

The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland: Analysis of responses to consultation

Why Research
April 2023

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the individuals and organisations who responded to the consultation and to all at Historic Environment Scotland who provided input and offered advice as required.

Contents

Contents	3
Executive Summary	4
Respondent Profile	4
Key Themes.....	4
Summary of Questions	6
Introduction.....	11
Background.....	11
The Consultation.....	11
Respondent Profile	11
Methodology	12
Shared Mission and Principles	15
Priorities, Outcomes and Actions.....	23
Delivery of the Strategy	48
Impact Assessments.....	53
Final Comments.....	61

Executive Summary

Our Place in Time (OPiT) is Scotland’s strategy for the historic environment. In 2022, the Minister for Culture, Europe and International Development and Minister with special responsibility for Refugees from Ukraine commissioned Historic Environment Scotland (HES) to lead an earlier than planned review of OPiT to ensure that it remains fit for purpose in a post-COVID-19 world.

A formal consultation was launched on 28 November 2022 and closed on 20 February 2023. A number of pre-engagement events were undertaken in Summer 2022 which fed into the development of the consultation draft of the strategy. A series of engagement events and interviews were also undertaken during the consultation period.

Respondent Profile

In total, there were 137 responses to the consultation, of which 57 were from organisations and 80 from individuals. The following table provides the profile of respondents.

Table 1: Respondent Groups

	Number
Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose (not for profit)	30
Charity or third sector organisation (not for profit) outwith the heritage sector	6
Local authority	5
Non-Departmental Public Body	6
Planning authority	5
Other	5
Total organisations	57
Individual	80
Total respondents	137

Key Themes

A number of key themes were evident across consultation questions and respondent sub-groups and from stakeholder events.

While respondents were generally positive about the overall draft strategy, its mission statement, its principles, priorities and KPIs, they outlined a number of additions or amendments they would like to see.

- **70% of respondents across all sub-groups supported the mission statement, compared to 23% who did not.**
- **Of the six principles set out, all were supported by around two in three or more respondents. The most supported was ‘we must care for, and protect, our heritage assets’ (cited by 90% of respondents); the least supported was ‘we must be prepared to make difficult decisions’ (mentioned by 68%).**
- **Of the three priorities outlined, 69% or more respondents supported each. The most supported priority was ‘Empowering vibrant, resilient, and inclusive communities and places’, by 80% of respondents.**
- **In terms of the KPIs, a majority of respondents overall (55%) wished to suggest changes to one or more of the KPIs and / or ideas for additional KPIs. Around one in three respondents agreed with all the KPIs while less than one in ten did not agree with any KPIs.**
- **In reference to the national level actions, half the respondents suggested changes to one or more of the national actions and / or had ideas for additional actions and just over a third (37%) agreed with the actions outlined. Only a small proportion (7%) disagreed with the national level actions.**
- **The vast majority of respondents either agreed (38%) with the local / regional level actions or suggested changes to one or more of the actions and / or had ideas for additional actions (43%). Only a very small number (7%) did not agree with these local / regional level actions.**

Overall, the draft strategy was perceived to be relevant to the historic environment and there was general agreement with various elements of the draft strategy. However, there were a few concerns that the draft strategy as it stands would mean that the core heritage work undertaken by the sector could be diluted.

There were some calls for the strategy to be realigned with the original Our Place in Time priorities of Understand, Protect and Value the environment as these are felt to better reflect the wider historic environment sector¹.

¹ Some respondents referred to the Our Place in Time principles of Understand, Care, Protect and Enhance the environment. When respondents include the word ‘enhance’ among their suggested wording for priorities, principles, etc., most respondents see this as being an underlying principle of managing the historic environment, or as a basis for all regulatory, policy approaches to managing the historic environment. Points were made about ‘enhance’ being in the existing HES mission statement and also in the environment outcome of the National Performance Framework. For these reasons, a few respondents want ‘enhance’ to be included as part of adapting the previous OPiT vision (only a small number mistakenly think it was in the original OPiT).

There was also a perception that the draft strategy focuses on the built environment and designated assets to too great an extent, and that there needs to be a focus on the depth and breadth of work undertaken within the historic environment. Linked to this, there were also calls for more references within the strategy to a range of different areas including archaeology, museums, gardens and landscapes and so on.

Despite the overall support for the KPIs and the national and local actions, there were some calls for these to be prioritised as it was felt these would be difficult to achieve in the timescale outlined (5 years). Respondents also noted that it would be challenging to measure the success of the strategy without targets, measures and milestones being applied to the KPIs and the national and local actions that sit under these.

Collaboration and partnership working across the historic environment was seen to be important, and HES should act as a catalyst and co-ordinator to ensure work is carried out. While respondents were generally keen to be involved in delivery of the strategy, there were concerns about the responsibility that would lie with organisations and a lack of funding and resources to help deliver this strategy.

On the whole, the areas of the strategy which were most positively received were the principle focusing on care and protection of heritage assets and areas focusing on the enhancement of community involvement with the historic environment.

Throughout responses, there were a number of comments on the language used in the draft strategy. There was a perception that felt the language used – ‘nationally we will’ and ‘locally you can’ – could be divisive and was also unclear as to who the ‘we’ and ‘you’ are. There were also some comments that this language is imprecise and unclear and, given that HES works alongside other government agencies and professional organisations, there were a small number of calls for roles and responsibilities to be attributed to different organisations.

Some respondents throughout the consultation wanted to view the strategy in terms of reflecting HES’s core remit, while others, mainly individuals, mistakenly thought it was a strategy for the organisation itself.

Summary of Questions

The mission statement

- 70% of respondents across all sub-groups supported the mission statement, compared to 23% who did not (Q14).
- There were some preferences for the mission statement to focus on protecting, safeguarding and valuing the historic environment as this is seen as the primary function of HES. A significant minority of respondents – mostly individuals and local authorities – thought the

mission statement was too vague or that its meaning was unclear; for example, there were some objections to the phrase 'harness the power' or the use of 'our' or 'our society'. A significant minority of respondents made suggestions for a revised mission statement.

The six principles

- Of the six principles set out, all were supported by at least two in three respondents. The most supported was 'we must care for, and protect, our heritage assets' (cited by 90% of respondents); the least supported was 'we must be prepared to make difficult decisions' (mentioned by 68%) (Q15).
- A significant minority of respondents across all sub-groups felt they could be more inspiring and felt there was little by way of innovation in them.
- A significant number of respondents made suggestions for additional principles.
- 'We must put people at the heart of this strategy': there were requests for clarification on this on how this would be applied.
- 'We must face the climate and biodiversity crisis': while the mention of climate as a central issue was welcomed, it was also felt that climate and biodiversity issues are a crosscutting priority for a wide range of organisations.
- 'We must care for, and protect, our heritage assets': respondents felt this was the most important principle and that heritage assets should be the central concern.
- 'We must work collaboratively across sectors': very little was said about this principle.
- 'We must be prepared to make difficult decisions': respondents felt this could be used as an excuse to justify actions or decisions that are against HES priorities.
- 'We must make inclusive and transparent decisions': this was perceived to be important in terms of who is making decisions, what the framework is for making decisions, what decisions are not in the public domain and where investments are made. There were requests for wide consultation with the public, communities and memberships of relevant bodies in decision-making processes.

Priorities, Outcomes and Actions

- There was widespread agreement with the three priorities (Q16), with 69% or more of respondents supporting each.
- A majority of respondents overall (55%) wished to suggest changes to one or more of the KPIs and / or ideas for additional KPIs. Around one in three respondents agreed with all the KPIs while less than one in ten did not agree with any KPIs. These were seen as

clear, progressive and supporting the main areas requiring focus on the context of current challenges. However, there were requests for reference to HES's perceived core purpose of care and protection of the heritage. A large minority of mostly individuals were unsure of the priorities' relevance to HES, claiming these were not central to the organisation's remit or regulatory function and were broad Scottish Government aims. There was also a view that these priorities were vague and too general.

- 'Enabling the transition to net zero': 69% of respondents agreed this needs to be considered in project delivery compared to 15% who disagreed, although there were some perceptions that this clashes with historic environment activities. There were also queries over whether this is achievable.
- 'Empowering vibrant, resilient, and inclusive communities and places': 80% of respondents agreed compared to only 5% who did not. This received little by way of comments.
- 'Building a wellbeing economy': 69% of respondents agreed compared to 9% who did not. There were requests for clarity as to what a wellbeing economy means.

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

- There was widespread agreement with the KPIs (Q17), although over half respondents suggested changes to one or more of the KPIs or provided ideas for additional KPIs. A large minority of respondents across all sub-groups queried how the KPIs would be measured. Again, there were requests for references to the care and protection of heritage assets.

National level actions under KPIs

- There was widespread agreement that the actions are the right ones to deliver against the KPIs, and the vast majority of respondents either agreed (38%) with the actions or suggested changes to one or more of the actions and / or had ideas for additional actions (43%). Only a very small number (7%) did not agree with these local / regional level actions; these were mainly individuals. (Q18). A key theme from respondents was a concern that the strategy may be unattainable, particularly within a five year timescale. Some of the national level actions are seen to be outwith HES's remit. There were also concerns over some of the language used, with calls for changes to be made and / or clarity to be provided. It was felt the draft strategy focuses on the built environment and designated assets and there were some calls for the KPIs to reflect the depth and breadth of work undertaken within the historic environment.

Local level actions under KPIs

- The vast majority of respondents either agreed (38%) with the actions or suggested changes to one or more of the actions and / or had ideas for additional actions (43%). Only a very small number (7%) did not agree with these local / regional level actions; these were mainly individuals (Q19). Responses to this question tended to reflect those given in relation to the national level actions. Some respondents felt the division between national level actions and local / regional level actions was exclusive and there is a need for greater reference to key delivery partners such as local authorities.

Delivery of the Strategy

- Respondents referred to a number of structures and mechanisms that are needed to oversee successful delivery of the new historic environment strategy (Q20). It was felt that HES would need to have a liaison, facilitation, education, support and guidance role. Funding and resources were seen to be key to delivery of the strategy, as was collaboration and partnership working across the wide range of organisations and individuals involved in the historic environment sector. There were also requests for transparency and accountability in decision making, as well as approaches to allow for the monitoring of delivery of the strategy; it was felt there need to be achievable and measurable targets set.
- When asked for suggestions on how a regional approach to delivery might work (Q21), a key mention was for HES to have a liaison or facilitation role and to set up regional hubs, although it was also felt by some that there is an existing regional infrastructure via local authorities that could be used. Collaboration and partnership working across a wide range of organisations was seen as fundamental. Again, funding (or a lack of it) was raised as a barrier to delivery of the draft strategy.
- Many of those responding to this consultation were keen to have some involvement in delivering the strategy (Q22). Some are already involved with HES and would like this involvement to continue.

Impact assessments

- Higher numbers of respondents felt there would be a positive impact on people with protected characteristics than a negative impact (Q23), although a significant number also felt there would be no impact.
- Almost half the respondents felt there would be a positive impact on the competitiveness of Scottish businesses, the third sector or the regulatory context (Q24); only a small proportion felt there would be a negative impact.

