rules, for evidence talk to Birdlife, or ClientEarth. From his work on Sellafeld and acid rain, he used EU legislation. It has teeth and is an arena for civic society. The EU is the greatest thing. It is unrealistic to hope for better things outside it. In Brussels, money talks, for sure it is not perfect. There are emissions discussions coming up soon and without the EU as a legal framework how would you ensure that UK Government abides by it?

The EEA is not *a la carte*, its all of it, legal homogeneity. If there is an EU directive it has to also apply to EFTA states. When you enter it you will be negotiation mode. The Habitats Directive is not part of the EEA, because of Norwegian whaling, was given an exemption. When Article 50 is triggered, there will be a timeframe. The EEA would likely be kind to the UK, you may get some transitioning time, but you do not need it, as you are already in it. The main thing is that EEA is not *a la carte*. For him there is frustration there are no Norwegians in the Council of Ministers, so have to use other countries as intermediaries. One of the few exceptions to EEA suite is the Habitats Directive, SPAs. Fisheries and agriculture are exempted, as Norway likes to have its own policies.

There are some things the EU doesn't cover as it is, including landscape. There is an opportunity now. What we have is not perfect, the tendency is to not open them up.

The law of the sea has its own international tribunal. Back in the mackerel wars, there were sanctions on the Faroes on the basis of unsustainable fishing. Think creatively about EU enforcement of standards.

As much of the law is devolved why don't we transpose everything right now, what is stopping this?

Can we afford to ignore trade? For example the Birds directive sits behind other policies. How can we keep them separate?

Mark L - on how EU law can be brought into UK law, have not seen the Repeal Bill. At the time of Brexit, all EU law will be UK law. On future directives, eg a GM regulation banning GM crops in Scotland, a current directive, the assumption is that if it becomes EU law before Brexit, it will be applicable in the UK. Of course it is possible that UK or Scotland can pass laws that are in tune with EU directives.

Mark R - there have been times where Scottish Government has been ahead of the game. With the current government, tracking EU standards coming through and applying them makes a lot of sense if becoming independent, showing we are compliant would make it easier for Scotland to remain or become a successor state, with the prospect of another independence referendum to bear in mind. We have new climate bill coming, from the previous Act we have the Land Use Strategy influencing how we manage the uplands. There is a lot of domestic legislation we can consider, petition on raptor persecution, some relevance of EU law there, and have a Good Food Nation bill, opportunities to move into a post CAP scenario looking at minimum environmental standards, these are in line with where the EU is going, we can track these and be ahead of the game. On mackerel wars, there is the issue of Scotland's capacity to police it, with just 3 boats. And with other players how to enforce fisheries compliance.

Is there a capacity problem for the Scottish Parliament, to horizon scan effectively, and try to get ahead of it? With 129 members has it enough resources to do it? It was set up to run a devolved administration. There are times when it punches above its weight, and times when there are not enough people to do the work, eg trade treaties and their impacts, not capacity to consider aspects of international trade and security. There are big issues of how to be a separate player going forward.

Mark L – the capacity of UK government is low, with very few trade experts. The fact is international agreements depend on international politics. The UK tended to be a voice for greater environmental protection. With UK outside the EU, it is not helpful on the international stage, notwithstanding Trump.

Lloyd – on the Law of the Sea, this and the International Maritime Organisation are important areas to find out more about. On fisheries, the Faroes would have been in a third country position in sharing out of quotas, and the UK may move into that category, moving from EU to the third country side of the table. If so the remaining 27 countries will potentially have an impact on how we maintain our fisheries, unless we seal off our maritime borders, which is not how Norway and the Faroes do it.

Trade is really the underlying part of it. Directives were part of a level playing field, that is why EIA is in it, very important. Issues like WTO are very important, which forms of incentives and subsidies

are permitted. RSPB will commission work on looking at what impacts these might have, to try and influence that debate. Some of the deals like TTIP are more political than regulatory.

Annalisa - Law of the Sea has its own tribunal, it solves disputes between states, was not set up for enforcement. On issue of trade agreements, EU law is incorporated by Japan for reasons of trade. For other areas we have to find other solutions.

Paal - IMO is a very good example, next to the Gothenburg protocol. A recent meeting in London decided for third consecutive time, from a Putin backed shipping company, to postpone any action on climate change. On aviation, the EU took the lead, it tried to impose a scheme, the International Civil Aviation Organisation, it would never have happened if the EU hadn't forced it. No teeth! On fisheries and agriculture, these are not part of the EEA, there is a model of proposing EEA plus. Could you imagine not exporting agricultural produce to the EU, and to do so you will have to abide by all the veterinary rules and on processing and consumption. On mackerel and fish, it is a brutal world out there. In Brussels, yes there is a fight to get the legislation, and then you go out and implement it. You have to respect the EU, it is more powerful. On climate, the situation is very different.

In relation to Paal's points can we do better than other members of the single market who are outside of the EEA? And what can we do as a sub national country? We have seen the First Minister trying to operate all levers, to various effects.

Within the different options on EEA, EEA plus, etc, how does an independent Scotland or Scotland as part of the UK operate? Among options being discussed currently is there any space for Scotland to seek a better deal as part of the UK?

With regard to us punching above our weight on fisheries, would Scottish Government share that position. If Scotland is within the UK, coming out of the EU, for Scotland to have an international voice, or being a bit more international, a lot of fisheries powers would have to be repatriated to Scotland. There are many options to negotiate within - 'Reverse Greenland' in connection with fisheries? And, if Scotland has EU regulations in its laws, does it have the power not to repeal EU commitments. Can Scotland refuse the Great Repeal Act?

Ross Finnie - where you have a specific law which has enshrined EU law, that will not be within the Repeal Act. We should be concerned about the supposed support here, 62% voted for staying in the EU, they did not vote for keeping 'interfering' EU laws.

