**National Park Commission - SAG 5-3 - Survey Analysis – First cut of the findings**

**Purpose**

1. This paper provides a first draft of the findings from the consultation survey and begins to identify the key issues for NatureScot‘s advice. SAG are asked to note and comment on the findings, focussing on the summary table in Annex A and sampling a selection of questions if time permits, and whether the key issues have been correctly identified.

**Analysis**

1. The analysis we have done to date is presented in summary tables for each question in Annex B. As noted in paper 5-2, we are still working through some of the individual responses and so the high-level summary table in Annex A is incomplete. We expect this phase of analysis to be completed by the end of December with further work then planned to review and quality assure the work.
2. Prioritising the analysis of the responses by organisations does not mean the individual responses are not important, and all responses will be included in the final analysis. In undertaking the analysis, we have been trying to pull out several elements for each question – the range of responses presented, the level of support for each of these responses and the level of authority that a response or group of responses may have. Clearly, this is not a precise science and further work will be needed to check the work done to date.

**Identifying the key issues**

1. To help identify key issues, Annex A provides a high-level summary of the summary tables, and gives each a RAG rating based on the degree of consensus, the level of detail of the responses, and where there appears to be more strongly polarised views.
2. To ensure consistency, this analysis was undertaken by the core National Park team and not by the individual analysts. However, each analyst was then asked to review the emerging conclusions, and changes have been made to reflect these comments.
3. With the caveat that the analysis has not been fully completed in respect to individual responses, the overall results suggest the following broad outcomes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Strong consensus | 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 19, 22, 24,28, 30, 32, 36 | 12 |
| Consensus but some detail to work though | 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38 | 21 |
| Least consensus | 1, 8, 9, 15, 16 | 5 |

1. Paper 5-4 considers further how we may address the areas where there appears to be least consensus, or where there is more work required to consider and present the range of ideas and suggestions made.

**NatureScot**

**December 2022**

**Annex A - High-level summary of consultation analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Strong consensus** | **Consensus but some detail to work though** | **Least consensus** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The role of National Parks** | 1. Do you support “leadership of nature recovery and a just transition to net zero” becoming the overarching purpose of Scotland’s National Parks? If not, what else would you propose? | Strong support for proposed role  Support for additional roles:   * Nature positive through climate change mitigation and adaption * Cultural heritage and landscape qualities * Sustainable social and economic and regeneration * Testing and demonstrating   Concern over implications for other aims of National Parks  Concerns over how timing of changes in relation to designation process |
| 1. Which of the proposed elements of leadership and action set out in the list above do you support? What others - if any - would you propose? | Strong support for elements listed  Some useful additional suggestions made, including:   * Ensure that economic impacts are Just * Innovate and pilot * Provide outreach and visitor engagement |
| 1. What opportunities are there for National Parks to generate private investment in natural capital? | A range of useful suggestions made |
| 1. What role should local communities play in the National Park and how should National Park authorities work with and for them to secure a just transition? | A range of useful suggestions made  Strong call for communities to be at the heart of National Parks |
| **Vision and Mission** | 1. Do you support a “vision and mission” for all of Scotland’s National Parks being clearly set out in a national statement? If not why not? | Very strong support for proposal  Some concerns over need to for each Park to have its own specific vision and mission too |
| 1. If you favour a national statement for Scotland’s National Parks being developed, what else should it cover? | A range of useful suggestions made especially in relation to the climate and nature crises |
| 1. To what extent should new National Parks be about the future potential of an area for nature restoration as well as what’s currently in place | Strong support for future potential adding to what is already of value  Support expressed for rewilding and also ensuring local communities where at the heart of, and benefited from, nature restoration |
| **The statutory Aims of National Parks** | 1. Are any specific changes to the existing four Aims required?  If so why, and what are they? | Mixed views expressed ranging from refresh/updating through to leaving unchanged and changing the context these are delivered in through the new purpose and mission and vision statement. Many responses were also concerned what any change would mean in practice. |
| 1. Which of these possible options, or mix of possible options, do you think would help strengthen the focus and contribution of National Parks, and why? | Mixed views expressed, with strongest support for a new overarching purpose, to secure nature recovery and a just transition to net zero, but also significant support for maintaining the four aims either as is or refreshed to reflect this new purpose. Many responses were also concerned what any change would mean in practice. |
| 1. Are there other options that could be considered? If so, what are they? | Very few suggested  Support for greater clarity on what the aims cover, how the terms within them are defined, and how they are expected to be delivered in practice. |
| **Obligations on Public bodies** | 1. Do you think there should be any changes to the wording in the Act to require public bodies to support delivery of National Park Plans? If so, what would you propose? | Strong support for stronger wording.  Concerns that this also needs policy alignment and funding to deliver. |
| 1. Do you have any other suggestions for improving partnership working to support the implementation of the National Park Plan by all | A range of useful suggestions made, including alignment with other priorities, future land management support and refreshing approaches to local community engagement. |
| **Existing powers and function** | 1. Could any of the existing powers and functions be used more effectively? If so, which ones and how? | Support for retaining and making better use of existing powers and function, including CP and land acquisition.  Support for retention of some form a planning function as set in the current legislation.  Importance of including relevant powers for visitor management.  Concerns that NPAs should be empowered and properly funded. |
| 1. Are any of the existing powers or functions redundant or unnecessary? If so, which ones and why? | Fewer comments made and most supporting the current provisions and highlighting the need for tailored approaches. |
| **New powers and function** | 1. What, if any, changes to the powers and functions in these areas should be considered and why? | A significant number of comments made.  There was generally support for all five areas, with a significant number of suggestions made relating to better management of land or sea and Improving protection, enhancement and enjoyment of nature (including through nature recovery zones land management) and sustainable communities  None mentioned in relation to climate change? |
| 1. Are there any other areas where strengthened or new powers and functions will be needed by the National Park Authority? If so, what are they? | A significant number of comments made with calls for strengthened powers in respect to land and visitor management and community development  Recognition of the need to consider powers for a coastal and marine area further |
| **Diversity between Parks** | 1. Should the powers and functions of National Park Authorities be decided on a Park by Park basis? Should any apply to all National Park Authorities? If so, which ones and why? | Mixed views expressed with strongest support for tailoring solutions via the designation order but also clear recognition that primary legislation and vision and mission is also needed to ensure consistency and brand. |
| 1. Are there any changes you would want to see to the governance and management arrangements of all National Park Authorities? | A range of useful suggestions made, including changes to size of the Boards, broadening representation, the creation of a single Parks agency |
| **Developing a nomination process for National Parks** | 1. Are these the key elements of an effective nomination process for National Parks in Scotland? | Very strong support for proposed elements, with concerns over how it would operate in practice    Some concern that the process needed to have a more strategic direction |
| 1. Do you have suggestions for improving any of the specific elements of the process? | Calls for further detail on support for nominations and how the independent panel would work in practice (and whether it would be expert or representative) |
| 1. Are there additional elements you want to see included, and if so, what are these? | A number of helpful comments made, largely reinforcing or building on the responses to Q20  Some key difference between individual and organisational responses |
| **Criteria – Selection Criteria- Outstanding national importance** | 1. Do you agree that outstanding national importance should be a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? | Strong support expressed for this criterion with the caveat that outstanding needed to be better defined, and some concerns that non-NP areas will be at a disadvantage. |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? | Yes, but with some useful comments made |
| **Selection Criteria –Size and coherence** | 1. Do you agree with size and coherence as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? | Strong support expressed for this criterion, including support for it to include ecological connectivity and consider boundary affects |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? | Yes with caveats, including inclusion of large scale infrastructure and consideration of marine areas |
| **Selection Criteria –Added value** | 1. Do you support the consideration of the potential contribution of the National Park in delivering nature recovery and a just transition to net zero as criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? | Strong support for this criterion, but with some caveats over implications of what nature recovery, just transition and net zero would mean in practice particularly for communities; also whether net zero should be prioritised or included alongside nature recovery |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? | Yes, with calls for additional consideration of equality, accessibility and transport, sustainable economic development and community involvement and empowerment |
| **Selection criteria – existing or other approaches** | 1. Do you support the assessment of the merits of a National Park compared to existing or other approaches as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? | Support for this criteria with some caveats around clarity, consideration of other national designations and how both positive and negative impacts could be assessed in practice |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? | Yes, with calls for a number of additional elements necessary to inform an evidence based approach Including resourcing and longer-term impacts and benefits. |
| **Selection criteria - degree of support** | 1. Do you support the consideration of existing support as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved? | Very strong support for this criterion, with some suggestions made about how best to gauge interest and the weight of national perspectives in the process |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they | Yes, with caveats around what local interest means and how communities are defined |
| **Selection criteria – strategic contribution** | 1. Do you support the assessment of the strategic contribution of an area as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved? | Very strong support for this criterion, with suggestions made around including cultural heritage priorities and contribution to 30x30 |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? | Yes, with points covering implications of 30x30 and net zero and sustainable development |
| **Selection Criteria – other issues** | 1. Are there any significant issues that are not covered by the proposed criteria? If so, what are they? | Relatively small number of responses highlighting the importance of community engagement; impacts on renewable energy targets and the need to consider negative impacts on the area |
| 1. Do you think any of the criteria are more important than others? If so, which ones and why? | Relatively small number of responses with a range of views expressed |
| 1. Do you think the selection criteria and proposed components provide the right balance between covering the issues required and simplicity? If not, how could they be improved? | Strong support expressed, with calls for increased simplicity and support |
| 1. Should more of the proposed components be quantifiable? If so, which ones, and how? | Relatively small number of responses with a range of views expressed supporting both more quantified approaches and retaining the balance between quantitative and qualitative assessments |
| **Other Issues** | 1. Are there any other issues about Scotland’s approach to National Parks or the selection of new National Parks you would like to raise in your response at this stage? | A range of views expressed covering a wide range of topics |

**Annex B – Summary Analysis by question (as of 14 December 2022)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** | **Q** | **page** |
| 1 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 19 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 21 |
| 8 | 23 | 9 | 25 | 10 | 27 | 11 | 29 | 12 | 31 | 13 | 33 | 14 | 35 |
| 15 | 37 | 16 | 39 | 17 | 40 | 18 | 41 | 19 | 43 | 20 | 45 | 21 | 47 |
| 22 | 48 | 23 | 50 | 24 | 51 | 25 | 52 | 26 | 53 | 27 | 54 | 28 | 55 |
| 29 | 56 | 30 | 57 | 31 | 58 | 32 | 60 | 33 | 61 | 34 | 62 | 35 | 62 |
| 36 | 64 | 37 | 65 | 38 | 66 |