- In terms of the impact on people in island communities (Q25), much higher numbers of respondents felt there would be a positive impact than a negative impact.
- Half the respondents agreed the environmental assessment had identified the likely environmental effects of the options, compared to only 12% who disagreed (Q26). A quarter of respondents felt additional environmental mitigation, enhancement or monitoring measures should be considered.

Final comments

- When asked whether they had any final comments on the draft strategy (Q27), issues raised echoed themes seen in earlier questions. Some of these respondents welcomed the opportunity to respond to this consultation and some provided background information on their organisation so as to set the context for their response. The key themes mentioned by respondents were:
 - There is a need to place more emphasis on the wide range of assets incorporated in the historic environment, for example, to include reference to undesignated assets (cited by a small minority across all organisation sub-groups).
 - This should be realigned with the original OPiT priorities (mentioned by a small minority across all organisation sub-groups).
 - Some use of language is divisive, for example, 'nationally we will' & 'locally you can' (cited by a small minority, across a range of sub-groups).
 - There is a need to include baselines / targets / measured deliverables (cited by a small minority of respondents across all sub-groups).
 - There is a need for a better definition of what is meant by the historic environment (cited by a small minority of respondents across all sub-groups, although mentioned by higher numbers of third sector organisations with an interest in the heritage).
 - Queries on where funding will be provided (cited by a few respondents across most sub-groups).
 - There is a need to define respective roles and responsibilities of organisations that will be involved in delivery of the strategy (mentioned mostly by third sector organisations with an interest in the heritage).
 - This puts too much onus on local authorities to deliver the strategy (cited by a few organisations, mostly local authorities and planning authorities).
 - This strategy should be renamed to differentiate itself from HES's own strategy as this is a strategy for the sector and not for HES (a small number of organisations, mostly those in the third sector with an interest in the heritage).
 - HES should open all sites that were closed due to COVID-19 and have yet to be reopened (a small number, mostly individuals).

Introduction

Background

1. Our Place in Time (OPiT) is Scotland's strategy for the historic environment. Published in 2014, it was developed by the Scottish Government in close collaboration with stakeholders. It sets out a vision of how the historic environment can be understood, valued, cared for, and enjoyed. This reflected the importance placed by the Scottish Government on the contribution of the historic environment to Scotland's culture, society and economy. This strategy was a high level framework setting out a 10 year vision for the historic environment.
2. When launched in 2014, its vision was that "Scotland's historic environment is understood and valued, cared for and protected, enjoyed and enhanced. It is at the heart of a flourishing and sustainable Scotland and will be passed on with pride to benefit future generations". This vision is underpinned by a series of three high-level aims. The key outcome for the Strategy is to ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of Scotland's heritage makes a strong contribution to the wellbeing of the nation and its people.
3. In 2022, the Minister for Culture, Europe and International Development and Minister with special responsibility for Refugees from Ukraine commissioned Historic Environment Scotland (HES) to lead a review of OPiT to ensure that it remains fit for purpose in a post-COVID-19 world.

The Consultation

4. A formal public consultation was launched on 28 November 2022 and closed on 20 February 2023. A number of pre-engagement events were undertaken which fed into development of the draft consultation paper. A number of engagement events were also organised and interviews undertaken during the consultation period.

Respondent Profile

5. In total, there were 137 responses to the consultation, of which 57 were from organisations and 80 from individuals. Respondents were assigned to respondent groupings in order to enable analysis of any differences or commonalities across or within the various different types of organisations and individuals that responded.
6. Table 2 below shows the number of respondents in each organisational category. As can be seen, the highest number of organisations were within the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose.

Table 2: Respondent Groups

	Number
Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose (not for profit)	30
Charity or third sector organisation (not for profit) outwith the heritage sector	6
Local authority	5
Non-Departmental Public Body	6
Planning authority	5
Other	5
Total organisations	57
Individual	80
Total respondents	137

7. During late summer 2022, HES and Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS) undertook extensive engagement across the sector and across Scotland. A total of 18 workshops and events took place and were attended by 191 organisations and 649 participants.
8. The Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS) conducted a series of workshops to enable and encourage the sector and related partners to respond to the consultation and to share their thoughts prior to submitting their responses. BEFS produced a consultation workshop activity report summarising key issues raised.
9. Additionally, HES conducted a series of six engagement events and produced a consultation engagement summary report. A number of those who attended events also submitted a response to the online consultation.

Methodology

10. Responses to the consultation were submitted using HES's consultation platform Citizen Space or by email. A small number of respondents submitted a response which did not answer the specific questions. These responses were analysed and incorporated into the report at the relevant sections. The findings from the BEFS consultation workshop activity report and the HES engagement summary report have been incorporated into this report where relevant. By and large the same issues and topics were mentioned by respondents who responded to the consultation and the consultation work and engagement events undertaken by BEFS and HES.

11. All responses were downloaded into an excel database which formed the basis for analysis of responses.
12. It should be borne in mind that the number responding at each question is not always the same as the number presented in the respondent group table. This is because not all respondents addressed all questions. This report indicates the number of respondents who commented at each question. When referring to respondents who made particular comments, the terms 'a small number', 'a few' and so on have been used. While the analysis was qualitative in nature, with the consultation containing only a limited number of quantifiable questions, as a very general rule it can be assumed that:
 - 'a small number' indicates up to 5 respondents;
 - 'a few' indicates around 6-9;
 - 'a small minority' indicates around more than 9 but less than 10%;
 - 'a significant minority' indicates between around 10%-24% of respondents;
 - 'a large minority' indicates more than a quarter of respondents but less than a half;
 - 'a majority' indicates more than 50% of those who commented at any question.
 - 'a large majority' indicates more than 75% of respondents who commented at any question.
13. Some of the consultation questions were composed of closed tick-boxes with specific options to choose from. Where respondents did not follow the questions but mentioned clearly within their text that they supported one of the options, these have been included in the relevant counts.
14. The researchers examined all comments made by respondents and noted the range of issues mentioned in responses, including reasons for opinions, specific examples or explanations, alternative suggestions or other comments. Grouping these issues together into similar themes allowed the researchers to identify whether any particular theme was specific to any particular respondent group or groups. Where any specific sub-group(s) held a particular viewpoint, this is commented on at each relevant question.
15. When considering group differences however, it must also be recognised that where a specific opinion has been identified in relation to a particular group or groups, this does not indicate that other groups did not share this opinion, but rather that they simply did not comment on that particular point.
16. While the consultation gave all who wished to comment an opportunity to do so, given the self-selecting nature of this type of exercise, any figures

quoted here cannot be extrapolated to a wider population outwith the respondent sample.

17. The following chapters document the substance of the analysis and present the main views expressed in responses.

Shared Mission and Principles

18. The consultation paper set out a draft mission and guiding principles for the new strategy. It took a mission-oriented approach in recognition that solving the challenges facing the historic environment requires multiple strands of activity, across multiple partners and multiple sectors. In working towards a shared mission, the consultation proposed overarching principles to guide work undertaken.

The mission statement

19. The first question asked:

Q14: Our aim is for this strategy to support prioritisation, and to help realise the value of the historic environment. We have drafted the statement below with this in mind. Do you support this mission statement?

Our mission is to harness the power of the historic environment for the benefit of our society

20. As demonstrated in Table 3, **over two-thirds (70%) of the respondents supported the mission statement**, compared to just under a quarter (23%) who did not support this. Similar proportions of individuals and organisations supported the mission statement.

Table 3: Do you support this mission statement?

	Yes	No	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	21 (70%)	6 (20%)	3 (10%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	-
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	6 (100%)	-	-
Local Authority (5)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
Planning Authority (5)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
Other organisations (5)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)
Total organisations (57)	39 (68%)	11 (19%)	7 (12%)
Individuals (80)	57 (71%)	21 (26%)	2 (3%)
Total respondents (137)	96 (70%)	32 (23%)	9 (7%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

21. Respondents were then asked to explain what they liked about the mission statement or what they would change. A total of 82 respondents made comments.

22. A large minority consisting of individuals and charity or third sector organisations with a heritage purpose wanted the mission statement to **reference or focus on protecting, safeguarding and valuing the historic built environment**. There was a desire amongst many of these respondents to incorporate the primary function of Historic Environment Scotland (HES) explicitly within the mission statement. A few of these respondents added that the statement lacked a definition of the historic environment², something that is in the current Our Place in Time (OPiT) statement. Similar numbers (mainly charity or third sector organisations with a heritage purpose, but also two local authorities) stated a preference for the previous version of OPiT, saying that it felt more generous, more positive, and had the historic environment for its own sake at its heart.
23. A few respondents across a mix of sub-groups spoke out in favour of providing cultural attachment to their built heritage, for example by way of learning old building methods and skills. Similar numbers said that the mission statement does not reflect the historic environment as an economic, social or wellbeing asset.
24. A small number from a range of organisation types viewed the mission statement as failing to reflect the existing regulatory framework. They wanted to see closer alignment with aims and missions in the wider built environment sector (e.g. National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)).
25. A significant minority of respondents (almost all of them individuals and local authorities) thought the **mission statement was too vague or that its meaning was unclear**. A small number commented that it was too bland or nondescript, or that it was uninspiring.
26. Respondents also focused on parts of the wording of the mission statement. Of these the greatest number (a significant minority of mainly heritage-related third sector bodies and local authorities) **disliked the use of 'our' or 'our society'**. The implication was that the historic environment is ours to use, rather than protect and appears therefore to be exclusionary and limiting its use to today rather than for all time. Several suggestions were made to amend this term to 'people', 'society', 'whole of society', 'our and future societies' or 'of Scotland'. Similarly, a few respondents regarded the term **'benefit of our society'** as being too narrow, with greater clarity needed as to what 'benefit' entails, and as to who 'society' represents. One heritage-related third sector body thought this might be exclusionary regarding tourists; 'to benefit society' was suggested as an alternative.
27. Objections to the term **'harness the power'** were also registered by a significant minority of respondents. Again, this was viewed as assuming the

² The draft strategy did include a definition on p6 in bold italics, so this definition may have been overlooked by these respondents.

historic environment does not require sustaining. Other negative aspects noted were that this is an unfamiliar term to those in the sector, it sounds too commercial, it sounds exploitative and that it does not provide positive associations. In general, more accessible or simple language was preferred, with respondents suggesting 'promote the value' or 'protect and enhance' as alternatives.

28. Similarly, the word 'power' was seen as making little sense in this context, with preferences for using 'value' or 'potential'. The word 'harness' was seen to have negative connotations in a controlling sense and alternatives were therefore suggested including 'protect and promote', 'promote', 'foster', 'develop' and 'cultivate'.
29. A significant minority of respondents made **suggestions for a revised mission statement**, as detailed below:
- 'Our mission is to maximise the use of the Historic Environment to the benefit of society now and for the future, by understanding, protecting, valuing, promoting, celebrating and utilising this irreplaceable resource that is fundamental to Scotland's identity.' (Local Authority)
 - 'Our mission is to actively manage Scotland's historic environment for its unique contribution to our society' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'We are Historic Scotland, we believe that the Historic environment is a current and vibrant part of Scottish society which plays a vital role in the economic, social, and education sectors of Scotland. We will harness the power of Historic Scotland to truly make a difference in our society.' (Individual)
 - 'Our mission is to help people know, experience, and interact with our past through the historic environment for pleasure, knowledge, health and imaging the future.' (Individual)
 - 'Our Mission is to sustain and enhance the benefits that our nation's heritage creates and ensure that the historic environment is at the centre of national life.' (3 Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose respondents)
 - 'Our mission is to understand, protect and harness the power of the historic environment for the benefit of our society' (Local Authority).
 - 'Our mission is to harness the power of the historic environment for the benefit of society, the economy and for the greater wellbeing of future generations.' (Individual)
 - 'Maximise the potential to create public benefit, while sustainably managing it to ensure that the essential qualities and character that underpin why it matters to people are secured for the benefit of

society now and in the future' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).