There is growing recognition that at the time of the Referendum that a lot of people didn't have enough information. Is it likely there will be a 2nd Referendum, should we be preparing for that as well as Brexit?

Has Scotland ever punched above its weight. The Great Repeal bill and can we not repeal it. And what possibility of a second independence referendum.

Annalisa - there is no precedent of a non-independent state joining the EU. It is unlikely but if there is a will there is a way. If the political will is there, but she does not think it is. Again, it is not tested. The only example we have is the Faroes and Greenland. They are not independent nations but have some independent legislative ability, something Scotland could be interested in is getting greater international law capacity and being more in control after Brexit.

Paal - Liechtenstein has a customs union with Switzerland, and is part of the internal market which Switzerland is not.

Mark L – we can dream up lots of schemes and wheezes that won't fly in the legal world. Only a tiny proportion of Denmark's population is not in the EU. 90 % of the UK would have left if Scotland stayed, that is not a feasible option. Ultimately the only way it can be is for Scotland to be a sovereign state, he does not think there is any halfway house. That doesn't mean it cannot enter into any arrangements under the UK arrangements. Repeal EU legislation, and it is unclear how EU legislation would apply after Brexit, and then it is up to the devolved countries to decide on what to have. On problems of compliance, yes, we could volunteer to comply, but we could not have a role in bringing it about.

Lloyd - agree about the wheezes. One he likes is the island of St Martin in the West Indies, half in the EU and half out. The proportion of populations, land border and integrated economy make wheezes impractical. On fisheries, so many areas of EU policy and law are devolved. Very little in these areas are reserved because the UK Government has always seen the EU framework as applying across the whole of the UK. If talking about the EU layer within that, we have potential for greater devolution in those areas and greater deviation between them. It will be interesting to see if the UK Government does seek to agree some common framework. In relation to WTO rules there will need to be something to ensure we are all compliant, with EU not there to provide the bottom line. On Repeal, we have primary legislation and secondary legislation, and until such time as the Scottish Parliament decides to change them, they will endure. On the Referendum – talk to your politicians!

Joyce - even if reverse Greenland is not going to happen, and we are out of the EU, on other configurations, if UK comes out of EU and Scotland wants a closer relationship with the EEA, would that be possible?

Mark L – cannot see how it would work.

Paal - by March you will see a whole new political landscape. No negotiations without notification, then something will have to happen. French elections, a conservative has a chance of beating Le Pen, but by not very much. There is only another 5 years to fix the issue of free movement of people. There will be a lot more understanding of the need to control country borders, a lot better than when Cameron tried to negotiate it.

Liechtenstein is part of the EEA. On legislation, there is not wide realisation of how modern and cutting edge EU legislation is. It will be very hard to keep the pace up in Edinburgh. Norway struggles with this. EU legislation has allowed Norway to modernise its economy. His advice was to lobby for membership of EEA to fix these issues. Until a new Government might hold another referendum.

Mark L - Scotland would have to be sovereign to be effectual.

What should we be doing. Within limited resources?

CAP and its impact on biodiversity, what will happen to that money and its devolution.

Discussions since referendum, most people have no clue about the extent of where the legislation and money comes from. There is a massive educational job to be done.

On the practical side, we are interested in teeth and mechanisms available to eNGOs. At the moment, if Scottish Government is not acting in line with the directives we can put in a complaint to the European Commission, relatively cheaply and quickly. If we are left with judicial review, it is far more expensive. What can the voluntary sector and LINK do to allow society to utilise the legislation we have?

Scottish Government is also in a sea of uncertainty. Officials need help in understanding all the different impacts. There are some experts inhouse. There is a job to be done to get intelligence to the right people for liaising within the UK, how to share the limited though excellent brain power most effectively.

Ross Finnie: re greater affection for the EU in Scotland and keeping their interest. If we are keeping pressure on the EU that every piece of food etc must meet equivalent standards, this increases the chances of them being thankful we are out. Ensure that our manufacturers know that the standards will be maintained and raised.

Mark R – it has been interesting. The issue of education is hugely important and issues of funding. The funding element is impacting on the environment now, withdrawal of Life and Leader funding, and at UK level ongoing questions of what we will do with the miraculous £350m, and uncertainty of Scotland's share of rural development funding, with questions about post 2020 and how we will be able to use that. In terms of tactics, we have to look for alliances with progressive states across the EU, for example the Wallonians in Belgium, their concerns on CETA were backed up by 350 m citizens. EU and global alliances. Many organisations here are part of international movements. By working together can support needs for evidence-based policy making, fair trade etc. There are speculations around different options, clearly a huge amount of uncertainty. We can waste a lot of time trying to analyse and second guess, the key thing is to focus on the principles and let the political process start to narrow some of it down. He thinks that it will narrow down to a second independence referendum, a political inevitability to that. And a focus on likely options that may arise out of that.

Annalisa - on CAP, no one knows, on enforcement, no one knows. These are conversations to have with Scottish politicians, what kind of powers will be repatriated to Scotland, what will Westminster want to keep. There are no precedents. It is all up for grabs. Ideas are welcome at this stage of the debate.

Paal - you are in for a lot of uncertainty. It is very complex and difficult. Do not sit down and watch. Get into it and articulate it, in Edinburgh and London. Norway has been pushed around, had some experience. On EEA, yes there is a democratic deficit. It could be a lot less with the UK on board. If EEA countries cannot be part of the council of Ministers and the EU Parliament, but maybe they could have a commissioner? The EFTA court is as legally binding as the EU Court of Justice. It is advisory, and you had better take that advice. EEA is free. You do not pay part of the EU budget. You pay for social and economic cohesion, goes to recipient countries direct, you have control of that. You do pay part of programmes, and have the same chance as others of getting the money back. Take advantage, read my reports, go for it!