| **Question 1** Do you support “leadership of nature recovery and a just transition to net zero” becoming the overarching purpose of Scotland’s National Parks? If not, what else would you propose? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, K55, K70, N77, K78, K82, K83, E96, C114, E119, E126, E131, L135, K136, L137, K138, K141, E147, L148, G149, N153, L154, K155, K156, N158, K159, K160, G170, E171, K172, N179, E181, K183, K186, K191, I195, L199, M215, G216, C217, K219, C221, K223, K224, C225, K213, Q230, | M21, L41, K83, C114, K138, K141, L148, N158, K156, K159, K160, G170, E171, N179, M215, K219, K223, K224 | K227, G226, K227, J187, C203, D206, G211, I222 |  | B98, K98, E129, K130, I133, K134, N150, I151, G174, I177, B188, K214 |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes | These agree and don’t propose additional purposes | These agree and propose additional purposes |  |  | These think the overarching purpose should be replaced |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1 Cultural heritage and landscape qualities**  They must, at their heart, retain a recognisable statutory purpose which relates to their 'special qualities' in terms of natural and cultural heritage and landscape (N150).  The four existing aims of Scotland’s national parks should be sufficient, conserve the wild qualities of the landscape (L148).  All four aims set out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act are important, the Sandford principle, as expressed through Section 9 (6) of the Act, states that where these aims come into conflict the Park Authority must prioritise the aim to “conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area” (K156) (L148)  Wish to see some clarity as to what the connection of the proposed overarching purpose is with the existing four collective aims set out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 (N158).  There are other important purposes of National Parks, including:   * conservation of cultural heritage * facilitating social and community engagement * landscape protection * to engage visitors with our heritage and potentially to manage visitor pressures (K159).   A balanced approach should be taken with the heritage, natural character and natural beauty of the land also being reflected in the purpose of national parks (N179).  We suggest that National Parks in Scotland should strive to meet the ABCD criteria set out in the [BES Protected Areas Report](https://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/policy/protected-areas) to ensure they are delivering for nature and people, while contributing to the wider nature network where possible. Currently we take the view that National Parks should not count towards the 30% target until they meet the ABCD criteria. | | | | | |
| **2. Sustainable social and economic and regeneration**  The key objectives of nature recovery and a just transition to net zero should be underpinned by a strong commitment to local economic, social and cultural regeneration (K160).  The future National Parks should be constituted with the Place Principle in mind (G170).  Sustaining and growing population should be a key feature of a National Park, particularly in areas which have suffered from historic depopulation (E171).  The overarching purpose should be that National parks are areas of increased environmental, economic and social sustainability (B98).  Protection and enhancement of cultural heritage and biodiversity, allow local communities and economies to thrive (E129), models of sustainable development (I133), the overarching purpose of a national park should be the restoration of nature. The purpose of nature recovery and just transition to net-zero must not contradict the Scottish Government’s vision for agriculture, of which food production is a key element (I151).  Thriving communities and nature-based livelihoods (K83)  Provision of education opportunities (M21)  Access to greenspace and wild land for sport and recreation (L41)  Promote heritage conservation, sustainable resource use, understanding, enjoyment and recreation and the sustainable social and economic development of the area’s communities (K141) | | | | | |
| **3 Nature positive through climate change mitigation and adaption**  We propose that the overarching purpose is amended to “leadership of nature recovery, climate change mitigation and adaptation and a just transition to net zero” in line with The Scottish Government’s commitment within the revised draft National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) that “Scotland’s future places will be net zero, nature-positive places that are designed to reduce emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change, whilst protecting, recovering and restoring our environment” (M215).  Recommend that National Parks are given an overarching purpose to:  “Lead nature recovery and a Just Transition to Nature Positive and Net Zero” (K223).  The Trust welcomes the proposed focus on nature recovery, not only conservation and enhancement, combined with a focus on a just transition to net-zero carbon emissions. We would strongly suggest strengthening and improving the purpose by stating “a just transition to net zero and nature positive” (K224) | | | | | |
| **4. Testing and demonstrating**  Rather than the somewhat nebulous concept of ‘leadership’, we suggest our NPs should be transparently demonstrating ‘best practice’ in nature recovery and transition to net zero as an overarching purpose (K219).  Testing transition approaches to net zero (J10) | | | | | |

| **Question 2**  Which of the proposed elements of leadership and action set out in the list above do you support? What others - if any - would you propose? | | | | | | | | | **summary response table** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | | | | | | |
| **agree** | | **mostly agree** | | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | | **mostly disagree** | | **disagree** | |
| respondent code | J10, L41, K55, K78, K82, K83, E96, C114, E119, E126, E129, K130, E131, I133, K134, L137, K138, K141, L148, K155, K156, N158, K159, K160, L163, E171, K172, E181, K186, J187, B188, K191, I195, L199, D206, K214, M215, C217, C221, K223, C225, K213, Q230 | |  | | E147, G216, K220, I222, K224, K227, K183, C203, G211 | |  | |  | |
| numbers - organisations |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| numbers - individuals |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| overall numbers |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| notes | These support all elements and include respondents proposing additional elements | |  | | These agree with some of the suggested elements but express reservations on others as indicated in the Table below | |  | |  | |
| **Agree with some of the proposed elements of leadership and action** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Promoting the need to do things differently and at greater pace | Recognising that change is inevitable and that nature recovery should not seek to simply replicate the past | Accelerating the transition in land and marine use to deliver climate mitigation and nature recovery | | Testing and embedding natural capital approaches | | Generating opportunities for greater private investment in natural capital | | Realising the just transition by championing reskilling and new employment opportunities | | Leading on improving ways of design and place making |
| K70, N153, L154, G174, I177, | K70, N153, G174 | N77, N153, G174, N179, | | B98, N153, I177, N179, | | B98, I177, K219 | | K70, B98, K136, I151, G174, I177, N179, | | M21, K70, N77, I151, L154, G174, I177, N179, K219 |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1 Key additional ‘key elements of leadership and action’ suggested**  See below ‘Suggestions for additional ‘elements of leadership and action’ below for fuller quotes.  **Ensure that economic impacts are Just**  Protect rural businesses, retain workers, and do not exclude the local population from the housing market.  **Innovate and pilot**  Avoid increasing bureaucracy and stifling innovation but aim instead to develop and provide exemplars of best practice.  **Provide outreach and visitor engagement**  Increase and strengthen ranger services to act as key contacts for visitors, to provide a wide range of effective learning experiences for visitors, local people, and schools, to tackle bad behaviour, and to protect the natural environment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2 These are the top three proposed elements attracting caveats**  See below for fuller quotes and comments on the proposed ‘elements of leadership and action’.  **Generating opportunities for greater private investment in natural capital**  Some respondents did not support / questioned this element (L41, K82), some pointed out that private investment shouldn't be an outcome in its own right (K183), that it should be accompanied by public investment (I195), and must meet exemplary standards of community benefit, environmental integrity and social justice (K160). There was support for strengthening this by specifying “**responsible** private investment in natural capital” and reference to the Scottish Government’s [*Interim Principles for Responsible Investment in Natural Capital*](https://www.gov.scot/publications/interim-principles-for-responsible-investment-in-natural-capital/). (N153, K156, K223).  **Testing and embedding natural capital approaches**  Some respondents did not support / questioned this element (K70) pointing out that it can be interpreted in different ways. (K141). There is concern that it does not adequately recognise all the benefits our environment provides, in particular the cultural and historic values experienced by people (G174), and there were calls for a focus on wellbeing and sustainable growth (N179).  **Realising the Just Transition by championing reskilling and new employment opportunities**  There was concern that this may be hampered by regulatory constraints (K78). Also concern that reskilling could result in the loss of traditional rural skills (I177), and there were calls for a focus on the crucial role of Countryside Rangers and allied professionals (K136). | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Suggestions for additional ‘elements of leadership and action’**  **Ensure that economic impacts are Just**  We believe that national parks also need to champion affordable, secure housing for people who live within park areas (K130).  A recurring concern from our members was that existing national parks have failed to retain local people or protect rural businesses, and that increased tourism and visitor access has driven up the price of property, thereby pricing out locals and resulting in an influx of wealthy, second homeowners. (I151)  New forms of sustainable development and related housing solutions should be viewed as a criticality. (E171).  **Innovate and pilot**  Need Government policy on how National Park leadership is intended to provide a best practice approach to influence wider spatial policies in other areas (N150),  There are real concerns among our members that national park designation would increase bureaucracy and stifle innovation. (I151)  National Parks need to be the foci for nature restoration at a faster and larger scale than what may be possible elsewhere. National Parks need to be exemplars of best practice. (N153).  **Provide outreach and visitor engagement**  The importance of increased and strengthened ranger services, who can act as a key contact for visitors if they need help or assistance, who are able to educate the public on what is and isn’t acceptable behaviour, and who also have powers of enforcement to tackle bad behaviour, protect other visitors and residents, and protect the natural environment (I151).  A key ingredient has been omitted – education. A NP has a uniquely important role to play in educating the public about the “why” and “how to” of the proposed actions. It can provide a wide range of effective learning experiences for visitors, local people, and schools. (K214)  **Comments on the proposed ‘elements of leadership and action’**  **Generating opportunities for greater private investment in natural capital**  Some respondents excluded / questioned this element (L41, K82)  Should be strengthened to specify “responsible private investment in natural capital” and should refer to the Scottish Government’s *Interim Principles for Responsible Investment in Natural Capital*. (N153, K156, K223).  There are concerns that local employment could be disregarded by landowners that seek to focus solely on investment and returns from natural capital. (I177).  Private investment may be a mechanism for delivering outcomes but shouldn't be an outcome in its own right. (K183).  Private investment in natural capital should only be encouraged in National Parks where it meets exemplary standards of community benefit, environmental integrity and social justice. (K160).  Natural capital projects inevitably require long term commitment and investment (B188).  The emphasis on private investment with no mention of public investment is dangerous. (I195)  The references to the potential role of National Parks in securing green investment are welcome. National Parks are already pioneering in this area through the *Revere project* facilitated by UK National Parks Partnerships. (G211)  Renewable energy developments that are immediately adjacent to National Parks would have the ability to provide investment in natural capital and implement habitat management plans. (C217).  **Testing and embedding natural capital approaches**  We strongly support the proposal that natural capital approaches should sit at the heart of national parks with a focus on wellbeing and sustainable growth. (N179)  Some respondents excluded / questioned this element (K70) - needs to be clearly explained or defined so it is understood what is actually meant in practice, as the term can be interpreted in different ways. (K141).  Natural capital as currently developed does not recognise the historic environment, culture or people, other than as potential consumers of nature. It does not adequately recognise the historic aspect of the assets, services, values and benefits our environment provides (G174).  **Realising the Just Transition by championing reskilling and new employment opportunities**  Achieving large scale regeneration will require a substantial number of businesses with a capable workforce. The regulatory constraints should be reviewed (K78).  The role carried out by Countryside Rangers and allied professionals have proved to be crucial (K136).  Considerable concern if ‘reskilling’ is aimed at the traditional sporting roles of gamekeepers and ghillies. (B188), there is a risk that ‘transitioning’ may result in fewer new job opportunities and traditional rural skills are lost forever, for example gamekeeping. (I177).  **Promoting the need to do things differently and at greater pace**  'Promoting' and 'recognising' will not lead to the change required without legislating, regulating and investing. (I195)  **Recognising that change is inevitable and that nature recovery should not seek to simply replicate the past**  Recognise that change is inevitable, and that nature recovery should be inspired and informed by the past but not seek to simply replicate it (I177)  **Accelerating the transition in land and marine use to deliver climate mitigation and nature recovery**  Should be expanded, to explicitly require National Parks to support appropriately sited developments within and adjacent to a Park’s boundaries that will contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, as well as Scotland’s net-zero targets. (M215) (C221)  **Leading on improving ways of design and place making**  Embedded placemaking principles will help to build attractive, vibrant places for people to live and will be key in making rural communities desirable place to live in. (N179)  Should include reference to cultural heritage (E129)  Need to emphasise sustainable travel and sustainable communities as key part of this. (L54). | | | | | | | | | | |