- 'Collaboratively harness the power of the historic environment for the benefit of our society, and in the long-term public interest.' (Charity or third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector)
- 'Utilise the Historic Environment to its maximum potential, while still retaining the essential and unique character and value of it, to the benefit of society now and in the future.' (Professional Body)

30. A large minority of respondents did however reinforce their support for the mission statement, with a few approving of the commitment to deliver and prioritise public benefits. Very small numbers noted that the statement encompassed the goals it needed to, and was clear and simple. A non-departmental public body (NDPB) thought it was inclusive.

The six principles

31. The next question asked:

Q15: These are the six principles that have been identified in feedback from the engagement workshops. Do you agree with them?

32. As demonstrated in Table 4, there was **widespread agreement with the six principles**. However, fewer respondents (two in three) agreed with "We must be prepared to make difficult decisions" than with the other five principles. There was little difference by sub-groups; slightly greater numbers of individuals than organisations tended to disagree with the principles.

Table 4: Agreement with the six principles

	Yes	No	Not sure	No response
We must put people at the heart of this strategy (137)	106 (77%)	8 (6%)	16 (12%)	7 (5%)
We must face the climate and biodiversity crises (137)	111 (81%)	7 (5%)	13 (9%)	6 (4%)
We must care for, and protect, our heritage assets (137)	123 (90%)	1 (1%)	5 (4%)	8 (6%)
We must work collaboratively across sectors (137)	118 (86%)	-	13 (9%)	6 (4%)
We must be prepared to make difficult decisions (137)	93 (68%)	10 (7%)	28 (20%)	6 (4%)
We must make inclusive and transparent decisions (137)	113 (82%)	5 (4%)	13 (9%)	6 (4%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

33. Respondents were then asked to explain what they liked about the principles or what they would change. A total of 92 respondents made

comments. A significant minority **affirmed their agreement**, saying they were appropriate or aligned with their own ethos and commitments.

34. Among other respondents who made comments about the six principles as a whole, a significant minority across all groups felt they **could be more inspiring, remarking that they were in no way radical or innovative**, or that they were general management principles which could apply to all organisations. Other comments were that they are woolly or bland.
35. On the wording used, a few respondents advocated the use of ‘we will’ instead of ‘we must’; it was intimated that this would ensure that the principles were fully considered and embedded in activities and decision-making. There were also a small number of queries as to whom the ‘we’ refers in the principles, with uncertainty as to whether this means Historic Environment Scotland, the heritage sector generally or grant givers.
36. Two heritage-related third sector bodies and a local authority saw a need to put the principles in priority order.
37. A significant minority of organisations (mainly heritage-related third sector bodies) made **suggestions for additional principles**. In particular, there appeared to be a campaign from a few respondents urging a new principle to embed support for skills. Three respondents (a local authority, a professional body and a heritage-related third sector organisation) advocated: “We must understand, investigate and record the historic environment (and support others who do this)”. Other single suggestions were as follows:
- ‘We must continue to increase knowledge about our heritage’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - ‘Our historic buildings are cultural assets for the benefit of the entire nation, merely held in trust for the next generation and those that follow’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - ‘A principle to ensure the sector is resilient and adaptable. (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose)’
38. Respondents also focused their remarks on each of the individual principles and these are provided in the following paragraphs.

We must put people at the heart of this strategy

39. Among the respondents commenting, **most asked for clarification**. A significant minority wondered how putting people at the heart of the strategy was to be done, both in term of ensuring inclusiveness and of how to reach and engage people, with suggestions to use regional organisations or a grassroots approach, without providing further details. A small number were unclear as to what ‘people’ constituted, questioning whether this meant or

included professionals, those who can contribute at a high and informed level, tourists or the Scottish diaspora.

40. A very small number of individuals stated a preference for putting heritage rather than people first, or at least overtly bringing in the concept of place to this principle; for example, “we must put people and place at the heart of this strategy” (Charity or third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector).

We must face the climate and biodiversity crises

41. A few respondents welcomed the mention of climate as a central issue. However, similar numbers (in what appeared to be a campaign) pointed out that climate and biodiversity issues were a crosscutting priority for all bodies (e.g. in line with NPF4 aims and policies) rather than just the historic environment sector, and that this should be reflected in the wording. Individuals attending the BEFS workshop noted that climate resilience needs to be linked to business resilience.
42. Small numbers of respondents thought this principle needed to be put into the context of what is possible regarding the built heritage (e.g. given that historic buildings are often not as energy efficient as modern buildings). A small number thought the principle lacked sufficient urgency to embed decisive action.

We must care for, and protect, our heritage assets

43. This principle, along with principle 5, elicited the most discussion. The chief theme (noted by a significant minority from across the respondent spectrum) was that this should be **the most important principle and that heritage assets should be the central concern**. Several respondents appeared to campaign for the inclusion of the words ‘understanding’ and ‘enhancing’ as part of the terminology used. Similar comments urged for better language to be used, in order to get across the hard work and investment that goes into conservation. Small numbers advocated for more detail about care and protection in the strategy.
44. A few organisations across most subgroups wished to expand this principle to emphasise the **value and productive uses to society and communities of heritage assets**; for example, heritage-led regeneration schemes.
45. Small numbers of respondents took the opportunity to draw attention to a perceived lack of resources available to care, support and sustain the historic built environment.

We must work collaboratively across sectors

46. Only a few comments about this principle were made. Small numbers pointed out that collaboration was already commonplace in the sector, for instance between agencies, professionals, the third sector and public and private concerns. A local authority was unclear as to whether the principle implied that HES does not work collaboratively and needs to catch up in this respect; very small numbers were unclear as to whether additional actions are required to enable collaboration to happen. A couple of respondents cited concerns about conflicting interests across sectors preventing collaboration, for example between protecting history and protecting the environment.

We must be prepared to make difficult decisions

47. **It was feared by a significant minority that ‘difficult decisions’ is a catch all expression to justify or excuse actions or decisions which are against HES priorities** (e.g. closing sites, redundancies, cuts due to funding pressures). Small numbers of respondents also viewed ‘difficult decisions’ as having negative connotations, recommending the use of more positive language. Alternative wording was suggested such as ‘We know that our decision-making needs to be flexible so we can adapt our work to new challenges’ (Individual) or “We will identify the most pressing needs and prioritise effort and resources in these areas” (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
48. However, a significant minority accepted that **making difficult decisions is always going to be necessary**.
49. Two individuals urged the need to take a long view for decision-making, as short term decisions can adversely impact the future value of the historic environment.

We must make inclusive and transparent decisions

50. The main theme reinforced the importance of **transparency in decision-making**. Issues needing this transparency, as cited by a significant minority of respondents included who is making decisions, what the framework is for making them, what decisions are not in the public domain, and where investments are made. In connection with this, it was regarded as vital that all data should be made available on which to base decisions.
51. A significant minority saw a **need for wide consultation**, to include the public, communities and memberships of relevant bodies in decision-making processes.
52. Inclusivity was also urged by a few respondents; however, two individuals had concerns about total inclusivity leading to restrictions in

decision-making that may not lead to the best results for buildings or structures.

53. A local authority and a heritage-related third sector body thought this last principle should be merged with other principles as it underpins all of them.
54. Finally, a few organisations across most sub-groups, as part of a campaign response, pressed for **principles 5 and 6 to be merged**, claiming they were essentially the same thing. It was suggested the merged principle could be ‘in order to make effective difficult decisions, the decision-making process should be transparent and inclusive’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).

Priorities, Outcomes and Actions

55. The consultation paper outlined a series of draft priorities, outcomes (expressed as Key Performance Indicators) and actions. These were developed on the basis of engagement feedback.

The priorities

56. The next question asked:

Q16: We have identified three key priorities as the focus for delivery over the next five years. Do you agree with them?

57. As table 5 shows, **there was widespread agreement with the three priorities.** However, fewer respondents (69% in each case) agreed with “Enabling the transition to net zero” and “Building a wellbeing economy” than with “Empowering vibrant, resilient, and inclusive communities and places” (80%). There was again little difference in terms of sub-groups.

Table 5: Agreement with the three key priorities

	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Enabling the transition to net zero (137)	95 (69%)	20 (15%)	15 (11%)	7 (5%)
Empowering vibrant, resilient, and inclusive communities and places (137)	109 (80%)	7 (5%)	14 (10%)	7 (5%)
Building a wellbeing economy (137)	94 (69%)	12 (9%)	24 (18%)	7 (5%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

58. Respondents were then asked to explain reasons for their answers. A total of 96 respondents made comments. A large number of these made comments regarding the priorities as a whole, with smaller numbers attributed to the individual priorities.

59. The largest numbers (a large minority) **affirmed their agreement**, generally commenting that the priorities were clear, progressive, bold, and supported the main areas requiring focus in the context of current challenges. A few organisations from across the spectrum concurred that the priorities aligned with those in other sectors’ strategies, including those for museums and galleries, tourism and the National Cultural Strategy for Scotland.

60. However, almost as many respondents (consisting mainly of heritage-related third sector and professional bodies) stated a desire to **add a reference or link to HES’s core purpose – i.e. heritage care and protection**, despite the strategy being about cross-sector priorities. This was considered a baseline priority and therefore needed to be overtly stated.

Furthermore, a few of these respondents saw a need to acknowledge the breadth and depth of work carried out across the sector such as heritage skills development. There were a small number of suggestions to initiate a fourth priority to meet this end, as stated below:

- 'Protect, investigate, record and understand heritage for the benefit of current and future generations'. (Local Authority)
- 'Caring, protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing our historic environment and knowledge of it'. (Heritage-related Third Sector)
- 'To Care, Protect, Understand and Enhance the Historic Environment'. (Professional Body)

61. Similarly, the same number (a large minority consisting of mainly individuals) indicated that they were **unsure of the priorities' relevance to the historic environment**, or in a few cases (mistakenly) HES, claiming these were instead broad Scottish Government aims. There were some concerns over the risk of core heritage work being diluted.

62. Further criticisms from a significant minority of respondents centred on the **priorities being vague and too general**. These respondents described the themes as cross-cutting in nature or that they could be applied to any organisation (i.e. not just those involved in the historic environment sector). Similar numbers (mainly individuals) were unsure what they would entail in practice, citing a lack of associated actions, targets and timeframes. A couple of heritage-related third sector bodies said they could not see how the priorities relate to the principles.

63. Very small numbers advocated for a link to The National Planning Framework (NPF4), or to embed other areas such as equalities into the priorities.

Enabling the Transition to Net Zero

64. This priority elicited the most comments from respondents. A significant minority of respondents across all sub-groups agreed this **needed to be considered in project delivery**, with aspects mentioned including energy efficiency, rewilding, replanting for carbon sequestration, understanding the whole life of buildings from construction to demolition, sustainability and fabric needs.