<http://esharp.eu/debates/the-uk-and-europe/uk-and-an-eea>

Mark L – there are a couple of areas to watch out for. It is assumed after Brexit that EU powers will revert to Scotland if not reserved. However, there will be areas where the UK will want to ensure there is a common approach across the UK, and where the UK decides it wants to overrule devolved administrations. Second point on the Great Repeal bill, it is ok where EU law is clear, but if not directly implemented into UK or Scottish law, there will be occasions where interpretations are different. Watch out and make sure bits of potential EU law are not pushed aside. Final point on knowing what is happening and capacity, relates to LINK's legal governance work to set up an environmental law body in Scotland. It is important, find out more. As well as assisting and taking up cases, it could provide some intelligence to NGOs as Brexit arrangements develop. Again, speak to

Governance Group, this could be a very important exercise to help NGOs participate (event on 14 December).

Lloyd - agree about sea of uncertainty and about the need for wider education. There is over £600m a year spent on agriculture by Scottish Government at the moment, mostly under strict regulations which gives them discretion within the framework of EU law. As eNGOs we are supportive of it for rural communities and the environment. We have been campaigning to reform the CAP for 30 years, this is an opportunity. Our long term objective will be public money for public goods, environmental and social and community benefit, etc. The big uncertainty is how UK will choose to divide up a UK budget. 18% comes to Scotland now, if the formula reverts to Barnett that will be 9%. You can imagine NFUS's reaction. In terms of our objectives we have an opportunity coming up with the Good Food Nation bill, environmental sustainability with respect to food production, to seek a duty on Scottish ministers to use the resource sustainably. This bill could be passed before Brexit kicks in.

There is a real opportunity to campaign for better access to justice within Scotland. Scottish Government has made good commitments to it and is equally guilty of not complying with regulations. We need a domestic legal system we can access quickly and cheaply, to address systemic issues and get an environmental court, not implemented by either party. He agreed with Ross Finnie on equivocalness re EU in Scotland. NGOs in international networks are agreeing lines to take with their governments negotiating on either side of the table. There are big and challenging issues. Speak up. He commended an article in that day's Herald today which Annalisa had influenced.

Joyce thanked the panel. She encouraged everybody to support newspapers that are doing good investigative work.

Workshop reports

Economics and Decent Living

Facilitator: Phoebe Cochrane, LINK Sustainable Economics Policy Officer. Note: Lisa Webb

The workshop commenced with five short presentations:

Ross Martin, SCDI stated that, in the upcoming period, there is a need for certainty and continuity in some areas. SCDI are trying to think positively in terms of opportunities, although some members are still daunted by what will happen next. SCDI is using its 'Blueprint' for Scotland's economy as a mechanism to address the challenges – this includes structural weaknesses in the Scottish economy eg low productivity; a need for greater innovation and internationalisation and the infrastructure needed to support these weaknesses, in particular a shift towards low carbon infrastructure. When SCDI talk about infrastructure they mean 'hard' (buildings, roads etc) and 'soft' (skills and development). Ross finished by stating that in order to bring this together, the emerging economy and environment must be seen as two sides of same coin not as competing interests. He saw the attachment to place, at a personal level, of business leaders as a possible way to engender change in attitudes.

Dave Watson, UNISON reminded us that UNISON has a large interest in gas and electricity industries as well as the public sector. The Autumn Statement is currently high on Unison's agenda, especially regards to austerity. There is a lot of pressure on revenue, particularly affecting local government with potential knock-on impacts for environment eg anything not nailed down in statute could go undone. As for others, Brexit is of course an issue for UNISON, in terms of the relationship with the

economy and issues around free movement. The health service in particular relies on EU Nationals. Dave noted concern that the language coming from the UK Government is deregulation, which is a real challenge for environment, food and other areas. Also an issue for them is the inequality agenda in terms of wages. UNISON is doing work around just transition and is part of the Stop Climate Chaos Scotland coalition. He tries to 'mainstream' the environment to prevent it getting 'lost'. His 'pitch' would be that we are good at talking about process and structures but that we need delivery and practical measures to mitigate austerity - "Let's get practical". He suggested three key areas of overlap between environmental, economic and social agendas: procurement, pensions and energy policy.

Ben Wray of Common Weal reminded us that political earthquakes, such as those we have seen this year, can't be understood without acknowledging the failure in Western economic systems. There is disconnection between GDP growth and standards of living experienced by most people. We need an economic agenda tied to wellbeing. Britain is very exposed in terms of reliance on global supply chains. We need a new agenda that will challenge neoliberal economics. Common Weal are asking the question 'how can we build a new economic model?' They are arguing for a Scottish national investment bank that supports SMEs with social and environmental objectives at their heart. We need to think about how the Scottish economy will transition out of Brexit. Common Weal is critical of EU State Aid rules so could this be an opportunity for positive change? Ben finished by saying that we need to think big and think progressively about a new economic model for Scotland.

Peter Kelly of Poverty Alliance told us that they have always discussed poverty eradication within the context of the sustainable development agenda. The Sustainable Development Goals are helpful in allowing them to make these connections, whereas it had previously sometimes been challenging to make the connections. Peter reminded us that 900,000 people in Scotland are living on low incomes. Poverty Alliance are working to find solutions to food insecurity and to develop sustainable food systems. They do a lot of work around the living wage, an area which is beginning to show progress with many employers signing up to a living wage. Peter believes that the SDG framework is useful in terms of providing objectives and as a basis for discussions. However, Poverty Alliance are disappointed that Scottish policy makers seldom refer to SDGs outside of the international development arena.

Lisa Stewart of Oxfam Scotland told us about their recently published [report](#) into decent work for low paid workers. Research around decent work and the Humankind Index shows that real people don't always make the distinction between economy and the environment in the same way that policy makers do. Lisa told us about [Oxfam's Doughnut Model](#), based on the idea that everyone should have a decent standard of living that does not exceed environmental limits. We are currently living beyond our environmental means in Scotland yet not everyone has a decent standard of living – thus the current economic model is not functioning.