| **Question 3**  What opportunities are there for National Parks to generate private investment in natural capital? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code |  |  | L41, K136. L137, C203, K220, C225, G226, K227 |  | I151 |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  | NFUS would like to see investment go to economic development, growth and enterprise for a wider area |
| **General comments on opportunities to generate private investment in natural capital**  This question ‘what opportunities are there for National Parks to generate private investment in natural capital’ does not ask respondents to agree or disagree with any specific proposition. A number of respondents made general comments:   * Private investment usually comes with a catch (or three) (M21), and public aims will not be achieved without spending public money (I195). * Develop and refine Scottish Government’s [*Interim* *Principles for Responsible Investment in Natural Capital*](https://www.gov.scot/publications/interim-principles-for-responsible-investment-in-natural-capital/) (K156) (K223) as a standard to help generate confidence for investment (B188). This must be accompanied by effective enforcement, which is a major weakness at present (K219). * Integrate with existing regional frameworks, such as City Region and Regional Growth Deals, Regional Economic Partnerships, and Regional Land Use Partnerships (N158). * In the report, [Rewilding and the Rural Economy,](https://www.rewildingbritain.org.uk/news-and-views/research-and-reports/rewilding-and-the-rural-economy) Rewilding Britain discuss the advantages and disadvantages of mechanisms for financing local nature-based economies. This includes: philanthropy and grants; direct nature fees; green taxes; impact investing; biodiversity offsets; payments for ecosystem services; green bonds; blue bonds; crowdfunding; grant capitalised incubator funds; and grant capitalised buy-out funds (K134). * The [Revere](https://revere.eco/) project helps design nature restoration projects, raise private capital to fund them, and generate revenue through sale of ecosystem services. (N153) It is being developed as part of the Future Nature programme delivery plan to test innovative approaches to investing in National Parks (G211). * Make use of ‘upcoming’ biodiversity credits (K82) (K138).   **Specific opportunities to generate private investment in natural capital**  Many respondents referred to one or more of the specific ‘opportunities to generate private investment in natural capital’ provided in the consultation. Most were supportive. Some additional ‘opportunities’ were suggested and other ‘opportunities’ are might be widened in response (as shown below). All the ‘opportunities’ are listed in order of the numbers of mentions each attracted, alongside key points raised.  **Carbon offsetting, carbon credits, the woodland and peatland carbon codes (amended)**   * These must provide financial benefit and employment to communities (D206). * There is a need for this to be well-regulated and genuinely reduce the carbon footprint of a National Park (G216).   **Habitat creation for carbon capture / management, ecological restoration (amended)**  **Payment for ecosystem services (additional)**   * A single piece of land may provide carbon sequestration, flood risk prevention to local communities and businesses, biodiversity restoration and health and well-being benefits. A first step is the ability to measure and value these benefits, using credible standards and metrics as a foundation for developing markets and tradeable credits (I133). Money should flow back into local communities. (K130).   **Sustainable local products/produce, including tourism (amended)**   * Should include tourism and truly sustainable artisanal non-damaging practices (K70).   **Renewables (additional)**   * Energy infrastructure projects, when undertaken in an appropriate manner will create opportunities for National Parks to generate private investment in natural capital and nature restoration, for example via habitat management and through community benefit payments. (M215) * Use Community benefit funds (C114). * Appropriate National Scenic Areas, from which windfarms are already excluded, should be considered for National Park designation to avoid the potential loss of investment in natural capital (C217).   **Planning gain, Biodiversity Net Gain and Marine Net Gain (additional)**   * Our members recognise the opportunity presented by Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and Marine Net Gain (MNG) for developments, such as renewable energy projects, to generate private investment in nature enhancement (M215). | | | | | |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** | | | | | |
| **2** | | | | | |
| **3** | | | | | |

| **Question 4**  What role should local communities play in the National Park and how should National Park authorities work with and for them to secure a just transition? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code |  |  | K213, K220, !222, K224, G226, K227, G216 |  |  |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| This question on ‘what role should be played by local communities in the National Park, and how National Park authorities should work with and for them to secure a Just Transition’, does not ask respondents to agree or disagree with any specific proposition.  All responses affirmed that local communities have a very important role to play in the National Park. Most responses focused on ‘working with’ rather than ‘working for’ local communities.  ‘A just transition to net zero’ is proposed as part of the ‘overarching purpose of Scotland’s National Parks’ and is considered under Q1 and Q2. Only a small number of responses to this question referred directly to the role local communities should play in securing a Just Transition – these are recorded at (7) below.  The table below presents a comprehensive overview of the key issues raised by respondents. | | | | | |
| **Top points made** | | | | | |
| **1 Employ best practice**  Although employing best practice is an overarching principle that should be applied to all aspects of working with local communities, a number of key observations and suggestions were made.  Community strategies or policy documents used by the existing national parks should be echoed in the new National Park (I133).  Local communities need to be consulted at all stages of the process, as highlighted by criteria D of the [BES ABCD criteria](https://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/BES_Protected_Areas_Exec_Summary.pdf) (see Q1) (K138).  Through the medium of co-design, rather than consultation (K130) (K134).  Feedback from NFUS members currently in national parks feel that not enough focus is placed on the views of local people, and that where community involvement was present that it was tokenistic. National park authorities must do better at making local representation more accessible and inclusive. Local communities are rarely a cohesive and unified voice (I151). | | | | | |
| **2 Build community capacity and skills for engagement and provide resources**  Engagement, from consultation through to participative action, needs to be adequately resourced to be effective (J10).  Grow the capacity of local communities to take an active role in the decision-making processes within the National Park (E119).  Local communities should also have equitable access to new employment opportunities that a national park is likely to generate and should be supported through relevant training and employability schemes (N179).  <https://outdoorpartnership.co.uk/> provides a model on work in the Eryri National Park in North Wales. The model provides supported training for young people and others within the national park in skills that allow them to work in adventurous activities within the park. The model would work in many different types of training and employment including tourism, hospitality, conservation, land management (L199). | | | | | |
| **3 Recognise the diversity of communities, and the wider population**  Local communities and communities of interest, such as recreational boaters who use the National Park, both need to be involved at as early a stage as possible (L41).  The Cairngorms Junior Ranger project as well as the John Muir Award provide great opportunities for youth involvement. Likewise, citizen science and citizen action are important, for example the Cairngorms Rare Plants and Wild Connections Project (N153).  There must be a balance of local interest with national interest within the National Park (K183).  Due to the recognised power imbalance between large landowners and local communities, there should be a mechanism to offer better local democracy and input from ordinary people who are not tied to large estates. (K186)  Thought should be given to the different geographical elements - these can broadly be divided into places:   * Where people live and work, with significant housing settlements, business activity, roads, energy and communications infrastructure * Primarily devoted to productive agriculture * That would be considered by most people to have a high degree of wildness with potential for carbon sequestration and biodiversity restoration. (K160)   National Parks must connect to urban populations e.g. with remote visitor centres? (N153) | | | | | |
| **4 Ensure there is representation at all levels**  Communities need to be involved in governance, developing the Park Plan and its implementation, including through direct representation on the Park Board (E96).  There is the potential for involving communities at all levels of National Park activities e.g. Board membership, inhabitants, workforce, volunteers, visitors, students (K223). Communities should be an integral part of all decision-making, particularly in regard to the provision of affordable housing and control of second-home ownership (K55). Communities should have a clear function at all governance levels, with special functions created for young people to be a part of the decision-making systems of parks (Q230). Direct representation in the Park Board and in the process of preparation and implementation of the Park Plan (M215). Local communities should be represented on the National Park Board (E126). | | | | | |
| **3 Communities have important perspectives to bring**  Communities should be represented on a group advising the Board of each National Park and their officials of the practicalities and consequences, good and bad, of proposals, in order that environmental and socio-economic impacts can be assessed (B98).  Local communities should play an advisory or supportive role on initiatives, highlighting what will change in the locality due to climate change, and act as a catalyst and sounding board for projects such as developing transition plans, local place plans or local emission reduction programmes (K141). | | | | | |
| **6. Pay attention to existing community structures**  The community empowerment agenda in rural Scotland has a rich and successful history of community-led planning and placemaking through, for example, the establishment of development trusts and community-led housing initiatives. RTPI Scotland therefore calls upon any designation process to take into consideration any existing Community Action Plans, Local Outcomes Improvement Plans (LOIPS) and Locality Plans. Furthermore consideration needs to be made to the role of emerging Local Place Plans (LPPs), a provision introduced in the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019 (N158).  There is a strong network of community development trusts and community councils in both existing national parks – this is a great asset to both parks, and should be used more as a central part to National Park discussions, particularly with reference to a just transition (E131).  Local climate action groups could lead on community engagement (E129). | | | | | |
| **7. The role local communities should play in securing a Just Transition**  A truly just transition to “net zero” must take account of inequalities of health, opportunity and access to public services at community level (K214).  Provision of broadband is vital to ensuring that rural communities are not left behind when it comes to a just transition, giving people access to jobs, education and training and supporting remote businesses (C229). | | | | | |

| **Question 5**  Do you support a “vision and mission” for all of Scotland’s National Parks being clearly set out in a national statement? If not why not? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, M21, L41, K55, N77, K83, E96, E119, E126, E129. K130, E131, I133, K134, K136, L137, K138, E147, N150, G152, N153, L154, K156, N158, K159, K160, L163, K172, N179, E181, K183, K186, J187, B188, K191, I195, L199, D206, G211, G216, C217, K223, C225, Q230 | K70, K82, K141, G174, I177, K213, M215, C221 | C114, I151, M215, C203 | I151 | K78, B98, E171, K214 |
| numbers - organisations | 44 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Overall consensus for a National ‘vision and mission’, as this would: give all selected areas the same stature; help coordinate ambition and action; give a cohesive, clear and overarching purpose (i.e. nature/culture versus social and economic development), goal and future vision for everyone to aim for; highlight priorities; provide for public understanding; develop a similar culture; and link to the global family of NPs. | | | | | |
| **2**  Recognition that the statement needs to capture more with regards to the climate and nature emergencies.  “A vision and mission statement for NPs would provide an ideal opportunity to explain how the imperative to do much more on nature recovery and a just transition fits with the existing NP aims.”(K141) | | | | | |
| **3**  Strong voice in responses seeking local setting of vision and priorities tailored to local circumstances and issues etc. Some respondents seeking a balance – a statement with an overarching national purpose yet enabling local vision setting. | | | | | |

| **Question 6**  If you favour a national statement for Scotland’s National Parks being developed, what else should it cover | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, M21, K55, K82, N77, K83, E96, E119, E129, E131, I133, K134, K136, L137, K138, K141, N150, N153, L154, K156, N158, K159, K160, E171, G174, N179, E181, K138, K186, J187, B188, K191, I195, L199, D206, G211, K213, G216, C221, K223, C225, Q230 | K70, E147 | L148, C114, L41, I151, C203, M215, C217 |  | K78, I177 |
| numbers - organisations | 42 | 2 | 7 |  | 2 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Strong support for the statement to include action for the climate and nature emergencies achieved through using landscape as a framework for better connected ecosystems and to manage ecological networks on a strategic scale.  “The National Statement should address how National Parks will contribute fundamentally to addressing the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity”.(N153) | | | | | |
| **2**  Significant amount of responses around the theme of making wider policy and practice links: consideration of co-working between Parks and other designated sites/landscapes; 30 x 30; Scotland’s National Performance Framework, Scotland’s Biodiversity Strategy; and wider national commitments at an international level, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity. | | | | | |
| **3**  Significant amount of responses around the theme of NPs delivering benefits for people and active, resilient, engaged and knowledgeable local communities. In addition, that NP’s should be accessible for all.  “The National statement should demonstrate commitment to those communities within and adjacent to the National Park” (E96) | | | | | |