65. Almost all other comments raised **issues with this priority**. Small numbers of respondents each cited the following:

- Clashes with heritage or historic environment activities (e.g. impacts on accessibility to remote locations, or on tourism) with comments that adaptation is more important in this context to add in sustainability without adversely impacting the historic environment.

- Lack of clarity regarding the meaning and implications of the priority for the historic environment (e.g. what the historic environment can contribute).
 - Scepticism about whether the aim is achievable with suggestions to alter it to provide a realistic aim (e.g. carbon emission reductions, absorbing more CO2 than you give out, etc.).
 - Concerns that the availability of funding / resourcing will be insufficient to facilitate the priority.
 - Transitioning to net zero not being the (core) role of HES³.
66. A significant minority of respondents spread across sub-groups sought to **rephrase the priority**, in particular to replace the word ‘enabling’ with a more active word such as ‘driving’ or ‘forcing’. Other suggested alternatives included the following:
- ‘seeking all means to reduce our carbon footprint’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - ‘a just transition to net zero’ (NDPB).
 - ‘tackling the climate and nature crises’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - ‘develop a suite of strategies which could assist the heritage sector in the transition to net zero’ (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).

Empowering vibrant, resilient, and inclusive communities and places

67. Relatively little feedback was provided on this priority, given it had the highest levels of agreement at the first part of the question. A few respondents agreed that it was important to include communities and treat them with respect. Very small numbers commented favourably about a place-based approach, stating that place is inextricably linked to community and that this aligns with other stakeholders in the built environment.
68. There were a very small number of suggestions to help realise the priority. The role of community empowerment teams and local organisations such as City Heritage Trusts were vaunted in supporting the changes desired by communities; and there were a couple of suggestions to mention or include Gaelic, seen as having a key role in protecting the cultural heritage. Two heritage-related third sector respondents highlighted a need for resources (e.g. professional skills) to support communities.
69. More negatively, a small number of respondents cited uncertainty about the role of the historic environment and what it can contribute towards this priority. There were also a couple of negative comments about the use of

³ A misinterpretation of the strategy purpose.

the word ‘empowering’ in terms of a lack of clarity over its meaning and a perception that it shifts the onus on taking action onto others.

Building a wellbeing economy

70. Almost all the comments on this priority were about a **need for clarity**; a significant minority across most sub-groups of respondents were unclear about what a ‘wellbeing economy’ is and about the context in which the term is used. A few questioned how this interacts with the historic environment and what tools will be used to enable it.
71. A heritage-related third sector body and an individual perceived that this priority would be better being subsumed into priority 2, which in its own realisation would help build a wellbeing economy. Two organisations urged the creation of local or green jobs as a way of facilitating the priority, for example, by bringing historic buildings back into use or remedying a lack of skills at a local level. A non-heritage-related third sector body was in favour of the open sharing of knowledge and data to support the priority.
72. However, respondents attending the BEFS consultation workshop noted that there is a need for a comprehensive skills programme in order to develop the skills necessary to deliver the strategy.

The Key Performance Indicators

73. Respondents were then asked:

Q17: Each priority has a set of outcomes expressed as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) associated with it. Do you agree with these KPIs?

74. As demonstrated in Table 6, a **majority of respondents overall (55%) wished to suggest changes to one or more of the KPIs and / or ideas for additional KPIs**. Around one in three respondents agreed with all the KPIs while less than one in ten did not agree with any KPIs.
75. Among individual respondents slightly more (44%) agreed with all KPIs than wished to suggest changes (40%). Among organisations, a large majority (75%) wished to suggest changes and only 14% agreed with all KPIs.

Table 6: Agreement with KPIs

	Agree with all KPIs	Suggest changes / additional KPIs	Don't agree with any KPIs	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	3 (10%)	25 (83%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	-	-
Non Departmental Public Body (6)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	-	-
Local Authority (5)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	-	1 (20%)
Planning Authority (5)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	-	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	-	1 (20%)
Total organisations (57)	8 (14%)	43 (75%)	1 (2%)	5 (9%)
Individuals (80)	35 (44%)	32 (40%)	8 (10%)	5 (6%)
Total respondents (137)	43 (31%)	75 (55%)	9 (7%)	10 (7%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

76. Respondents were then asked to comment, and 92 did so. The bulk of comments related to the KPIs as a whole, with smaller numbers making remarks about individual KPIs.
77. A large minority across all sub-groups **queried how the KPIs will be measured**, saying measurement and monitoring are essential to assessment of success and outcomes of the strategy. Baselines and timeframes were mentioned as necessities for measuring the outcomes for KPIs.
78. Significant numbers of respondents wished to see **care and protection of heritage assets or HES's core areas** specifically mentioned in the KPIs. A further significant minority advocated explicitly mentioning traditional building skills and the development of this workforce. Slightly smaller numbers from a range of sub-groups saw a need to mention or reference archaeology, seeing this as an important sector.
79. The following **criticisms of the KPIs** were each raised by a significant minority of respondents:
- There are too many KPIs (e.g. too many for 5 year strategy, mentions of folding some KPIs into others, and of a need to prioritise some over others).
 - They are a significant burden (e.g. for local authorities, planning authorities and third parties) which will result in resourcing issues. This criticism was made by local authorities, planning authorities and third sector organisations.

- They are vague, difficult to understand and may not be the right tools for a strategy document.
80. A few local authorities and professional bodies said the KPIs do not meet SMART(ER) processes / objectives (i.e. being Specific, Measurable, Accepted as Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound, Evaluated so that updates/changes can be made, and Reviewed and potentially readjusted). It was noted that this performance metric now forms part of government and local authority procurement goals.
81. A small number of respondents noted that the KPIs are not the sole responsibility of the historic environment sector and are subject to a wide variety of actors. There were also comments about a need for a robust link to the planning system (e.g. to the scope and function of NPF4).
82. A significant minority of respondents proposed a wide variety of additional KPIs, listed below:
- 'Rehabilitation of the natural environment under Historic Environment Scotland' (Individual).
 - 'Increased participation of retired and older people in heritage' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'The historic environment is better protected, managed and shared' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'Engaging with marginalised communities' (Individual).
 - 'Improve the management of the online database of information on archaeological sites, monuments and buildings in Scotland, including integration of Canmore and regional HERs, making all available online' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'Create working relationships with community groups and volunteers in Scotland' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'The amount of time an asset is accessible to the public and a measure of the level of accessibility (Individual).
 - A KPI needed showing how to achieve 'caring, sharing and creating better understanding of our historic environment' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - A KPI to reflect the following statement: 'At the same time, we need to reverse the catastrophic loss of plants and animals that has been ongoing in Scotland as elsewhere across the globe and need to re-establish our connection with nature' (Planning Authority).
 - 'Support local communities to investigate and record their local heritage' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).

- 'Foster working relationships with groups and volunteers in Scotland, at local, regional and national levels' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'Collect and disseminate heritage information, ensuring systems are in place so that information is publicly available' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
 - 'Increase the number of built heritage assets that are restored and cared for' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).
83. Additionally, there were single suggestions of extra KPIs focusing on racism and race equality (e.g. minority ethnic involvement with respect to the workforce, volunteering and visitors), referring to the discovery and recording of the historic environment, and on the quality of design and the outcomes for wellbeing of users.

KPI 1: Enabled emissions reduction

84. There were a few comments about the focus of this KPI **being too narrow**, particularly in that it concentrates on buildings too much in comparison to sites, monuments and archaeological remains.
85. Similar numbers proposed wording changes: 'enabling' was again thought of as a weak term to use, 'delivery mechanism' in the proposed measure needed to be better defined, and there was a request to include 'reduce demand' alongside 'emissions reduction'.
86. A small number of respondents were keen to stress that traditional building practices were better for emissions, and that this should be addressed through the KPI; for instance, that repairing buildings rather than retrofitting them used less energy, that traditional buildings need a different approach to insulation, and that the use of lime mortar rather than cement should be encouraged as this absorbs carbon dioxide in the hardening process. Conflicts were mentioned concerning planning legislation and the repurposing of historic buildings.
87. Finally there were a small number of comments regarding net zero as not being achievable by the deadlines set; other comments included requests for information on emissions baselines and a target date.

KPI 2: Prepared the historic environment to be more climate resilient

88. The primary comment amongst relatively few remarks made about this KPI concerned **a need for clarity** (e.g. to identify actions rather than aspirations).
89. A very small number recommended joint working on adaptation plans or climate change guidance with the Scottish Government, local authorities

and planning authorities. A planning authority pinpointed a need for funding increases for a climate change mitigation programme.

KPI3: Created new pathways for key green skills to deliver the historic environment's net zero transition

90. Requests were made by a few respondents to **give a definition of the key skills needed**, with calls for traditional heritage skills to be given priority. Small numbers thought that reviewing and consolidating current skills shortages would be more transformative (e.g. increasing planning skills). Very small numbers suggested collaborating with higher education institutions or other historic environment provision bodies to deliver the necessary skills.
91. A need was foreseen by a small number of respondents for clear actionable plans to give oversight and control over this KPI.

KPI 4: Supported organisations that care for the historic environment to be more resilient

92. A few respondents cited a **necessity for resources or funds** in connection with this KPI.
93. A small number of organisations suggested a terminology change to 'Support organisations that study, care for and promote the historic environment to have the right skills and be more resilient', in order to tie into other initiatives. A non-heritage third sector body wanted to expand the terminology from 'organisations' to 'stakeholders'.
94. A need for better indicators of resilience was pinpointed by a very small number of respondents. Suggestions included 'the number of organisations relative to [increase/decrease]' and 'Increase/decrease in their size/scope of work', as well as a need to include voluntary / community groups in the KPI measure. However, two respondents considered that strategic plans were unnecessary as a measure because all local authorities have to have these in place anyway.

KPI 5: Communities have a stronger voice in decisions about their historic environment

95. A few respondents welcomed this, saying that **local community involvement in decision-making was important**; however, a small number cautioned that it was essential to ensure communities are well informed and care needs to be taken in weighing up their input against that of professional advice. A small number of respondents thought the KPI was not useful as there had been success with it in the original OPiT.

96. A small number of respondents cited the importance of participatory governance, with one perceiving that community planning partnerships had been very variable in their effectiveness.
97. **Difficulties with the suggested measure** were raised by a few respondents, with small numbers perceiving it as not a full reflection of the KPI. It was intimated that evidencing the involvement of local communities in national, regional and local decisions might be only achievable through the planning process or would be difficult to evidence with a developer-led planning system. There were also suggestions that the measure was too focused on planning (i.e. not including community voices in other decision-making arenas). One alternative suggestion for a measure was to 'Evidence the inclusion of the historic environment placemaking and community voice in local, regional and national plans' (Charity or third sector organisation with a heritage purpose).

KPI 6: Increased participation of children and young people in heritage

98. Most comments – a significant minority overall – saw this KPI as having **too narrow a focus** in that it should include other groups: older people, disabled, minorities, those from less wealthy families, migrants with skills, and those with protected characteristics were suggested inclusions.
99. Respondents agreed with the importance of starting early, with suggestions to introduce heritage at schools. An individual respondent urged the use of Scots language and local dialects as a means of engagement.
100. A small number thought the measure was too vague with definition needed regarding participation. One suggestion was that participation should be measured by lifelong engagement with heritage.