There followed a general discussion about **economic measures** and **societal behaviour**. It was noted that the Low Carbon Behaviours Framework, published by the Scottish Government that day, showed that some sustainable behaviours are at a standstill or regressing. But how can we effect change, for example can cycling to work be shown to help the economy?

It was commented that local authorities simply take infrastructure projects "off the shelf" because it is simple to do so. The City Deals are assessed on growth in GDP and GVA. To counter this we need to capture minds, have the conversation about how we are spending the money, look at long-term aims and have a range of metrics including low-carbon ones. The Stirling City Deal, which has been crowd sourced, is providing a new model of how City Deals are put together.

Someone said we don't have an **effective narrative** and several others agreed that we are failing to get our narrative across. It was also noted that there is a political threat in terms of shifts to the right. Thus, environmental organisations have to build alliances, prevent overconsumption and a right wing agenda. eNGOs are aiming to engage more and accept that they need to make the issues relevant to the average person. The environmental movement needs to be prepared to talk about different things – eg Air Passenger Duty.

It was pointed out that the main weakness is that we use **GDP** as a measure. A book called “GDP – a brief but affectionate history” by Diane Coyle was a recommended read! It was pointed out that while GDP may be a horrible measure, it is easy to understand. As eNGOs, we need to simplify our argument ie if it is not sustainable as per the terms of the Brundtland definition, then we don't support it. Another point was that we need to do better at showing biodiversity/ environment as a measure of wealth, with ecosystem services and natural capital as the basis of indicators. Also the value of highlighting community environmental projects and links to wellbeing.

On **just transition**, it was pointed out that we sometimes miss the human element and that it's not possible to simply move people from the oil and gas industry to low carbon jobs. Others agreed that workforce planning and succession planning is often inadequate and it's wrongly assumed that people have the skills or desire to move between different roles.

Also the need to eNGOs to think through equity issues of its own practice and to be tooled up to scrutinise investment.

Private, public and NGO alliances were discussed. Some believe that although there are many areas of joint agreement, there is still a reluctance for us to work together. It was stressed that it's important for the environment sector not to be regarded as campaigning for tougher controls for their own sake but rather that it's about seeking a level playing field for business.

One comment was that NGOs with a mandate for a particular area of work are not keen to stretch that mandate even though it could be relevant. We should consider unlikely alliances eg with Virgin Trains on Air Passenger Duty. We could be better at working with private sector and using examples of good business practice to convince our politicians. Someone added that we need to do more to assist local economies rather than working with the big players. The perverse nature of the focus on productivity, which gets rid of jobs, was noted.

Fuel poverty was noted as another key area of potential overlap between us.

Some closing thoughts from the contributors included:

- Scotland has an advantage in being agile – SEPA noted as an example
- ‘No wealth without diversity’
- Opportunity of Scottish Housing Standard review
- We have to get the environmental agenda into the big investment programmes.

Health and Environment

Facilitator Celia Nyssens, Nourish Scotland. Note Jen Anderson

Our Informers: Clare Shanks, British Lung Foundation, Ian Findlay, Paths for All Partnership, Emilia Hanna Friends of the Earth Scotland.

British Lung Foundation – BLF is a UK policy and campaigning NGO, Glasgow-based, current campaign focussed on the scope to breathe clean air with healthy lungs. Improving air quality and lowering pollution are key objectives, given the current public health crisis. 1 in 5 people, or 12 million across UK have lung disease, the issue affects everyone, relates to Group 1 carcinogens proved to exacerbate other conditions and lead to early death. This is also a wider social justice issue since it affects deprived areas and children disproportionately: children, whose lungs are just developing, are five times more likely to suffer; premature birth is 5 times more likely in polluted areas. BLF have 6 asks in development for the UK Parliament's upcoming Clean Air Bill including zoning across the UK, independent, real world emissions-testing, air pollution monitoring around schools for behaviour change, improved public awareness around these and wider health issues, and tax incentives for removal of diesel fumes from our roads. The work is public-facing including a petition. A New Clean Air Bill coalition is building across the UK, aiming to lobby all UK governments, work with ClientEarth, address this as a UK-wide issue and campaign. ClientEarth's recent legal challenge was supported by the High Court which ruled that Government's 2015 Air Quality Plan failed to comply with the Supreme Court ruling or relevant EU Directives. If the verdict is not overturned, ministers will have to come up with a new, more ambitious plan to tackle air quality. BLF wants to see EU Clean Air Programme for Europe transposed in the UK, with clarity for the devolved governments and emboldened action across the country.

Paths for All – A champion of everyday walking in the community and to and from the workplace for health, of active environments and active travel. In a context where £94 million of Scotland's spend on health is related in some way to the lack of physical inactivity, as is a lot of premature death. This relates to 20% of mental health challenges, 30% of cases of the clinically obese, 50% of cases of fractures among females over the age of 50. Overall, 40% of adults do not even achieve the minimum guideline of ensuring that they have 150 minutes per week of moderate activity. A long-term solution is to encourage activity which would also reduce a lot of serious health conditions and spending on these. Most statistics indicate that walking is the best route – it's free, its non-mechanised, it's available to most people, wherever they are. This links to addressing causes not symptoms, and achieving a great deal by making very slight personal changes. Whilst trends are in right directions (5% up in ... years at household level) a step change is needed. NGOs, in particular those with reserves and visit-able properties, can help create opportunities for activity and recreation, as well as encouraging active travel. Research increasingly illustrates health outcomes are critically linked to quality of environment available. Glasgow is an obvious example of varied access/equality: focus needs to be on good walkable routes and places in and throughout towns and cities. NGOs' advocacy on these issues could be more joined up.