| **Question 7**  To what extent should new National Parks be about the future potential of an area for nature restoration as well as what’s currently in place? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | M21, L41, K55, N77, K78, K82, K83, E96, C114, E126, E129, K130, E131, I133, K134, L137, K138, E147, L148, N150, N153, L154, K155, K156, N158, K159, K160, E171, K127, E181, K183, K186, J187, B188, K191, I195, D206, K219, K223, C225, Q230 | J10, E119, K136, K141, G174, I177, N179, L199, I204, G211, K213, K214, C217, C221 | K70, I151, C203, M215, G216 |  | B98 |
| numbers - organisations | 41 | 14 | 5 |  | 1 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Overall, most respondents agreed that NPs should be about the future potential of an area for nature restoration as well as what’s currently in place, as there is a significant need to address the climate and nature emergencies e.g.:  “If ‘leadership of nature recovery and a just transition to net zero’ becomes the overarching purpose of Scotland’s National Parks, which we believe it should, then nature restoration and protecting existing areas of high biodiversity value should be a key consideration in all decisions that are made.”K138  “There is a huge opportunity for National Parks to expand their role in nature restoration and protection at-scale. Any new National Parks must be designated to have a key focus on nature recovery and achieving Net Zero.”K156 | | | | | |
| **2**  The theme of rewilding featured in a number of responses e.g.:  **“**Rewildingis the large-scale restoration of ecosystems to the point where nature is allowed to take care of itself. Rewilding aims to reinstate natural processes and, where appropriate, missing species – allowing them to engineer and restore habitats. Effective rewilding encourages a balance between people and nature. This approach is perfectly suited to our national parks, where large areas still require significant regeneration.”K130 | | | | | |
| **3**  The theme of not leaving people out of the nature restoration picture also featured throughout Reponses e.g.:  “A fundamentalist approach to nature restoration has the potential to alienate local communities and landowners whose stewardship has already resulted in generating a historic landscape with considerable nature conservation value.”K136  “Alongside existing nature restoration practices, we need to see ambitions to develop innovative approaches which drive nature recovery, we need to improve people’s connections with nature, and we need to fundamentally ensure that these landscapes go beyond visual appeal and provide places for living and working communities.”I133  “Communities and businesses expect National Parks to be about nature restoration – and not just about conserving what is already in place. Visitors to National Parks also expect there to be nature restoration – it’s the main stated reason for visits to National Parks. But it is important that communities are involved early on in discussions about what that nature restoration might mean.”E131 | | | | | |

| **Question 8**  Are any specific changes to the existing four Aims required?  If so why, and what are they? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree**  *(in here I have included everyone who said yes to changes and had something to say that made sense)* | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) (*in here I have included* ***Unclear*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** *(in here I have included* ***No response,******No view*** *and* ***No*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* |
| respondent code | E96  N158  J10, K55  N77, I133, K159, L199  M21, K186, K214, C219  K70, K82, E129, D206,  L41, K78, K83, E119, K130, K134, N153, K156, K172, N179, K183, J187, K223, K224, G225  C114  E131  K160, *G211*  I177  K215, C221  Q230 |  | I222, G226, K220, I113 |  | M51, L135, G149, G152, L154, K155, G170, I195, C203, I204, C229    B98, E126, K136, L137, L138, K141, E147, L148, N150, I151, L163, E171, G174, L178, E181, B188, K191, K213, K216, C217, |
| numbers - organisations | **39** |  | **4** |  | **31** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes – see below |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| 1. Many respondents were clear that they felt no changes are required, although a small number of those respondents did go on to then suggest some possible changes if changes are going to be made anyway. | | | | | |
| 2. Of the respondents who felt that changes are required, many of them stated that nature recovery and net zero should be the focus. Nature recovery and net zero being the focus was also mentioned by quite a number of the respondents under 1. above (those who were not seeking changes but then went on to make suggestions for changes if changes were to be made). | | | | | |
| 3. After 2. above, the most popular requested changes with respondents were ‘conserving and enhancing natural and cultural heritage’ and ‘sustainable use of resources’ with varying divergent comments but generally supporting nature. | | | | | |
| **Notes**  Any text with yellow highlight above has been added after receiving this form to complete.  G211 LLTNPA response is a board paper for 12 Dec and their code above is in italics because their response is draft.  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal. They are NOT included above.  Q230 has provided one answer for Qns 8/9/10 and I have allocated it to Qn 9 analysis and treated their response like they are referring us to Qn 9. Code is included above.  All 75 organisation responses are included – this has been double checked (with the exception of K227). | | | | | |

| **Question 9**  Which of these possible options, or mix of possible options, do you think would help strengthen the focus and contribution of National Parks, and why | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** *(in here I have included everyone who had something to say that made sense)* | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) (*in here I have included* ***Unclear*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** *(in here I have included* ***No response*** *and* ***No view*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* |
| respondent code | B98, I133, N150, G174, I177, B188, K213, K214,  K130, K134, K136, K156, K160, N179, K191, G216, K223  C114, E126, N153, L154, N158, E181, I195, M215, C217, C221,  M21  E119  L137,  K159  L41, E129, I151, J187, L199  K55, K70, E96,  K82  N77  E131  E138  D206  Q230 |  | K220, I222, G226, I113  K78, K83, K141, K147, |  | J10, M51, L135, L148, G149, G152, K155, L163, G170, E171, K172, L178, K183, K186, C203, I204, *G211,* K219, C229  K224,  C225 |
| numbers - organisations | 45 |  | 8 |  | 21 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes – see below for notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1. Of the responses that said something about options, the majority were keen on *“keeping the four Aims but include a new overarching statutory purpose to secure nature recovery and a just transition to net zero”*** | | | | | |
| **2. Of the responses that said something about options, after point 1. above, the next most popular point was to**  *“keep the policy intention of each Aim but rewording them to better reflect a new vision and mission statement”* | | | | | |
| **3. The next most popular option after points 1 and 2 above was to retain the current status quo – keeping the 4 Aims as currently worded. Some sideline debate about whether this was better because no new legislation would be required (?) so it would be quicker to implement a new NP and that everything needed could still be fitted in eg increased focus on net zero and biodiversity loss.** | | | | | |
| **Notes**  Any text with yellow highlight above has been added after receiving this form to complete.  G211 LLTNPA response is a board paper for 12 Dec with a suggested response and I have put their response code in italics above. I have added their comments in to my analysis of Qn 8 not Qn 9 as they seem to apply best there rather than here.  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal and Respondent Code not included in the table above.  All 75 organisation responses are included – this has been double checked (with the exception of K227).  Q230 has provided one answer for Qns 8/9/10 and I have allocated it to Qn 9 analysis. Code is included above. | | | | | |

| **Question 10**  Are there other options that could be considered? If so, what are they? | | | | | **summary response table** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | | |
| **agree**  *(in here I have included everyone who had something to say that made sense)* | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’)  (*in here I have included* ***Unclear*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* | **mostly disagree** | | **disagree**  *(in here I have included* ***No response*** *and* ***No view*** *and* ***No*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* |
| respondent code | G216, K78, K70, E96, N77, E131, K160, K141, I151, K186, N153, K156, K183, K219, K223, D206, K213  Q230 |  | K224, I222, G226, K220, *G211*  K83, I113, N179, |  | | J10, M21, L41, M51, C114, E119, K130, K134, L135, K138, E147, L148, G149, N150, G152, K136, L137, L154, K155, N158, K159, L163, G170, E171, K172, G174, I177, L178, E181, J187, K191, I195, L199, C203, I204, K214, M215, C217, C221, C229  E129  K55, K82, B98, E126, I133, B188, C225 |
| numbers - organisations | **18** |  | **8** |  | | **48** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  | |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Notes – see below |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | | |
| 1 The majority of respondents had nothing to say on this question and seem to have covered their points in their responses to Qns 8 and 9 | | | | | | |
| 2 Of the additional options suggested the most frequent one (4 responses) was for clear definitions to be provided for the terms in the Aims and that these definitions should be updated to be in line with the vision and mission for Scotland’s national parks. Plus 1 response asking for definition of ‘greater weight’ and how it should be applied. Plus 2 responses seeking evidence to be used to set the new Aims with monitoring and review of the Aims thereafter. | | | | | | |
| 3 The request for the Sandford principle to apply to all public bodies in the NP not just the NPA is noteworthy (3 responses) | | | | | | |
| **Notes**  Any text with yellow highlight above has been added after receiving this form to complete.  G211 LLTNPA response is a board paper for 12 Dec with a suggested response and I have put their response code in italics above. I have added their comments in to my analysis of Qn 8 not Qn 10 as they seem to apply best there rather than here.  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal and Respondent Code not included in the table above.  All 75 organisation responses are included – this has been double checked (with the exception of K227).  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal  Q230 has provided one answer for Qns 8/9/10 and I have allocated it to Qn 9 analysis and treated their response like they are referring us to Qn 9. Code is included above. | | | | | | |

| **Question 11**  Do you think there should be any changes to the wording in the Act to require public bodies to support delivery of National Park Plans? If so, what would you propose? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree**  *(in here I have included everyone who had something to say that made sense)* | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) (*in here I have included* ***Unclear*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** *(in here I have included* ***No response,******No view*** *and* ***No*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* |
| respondent code | E96, J187,  M21  J10, K83, K130, K134, K214, G216,  N77, K78, K141, K159, K160,  N153, K191,  G149  L154, K172, N179, K186, I195, *G211*, K213, Q230  K156, K223  N158 |  | K55, K70, E119, L148, G152, B188, K224, I222, G226, K220, I151,  I113, |  | M51, L135, K136, L137, K138, E147, N150, K155, L163, G170, G174, L178, K183, L199, C203, I204, C217, C221,  L41, C114, E126, I133, C225  K82, B98, E129, E131, E171, I177, E181, D206, M215, K219,  C229 |
| numbers - organisations | **28** |  | **12** |  | **34** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes – see below |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| 1. The majority of responses that did have a view on this question were in favour of changing the wording to make the duty apply to other public sector organisations. 28 in favour vs 10. Various wordings were suggested but all on a similar vein. | | | | | |
| 1. A number of respondents said that resources and budget would be required to help other organisations meet this requirement were it to be introduced. | | | | | |
| 1. Concern about how organisations with particular duties and plans could be made to fit in with / contribute to a National Park Plan which could be contrary to their own plans. | | | | | |
| **Notes**  Any text with yellow highlight above has been added after receiving this form to complete.  G211 LLTNPA response is a board paper for 12 Dec with a suggested response and I have put their response code in italics above. I have added their comments in to my analysis of Qn 8 not Qn 10 as they seem to apply best there rather than here.  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal and Respondent Code not included in the table above.  All 75 organisation responses are included – this has been double checked (with the exception of K227). | | | | | |

| **Question 12**  Do you have any other suggestions for improving partnership working to support the implementation of the National Park Plan by all | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree**  *(in here I have included everyone who had something to say that made sense)* | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) (*in here I have included* ***Unclear*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** *(in here I have included* ***No response*** *and* ***No view*** *and* ***No other suggestions*** *because that makes most sense in relation to this Qn)* |
| respondent code | E96,  M21, E147  L41,  K138,  K70, I133, I151, E171, I177, N179, K191, D206,  K136, Q230  N77, B98, E129, E131, L137, N153, E119, E181, G174  C114, M215  K141, K156, K159, K183, K213, G216  N158  L178  J187  *G211*  K214  K223  C229 |  | K224, K220, I222, G226, I113 |  | J10, M51, K83, K130, K134, K135, L148, G149, N150, G152, L154, K155, L163, G170, E172, K186, B188, I195, L199, C203, I204, C217, K219, C221, C225,  E126, K160  K55, K78, K82, |
| numbers - organisations | **39** |  | **5** |  | **30** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes *– see below* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| 1. Many potentially helpful suggestions were made – it is worth reading the list in the full analysis as they can’t all be repeated here. | | | | | |
| 1. Aligning the National Park Plan priorities with the priorities of local authorities and other stakeholders so that everyone is working towards the same priorities featured highly. | | | | | |
| 1. Using locals’ and communities, including land managers, detailed knowledge *more meaningfully* featured. | | | | | |
| 1. Aligning agricultural support payments with the NP aims, and ensuring that the management plans that large landholdings will soon have to write (under the Land Reform proposals) align with NP aims, was suggested. | | | | | |
| **Notes**  Any text with yellow highlight above has been added after receiving this form to complete.  G211 LLTNPA response is a board paper for 12 Dec with a suggested response and I have put their response code in italics above.  K227 – not responding to this consultation as cover Eng & Wal and Respondent Code not included in the table above.  All 75 organisation responses are included – this has been double checked (with the exception of K227). | | | | | |