KPI 7: Delivered a responsible economic contribution

101. Most comments (a significant minority) inferred a **lack of clarity** as to what this KPI means, with queries about what constitutes 'responsible' and about what its end goal is.
102. The KPI was regarded as difficult to measure, in particular assessing the increase in contribution from the historic environment. A few suggestions were made to help with this perceived difficulty, as follows:
- The return of the Scotland's Historic Environment Audit or something akin to Historic England's Heritage Matters.
 - Regional contributions of tourism.
 - Numbers employed in the historic environment sector.
 - The return of heritage assets into productive use.

- The use of better statistics to demonstrate the cumulative value of the archaeological sector beyond, for example, HES assets and tourist attractions.

103. A small number of respondents foresaw possible conflicts, intimating there needed to be value placed on the historic environment to balance out actions to achieve a wellbeing economy. The historic environment was perceived by these as a significant contributor to the economy while receiving little return in terms of investment in the care and development of the heritage.

KPI 8: Increased the proportion of jobs created in the historic environment that meet fair work practice

104. The main thread (stated by a few respondents) was that this **KPI should not be specific to the historic environment strategy but should be a broadly applying national or governmental KPI**. These respondents urged that all jobs should meet fair work practice, with small numbers saying they were unaware that jobs in the historic environment sector fail to do this.

105. Most comments about the measure expressed negative views regarding zero hours contracts, saying these were exploitative and should not be allowed in any form. A very small number viewed the measure as having a narrow approach to fair work. A small number thought more reflection was needed owing to the sector's reliance on volunteers. Very small numbers foresaw difficulties in measuring the KPI due to the large number of employers, while there were suggestions that this could be measured by the numbers of apprenticeships created or by the number supported to gain core heritage skills.

KPI 9: Helped to improve wellbeing and quality of life through engagement with heritage

106. Among the relatively few remarks aimed at this KPI, a small number expressed support, saying this needs to be developed. A clearer definition of activities which deliver wellbeing was requested, with a small number of respondents keen to ensure people are in touch with their origins or have a sense of place to this end.

107. Very small numbers were concerned that targeting SIMD areas and under-represented groups would not be the best measure to audit this KPI, perceiving these as difficult to assess because of the variety of influencing factors, or urging that the metric should be broadened. Regarding the latter, a wording addition to the measure was suggested as follows: 'and taking steps to ensure our volunteer programmes are more inclusive' (Charity or third sector organisation (not for profit) outwith the heritage sector).

National level actions under KPIs

108. The consultation then went onto ask about actions that might be taken at a national level to deliver the mission. Respondents were asked:

Q18: Under each KPI, there is a set of actions that might be taken at a national level to deliver the mission. Do you think these actions are the right ones to deliver against the KPI? Can you suggest alternatives?

109. As demonstrated in Table 7, **half the respondents suggested changes to one or more of the actions and / or had ideas for additional actions** and just over a third (37%) agreed with the actions outlined. Only a small proportion (7%) disagreed with the national level actions. Higher proportions of organisations than individuals suggested changes (72% compared to 34%).

Table 7: Agreement with national level actions

	Yes, agree	No, do not agree	Suggest changes	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	5 (17%)	1 (3%)	23 (77%)	1 (3%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	2 (33%)	-	3 (50%)	1 (17%)
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	1 (17%)	-	4 (67%)	1 (17%)
Local Authority (5)	1 (20%)	-	4 (80%)	-
Planning Authority (5)	1 (20%)	-	3 (60%)	1 (20%)
Other organisations (5)	1 (20%)	-	4 (80%)	-
Total organisations (57)	11 (19%)	1 (2%)	41 (72%)	4 (7%)
Individuals (80)	40 (50%)	8 (10%)	27 (34%)	5 (6%)
Total respondents (137)	51 (37%)	9 (7%)	68 (50%)	9 (7%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

110. A total of 86 respondents then provided additional commentary in support of their initial response, some of whom simply reiterated their support for the national level actions.

111. Some respondents provided general comments on the national level actions and others commented on specific national level actions. Some respondents noted their dislike of some of the language used in this section of the consultation paper, with a perception that it is divisive (national / local or we / us).

General comments on the national level actions

112. The key theme to emerge here was **concern that the strategy, while being ambitious, may be unattainable**. Furthermore, it was felt that some of the national level actions will be outwith the sector's ability to deliver. An example of this was in relation to the action 'advocate to government for a VAT rebate'. This is not a devolved area and there is no clarity as to whether the use of the word 'government' is referring to the Scottish government or the UK government. Linked to this concern, a few respondents also felt the **strategy was too ambitious given the timeframe for implementation** of these actions is limited to five years. One organisation in the third sector with an interest in the heritage suggested the strategy should set out short, medium and long term outcomes; another suggested the timeframe for implementation should be set out over a ten year period. A planning authority suggested that the list of actions should be prioritised.
113. There were a number of comments on the **language used** in the draft strategy. A few organisations (mostly local authorities and organisations in the third sector with an interest in the heritage) felt the language used – 'nationally we will' and 'locally you can' – could be divisive and was also unclear as to who the 'we' and 'you' are. There were also a few comments that this language is imprecise and unclear and, given that HES works alongside other government agencies and professional organisations, there were a small number of calls for roles and responsibilities to be attributed to different organisations.
114. Given that other sectors such as farming and forestry can have an impact on the historic environment, a small number of third sector organisations with a heritage purpose suggested a need to **broaden the actions so they apply to all sectors**. There were also a small number of suggestions for the **strategy to have a stronger connection with other policy areas** such as national planning policy, or to engage with national developments such as the national walking and cycling network.
115. Another issue raised – primarily by local authorities – was that **this lays a significant burden on local authorities and other organisations** to deliver the strategy. Linked to this point, a small number of respondents also commented on the need for appropriate funding for delivery of the strategy or that delivery of the strategy will depend on available resources.
116. A small number of organisations felt it needs to be made clear that the actions outlined in the strategy are only a sample of what could be undertaken and it needs to be clearly emphasised that this list is not exhaustive.
117. A small number of respondents felt there needs to be some form of measurement of the outcomes and success of the strategy, although there

were also a small number of comments that it will be hard to measure success, as a multiplicity of factors and organisations can influence the outcomes. A third sector organisation with a heritage purpose suggested that as this strategy will be delivered by multiple players, the strategy should be seen as a high level framework across the historic environment sector.

118. A small number of organisations – mostly local authorities – noted a perception that the KPIs and actions should not be used as a basis for making decisions on funding applications, particularly given that some actions are not related solely to the historic environment (this was not suggested in the strategy and reflects a concern in the sector over funding conditions).

119. Some respondents noted issues that have been omitted in these KPIs and national level actions that should be included. These were mostly references to the need to reflect the depth and breadth of work undertaken within the historic environment, for example, to include mentions of archaeology, monuments and so on. There were also a few mentions of the need to include reference to research / innovations or research / discovery and the use of IT.

Comments on KPI1: Enabled emissions reduction

120. The only comments made by more than one respondent focused on the issue that buildings in the historic environment are not energy efficient. The most effective way to help energy efficiency be delivered – at least to an extent – were for training in the relevant skills, working with construction firms and crafts people and owners of older buildings on how best to reduce emissions while still caring for the fabric of the building.

Comments on existing actions

<p>Bullet 1: establish a carbon emissions baseline for Scotland's historic building stock</p>	<p>Will require organisations to take a proper carbon baseline assessment but there is currently no standard method to do this (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p> <p>Replace with a task to increase knowledge and datasets, working with other partner organisations on methodologies (this would be more realistic) (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
<p>Bullet 2: Drive a fabric-first approach to energy efficiency measures in historic buildings</p>	<p>Should be 'drive a fabric-first approach to energy efficiency measures in historic buildings and promote passive rather than active measures to control environmental conditions' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p> <p>The principles are good but there is a need to refine</p>

	the language eg appropriate fabric first approach to energy efficiency improvements (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)
Bullet 3: Work to enhance the way that public procurement supports the use of traditional materials , and the skills needed to work with them	Should say ‘provide advice, support and guidance to owners looking to reduce the emissions of their historic buildings and the collections that may be housed with them.’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)
Bullet 5: Work with training providers to ensure contractors have the skills and knowledge needed to improve the condition and energy efficiency of traditional buildings	This should have a requirement for all building trades to have minimal skills and understanding of traditional skills and materials (Individual)
Bullet 7: Advocate to government for a VAT rebate on repair and maintenance	This should specify 0% VAT rebate (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)
Bullet 8: Work to reduce emissions from heritage tourism visits	This is complex to deliver as it depends on a wide range of organisations. This should be modified to ‘identify how emissions can be reduced from heritage tourism visits’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage) This should include reference to the marketing mix (Other organisation)
Bullet 10: Lead by example in the way that Scotland’s public sector mitigates and adapts the historic environment assets they are for	This should be followed by ‘with a heritage / conservation led fabric-first approach’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)

Suggested new actions to be included

- ‘Develop training and guidance to help organisations achieve net zero goals’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Supporting local organisations to deliver local solutions and advocate / mainstream’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Developing net zero products and experiences to support the decarbonisation of the supply chain’ (Other organisation).
- Influencing visitors behaviour at planning stage and in destination – incentives sustainable choices’ (Other organisations).

- ‘To encourage maintenance by private owners’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘To ensure common products can be sourced from recycled and other sources with lower carbon footprints, and increase recycling opportunities for some common products such as compatible toner cartridges’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Cutting energy use in historic buildings’ should be followed by ‘in ways that do not damage the fabric or the buildings (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)’.

Comments on KPI2: Prepared the historic environment to be more climate resilient

121. The key comments made by small numbers of respondents in relation to this KPI included a need to involve local people and local organisations and provide more detail on the value of local community groups. As at some previous questions, there were also a small number of comments that this is too focused on the built environment. While an individual commented that they liked the reference to the Traditional Buildings Health Check, an organisation in the third sector with a heritage purpose felt this check should be extended to incorporate appropriate retrofit energy efficiency advice.
122. There were two suggestions for changes or additions to the title of the KPI. One was that this should be cross-referenced to the fabric first approach to ensure buildings are adapted to suit climate change; and the other was to incorporate ‘the extent to which historic environment is more resilient to the changing climate’.
123. Respondents felt that bullets 2, 3, 4 and 6 should be priorities under this KPI. The only comments made in relation to the existing actions was that bullet 6 (‘Use heritage to engage with the public to increase their understanding of climate change and its impact’) should include reference to using indoor and outdoor spaces, rather than ‘heritage’.

Comments on KPI3: Created new pathways for key green skills to deliver the historic environment’s net zero transition

124. There were only a small number of comments on this KPI, with a third sector organisation with a heritage purpose noting that this needs to address the issues of supply and demand, and another felt this KPI places an onus on property owners but that there is a need to offer links to appropriate advice and guidance as well as information on organisations that can offer advice.

Comments on existing actions

125. There was a suggestion that bullets 2 and 3 should be priorities under this KPI and that bullets 4 and 5 need a corresponding action.