Friends of the Earth Scotland – Running an air pollution campaign linked to tackling diseases such as those covered above and the win-wins of getting people out of cars and onto foot/bike/active travel. Importantly for FoES this links to climate change and emissions targets, and the necessary shift away from use of fossil fuels which would also lead to better air and better health. The audience interested in air pollution and health is different from the audience for environmental issues. Tactics have been a 3-year campaign through the media putting pressure on Scottish Government around air pollution, ongoing levels which breach EU law and Scottish regulatory standards, ranking and publishing air quality data in the public domain, lobbying MSPs and Councillors for action especially in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Emilia Hannah and James Curran (LINK Honorary Fellow) jointly represent LINK on Government's Cleaner Air for Scotland (stakeholder) Group (CAFS). CAFS grew out of government strategy published in 2015 aiming to comply with EU regulations asap, having been pressured by NGOs and agreeing to set up the group. NGOs have been critical that the remit does not go far enough and at the under-ambition regarding transport as a generator of unclean air. However, a key development is Scottish government's commitment to establishing a network of Low Emissions Zones by 2018 – areas in polluted cities where most polluting vehicles are restricted.

Effort will be needed to ensure LEZs are good, and are effective. So though the jury is out on whether CAFS will deliver, progress is positive at this point. FoES is working with active travel organisations pushing for greater investment in walking and cycling for the many benefits this will deliver.

Views from round the room:

Celia thanked the 3 contributors for their very useful scene-setting, and opened the discussion up to thoughts from round the room.

Transport is one of several sectors contributing to much higher than acceptable emissions. Farming and land use is another critical area.

Scottish Pilgrim Routes Forum now taking off, ties into European interest in off-road travel; this is a bottom-up network of 60 organisations and individuals promoting routes across Scotland, with connection to spiritual and wellbeing agendas and environmental health, via use of country and linking up cut-off communities – with economic spin-offs. Encouraging volunteer steering groups and will capacity-build with them and explore how such groups can act as ambassadors.

All data shows that there are no negative impacts on land from walking and cycling routes despite concerns at the time of Scotland's first Land Reform Act, mainly owing to Scottish Outdoor Access Code. Benefits of encouraging people out far outweigh actual impacts of a pattern of responsible use. Scottish Natural Heritage's Forum for Land Route Managers was noted.

EU categories of health cover physical, mental and social. Social health connects to inequalities, exclusion. 50% of the UK's population is anyway excluded by design of infrastructure around cars and car-use. So, to tackle deprivation and health is to address these exclusions and inequalities and the environmental concerns.

For physical activity sometimes the action needed is incredibly simple and inexpensive— eg putting gravel/hard core on existing muddy paths is enough to attract local people out to walk these previously unattractive areas.

in the bigger picture of social health, longer walks are important alongside provision of shorter local routes and accessing open country brings additional mental benefits to walkers. Work is needed to ensure there is a variety of routes, across the country, and that good public transport is available to access these and the benefits of using them is well communicated.

Some organisations which espouse the benefits of physical activity spend a lot on repairing paths, which demands resources. The Health Department should have a role in supporting this kind of spend to support government objectives of their availability and accessibility to all. Transport policy which is about to be reviewed in Scotland should have walking and cycling high on its agenda.

Tourism and economic development sectors should be encouraged to acknowledge walking and cycling as very important and needing investment. It is critical to make these links between economy, transport, health, education, environment clearer and translate messages so that these are clearly understood by policy-makers in these fields.

[We walk, we cycle, we vote](#) campaign is among various voices currently calling for 10% of transport budget in Scotland to be allocated to support walking and cycling, and for that objective to be top of the transport agenda given the impact of cars on the most vulnerable in society.

Current pattern of cuts to rural bus services is critical in relation to any aspirations to shift behaviour and investment.

Roads are not safe for biking and walking. In terms of how to change this trajectory, useful to refer to hierarchy and to press for active travel to be top of the Scottish transport agenda.

Using legs and lungs to tackle obesity (wrt. recent letter in Herald) Achieving this needs the right infrastructure in place and crucially, getting children walking and cycling to schools by building the routes for them to do so safely. There is scope to argue for investment within UK's intended £2billion extra spend on infrastructure, for paths.

Scope to work together:

The group saw plenty scope to join messages up, support /complement one another's advocacy. Indeed, the context had probably never been better, with policy drivers are pointing much more in the right direction and politicians willing and aware; there was real opportunity to get proper implementation of all existing strategies and current initiatives.

Upcoming initiatives offering scope included:

- The Cleaner Air Bill at Westminster
- UK infrastructure spend plans
- The London City National Park discussion (protect/encourage use of spaces)
- The Buses Bill at Westminster: could this inform rural bus strategy Scotland
- Obesity strategies in Scotland and UK - advocacy around food, diet, activity, linked to health – the H&S Committee at W/m taking evidence on obesity strategy
- The upcoming review of Scotland Transport strategy
- The Climate Bill & Plan consultations, in Scotland, due in early 2017
- The upcoming Good Food Nation Bill in Scotland
- The expected Planning White Paper Scotland and next Planning Framework (in relation infrastructure for walking and cycling and space)
- Local Authority elections (England, Wales and Scotland) May 2017
- Review of health bodies due in Scotland - scope for further integration and for more focus on individual/self-management; obvious route for advocacy; in addition, better representation on local health boards is another aspect offering opportunity
- Increasing dialogue about need/value of paths in deprived communities; also opportunity to encourage NHS staff to use grounds to improve own health and fitness
- Pressure for more national parks in Scotland offers scope to press for better access and more parks, alongside protection of parks
- Dialogue with communities; Nourish is talking with socially deprived and lower income communities about food insecurity; Keep Scotland Beautiful working with communities via Climate Challenge Fund with feedback from communities helping to shape future KSB policy
- Future of financial support to farming in UK: important to challenge farming's contribution to air pollution; in this respect organic farming has fewer impacts on air and water quality offering links between environmental and health advocacy and benefits for farmers and affected communities. Brexit discussions are route to press for environmental and health public goods for every £ spent in this sector. LINK's Food and Farming subgroup have near-ready proposals; changing vision in farming community will be needed to effect a shift in which the health arguments are more likely to resonate with the politicians who need to require that change
- Urban greenspace; advocacy on the health benefits of greenspaces, the need for more of these, comparing greater stress on people in urban areas vs. rural peacefulness, referencing humans as part of natural world, importance of nature, trees and open spaces to our health
- Volunteering – the existing high level of volunteering and the scope to encourage others to volunteer are linked to health; volunteering is known to deliver health benefits