| **Question 13**  Could any of the existing powers and functions be used more effectively? If so, which ones and how? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, M21, K55, N77, K82, K83, C114, E119, E129, K130, I133, K134, K136, K141, E147, I151, N153, L154, K156, N158, K159, K160, E171, K172, G174, L178, N179, K186, J187, B188, G211, K213, M215, G216, K220, C221, Q230  A3, A5, A11, A13, A23, A25, A26, A32, A33, A35, A36, A38, A39, A40, A42, A43, A45, A46, A48, A49, A53, A54, A61, A64, A66, A69, A72, A74, A75, A80, A81, A84, A85, A87, A90, A93, A100, A101, A102, A105. A106, A109, A123, A125, A127, A139, A142, A145, A157, A162, A164, A165, A166, A167, A168, A175, A176, A182, A190, A197, A202, A205, A207, A208, A210 | E96, E181  A58, A95, A104 | L41, E126, G152, C203, D206, C217, C225  K78 – see answer to Q12,  I113 – see answer to Q38  A1, A8, A12, A18, A22, A27, A30, A34, A50, A65, A67, A73, A76, A88, A89, A91, A92, A94, A108, A110, A115, A116, A117, A122, A132, A143, A144, A161, A189, A192, A193  A19 – see answer to Q6 | A59, A79 | K214  A9, A17, A103, A118, A121, A146, A169, A194, A209 |
| numbers - organisations | 37 | 2 | 7 + 2 refer to answers to other questions | 0 | 1 |
| Numbers - individuals | 65 | 3 | 31 + 1 refers to answer to other question | 2 | 9 |
| **Overall numbers** | **102** | **5** | **38 + 3 refer to answers to other questions** | **2** | **10** |
| notes | G152, N179, J187 and C225 would like to discuss further.  Q230 raise need for body responsible for overseeing implementation of national vision across suite of National Parks in Scotland.  A106 advocates ‘an all purpose authority’ for land & natural resource management. |  | A91 cautions more consideration needed re: powers to transfer functions. |  | Individual responses favoured less regulation and more collaboration with local communities |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** National Park Authorities should be empowered and sufficiently funded to use the full range of their existing powers. Examples: compulsory purchase and land acquisition powers could be used where needed to improve habitat connectivity, accelerate change or prevent negative impacts. | | | | | |
| **2 Planning**: responses generally supported maintaining flexibility in how the planning function is delivered in each National Park. Several consultees expressed the view (in Q14) that the planning function should remain with the local authority. A review of the existing planning powers and the differing arrangements between CNPA and LLTNPA was suggested to identify how the effectiveness of local planning control could be improved, particularly in the light of the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019 and also resource constraints. Several responses advocated that the planning functions and Park Plans should be aligned with Scottish Government’s commitment in NPF4 for climate change and nature recovery. | | | | | |
| **3 Visitor management**: responses advocated strengthening the powers to deal with irresponsible and anti-social behaviour, with specific suggestions including more scope for National Park Authorities to use fixed penalties and the potential for management rules to be made available as a management tool by National Park Authorities on all land in the Park. **Rangers**: responses advocated increased ranger provision with enhanced enforcement powers, ranger functions broadened to secure a wider range of environmental outcomes (especially to promote and deliver cultural heritage outcomes) and the National Park Authority being the funding body. | | | | | |
| **4 Rights of Way:** National Park Authorities should be given the local authority role on public rights of way to enable a more joined up approach on access. One consultee suggested this could be done by the local authority(ies) delegating their powers for managing rights of way, rather than necessarily needing legislative change. | | | | | |

| **Question 14**  Are any of the existing powers or functions redundant or unnecessary? If so, which ones and why? | | | | | **summary response table** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | | **disagree** |
| respondent code | I133, I151, Q230  A18, A19, A47, A93, A124, A140, A144, A164, A165, A197 | E96, E119  A8, A139 | L41, B98, C114, E126, E147, N153, N158, K160, N179, B188, C203, M215, C217, C221, C225  K78 – see answer to Q12,  I113 – see answer to Q38  A1, A12, A13, A22, A34, A35, A36, A45, A49, A50, A53, A65, A66, A73, A91, A92, A95, A108, A115, A116, A122, A132, A143, A161, A166, A168, A176, A209 | A101, A189 | | K70, K82, E129, K141, L154, E171, E181, K213, K214  A9, A17, A25, A27, A30, A38, A46, A59, A67, A75, A76, A85, A89, A94, A103, A109, A110, A117, A167, A169, A175, A194, A205, A207 |
| numbers - organisations | 3 | 2 | 15 + 2 refer to answers to other questions | 0 | | 9 |
| numbers - individuals | 10 | 12 | 28 | 2 | | 24 |
| **overall numbers** | **13** | **14** | **43 + 2 refer to answers to other questions** | **2** | | **32** |
| notes |  |  | N179 would like to discuss further. |  | | Some responses refer to all powers & functions, others to specific ones. |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | | |
| **1** Although some of the powers and functions have not been used to date, consultees mostly didn’t see that as a reason to remove them from the legislation. | | | | | | |
| **2** The type and function of any new National Park will determine the range of powers required and how best to utilise these moving forward, for example to ensure integration of the planning and access powers and functions of local authorities and National Park Authorities. | | | | | | |
| **3** Specific suggestions of powers or functions that may be redundant or unnecessary included: research & development and national ranger functions (consultee suggested these should be moved to a body overseeing the suite of National Parks in Scotland); compulsory purchase and land acquisition; planning control (several consultees suggested they should remain with the local authority, others suggested that local authorities should have reduced powers) | | | | | | |

| **Question 15**  What, if any, changes to the powers and functions in these areas should be considered and why? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, K55, N77, K82, K83, E96, C114, E129, K130, I133, K134, L137, N153, K159, K160, E171,K172, E181,K186, J187, I195, C203, D206, G211, K213, M215, G216, C221, Q230  A3, A11, A12, A19, A22, A23, A26, A27, A28, A29, A30, A31, A32, A33, A35, A36, A38, A39, A42, A43, A45, A46, A47, A48, A49, A50, A53, A54, A64, A65, A66, A67, A69, A71, A72, A74, A75. A80, A81, A84, A85, A86, A87, A90, A92, A95, A97, A100, A101, A104, A105, A106, A110, A112, A115, A122, A124, A127, A143, A145, A169, A182, A189, A190, A194, A196, A197, A200, A201, A205 | K141, I151  A9, A34, A116, A162, A185, | M21, L41, E119, E126, E147, G152, N158, L163, I177, N179, B188, C217, K223, C225  K78 – see answer to Q12,  I113 – see answer to Q38  A1, A2, A8, A18, A60, A61, A76, A91, A93, A94, A108, A117, A132, A139, A144, A161, A165, A166, A167, A168, A175, A176 | E131 | K70, B98, K214  A13, A17, A25, A59, A73, A89, A103, A118, A140, A146, A207, A209 |
| numbers - organisations | 29 | 2 | 14 + 2 refer to answers to other questions | 1 | 3 |
| numbers - individuals | 70 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 12 |
| **overall numbers** | **99** | **7** | **36 + 2 refer to answers to other questions** | **1** | **15** |
| notes | A205 is worth considering further. |  | G152 & N179 would like to discuss further.  A60 & A91 are worth considering further. |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** Consider designation of nature recovery zones within National Parks to enable landscape-scale restoration. Differing views as to whether such zones should be areas not currently designated or to replace existing piecemeal habitat designations. Such zones could contribute to 30x30 and 10% highly protected targets. | | | | | |
| **2** Various additional powers and functions proposed to better align land management within the National Park to the Park aims, including:   * incentivising land managers to prioritise nature * strengthening the duty of public bodies to further the aims of the National Park in all the functions they undertake (land management, funding, licensing, etc.) * strengthening the role of the National Park Plan in influencing funding priorities * devolving agricultural and forestry funding to National Park Authorities * strengthening the role of National Park Authorities where a decision by other parts of the public sector would have an adverse impact on the Park purposes and aims * National Park Authorities owning and/or managing any public land in the Park * National Park Authorities having greater powers with respect to deer management and INNS. | | | | | |
| **3** Consider introducing minimum standards for land management and the powers to enforce them. | | | | | |
| **4** If a new coastal and/or marine National Park is proposed, consideration should be given to how to best integrate the coastal and marine planning functions. | | | | | |

| **Question 16**  Are there any other areas where strengthened or new powers and functions will be needed by the National Park Authority? If so, what are they? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, M21, K70, K82, E96, E129, I133, K141, N153, K156, K159, K160, E171, K172, K183, J187, B188, I195, L199, D206, G211, K213, K219, K220, K223  A2, A15, A19, A22, A27, A30, A35, A40, A49, A50, A61, A65, A66, A67, A86, A91, A94, A99, A103, A104, A108, A110, A122, A162, A164, A165, A166, A167, A193, A196, A205, A208 | A123 | L41, C114, E119, E126, E147, I151, N158, N179, E181, C203, M215, C217, C221, C225  K78 – see answer to Q12,  I113 – see answer to Q38  A1, A12, A13, A32, A45, A60, A73, A75, A92, A93, A116, A117, A132, A161, A168, A175, A176, A189 | K78  A76 | B98, I177, K214  A8, A9, A17, A18, A38, A85, A89, A115, A118, A143, A146, A207, A209 |
| numbers - organisations | 25 | 0 | 14 + 2 refer to answers to other questions | 1 | 3 |
| numbers - individuals | 32 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 13 |
| **overall numbers** | **57** | **1** | **32 + 2 refer to answers to other questions** | **2** | **16** |
| notes | A205 and A91 are worth considering further. |  | C225 would welcome engagement with SG to ensure that NP plans do not impact negatively on development of Scotland’s transmission network |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1 Marine**: A National Park with a marine area will introduce a new suite of criteria, interests and legislative context, which will need to be reflected in any new or amended powers e.g. planning powers and/or functions given to the National Park Authority (and/or Local Authorities) from Marine Scotland. | | | | | |
| **2 Land management**: Consider providing National Park Authorities with greater control or influence over the delivery and prioritisation of funding, including SG agricultural and forestry grants, also powers in relation to the management of deer and grouse moors, to enable closer alignment with the delivery of National Park plans. | | | | | |
| **3 Visitor management**: Calls for the National Park authority to have the necessary powers and functions to be able to manage visitor pressures, including traffic and parking management, provision of bins and toilets, and have a range of enforcement options. There may be a case for visitor taxes to be collected by National Park Authorities, or a mechanism ensuring that visitor services benefit from the visitor levy. | | | | | |
| **4 Community development**: community well-being development powers should be broadened to align with and support wider goals to create sustainable, resilient and thriving communities. | | | | | |