<p>Bullet 1: Revise and expand the sector Skills Investment Plan to identify the opportunities and actions needed to create a sustainable skills ecosystem, and to provide the green skills needed to support the historic environment's net zero transition</p>	<p>Add "recognising and responding to the failures / shortcomings of the SIP" (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
<p>Bullet 3: Develop baseline data for Scotland's heritage skills needs to inform planning and decision making</p>	<p>Should be 'develop and support baseline data' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>

Comments on KPI4: Supported organisations that care for the historic environment to be more resilient

126. The key comment about KPI4, albeit only mentioned by a small number of respondents was that support is needed from HES for small organisations, in terms of leadership, practical support and funding.

127. A third sector organisation with a heritage purpose commented that the KPI should be worded differently: 'support organisations that study and care for the historic environment to have the right skills and be more resilient'.

Comments on existing actions

<p>Bullet 1: Scale up existing programmes to promote business skills, strategic and succession planning, and digital literacy across Scotland's heritage</p>	<p>There is a need for more reference to digital; need HES support of open knowledge-based approaches (third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector)</p>
<p>Bullet 7: Develop the Research and Development infrastructure for heritage in Scotland by creating new national centres for skills and innovation</p>	<p>'Encourage incorporation of open knowledge / digital skills in new national centres' (third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector)</p>

Suggested new actions to be included

- 'Support skills audits and cross-sectoral partnerships which can provide training, share skills, knowledge and capacity to address

identified needs' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

- 'To support volunteer management' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- 'Work to improve our knowledge of the organisations that make up the historic environment, and their support needs' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

Comments on KPI5: communities have a stronger voice in decisions about their historic environment

128. The key comment in relation to this KPI was that collaboration is important and there should be reference to working with partners outwith the heritage sector. A suggested alternative title for this KPI was 'Evidence the inclusion of the historic environment placemaking and community voice in local, regional and national plans'.

Comments on existing actions

<p>Bullet 1: Ensure grant programmes and funding have positive, community-focused outcomes and objectives</p>	<p>There is a need for open licenses for digital output (third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector)</p> <p>There is a need for more information on how this will be achieved (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
<p>Bullet 2: Work collaboratively to ensure that the historic environment is represented in local place planning and destination management</p>	<p>Is the reference to 'local place planning' a reference to 'Local Place Plans'? (Planning authority)</p>
<p>Bullet 3: Provide advice, guidance, and inspiration to enable communities to acquire and manage heritage assets</p>	<p>Should read as 'provide advice, guidance and inspiration to enable communities to hold positive conversations about how to priorities resources recognising that not everything can be conserved. Support conversations and processes that result in good disposals' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p> <p>There should be reference to funding (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
<p>Bullet 4: Ensure a diversity of voices when decisions about the historic environment are made, through targeted community engagement and capacity building</p>	<p>Should read 'ensure a diversity of voices' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p> <p>There needs to be a commitment to address structural barriers that exclude some groups (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p> <p>There should be reference to the Scottish Government's Place Standard or Design Standard tools (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
<p>Bullet 5: Provide funding and capacity</p>	<p>This should not be limited to community groups (third sector</p>

building programmes for community groups looking to engage with and care for the historic environment	organisation with an interest in the heritage)
---	--

Suggested new actions to be included

- ‘Provide funding for community heritage courses to enable people to learn about their local heritage’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Provide funding for regional events, allowing museums, heritage organisations, community trusts, commercial units and individual researchers to come together’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Provide funding for community groups surveying and recording old and new sites’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Provide advice to community groups wishing to record new sites in the national database’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Create or support organisations which aim to create regional networks’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Provide guidance on best practice and relevant quality standards to community organisations in engaging volunteers to care for the historic environment in their communities’ to reflect the contribution of volunteers’ (third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector).

Comments on KPI6: Increased participation of children and young people in heritage

129. The only comments cited by more than one respondent was that there could also be collaboration with other organisations outwith schools and colleges, such as Duke of Edinburgh; that there is a need to link this to employment opportunities supported by training; and that there could be links into work experience, career development and apprenticeship opportunities. Two individuals also commented that this is exclusionary and should be focused on increasing the participation of all people including disadvantaged groups and under-represented groups.

Comments on existing actions

Bullet 3: Collaborate with children and young people on co-designed projects	Should read ‘continue to provide’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)
---	---

<p>Bullet 9: Work with education authorities and providers to embed heritage across the Scottish curriculum, with a focus on creative learning and play</p>	<p>This should read ‘Work with education authorities and providers to embed heritage across the Scottish curriculum, with a focus on archaeological learning, creative learning and play’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage)</p>
--	--

Suggested new actions to be included

- ‘Provide funding in teacher training courses to that new teachers come out with a good understanding of the historic environment, archaeology and museums’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Provide funding in teacher training courses to that new teachers come out with a good understanding of the historic environment, archaeology and museums and how to promote it to young people’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Work with Scottish Education policy to enable more curriculum for excellence projects to be prioritised and supported, especially for secondary school level’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Making the historic environment more relevant to people’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

Comments on KPI7: Delivered a responsible economic contribution

130. Most comments in response to this KPI focused on aligning this KPI with other elements of policy such as a commitment to sustainable tourism, focusing more on the economic contribution of heritage-based tourism, including references to wellbeing and aligning to Community Wealth Building. One third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage felt the wording of this KPI should include ‘sustainable’ instead of ‘responsible’.

Comments on existing actions

131. The only comments in relation to existing actions were made in reference to bullet 2 (work to embed heritage and the historic environment in future Scottish Government strategies); the comments were that this is not well defined and needs to include measures to enable monitoring and assessment of delivery and success. There was also a comment that this does not consider alignment with other strategies in the wider culture / heritage sector.

Suggested new actions to be included

- ‘Consultations with local organisations and museums to gain their input’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

- ‘Ensure that those managing change to the historic environment can maximise potential for public benefit from those activities’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

Comments on KPI8: Increased the proportion of jobs created in the historic environment that meet fair work practice

132. The only comment made by more than one respondent was that this needs to be more ambitious; with one NDPB suggesting that jobs need to be embedded within the communities that are served. A third sector organisation with a heritage purpose suggested there needs to be a measurable for the Young Person’s Guarantee.

Comments on KPI9: Helped to improve wellbeing and quality of life through engagement with heritage

133. Two third sector organisations with a heritage purpose felt that while volunteering is important within the sector, that the current crisis in recruiting more volunteers is ignored.

134. Only one existing action was commented on – Bullet 3 (Build on Make Your Mark volunteering participation campaign to grow the number, diversity, and skillset of heritage volunteers) – and that was to include a commitment to improving accessibility to volunteering opportunities.

135. A series of possible additional actions were suggested by respondents, and these included:

- ‘To identify and support volunteering’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Identify what groups exist, and build networks to help complement and not compete. Work with organisations such as SCHA to identify and determine needs’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Create a study to show the positive health benefits and wellbeing people gain by heritage activity’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Build partnerships with outdoor and walking groups and health organisations to promote exercise and healthy living’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Fund projects which can address literacy and numeracy using the historic environment, for example, on digs’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Raising awareness of the benefits of volunteering’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

Local level actions under KPIs

136. The consultation then outlined a series of actions that might be taken at a local level to deliver the mission. Respondents were asked:

Q19: Under each KPI, there is a set of actions that might be taken at a local (regional) level to deliver the mission. Do you think these actions are the right ones to deliver against the KPI? Can you suggest alternatives?

137. As shown in table 8, the vast majority of respondents either agreed (38%) with the actions or suggested changes to one or more of the actions and / or had ideas for additional actions (43%). Only a very small number (7%) did not agree with these local / regional level actions; these were mainly individuals.

Table 8: Agreement with local (regional) level actions

	Yes, agree	No, do not agree	Suggest changes	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	22 (73%)	3 (10%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	1 (17%)	-	4 (67%)	1 (17%)
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	1 (17%)	-	3 (50%)	2 (34%)
Local Authority (5)	1 (20%)	-	4 (80%)	-
Planning Authority (5)	1 (20%)	-	2 (40%)	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	1 (20%)	-	4 (80%)	-
Total organisations (57)	9 (16%)	1 (2%)	39 (68%)	8 (14%)
Individuals (80)	43 (54%)	9 (11%)	20 (25%)	8 (10%)
Total respondents (137)	52 (38%)	10 (7%)	59 (43%)	16 (12%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

138. Respondents were then given the opportunity to provide further comments in support of their initial response. A total of 73 respondents opted to provide additional commentary.

General comments

139. To a large extent, comments made in response to this question tended to echo those made at the previous question. These included references to:

- The burden this strategy and the suggested actions place on local authorities, regional and local groups.

- The need for appropriate support for local groups to deliver on these actions. Support included resources, skills, funding and people capacity.
- There will need to be central co-ordination along with guidance and support from HES.
- Some KPIs and / or actions will require further clarification.
- A multiplicity of factors can influence outcomes.
- There is need to clarify this is only a sample of what can be done.
- This focuses on a narrow range of work in the historic environment sector and there is a need to reflect the depth and breadth of work undertaken, for example, to include mentions of archaeology, monuments and so on.
- This does not reflect how the sector will achieve individual actions.
- This needs to be written in language that is accessible to all potential users and in plain English. Additionally, the language is divisive and lacks clarity as to who 'you' is defined as.
- Concerns that the KPIs and actions will be used as a basis for deciding on funding applications and that some small organisations may be pushed into making unrealistic commitments in order to obtain funding.
- Actions need to be focused on what is achievable within the historic environment.
- Some actions are already being delivered so it may be difficult to determine where and when success is achieved.
- Respondents attending the BEFS workshop noted that localness should not be prioritised over expertise.

Comments in relation to specific KPIs

KPI1: Enabled emissions reduction

140. Only very small numbers of respondents commented on this KPI. Comments included that all emissions need to be taken into account and that all should be encouraged to use recycled materials such as paper and ban the use of single use plastics.
141. A suggested new action was 'ensure your historic building(s) are regularly maintained and in good condition to reduce heat loss / carbon emission, advocate and provide local solutions linking historic environment conservation to emissions reduction' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

KPI2: Prepared the historic environment to be more climate resilient

142. Only a small number of respondents commented on this specific KPI, with the key comment being that small organisations are unlikely to have the knowledge, expertise or resource to create a Climate Adaptation Plan (CAP) and that there is a gap between expectation and ability to deliver on this.
143. One additional action was suggested as fitting with this KPI. This was 'ensure decisions and funding allocation support the conservation / resilience of the historic environment in response to local issues' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

KPI3: Created new pathways for key green skills to deliver the historic environment's net zero transition

144. The only comment made by more than one respondent was that there is a need to refer to local trades and businesses to support local communities. A third sector organisation with a heritage purpose suggested introducing an accreditation for crafts people so they can better advertise their skills and services.

KPI4: Supported organisations that care for the historic environment to be more resilient

145. Once again, only a small number of respondents made any comments about this specific KPI. The only comment made by more than one respondent was that there is a need to identify and address areas of volunteer fatigue. Two organisations in the third sector with a heritage purpose felt the action (explore potential to diversify income streams) needed to be strengthened or that it should exclude paywalling or restriction of action that would impede open and free sharing of digital assets and content.
146. One third sector organisation with a heritage purpose suggested an additional action under this KPI of 'help organisations to understand an outcomes, activities, measures approach to their strategic planning'.