The group agreed:

- NGOs could collaborate more often on joint submissions so that Government(s) hear same message echoed from broader voice, with commonality in the top-line message and freedom to focus on own concerns at the detailed level
- NGOs could collaborate over a joint letter to Shona Robison making these top-line points copied to other relevant Cab Secs

- NGOs could share key asks at elections, starting with local elections in May 2017 (noted that a database of all candidates is likely to be available ahead of the elections for lobby purposes)
- NGOs could collaborate with health service over joint press releases - health service are willing and would like to know about such opportunities; NHS could ultimately advertise NGOs as prescription routes to health; consider Apps and adverts/video clips on activity and health
- ENGOs should attend / be a further voice at health and transport conferences
- ENGOs could lobby Health Minister (noted that current Environment and Climate Minister acknowledges importance of advocacy across portfolios)
- ENGOs could extend their outreach, dive in and identify where health and environment concerns meet (Ramblers, Sustrans, Paths for All are among those already active)
- ENGOs could form partnerships with health and social care organisations; eg., health boards have low environmental presence at present, LINK could seek places on members' behalf; much funding is channelled via these bodies
- LINK should consider joint actions through which it can engage more with the health agenda

Participative Democracy

Facilitator Craig Macadam, Buglife. Note Alice Walsh.

We heard from the two workshop informers first.

Angus Hardie described the [Scottish Community Alliance](#) as a 'meta network' of national networks with community based memberships. The unifying theme is community empowerment. His understanding of the term participative democracy is when citizens are able to play an active part in shaping their lives. At the moment Scottish Government is interested in the concept, the most obvious example being the Community Empowerment Act, which includes the right to request assets to be transferred into community ownership and the right of the public to participate in public body decision making to improve outcomes, the latter yet to be tested. Government is very enthusiastic about participatory budgeting, and is developing pilots and capacity around the country, with the aim for 1% of local authority budgets being distributed that way.

There are bills coming soon on Planning, Decentralisation, and the Circular Economy, all with real opportunities for community participation. It is probably not because politicians have seen the light, but more about pragmatics and public service reform. In the five years since the Christie Commission report, public services are becoming completely unsustainable with spending up and services less effective. Fundamental reform is required, no more command and control. Such a fundamental culture change to community-led services is asking a lot. When austerity came, local authorities were resistant, this is where the Decentralisation Bill comes in. Functions will be stripped, some rationalised, some ceded to communities, there will be new forms of democratic space. The CoSLA report notes we have got to accept variability in quality, a huge break from before. Whether the shift is pragmatic or idealistic doesn't matter. There will be a lot more happening at local level, a lot which will present challenges to the environment sector. Another drive may be the democratic deficit in relation to representation; low turnout in local government elections has been allowed to persist, now there is bit of panic, a fear of what happens when large sectors of the population become disengaged from the democratic process, what happens when people give up.

Clare Symonds from [Planning Democracy](#) explained that her organisation is based on the assumption that democracy works, and it aspires to the participative type. This means deliberative

dialogue to enact meaningful change. There is some opposition to this concept. When people talk of communities of place and of interest, are we in the environmental sector a minority voice? Discussions within the LINK Planning Group showed some concern that people, given the opportunities, may choose non-environmental options. Does how you frame the discussion influence how people react? Is it about agreeing to disagree? What do you get out of it at the end of the process? Are we making the most of linkages with communities, and should we be engaging more with the Community Empowerment Act? Planning Democracy is concerned with Equal Right of Appeal for communities. Because of PD's lack of resources, it is asking people to be its voice. They are not always 'on message' but the general gist is. This can be quite scary, not always the right message, on the plus side it can be good if politicians are hearing different voices. With the Planning Bill there is an opportunity to push the participation agenda. The current plans are that it is giving no power, no rights, all focus on frontloading and no right of appeal on decisions. Are we really getting what we think we are?

Discussion followed. Peter Pearson with long experience of being a director of community based housing associations, where over the last 30-40 years they were given powers over large budgets, a success story. He thought Government has little idea of how much support these communities needed to get to a functional state, about 5 years, to establish the systems. Currently JMT works with communities including for buyouts of large estates. In the wider picture with no support for the basics, this policy has not been successful. He noted that community housing associations did not save money, though community buy-in was a benefit, and now people are being asked to help adapt to cuts, so he questioned what is in it for them to be at the sharp end of criticism formerly directed at government?

Others felt there is a dissonance between local communities and power, resulting in community councils being driven demented and huge difficulties when facing well-resourced developers (citing JMT and Cairngorms Campaign court cases), and the problems of getting new people onto community councils.

Angus noted that Development Trusts have grown, and as with the Scottish Land Fund, having something to invest is crucial.

Land use strategies and deer management, both are very rural, both are characterised by regional solutions being developed. Could this be an opportunity for new models, although there is no funding for regional land use strategies.

If participatory democracy is to have meaning there also has to be a degree of threat that makes government listen. There has to be a right of challenge. This is a wider question of access to justice. You can have all the rhetoric but it is meaningless without teeth. This argument has changed the mind of some MSPs on ERA in relation to Planning.

Local Government – participation in *whose* decision making process. There are many different organisations with different perspectives. Support is afforded to groups to engage with those processes. It is hard enough for our sector, and in Climate Challenge Fund with asset transfer work, there are groups that struggle with where to begin and others that are fine. There are very few resources to support it, and a tendency to see it as easier to deal with affluent communities.