| **Question 17**  Should the powers and functions of National Park Authorities be decided on a Park by Park basis? Should any apply to all National Park Authorities? If so, which ones and why? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | J10, E96, I151, E171, I177, E181, K214 | M21, N77, K78, C144, E119, K160, J187, D206, G211, K213, G216 | L41, E126, N158, C203 | E131, I133, K141, E146, N150, N179, B188, K219 | K55, K70, K82, K83, B98, E129, K130, K134, N153, L154, K159, K172. L178, K186, I195, L199, M215, C217, C221, K223 |
| numbers - organisations | 7 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 20 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  A fairly even mix of views on this question. With, overall, responses skewed towards powers and functions to be decided on a Park by Park basis, as this would enable consideration of; local socio-economic and environmental circumstances, needs and opportunities; different requirements, potential and ambitions for each area; and different local aspirations, constraints and conflicts. | | | | | |
| **2**  Significant number of responses in favour of all powers and functions applying to all NPs and not on a Park by Park basis, particularly relating to planning.  Where core principles, powers and functions should be kept on a national basis providing a consistent approach and avoiding any potential to weaken powers and cause confusion – providing a clear public message in terms of the purpose and functions of national parks.    “The powers and functions of National Park Authorities should be universal across all National Parks in Scotland. To do otherwise could limit flexibility, confuse the public and potentially create different tiers of Park, watering down their ‘National’ status.”(B98) | | | | | |
| **3**  Some responses suggested a balanced approach could be achieved, recognising that all NPs will be different although they could all be guided by similar overarching principles e.g.:  “It would probably be more useful if there was consistency between the National Parks – even if this was a menu based approach where the different parks could, in consultation with their communities, select the powers and functions most appropriate to them.”(E131)  “A roughly similar model for all National Parks in Scotland as the ‘brand’ is well understood, but agree that powers and functions should be decided on a park by park basis and be adjusted as appropriate to the area via the individual Designation Orders.”(K141) | | | | | |

| **Question 18**  Are there any changes you would want to see to the governance and management arrangements of all National Park Authorities? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | C229, K70, B98, E131, I133, K134, K138, K141, N150, I151, N153, K159, E171, I177, N179, K186, J187, L199, D206, K213, K219, K223 | K55, K82, K83, E96, C114, E147, K160, K172, G211, M215, C221, C225 | J10, E119, E181, C203, C217 | K130 | L41, K78, E126, E129, B188, K214, G216 |
| numbers - organisations | 22 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** Most respondents felt that there should be changes to the governance and management arrangements of all National Park Authorities.  The main theme being changes to the Boardse.g.reduction in their size; more training for members; members to have ecological skills; the ability to drive the formation of policy; and better balanced representation, with individuals who live within NP areas and more youth, gender, and ethnic diversity, as the current processes “is not delivering the equality, diversity and inclusion outcomes that are being aspired to in Scottish public life” (G211).  The National Parks (Scotland) Act could be “strengthened to more explicitly require Board members to have significant skills, expertise and commitment to the purposes of National Parks.”K223  “Young people are the future of Europe’s protected areas and we care about sustaining our rural landscapes but we are under-represented in the decision making process”E131 | | | | | |
| **2** A significant number of responses suggested a National Park Service (or similar) where NPs could work together to save costs and duplication and benefit from an economy of scale, joint national promotion and the sharing of best practice.  “Now is the obvious time to consider the merits or otherwise of establishing a single National Park Service while retaining NDPB to ensure there is some accountability at both national and local levels.”(K213) | | | | | |
| **3** Notable other themes include:  “Landscape management priorities can provide a framework for determining strategic priorities and funding decisions for any area of land”(N179)  Strengthen monitoring and reporting on targets and natural capital accounting. | | | | | |

| **Question 19**  Are these the key elements of an effective nomination process for National Parks in Scotland? | | | | | **summary response table** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | | **disagree** |
| respondent code | M21, L41, K55, K82, E96, E126, E129, K141, K213, N150, K159,  K160, L163, E171, G174, I177, I195  L199, C203, D206, K191, N179, E181, K214, C217, K223, A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A9, A13, A15, A17, A25, A27, A29, A31, A32, A33, A34, A40, A42, A53, A57, A59, A61, A64, A65, A71, A72  A73, A74, A75, A76, A84, A89, A93, A94, A97, A99, A100, A101, A103, A104, A106, A110, A112, A115, A116, A117, A121, A124, A128, A143, A164, A165, A166, A167, A168, A169, A173, A175, A176, A180, A189, A190, A192, A194, A200, A201, A202, A207, A208, A210, | E119, A45, A49, A127, A161, A95, A185, A16, A47, | K70, E147, I151, N158, C225, K183, I133, Q230, N153, K156, K78, A8, A19, A35, A86, A88, A120, A132, A118, A109, A50, A18, A39, A67 | M215, C114, C221 | |  |
| numbers - organisations | 26 | 1 | 11 | 3 | | 0 |
| numbers - individuals | 70 | 8 | 13 | 0 | | 8 |
| overall numbers | **96** | **9** | **24** | **3** | | **8** |
| notes |  | Individual resistance to the final decision being made by Scottish ministers instead of environmental experts (A16, A47) | Some participants (N153, K156, K78, A39, A67) made reference to the necessity of a balance between a bottom-up and expertise-led, top-down approach. This does not answer **this** question regarding the specific elements listed in the consultation, but **is** a response to the **approach** behind the nomination and evaluation process. This recurs in Qs20 and 21 where quotes are given. |  | |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | | |
| **1**  Organisations predominantly strongly supportive of the listed elements for an effective nomination process for National Parks in Scotland. | | | | | | |
| **2**  Individuals were predominantly supportive of the listed elements for an effective nomination process for National Parks in Scotland, though they articulated much more explicit resistance than organisations, with a repeated opposition to the ‘competitive’ nature of the process which will end up judging the best **nomination** rather than the best area itself. | | | | | | |
| **3**  There was recurrent reference made regarding the approach to the nomination and evaluation process rather than the specific elements themselves around the need to have a balance between a bottom-up approach and contributions of appropriate expertise from both organisations and individuals. A critique levied on the bottom-up approach was, “I see a glaring issue here - the nominations can be as bottom up as you like but the fact is the decisions are still being made top down.” – Respondent A66.  We cannot market this process as co-produced or co-designed if the decisions are still being made by a single executive power. | | | | | | |

| **Question 20**  Do you have suggestions for improving any of the specific elements of the process? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **Agree**  **(yes)** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree (no)** |
| respondent code | C114, E147, C225, L41, N153, K70, E96, I151, L154, C221, M215, K159, K214, K183, K141, D206, K156, C217, K213, E181, I133, G174, K191, K136, K155, A36, A1, A104, A175, A108, A49, A45, A143, A16, A64, A75, A86, A120, A161, A208, A210, A164, A165, A166, A167, A19, A93, A12, A59, A67, A88, A185, A205, A209, A89, A66 |  | E171, I222, K224, N158, A8, A18, A50, A71, A101, A107, A132, A139, A168 | A13 | K82, K160, E126, E129, C203, E119, A6, A9, A17, A25, A27, A31, A35, A42, A43, A65, A73, A74, A76, A84, A94, A97, A100, A103, A110, A112, A115, A116, A117, A169, A176, A189, A190, A194, A201, A207 |
| numbers - organisations | 25 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| numbers - individuals | 31 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 30 |
| overall numbers | **56** | **0** | **13** | **1** | **36** |
| notes |  |  |  | “No, but it worries me that Scottish Ministers are the ones who decide. How many decisions will be distorted by politics, financial considerations and non-conservation priorities?” |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  A higher proportion of organisations felt there were improvements to be made on specific elements of the nomination and evaluation process than those who did not. The most popular areas for improvement were making the provision of advice and other support for potential areas to prepare nominations more widely promoted and available to inform who is able to nominate areas (5), dealing with potential/proposed development or other changes (3), communication and engagement (of community members, land owners, farmers) (3), and expert panel membership as part of an open and transparent evaluation of nominations based on the agreed framework (3). | | | | | |
| **2**  Around half of individuals who responded to Q20 thought improvements could be made on specific elements of the nomination and evaluation process and over twice as many individual respondents were unsure if improvements could be made, compared to organisational respondents. | | | | | |
| **3**  The strongest suggestions that came through from individuals were: on communication and engagement of communities (5), but taking beyond just engagement to require consent from local communities themselves regarding the establishment of a national park (A185) and a call for it to be a democratic process (A59, A67); and expert panel membership (8). However, there was a slight push back (4) to expert panel membership which called for listening to practitioners over ‘experts’, with no definition given of practitioners who are not experts.  In sum, a representative panel seems to be being called for in the evaluation of nominations involving experts, practitioners, and local communities. Two respondents explicitly stated that “politicians” should not be the ones who decide (A13, A47). | | | | | |

| **Question 21**  Are there additional elements you want to see included, and if so, what are these? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree**  **(yes)** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree**  **(no)** |
| respondent code | A8, A22, A74, A97, A108, A112, A143, A164, A194, A50, A19, A71, A118, A190, A66, A1, A13, A27, A16, A64, A86, A35, A36, A109, A42, A89, A106, A45, A67, A73, A76, A88, A175, A101, A99, A210, A161, E96, E119, L199, I151, K141, K213, C217, I222, C114, M21, K136, E147, N153, N158, D206, M215, C221, K223, K224, C225, Q230 |  | A18, A132, A146, A192, A12, A125, A165, A166, L41, E171, E181, C203 | E129 | A9, A17, A31, A43, A65, A75, A93, A94, A103, A110, A115, A116, A167, A169, A176, A189, A205, A207, K82, E126, K160, K214 |
| numbers - organisations | 21 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| numbers - individuals | 37 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 18 |
| overall numbers | **58** | **0** | **12** | **1** | **22** |
| notes |  |  |  | “No. Though there needs to be clear and accessible communication throughout to develop and maintain community and public trust in the process.” (E129) |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Of those organisations who responded to this question, the majority wanted to see additional elements included in the nomination and evaluation process. Some of the most popular suggestions were around community engagement/consultation included (9), followed by transparency (4), accountability via support, monitoring, analysis, and good management (4), and inclusion of the nomination impact and potential (ecological impact, food security impacts, rural economy, fiscal implications). One organisation wished to include an element of community voting which was not echoed among other organisations but was echoed by individual respondents (see below). | | | | | |
| **2**  Of those individuals who responded to this question, the majority wanted to see additional elements included in the nomination and evaluation process. A significant number wanted to see community engagement and communication (9) and the addition of accountability, including transparency and monitoring and assessment (6) that are published publicly to see how the health of natural and cultural heritage is progressing/contributions made to net zero and just transition (A45). Other popular responses included incorporating community voting and veto power (4), including funding and fiscal management (3) in the framework, as well as including expert opinion (3), and making National Parks part of systems thinking (3), i.e. ensuring it is linked in to the wider impacts on Scotland’s nature (contributing to 30x30 targets, connecting Scottish wilderness). | | | | | |
| **3**  An individual respondent raised the point of incorporating more-than-human representation, by making the natural world itself a stakeholder in the process:  “Representation should be given to non human residents and ecosystem elements such as rivers and mountains at the outset. This will help mitigate an anthropogenic bias which is at it’s heart the root of the problem these national parks are designed to address.” (A50) | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 22**  *Do you agree that outstanding national importance should be a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? Codes in italics refer to written responses on eRDMS* | | | | | **summary response table** |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | M21, L41, K55, K78, E96, C114, E126, E129, I133, L137, K141, N150, N153, L154, K156, N158, K160, L163, G174, I177, N179, E181, K183, K191, L199, C203, D206, *G211, K213, K214, M215, C217, K219, K220, C221 (same as M215), K223*  A1, A3, A4, A5, A13, A17, A19, A25, A27, A29, A33, A34, A36, A37, A40, A44, A45, A47, A49, A50, A53, A54, A57, A59, A61, A65, A67, A71, A73, A74, A76, A84, A89, A89, A93, A94, A95, A101, A103, A104, A106, A107, A115, A117, A121, A127, A128, A144, A164, A165, A166, A167, A169, A173, A175, A175, A176, A180, A189, A190, A192, A194, A207, A209 | - | K70, E119, E147, E171, J187, I195, *G216, I222, K223, K224, C225, G226, K227, E171, A192*  I151, K159, *Q230*  A2, A12, A18, A30, A35, A63, A66, A79, A108, A118, A132, A140, A144, A161, A162, A168, A185, A193, A197, A200, A205, A210  A31, A32, A42, A64, A75, A112, A123, A124 | - | J10, K136, K155 |
| numbers - organisations | 36 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 3 |
| numbers - individuals | 64 |  | 30 |  |  |
| overall numbers | 100 |  | 48 |  |  |
| notes | K82 answered yes and no – not counted. *C221* and *M215* provided the same answers. |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  “Outstanding” needs to be defined. (Some think this should be just about nature, especially the individuals – others that it should be about social/cultural as well) | | | | | |
| **2**  Include all landscapes, not just the “best”, including those with restoration potential and close to urban areas | | | | | |
| **3**  Let individual applicants make the case for national importance, rather than predefining this | | | | | |