KPI5: Communities have a stronger voice in decisions about their historic environment

147. Comments on the existing bullet points were that bullet point 1 (explore and share stories of places, communities, and people, especially of groups who have been historically under-represented) is not an active invitation to seek learning from those who have been marginalised to share their own stories (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
148. In relation to bullet point 3 (share your experiences and learning from projects that you've undertaken, including stories of failure as well as success), it was felt this should be included throughout the draft strategy with

a broader reference to place-based and specific reference to the Place Principle (cited by an NDPB).

149. Suggested new actions included:

- ‘People to advocate for the historic environment to their local decision-makers and representatives’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Ensure grant programmes and funding have positive, community-focused outcomes and objectives’ (NDPB).
- ‘Encourage communities to use and engage with local archives to better understand the history and heritage of their neighbourhoods’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Identify gaps in local knowledge, and propose ways to address these, ideally in collaboration’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

KPI6: Increased participation of children and young people in heritage

150. Only a small number of respondents commented on this specific KPI, with requests to include the creation of links with young people’s groups such as scouts, and reference to looking beyond schools for training opportunities for young people and apprenticeships.

KPI7: Delivered a responsible economic contribution

151. Once again, only a small number of respondents commented on this KPI. It was felt there is a need to do more work to actively reach out to under-represented groups and engage with those who are not traditionally visible in the heritage sector, as well as creating links with tourism providers.

152. Three additional actions to be incorporated into this KPI were suggested. These were:

- ‘Collect and celebrate data/case studies on the economic contribution of heritage, ensure that income-generating systems such as TVL⁴ provide critically-required sustainable funding to support local historic environment conservation and organisations’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
- ‘Sharing digital assets freely and openly in order to make the heritage accessible for everyone’ (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

⁴ transient visitor levy

- 'Work to recognise and overcome barriers to engagement, so that benefits from participation are felt as widely as possible' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

KPI8: Increased the proportion of jobs created in the historic environment that meet fair work practice

153. There was reference to the need to do more work to actively reach out to under-represented groups or to promote heritage careers through schools and universities.
154. One additional action was suggested, which was 'engaging with training that embeds anti-racist, anti-ableist and inclusive values within organisational cultures and programming' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

KPI9: Helped to improve wellbeing and quality of life through engagement with heritage

155. Comments included that this needs to be co-ordinated at a national level where resources are best provided, along with references of a need to do more work to actively reach out to under-represented groups and engaging with those who are not traditionally visible within the heritage sector.
156. New actions to be included under this KPI included:
- 'Collect and celebrate data/case studies on the wellbeing contribution of heritage' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).
 - 'Engage with your local Third Sector Interface and /or Volunteer Scotland to ensure your volunteering programme reflects best practice and address key barriers to participation and delivering a positive volunteer experience' (third sector organisation outwith the heritage sector).
 - 'Nationally we will continue to support community archaeology and community archaeology groups, through programme such as Adopt-A-Monument, together building capacity for a greater diversity of participants and greater number of wellbeing outcomes' (third sector organisation with an interest in the heritage).

Delivery of the Strategy

157. It is important to understand what structures and mechanisms are needed to ensure successful delivery of the new historic environment strategy.

158. The first question in this section asked:

Q20: What structures and mechanisms are needed to oversee successful delivery of the new historic environment strategy?

159. A total of 100 respondents answered this question, with a majority of these referring to **role(s) and responsibilities that need to be undertaken by HES** in order to drive forward delivery of the strategy. Suggestions made by a number of these respondents pointed to HES having a liaison, facilitation, education, support and guidance role across the historic environment. Mentions from respondents included:

- Having a strong communications strategy.
- Offering a capacity on the HES website for voluntary groups and individuals to be able to access support and guidance, for example, being able to access online advice and toolkits.
- To align the strategy with all national plans and strategies, with particular reference to NPF4 and other planning-related policies.
- Linking up with other sector bodies.
- Supporting and working with local communities and engaging directly with local communities.
- Fostering networks at national, regional and local levels. One NDPB suggested HES ensure there is a structure to influence and work proactively at a local place-based level as well as at a national level. For example, establishing regional community boards to gather local ideas and support.

160. In order to help bring these suggestions to fruition, there were a small number of comments that local HES managers should have access to budgets or that there is a need for HES to have an enhanced regional presence.

161. **Funding and resources** to be able to deliver this strategy was mentioned by a large minority of respondents across all sub-groups. Respondents noted that the strategy needs to be adequately resourced, that there needs to be monetary support for organisations involved in delivery of the strategy and that HES and partner organisations will also need to be funded at a national and local level to ensure delivery of the strategy. There

were also a small number of comments on the need to ensure staffing resource with the capacity to deliver on this strategy.

162. Another key theme emerging at this question was about the **need for partnership working and collaboration**. A wide range of different organisations at national, regional and local levels was cited as potential partners, including local authorities, planning authorities and other stakeholder organisations and key organisations within different parts of the historic environment sector. There were also a few comments about setting up new partnerships to stimulate cross-sectoral collaboration and professional development and to allow for cross-fertilisation of ideas. A few respondents commented on their current involvement with OPiT on steering groups or working groups.
163. The need for **transparency to underpin delivery structures and mechanisms** was cited by a small minority of respondents, with references to the need for transparency throughout the work undertaken across the sector as well as work undertaken by HES, including reporting, decision-making and decision-making processes.
164. Allied to this last point, there were also references to the need for **accountability in decision-making processes** at national, regional and local levels; as well as effective oversight in the delivery of the new strategy.
165. As at some previous questions, a significant minority of respondents across most sub-groups referred to the need for **achievable and measurable targets** to be set in order to assess the success and outcomes of the strategy over time. There were suggestions from small numbers of these respondents that the KPIs should all be SMART or that targets could be set for the short, medium and long term.
166. Linked to this point, there were also requests from a significant minority of respondents across most sub-groups for **effective monitoring**, again with reference to the need to measure achievements against KPIs. It was felt that setting up a set of metrics to be used for measuring success and outcomes would be the most effective approach.
167. Other structures and mechanisms suggested by respondents included:
- Diversification and development of governance mechanisms so as to ensure inclusion and diversity across the strategy. A small number of respondents within the third sector with an interest in the heritage made specific reference to the Strategic Historic

Environment Forum (SHEF)⁵ and felt it could take on a role overseeing delivery of the strategy. There were also a small number of requests to ensure the CEO Forum represents relevant bodies across the sector, again referenced by third sector organisations with an interest in the heritage.

- There were a few calls for data sharing across the historic environment sector, with a suggestion for shared interactive portals for the collation and dissemination of data, and another suggestion that all data should be held in national databases that are readily available for all who wish to access this. There was also a query as to how the strategy will approach the systematic collection of data to support the measurement of KPI delivery. These comments came primarily from third sector organisations with an interest in the heritage.

168. There were a few comments from third sector organisations with an interest in the heritage on the need for further consultation prior to the final strategy being developed and published.

169. Respondents attending the BEFS workshop noted there is an emerging conflict of preserving buildings (including designated buildings) and conservation areas in terms of net zero contributions. They also felt there is a need for guidance to understand where actions need to be taken by property owners, for example, guidance on adaptation measures; also that home owners may need to be incentivised to undertake the work necessary to meet timescales. These respondents also highlighted that retrofitting existing properties could be an issue.

170. The next question went onto ask:

Q21: Participants attending the engagement workshops asked for regional opportunities and mechanisms to help deliver the strategy. Do you have suggestions for how a regional approach to delivery might work?

171. A total of 80 respondents answered this question. A large minority of these respondents pointed to some form of **liaison or facilitation role for HES**. A number of these respondents suggested that HES should have regional bases to deliver this strategy, with central support and leadership. It was felt the strategy could be delivered more effectively if HES has a network of regional officers to deliver the strategy. One third sector organisation with a heritage purpose suggested this could operate along the same lines as the Empty Homes Partnership. HES would also need to collaborate and work in

⁵ The Strategic Historic Environment Forum for Scotland was set up in 2014 to help deliver [Our Place in Time – The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland](#). Its purpose is to provide top-level leadership across heritage organisations and other bodies, with the aim of realising a shared vision for Scotland's historic environment, as outlined in the Strategy.

partnership with a wide range of individuals and organisations including the voluntary sector, local communities and other local groups with an interest in the historic environment such as traditional building forums, as well as local authorities, regional economic partnerships, national organisations such as the National Trust for Scotland (NTS) and so on. There was a suggestion from a small number of respondents that sub-divisions of SHEF could represent regional and local areas as well as different sectors.

172. It was also suggested that HES would be able to set up hubs and networks to support community heritage activities for the wide heritage arena. At these hubs, HES could offer training days to share good practice or run online events to make participation easier.
173. A small number of respondents felt that a regional infrastructure already exists via local authorities and that HES should make effective use of this. An organisation in the third sector with a heritage purpose felt that a regional element to the strategy is important because there are lots of regional variations across Scotland and a degree of flexibility and regional autonomy would be necessary to undertake what works best for each region.
174. An advantage of a regional or local approach and identified by a few respondents was that the local business community, local suppliers, disability groups and other heritage organisations would have a greater level of involvement in delivery of the strategy that is not currently available to them.
175. A small number of organisations – mostly local authorities – felt that it would be difficult to define formal regional structures but there would be potential for informal regional structures such as the Conservation Officer Group (COG) or the Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS).
176. However, a small number of organisations also cautioned that regional opportunities would need to be considered more fully in the strategy, for example, in consideration of how OPiT can help support regional priorities as set out in section 1 of NPF4. It was also felt that NPF4 and the development planning process would be able to help realise some of the commitments set out in the strategy.
177. While respondents appeared to be largely supportive of regional opportunities and mechanisms to help deliver the strategy, a few respondents commented on the need for funding and resources to the various organisations and groups that would be involved.
178. A small number of respondents – mainly individuals – also felt that a national approach with regional input would be a more effective approach in terms of the distribution and efficient use of resources.
179. The final question in this section of the consultation asked:

Q22: If applicable, what role would you like to have in delivering the strategy? An example of a role could be taking part in a steering group overseeing delivery of the strategy or taking part in a working group that delivers to a particular priority.

180. A total of 86 respondents, across all sub- groups answered this question. Many of these noted they would be happy to be involved with a working group or steering group, with some focusing on their area of expertise as being of use. A number also noted they would like to participate without giving any further detail.
181. A number of respondents – mainly organisations across all sub-groups – commented that they are already involved with OPiT and would like to continue with this involvement. These respondents noted a range of ways in which they are currently involved and these included:
- City Heritage Trusts already working to help with the local delivery of the national strategy.
 - Local authorities and planning authorities who play a significant role in managing the historic environment via the planning process.
 - Helping to develop traditional skills within the workforce.
 - OPiT working groups.
 - Involvement in Make Your Mark⁶.
182. Some of these organisations also noted they could use their membership to help deliver and advocate for various activities under the strategy.

⁶ Make Your Mark supports everyone in Scotland to volunteer with historical, cultural and nature organisations

Impact Assessments

183. The consultation paper explained that Historic Environment Scotland is keen to understand how the strategy will affect people across Scotland and asked a series of questions about the impact of the strategy on various different groups. The first question asked:

Q23: What impact do you think the strategy might have on people with protected characteristics? Please add any further comments.