The Christie report recommended co-design, co-production and co-delivery. LAs need to listen to all types of communities. Participatory and representative democracies are not mutually exclusive, though need to mesh better. Representative democracy needs to be more responsive. LAs are very

remote from communities, the system has not evolved much beyond its Victorian roots. There are well known techniques but they are not being used, cf 1969 Skeffington report, the establishment is grossly out of touch.

Energy planning has moved backwards, and become very adversarial. It costs a lot to engage in a public inquiry and if you don't have legal expertise you are ripped apart. JMTs experience wrt Beaulieu Denny and Stronelairg are cases in point. This is a huge area where people have been excluded.

For marine spatial planning are there additional difficulties in that environment being more out of sight? There is optimism in some cases. The continuum is from very poor to good on land reform, and we are looking at opportunities there. On Marine it is regional marine planning. LINK sits on the Clyde Marine Partnership where some vested interests. When these are threatened they play dirty, and are a huge challenge.

Where does Scotland sit in relation to others: its ahead on rhetoric but worse across UK on delivery. Protected Expenses Orders are harder to get than in England and Wales and the Scottish legal system is more restrictive. Scotland is worse than some states within the US. It is because we treat these as political decisions when they should be made on merit. No politician wants to cede power. In the arguments about where power should lie between tiers, some believe it is between national and local, and what is a community? At national level it is important to have a voice as a community of interest. The Community Empowerment Act is rhetoric, and not delivering eg on the right to participate in an outcome. The only redress for communities is through judicial review.

Marine is not entirely absent from land use planning. The connection to the issues, eg nature conservation, is similar. On the size of a community, some people have a very strong interest, eg a small number of fishermen and large number of people who are in favour of nature conservation. In extreme cases the community may be just one individual and that may be justified.

Differing views were expressed on the rhetoric versus reality. Recent experience from a meeting about guidance on allotments as part of the CE Act showed to SAGS that Government was trying hard to listen, though it could take another decade to know if this will bear fruit. Others felt we have been involved in such discussions for decades already without seeing any change, and that what Government is saying is quite contradictory to what it is doing. It was noted that In England there are efforts to downscale the rhetoric and to bring reality down to Scottish levels.

On the question of Beaulieu Denny line undergrounding, 90% of it would have been paid for by consumers in England. The next big decision was for the Lake District, which was undergrounded.

The Aarhus Convention in theory gives citizens a right to participate in decision making. The UN Economic Commission for Europe has a compliance committee where you can lodge complaints. It is up to us to use it and embarrass the government.

Are there opportunities?

Planning Democracy is an example of an organisation working well with communities, mutually supportive. There is a certain amount of self-help going on within the environment sector. Really large issues are complex.

The **Good Food Nation Bill is an opportunity**, its where people meet their environment on a plate, and taps into workers' rights nationally and internationally.

Challenge will be the volume of consultation for communities to engage.

Environment sector could listen more, eg on allotments and Good Food Nation Bill, **telling the stories of where people are**, the skills they have.

We could stop getting involved so much in consultations and pick up where people are, engage them at the level they want. We have plenty of policies that have not been implemented. There is **no enforcement**, eg on planning. Consultations are specialist, boring and difficult.

LINK Local was set up to help provide regional links for communities interested in environmental issues. A pilot project for one year, now 6 months in. **Scope here for more input.**

It is very resource intensive getting people involved. We know that on Marine from the *Don't Take the P* campaign. It brought some political costs, and many gains. We had been pushing for a Marine Act for 20 years.

If some **guidance and information** can be provided in the right way, (eg RSPB's Bite back pack for planning issues), could LINK bodies do something useful here? Buglife also provided similar resource for its members. A joint project on biodiversity and planning. FoES had an educational module for environmental justice activists.

Angus noted that it is a very cluttered market, and hard to know where to focus on it. The idea of **community anchor organisations** is current – investment in local anchor organisations to support other more granular organisations. He would like to see more join up with local representation.

Place Tool - been interesting work in Dumbartonshire. NHS sees it as entry level, for those who want to engage. It was a genuine attempt to bring sectors together. The result is a local place plan, government has invested in this. Some had grave reservations wrt its flexibility, and lack of biodiversity content. It is being used and rolled out and government is keen on it.

Plenary chaired by Helen Todd

There was no formal feedback session from the groups. Helen invited points raised there that should be more widely shared. Brexit is important and we need to be active about it and keep talking about how the environment matters. It shouldn't distract us from other issues.

From participative democracy discussion there is a lot of regional grass roots join up we could be progressing with.

If you want to change rural land use policy, Brexit is the best opportunity we have.

Engagement with communities will be increasingly a premium. The Good Food Nation Bill is an opportunity; the environment on a plate and food is not just about farming, that is a big opportunity for us.

It was interesting to talk to all the other sectors, the linkages between the environment and others and the importance of making these alliances. This needs some definite steps to set up how the environment sector can take on social justice issues and for others how they take on environmental issues. It was said that people in the real world do not make these distinctions. If we are to make the most of this we need to incorporate it into our work to move forward.

Summing Up by Joyce McMillan

This had been a slightly 'double' congress, on Brexit and on the themes of linking the environmental agenda with the social justice and economic agendas. It was very interesting to have the conference

at this particular time. There were many useful aspects to the Brexit discussions, and we are grateful to everyone for pushing the debate forward with their contributions. It has been useful to have Paal Frisvold here, the one person who said there is an answer – to **campaign to become a member of the EEA**. Not everyone may back that, or even take a view on it. It gives us something definite to think about. EEA offers a transitional state which incorporates the environmental protections. We should consider the real options and then take a view.

The second clear proposal is we can **take the opportunity to put some very desirable legislation into Scots law**, to try and track what might have been coming down from the EU and grab it before the ship leaves the quay - we should all be looking at this. The Good Food Nation Bill is a great opportunity, touching on practically every main environmental subject.