| **Question 23**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they? Codes in italics refer to written responses on eRDMS* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, E96, C114, E119, E126, E129, I133, L135, K136, L137, K138, N150, N153, K159, K160, I177, N179, E181, J187, K191, D206,*G211, K213, K214, M215, K223* | L199, G152 | J10, K55, I151, G152, N158; G174, L199, E147 & C203 (no comment), *G213, I222, K224, C225, G226, K227, Q230, E171, A192* | - | - |
| numbers - organisations | 26 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes | K82 answered yes and no – not counted |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Include biodiversity restoration potential | | | | | |
| **2**  Include climate mitigation potential including existing infrastructure such as renewables (also marine/offshore) | | | | | |
| **3**  Include communities/Just Transition and health & well-being | | | | | |

| **Question 24**  *Do you agree with size and coherence as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how? Codes in italics refer to written responses on eRDMS* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | M21, L41, K55, K70, K78, E96, C114, E119, E126, E129, I133, K136, L137, K138, K141, N150, N153, L154, K155, N158, K159, K160, G174, I177, N179, E181, J187, K191, I195, L199, D206, *G211, K213, K214, M215, C21, K223, Q230* | - | E147 (no comment), G152, K172, *G216, I222, K224, C225, G226, K227,* I151, *E171, A192* | J10, C203 | - |
| numbers - organisations | 38 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| numbers – individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes | K82 answered yes and no – not counted |  |  | “The focus should be on economic activity which contributes to net zero and, in part, challenges the prevailing conservation culture with an environmental culture.” (J10) Answer recorded as “not sure” but content suggested a “no”. |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Nature Networks and ecological connectivity | | | | | |
| **2**  Administrative boundaries and resources | | | | | |
| **3**  Boundary effects and equal opportunities | | | | | |

| **Question 25**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Codes in italics refer to written responses on eRDMS* | | | | |  |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, K70, K78, E96, C114, E119, E126, E129, K136, L137, K141, N150, N153, G174, I177, J187, D206, *G211, K213, C217, K223* | J187, K141, *K213,* L41,  M21, K160, I195, K78, E129, N153, K156, L199, *M215* | K55, I133, K156, N158, K159, *G216, I222, K224, C225, G226, Q230, E171, A192* | \_ | \_ |
| numbers - organisations | 21 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes | K82 answered yes and no – not counted | Recorded as “agree but refinement suggested” |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Need large scale for landscape-scale restoration and amenity | | | | | |
| **2**  Clarify whether large-scale infrastructure (e.g. wind farms, electricity transmission) and intensive land uses would be excluded | | | | | |
| **3**  Define marine limits | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 26** *Do you support the consideration of the potential contribution of the National Park in delivering nature recovery and a just transition to net zero as criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, K55, K78, K82, E96, E126, E129, L135, L137, N153, L154, K155, K156, N158, K159,I177, N179, E181, K191, I195, C203, D206, K213, M215, K223, Q230,  **A2, A5, A6, A9, A12, A13, A15, A16, A17, A19, A27, A28, A29, A31, A32, A34. A35, A36, A37, A39, A40, A42, A50, A54, A57, A61, A64, A65, A67, A71, A72, A74, A75, A84, A86, A88, A89, A90, A94, A100, A101, A102, A103, A104, A107, A112, A115, A116, A117, A121, A123, A127, A128,**  **A132, A142, A143, A145, A168, A169, A175, A176, A189, A190, A192, A193, A194, A196, A200, A201, A209, A210** | M21, N150, K160, G174, C114, C221,  **A4, A11, A25, A33, A45, A47, A59, A73, A76, A93, A95, A161, A166, A185, A197, A205, A207** | K70, E119, I133, K136, K141, E147, E171, C217,  **A1, A3, A22, A30, A49, A106, A124, A125, A180, A202** | **A8, A53, A66, A97, A108, A110, A120, A208** | I133, C203, K214  **A18, A79, A109, A118, A122, A139, A144, A146, A165** |
| numbers - organisations | 26 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
| numbers - individuals | 71 | 17 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| overall numbers | 97 | 23 | 18 | 8 | 12 |
| notes |  | Qualified support.  May support nature recovery but not net zero |  | May support the ambitions but feel NP mechanism not the route to achieve these. Query the need for a NP per se. versus a national approach | Includes views that see human activity as incompatible with nature recovery |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  These are ‘principal and critical’ elements in new National Parks as solutions towards interlinked crises, and align with wider national policies. This is the voice of the majority. A minority of organisations argue that designation would not change existing ambitions for nature recovery and net zero. A large number of individual support the inclusion of both criteria, some passionately so. However, there is some division on whether net zero should be prioritised or included alongside nature recovery. Nature as stakeholder, with rewilding and species reintroductions is suggested as additional criteria, in the context of nature recovery. | | | | | |
| **2** Clarity could be improved around the definitions of nature recovery, net zero and just transition, how these would be achieved and at what landscape scale and time scale. What essential infrastructure will be required and supported in practice, in order to reach net zero, needs to be made more explicit. Some individuals feel net zero and just transition need better explanation or are meaningless terms. Some are concerned that this would open the door to renewable energy infrastructure within the NP. | | | | | |
| **3** Consideration needs to be given tolandscape, cultural and community needs, and potential conflicts of interest over land use and development. Some individuals suggest that human activity is incompatible with nature recovery within a NP boundary. Others are concerned that the local economy, jobs and development needs support, so there are opposing views here, both among organisations and individuals. | | | | | |

| **Question 27**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, K82, E96, E119, E126, I133, K136, L137, K141, L154, K155, N158, K160, L178, N179, E181, K191, I195, D206, K213, M215, C217, C221 |  | E147, E171, C203, M51, K55, E129, N150, G152, G174, L199 |  |  |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** Safe access and inclusionfor all (including disadvantaged groups)to ensure full diversity and community cohesion, in tandem with public education on the NP role and values. | | | | | |
| **2** Transport options need to include active travel routes, with connections beyond park boundaries. This should include a clear definition of sustainable transport and align with net zero ambitions. | | | | | |
| **3** Natural resources, renewables infrastructure and visitor economy can help to provide sustainable economic development for local communities and nature based jobs. These benefits must be in place and not incompatible with maintaining environmental quality. | | | | | |

| **Question 28**  *Do you support the assessment of the merits of a National Park compared to existing or other approaches as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved and, if so, how?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) included unclear | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, K70, C114, E119, E126, E129, I133, K136, L137, K141, N153, N158, K160, L163, G174, E181, K191, I195, L199 |  | M21, K78, E147, I151, E171, I177, C203, D206, C221, K223, Q230, K82, E96, G152, K159, N179 |  |  |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** A number of comments for further clarity would welcome assessment against other national/ international designations, mechanisms or land management to see whether a new NP would add value or not. | | | | | |
| **2** Support for cost and benefits approach including the financial aspect, and a breakdown of other merits, to compare different approaches, for further clarity. | | | | | |
| **3** Potential for a strengthened purpose for a new NP, possibly to include additional or new and innovative benefits. | | | | | |

| **Question 29**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) includes unclear | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, E126, E129, L137, K141, N150, N158, K160, E181, K213 |  | E147, E171, C203, I151, G174, K191, L199, C217, J10, K55, E96, C114, E119, K214, M215,C221 |  |  |
| numbers - organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1** A number of comments were made on the need for adequate resourcing and a financially sustainable model with costs/benefits analysis, including skilled staff within any new Park Authority and across planning authorities. | | | | | |
| **2** Consider the longer term impacts and benefitsincluding the ‘joint delivery of multiple and integrated benefits for people, nature and climate’. This should include social benefits for health and wellbeing, and better public awareness. | | | | | |
| **3** Consider interactions with other designations / approaches, using an evidence based approach. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 30**  *Do you support the consideration of existing support as a criterion? Could the clarity of it be improved?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| ‘full analysis document’ criteria used | **Yes, existing support should be a criterion** | **Yes, the clarity could be improved.** | **No view** | ***If reported, nobody except 2 people disagreed.*** | **No, existing support should not be a criterion.** |
| respondent code | **J10**;**M21**;**L41**;**K55**;**K78**;**K82**;**E96**;  **C114**;**E126**;**E129**;**I133**;L136;**L137**;**K141**;  **N150**:I**151**;**G152**;**N153**;**L154**;**K155**;**N158**;  **K159**;K160;**L163**;**E171;I177**;**N179**;**E181;**  **J187**;K19;**I195**;**L199**;**D206**; ***K213; K214;*** ***K219;C221;*** ***K223;*** ***I222;C225*** | **L195** | **C203; E119** |  |  |
| numbers - organisations | **40** | **1** | **2** |  |  |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1 Gauging interest:** Specific evidence of local support such as a referendum could be required. A co-production approach should be implemented. Must consider wider ‘communities of interest’ as well as local communities e.g those who benefit from the area – hillwalkers, businesses (inc.farming, power generation) and ensure consultees are as informed\* as possible. Local community opinion should be central and their ‘well being’ should be over arching.  \* The word ‘informed’ came up often C114;L133;L137; K223. This is interesting. When I took up the role of ranger in Fife Regional Park immediately after its designation there had only been one landowner with objections – the only absentee landlord who had not been visited on the ground by the original ranger. | | | | | |
| **2** **Local infrastructure –** the designation can have a positive ( if resourced) and negative impact from higher visitor numbers | | | | | |
| **3 Weighting** of priorities should be agreed e.g National, Regional, Local. Expectations should not be raised by accepting nominations from areas where support is absent or unclear. Areas that are of outstanding national importance should be taken into account. | | | | | |