Third, are issues about capacity and governance. We had another powerful message from Paal that whatever you think of the EU - it may not be flawless in its vulnerability to being pushed by powerful vested interests etc - is its capacity to keep updating new legislation, keeping members generally ahead of the game. If we are losing capacity at that level how can we still buy into it or replace it? It will need capacity to implement some of the ideas coming out of the EU, as a non-member. Some of the problems of overstretch are with Scottish Parliament. With our interest in governance issues, we will need to **engage closely in 20th anniversary reforms of the Scottish Parliament**, looking ahead to the next 25 years. Many of our member organisations spend a lot of time engaging with the Parliament so we have much to bring to that.

Next, think about the **local level of our democracy**. Are Lesley Riddoch and others right that it is terrible? Has the SNP centralised things that should not have been? Are people able to have a sense of control at local level, and will we need new structures? Esteem for local government has never been lower. Local democracy does not fit with people's sense of belonging, and we fall short with comparable European nations. What sense do people have of local representation, some kind of regional government maybe, but not local as other nations would understand it. How can it have more autonomy and relationship to people's lives?

We should also as LINK consider the point about **education and awareness**. In the run up to the referendum there was a lack of substantive information about what the EU was doing well, or critiques. The sum total of the message was negative. As an umbrella body we need to think more about what we can do to raise awareness about where our environmental protections come from. We don't know what that will look like. Traditional journalism is now very weak. We need to be more on the front foot with our social media strategy. What will be thrown away? It is something to think about in the changing climate of public debate.

From workshop discussions and our headline - keeping the environment on the political agenda during the Brexit years, **we have some opportunities. These issues of environmental integrity are moving up the agenda**. On health, it was very obvious from the discussions that we are part of the environment. We cannot live separately from it in this dangerous way. **The arguments on health are advanced and are appealing to politicians, and can only get stronger**. On the economy, we are making big progress in trying to get rid of the false split of doing good things for economy on the one hand, or the environment on the other. After the 2008 crash the environment dropped down the agenda due to this false dichotomy. **It is now becoming more obvious that the environment and the economy have to be hand in hand. These arguments are irresistibly strong, so the harder we can push them the better**. Somebody spoke about translating our arguments into health or economy. We are coming close to the boundary where nothing will work unless they do. Core

arguments about the importance of the environment are irresistible. Joyce finished by thanking to the staff team and all our speakers, informers and facilitators.

Delegates (some

Name	Organisation
Charles Millar	Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland
Carol Barbone	BG Group
Isabel Jones	British Ecological Society
Claire Shanks	British Lung Foundation
Craig Macadam	Buglife
Ben Wray	Common Weal
Andy Heald	Confor
Emilia Hanna	Friends of the Earth Scotland
Matthew Crighton	Friends of the Earth Scotland
Paal Frisvold	Geelmuyden Kiese Brussels
Mark Lazarowicz	Hon Fellow - Panel
Peter Pearson	John Muir Trust
Kevin Lelland	John Muir Trust
Helen McDade	John Muir Trust
Nicola McCallum	Keep Scotland Beautiful
Paul Wallace	Keep Scotland Beautiful
Evie Murray	Leith Community Crops in Pots
Alice Walsh	LINK
Jen Anderson	LINK
Lisa Webb	LINK
Daphne Vlastari	LINK
Karen Paterson	LINK
Phoebe Cochrane	LINK
Alastair Lavery	LINK Honorary Fellow
Ross Finnie	LINK Honorary Fellow
Dave Morris	LINK Honorary Fellow
Mike Robinson	LINK Honorary Fellow
Emilie Devenport	LINK Marine Project
Charlotte Hopkins	LINK Marine Project
Joyce McMillan	LINK President
Eleanor Harris	LINK Species Champion Intern
Tim Ambrose	LINK Treasurer
Catherine Gemmell	Marine Conservation Society

Calum Duncan	Marine Conservation Society
Eilidh Nicholson	National Trust for Scotland
Celia Nyssens	Nourish Scotland
Pete Ritchie	Nourish Scotland
Lisa Stewart	Oxfam
Ian Findlay	Paths for all Partnership
Clare Symonds	Planning Democracy
Peter Kelly	Poverty Alliance
Brendan Paddy	Ramblers
Helen Todd	Ramblers, LINK Chair
Paul Walton	RSPB
Lloyd Austin	RSPB
Rea Cris	RSPB
Anna Brand	RSPB
Rebecca Bell	RSPB
Judy Wilkinson	Scottish Allotments & Gardens Society
Eddie Palmer	Scottish Badgers
Allan Bantick	Scottish Badgers
Angus Hardie	Scottish Community Alliance
Ross Martin	Scottish Council for Development & Industry
Ross Anderson	Scottish Council for National Parks
Margaret Greene	Scottish Geodiversity Forum
Sally Thomas	Scottish Government
Caro Cowan	Scottish Government, Sea Fisheries Division
Mark Ruskell MSP	Scottish Green Party
Clive Mitchell	Scottish Natural Heritage
Nick Halfhide	Scottish Natural Heritage
Ian Bray	Scottish Natural Heritage
Nick Cooke	Scottish Pilgrim Routes Forum
Tom Brock	Scottish Seabird Centre
Beryl Leatherland	Scottish Wild Land Group
Tom Leatherland	Scottish Wild Land Group
Lucy Graham	Scottish Wildlife Trust
Paula Charleson	SEPA
Laura Stewart	Soil Association
Dave Watson	Unison
Annalisa Savaresi	University of Stirling

Miranda Geelhoed	University of Strathclyde, Environmental Law & Governance
Mara Ntona	University of Strathclyde, Environmental Law & Governance
Dr Antonio Cardesa-Salzmann	University of Strathclyde, Lecturer in EU Environmental Law
Sarah Dolman	Whale and Dolphin Conservation
Charles Dundas	Woodland Trust

Alice Walsh, December 2016.