| **Question 31**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they* | | | | | **summary response table** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | | **disagree** |
| **Categories from consultation**  **response doc** | **Yes, agree with all the proposed components.**  There are no missing components | **Agree with one or more but not all proposed components.**  **There are missing components.** | **No view** |  | | **No, disagree with all proposed components** |
| respondent code | **L41; K141;K82; E126; E129; J187; D206;N150; N179;I133; E181; K213;K214;**  **L137;K141** | M21;K219;K223;  I222;C225  K224;  J10;  L21; E96  K55;  K78;E181; L199;  E129;I151;K160  E96;  C114;  I133; K159; E181; I222;  N158;N179;  G174; K19; K191;  K214 | **E171;I177;C203;** **E147;E119**;***G212;M215;***  ***G216;C217;M218; K220;***  ***G226; K227* ;K219;** ***C221;*** ***K223;*** ***I222; C225; K224;Q230;*** |  | |  |
| numbers - organisations | **15** | **28** | **20** | **0** | | **0** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  | |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  | |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | | |
| **1 Support from the local community** is vital however be aware that a ‘local group’ may not be representative of the wider community. Needs to be a clear idea of how much support counts as sufficient ( cf community land buy outs threshold) | | | | | | |
| **2 Definition of communities** needs to include communities of interest as well as of place. Where land owners and businesses ( the private sector) fit in needs to be clear. Consider also the areas adjacent to the park. | | | | | | |
| **3 Solution focussed, partnership working** should be encouragedto enable overcoming conflicts and to address the feeling that National Parks bring more regulation and interference. Consider delegation of powers to other agencies ( economic, e.g tourism) | | | | | | |

| **Question 32**  *Do you support the assessment of the strategic contribution of an area as a criterion?*  *Could the clarity of it be improved?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| Consultation response full analysis category used | Yes, strategic contribution should be a criterion | Yes, the clarity could be improved. | No view |  | No, strategic contribution should not be a criterion |
| respondent code | **J10;M21;L41;K55;**  **K78;K82;E96,**  **C114;E119;E126;**  **E129;I133;L135;K136;**  **L137;K141;N153:l154;**  **K155;N158:K159; K160;L163;E171;G174;**  **I177;N179;E181;J187;**  **K191;**  **I195;L199;D206;*G211; K213; K214;G216;K219;C221; K223;*** ***K224;Q230*** | K160;N179 | **E147;C203; I151; *I222;*** |  |  |
| numbers - organisations | **42** | **2** | **4** | **0** | **0** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1 Areas should qualify in terms of national (strategic) importance** this might be specific designations or reflective of national priorities – social, economic and environmental. Importance of cultural heritage should be recognised as should best practice – National Parks should ‘lead’\*.  \* Lots of reference to areas of environmental policy etc that parks should lead on, crosses support, and strategic contribution. | | | | | |
| **2 National Parks should deliver the 30x30 commitment** but designation should notautomatically count towards that 30%, Language should be modernised to include nature recovery and the climate crisis. | | | | | |
| **3 More information is required to make this question clear (**communication of 30x30, for example) | | | | | |

| **Question 33**  *Do you agree with the proposed components? Are any components missing and, if so, what are they?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| Corresponding category of response on consultation response full analysis doc. | Yes, agree with all the proposed components. | Agree with one or more but not all proposed components.  There are missing components. | No view; Not sure |  | No, disagree with all proposed components |
| respondent code | **K55; K82; E96; E126;**  **E129; I133; L135; K136; L137; K138; K141; I151; N153; K159; K160; G174; E181; K213;L199; D206;K214** | **K70;**  K160;D206;  **L135; I151;G211;**  K138; I177;  E129;K136; K219;C221;  K223;C225;K224  **L41;** **J10;C114;**  **K78,K213;**  **I133;N153;**  **K159;G174;**  **J187;G21;**  **K191** | **E119; E147;E171;C203; I177; *G211; G216; K219;C221;*** ***K223; I222; C225;*** ***G226;*** ***K224;Q230*** |  |  |
| numbers - organisations | **21** | **27** | **15** | **0** | **0** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1 The 30x30 commitment** needs to be further clarified and explained. Nature restoration and land management go hand-in-hand. Nature recovery and 30x30 overlap and should need no separation. Needs to include restoration and protection explicitly. Needs clarity for land managers in particular. | | | | | |
| **2 Net zero –** point 1 restricts this to nature conservation by default, National Parks should contribute to net zero strategically, the support of renewables needs to be considered within and adjacent to the park. Needs clarification. Must be nature positive as well as net zero. | | | | | |
| **3 What the designation can bring** should be emphasised, sustainable development, better infrastructure and visitor management. Only our finest landscapes should be designated. Designation should be seen as a catalyst for ambition and innovation. This includes opportunities for good land management practice in the broadest sense, including the integration and management of cultural heritage, responsible tourism to be demonstrated and shared. Just transition needs clarification. Don’t forget marine! | | | | | |

| **Question 34**  *Are there any significant issues that are not covered by the proposed criteria?*  *If so, what are they?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | E96, K160, E171, I133, K159, L199, C203, C221, M21, I151, M215, C217, G226, Q230 |  | E126, E119, K136, E147, N158, L137, K220, C225, I177 |  | L41, K55, K82, E129, K141, N179, E181, G211, K213 |
| numbers - organisations | **14** |  | **9** |  | **9** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Community empowerment and the necessity of high levels of community engagement are highlighted as being very important in this process. | | | | | |
| **2**  A National Park designation in an area that does not already have a designation e.g. NSA, could limit the amount of land available for renewable energy generation, and therefore have a negative impact on Scotland’s journey to net-zero. | | | | | |
| **3**  The current criteria seem to be more focussed on potential benefits that a National Park could bring to an area, without any criteria that allow for potential negative impacts to be analysed. | | | | | |

| **Question 35**  *Do you think any of the criteria are more important than others?*  *If so, which ones and why?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | K141, N179, D206, E181, K213, K55, K78, K82, N153, K160, K191, L41, K136, M215, C221, K224, C225, I151, I222, I177, G211 |  | E126, E119, E147, N158, C203, C217, K220, E96, C114, L137 E171 |  | J10, E129, I133 |
| numbers - organisations | **21** |  | **11** |  | **3** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  |  |  |  | It seems that some groups perceive nature recovery to be placed well above all else, and want all criteria to be viewed equally. |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Nature recovery and a just transition to net-zero are the most important criteria to consider, as we are facing the dual biodiversity and climate crises. National park designation can help to mitigate against them, and also provide opportunities for communities. | | | | | |
| **2**  Outstanding national value should be a high priority when selecting which area to designate as a new National Park. Not necessarily the entire area, but at least some of it should of outstanding national value in terms of nature and (but not only) culture. | | | | | |
| **3**  All of the criteria listed are important, and they will be of differing importance in different areas. Therefore, ranking criteria or choosing certain ones to treat as most important is not appropriate. Local stakeholder engagement should be used to guide which criteria will be more important in each area. | | | | | |

| **Question 36**  *Do you think the selection criteria and proposed components provide the right balance between covering the issues required and simplicity? If not, how could they be improved?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | L41, K55, K82, E96, C114, E126, E129, I133, L137, K141, N158, K160, N179, E181, L199, K213, M215, C221 | D206, K191, K223, K220, Q230 | E119, K136, E147, I151, I177, C203, C225, C217 |  | J10 |
| numbers - organisations | **18** | **5** | **8** |  | **1** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  | There were several respondents whose only suggestion was to add in some definitions for technical terms. |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Keeping the process simple, while ensuring key issues are covered is very important, and the current format achieves that. | | | | | |
| **2**  As this process will involve lots of engagement with non-sector individuals, or people without expertise knowledge, some clarity on definitions would be beneficial. | | | | | |
| **3**  - | | | | | |

| **Question 37**  *Should more of the proposed components be quantifiable? If so, which ones, and how?* | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree** | **mostly agree** | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** | **disagree** |
| respondent code | I177, K213, K141, K55, I133 | C114, M215, Q230, K160, | K78, E96, D206, E126, I151, E119, K136, L137, E147, N158, E171, N179, E181, L199, C203, C221 |  | L41, K82, E129, N153, K214, C217 |
| numbers - organisations | **5** | **4** | **16** |  | **6** |
| numbers - individuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| overall numbers |  |  |  |  |  |
| notes |  | The term “where possible/practical” featured a lot. |  |  |  |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  Quantifiable criteria are desirable because they can be used to ensure transparency in the decision-making stage, and they can be measured later in the evaluation stage. This can increase trust and confidence in the decision-making process. | | | | | |
| **2**  Quantifying criteria is desirable **where possible**, but care should be taken not to prioritise criteria that are quantifiable over those that are not – “what can be counted is very often not what truly counts”. | | | | | |
| **3**  As quantifiable criteria are easier to integrate into statistical analysis, rather than qualitative or anecdotal data, it can be tempting to give them more weight. This should be avoided, as it will result in an unbalanced approach. | | | | | |

| **Question 38**  Are there any other issues about either Scotland’s approach to National Parks or the selection of new National Parks you would like to raise in your response at this stage? | | | | | **summary response table** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **numbers of responses per category** | | | | |
| **agree**  *(yes, multiple other issues raised)* | **mostly agree**  *(yes, one issue)* | **not sure** (includes “no view”, excludes ‘no response’) | **mostly disagree** *(same as disagree)* | **disagree**  *(no, no other issues)* |
| respondent code | L41, K82, I133, I222, E119, K136, I151, K159, K160, I177, L178, A175, A93, A61, A68, A118, A91, A205, A12, A207, A97, A197 | M21, K70, E96, K183, K186, J187, C203, G212, M215, C217, C221, C225, N77, C114, N153, K155, K156, E171, G174, K220, I113, A164, A76, A62, A56, A75, A115, A106, A110, A89, A44, A116, A1, A103, A132, A185, A176 | D206, K227, G211, G216, A210, A53, A25, A74, A127, A196, A161, A45, A16, A60, A72, A100, A162, A146, A32, A27, A66, A104, A105, A30, A5, A122, A13, A19, A50, A108, A18, A169, A8, A139, A9, A24, A86, A67 |  | K55, K78, B98, E126, E129, E147, A17, A54, A64, A65, A84, A117,  A121, A143, A165, A166,  A167, A189, A194, A209, A94, A73, A128, A144 |
| numbers - organisations | 11 | 21 | 4 | N/A | 6 |
| numbers - individuals | 11 | 16 | 34 | N/A | 18 |
| overall numbers | 22 | 37 | 38 | N/A | 24 |
| **Top three points made** | | | | | |
| **1**  11 individuals (and 4 organisations) raised concerns about the design of the national park. This largely covered: issues around placement, connectivity and size; how and who it is run by, with many of these advocating for community-led, ranger-led national parks with decentralised powers to limit bureaucracy. | | | | | |
| **2**  8 organisations (and 3 individuals) raised concerns about visitor management/ sustainable tourism. This included issues with ‘shooting tourism’ both the positive and negative sides. This also included concerns over access/camping and the role that rangers can play. As well as negative tourism developments. | | | | | |
| **3**  6 Organisations raised concerns surrounding national parks and their impacts on the renewable industry. These were largely said to be avoidable if national park designations stuck to areas appointed ‘national scenic area’ and avoided any potential renewables developments. (These were raised by various renewables organisations). | | | | | |
| *others*  Organisations  7 Organisations discussed issues and opportunities around value for money/funding. This included alignment of funding with agricultural support to enhance resources but also to be aware of the risks that it may thwart aims – this could be reduced if NPA had more control over these? There were other concerns about whether there was sufficient funds for the creation of new national park and whether a national park was actually needed to achieve the said aims.  Individuals  5 individuals raised concerns over the value for money/funding – similar to the organisations concerns.  5 individuals discussed aspects of lessons to learn from past experiences, and that this is vital in the creation of a new national park.  5 individuals also raised concerns about the lack of past data/monitoring to determine how successful the other 2 national parks are, to base the future creation of them off. | | | | | |