184. As demonstrated in table 9, much higher numbers of respondents felt there would be a positive impact rather than a negative impact. That said, significant proportions of respondents felt there would be no impact or did not provide a response to this question.

Table 9: Impact on people with protected characteristics

	Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	No response
Age	57 (42%)	6 (4%)	27 (20%)	46 (34%)
Sex	31 (23%)	4 (3%)	54 (39%)	48 (35%)
Sexual orientation	31 (23%)	3 (2%)	54 (39%)	49 (36%)
Gender reassignment	27 (20%)	3 (2%)	59 (43%)	48 (35%)
Disability and long term conditions	51 (37%)	5 (4%)	34 (25%)	47 (34%)
Race	42 (31%)	3 (2%)	43 (31%)	49 (36%)
Pregnancy / maternity	37 (27%)	5 (4%)	47 (34%)	48 (35%)
Marriage and civil partnerships	29 (21%)	3 (2%)	57 (42%)	48 (35%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

185. Respondents were invited to provide comments in support of their response to Q23 and 47 chose to do so.

186. A number of respondents noted qualified support for the strategy in terms of people with protected characteristics, with a few comments that if the strategy is delivered successfully, it should benefit all groups of people. That said, there were a very small number of comments that the strategy does not identify how it will take the protected characteristics into account or that it does not provide enough detail to assess the level of impact on people with protected characteristics. In line with this – and mentioned at earlier questions – there were a small number of comments of the need for hard measures of accountability.

187. A small number of individuals commented that the focus should be on the historic environment.
188. A small minority of respondents across most sub-groups commented on additional protected characteristics that they felt should be included. While age was included as a protected characteristic, a few respondents referred specifically to older people, particularly as many volunteers in the historic sector are older and their involvement is important. While respondents were generally supportive of the actions to involve more young people in the historic environment, a few respondents in the third sector with an interest in the heritage felt that the strategy should also make reference to older people. One organisation felt that a continuation of the Make Your Mark initiative should increase the participation of under-represented groups.
189. There were a small number of references – mainly from individuals – about the lack of reference to individuals with disability and long term conditions, with comments about the need to ensure that all historic buildings offer access to people with disabilities.
190. Other groups felt to have been excluded in the strategy included:
- Women.
 - Minority ethnic groups.
 - Religions.
191. A few respondents noted they did not like this question or queried the relevance of protected characteristics to the historic environment.
192. The next question then asked:

Q24: What impact do you think the strategy might have on the competitiveness of Scottish businesses, the third sector or the regulatory context?

193. As table 10 demonstrates, almost half (45%) the respondents felt there would be a positive impact on the competitiveness of Scottish businesses, the third sector or the regulatory context. Only a small proportion (7%) of mainly individuals felt there would be a negative impact.

Table 10: Impact on the competitiveness of Scottish businesses, the third sector or the regulatory context

	Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	9 (30%)	1 (3%)	5 (17%)	15 (50%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	2 (33%)	-	1 (17%)	3 (50%)
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	1 (17%)	-	-	5 (83%)
Local Authority (5)	2 (40%)	-	-	3 (30%)
Planning Authority (5)	3 (60%)	-	-	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	2 (40%)	-	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
Total organisations (57)	19 (33%)	1 (2%)	7 (12%)	30 (53%)
Individuals (80)	43 (54%)	9 (11%)	15 (19%)	13 (16%)
Total respondents (137)	62 (45%)	10 (7%)	22 (16%)	43 (31%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

194. A total of 38 respondents then provided additional comments in support of their initial response to this question.

195. A minority of these respondents pointed out ways in which the strategy could create opportunities for a positive impact on businesses. These included:

- Increased opportunities for businesses to benefit more from the historic environment through marketing food, tourism or using the heritage to support brands.
- Helping to make Scottish businesses competitive and sustainable.
- Helping organisations to maximise the potential of their heritage assets to attract tourists, contribute to the local economy and foster community cohesion and wellbeing.
- Increased skills education and training and addressing business skills gaps would help to ensure the traditional skills are maintained and create employment opportunities.
- Collaboration and the sharing of good practice and ideas would help to build resilience.
- Involving more local businesses and volunteer groups in working with heritage assets, which are seen by some to be a key element of the visitor / tourist economy and an important economic asset.

196. While a number of respondents noted ways in which the strategy could create opportunities for a positive impact on businesses, some respondents

qualified their response along the lines of ‘the impact of the strategy on businesses would depend on effective delivery of the strategy’. Once again, there were references to the need for support from HES and to have good regional networking and support for communities and businesses.

197. A very small number of respondents noted that the current economic climate including rising inflation and the cost of living make it difficult to see how the strategy can achieve many positive economic outcomes for Scottish businesses, although a similar number of respondents felt that longer term the strategy should have a positive impact.

198. The next question asked:

Q25: What impact do you think the strategy might have on people in island communities?

199. As table 11 shows, greater numbers of respondents felt the strategy would have a positive impact on people in island communities than a negative impact (42% compared to 5%). As at the two previous questions, a significant proportion of respondents felt there would be no impact (18%) or did not provide a response to this question (36%). When we look at sub-group information, individuals were more positive than organisations, with 56% of individuals attributing a positive impact to the strategy compared to 21% of organisations.

Table 11: Impact on people in island communities

	Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	7 (23%)	2 (7%)	7 (23%)	14 (47%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	2 (33%)	-	1 (17%)	3 (50%)
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	-	-	1 (17%)	5 (83%)
Local Authority (5)	2 (40%)	-	-	3 (60%)
Planning Authority (5)	1 (20%)	-	2 (40%)	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	-	-	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Total organisations (57)	12 (21%)	2 (4%)	13 (23%)	30 (53%)
Individuals (80)	45 (56%)	5 (6%)	11 (14%)	19 (24%)
Total respondents (137)	57 (42%)	7 (5%)	24 (18%)	49 (36%)

Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding

200. A total of 31 respondents then provided additional comments in support of their initial response to this question.
201. A key theme, albeit only from a few respondents was that some of Scotland's most significant heritage is found in island communities and that the strategy needs to recognise this and ensure that the islands are not disadvantaged with demands that they meet certain standards which might not be achievable.
202. It was also felt to be important that the strategy has a strong local focus and input, given that the level of engagement with the historic environment and the sense of ownership of local historic monuments and heritage tends to be higher than in other areas of Scotland. An NDPB suggested there is a need for a locally informed and tailored approach to communities and places in implementing the strategy. A local authority noted that previous investment via Conservation Area Regeneration Schemes (CARS) has had a positive impact on island communities and should be continued under the new strategy.
203. A few respondents also suggested the strategy needs to recognise the impact of climate change and that this issue leads to other unique impacts on island communities such as increased transport costs or logistical issues in the protection or conservation of heritage assets. Again, there respondents felt there is a need for flexibility within the strategy so that island communities can address heritage-related issues with solutions tailored for their specific contexts. However, conversely, a small number of organisations noted that island communities need the same support as those provided on the mainland.
204. Another issue raised by respondents – primarily individuals – and echoing earlier questions, was of the need for funding for implementation of the strategy.
205. Finally at this question, a small number of organisations commented that the impact assessment had suggested there would be significant consultation with island communities regarding the formation of the strategy but that this did not happen.
206. The final question in this section of the consultation asked:

Q26: Has our environmental assessment identified the likely environmental effects of the options?

207. Table 11 shows that **half the respondents felt the environmental assessment has identified the likely environmental effects** of the options, compared to only 12% who disagreed. Individuals (nearly two in three) were

more likely to agree that the likely environmental effects had been identified than organisations (18%). However similar small proportions of organisations and individuals (12% and 13% respectively) said the impact had not been identified.

Table 11: Whether environmental assessment has identified the likely environmental effects of the options

	Yes	No	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	10 (33%)	17 (12%)	52 (38%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	3 (50%)	-	3 (50%)
Non-Departmental Public Body (6)	-	-	6 (100%)
Local Authority (5)	3 (60%)	-	2 (40%)
Planning Authority (5)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	-	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Total organisations (57)	18 (32%)	7 (12%)	32 (56%)
Individuals (80)	50 (63%)	10 (13%)	20 (25%)
Total respondents (137)	68 (50%)	17 (12%)	52 (38%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

208. Respondents were then asked:

Q26b: Do you think there are any additional environmental mitigation, enhancement, or monitoring measures that should be considered?

209. As demonstrated in Table 12, a quarter of the respondents overall (25%) thought additional environmental mitigation, enhancement or monitoring measures should be considered. However, nearly two in five (38%) did not think this.

210. Greater proportions of individuals (30%) thought additional measures should be considered than organisations (18%). However, over half of organisations chose not to respond to this question.

Table 12: Do you think there are any additional environmental mitigation, enhancement, or monitoring measures that should be considered?

	Yes	No	No response
Charity / Third sector - heritage (30)	6 (20%)	9 (30%)	15 (50%)
Charity / Third sector – non-heritage (6)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)
Non Departmental Public Body (6)	1 (17%)	-	5 (83%)
Local Authority (5)	-	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Planning Authority (5)	-	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Other organisations (5)	2 (40%)	-	3 (60%)
Total organisations (57)	10 (18%)	16 (28%)	31 (54%)
Individuals (80)	24 (30%)	36 (45%)	20 (25%)
Total respondents (137)	34 (25%)	52 (38%)	51 (37%)

(Figures might not add to 100% due to rounding)

211. Respondents were then asked:

Q26c: Do you have any other comments on the environmental assessment? If so please comment below.

212. Only 34 respondents (mostly individuals) made other comments. Most of these detailed themes which they thought should be included or have greater coverage in the environmental assessment.

213. A few individuals reiterated that there needed to be a focus on maintaining and preserving the historic environment, with additional perceptions that simply using the historic environment without maintenance will impact negatively on the environment (e.g. from erosion or changes of vegetation). Conversely it was foreseen that sustainable management of the historic environment will not have adverse impacts.

214. Points about building work and the usage of building materials were also made. These mainly advocated the use of traditional materials, regarded as non-toxic, low in energy and low in emissions of greenhouse gases. A professional body disagreed, saying that modern materials have better performance, fewer maintenance requirements and are less expensive. An individual saw a trade-off between local (negative impacts locally) and remote (negative carbon footprint from transport) sourcing of materials in terms of environmental impacts. There were a very small number who advocated the benefits of developing conservation skills, perhaps by using HES's expertise.

215. A small number raised the impact of funding and resourcing issues in managing historic assets, citing inflation, the cost of living and reduced funding as negatives. There were suggestions for council tax and business rates relief, and a professional body welcomed the exploration of VAT rebates for improvements to historic buildings.
216. A small number of respondents urged the inclusion of transport and travel effects caused by tourism, with their resulting environment stresses, with suggestions made to facilitate public transport use to sites, and to look at HES's own environmental impact and its impact on promoting travel and tourism. A heritage-related third sector body saw a need to include island-specific impacts.
217. A small number of individuals wanted more inclusion of the effects on the natural world in the environmental assessment, with one commenting it was too anthropocentric.
218. A non-departmental public body stated the following specific areas should have further consideration, as follows:
- Mention of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Policy in the cultural heritage section of Appendix B (page 40).
 - Under Annex D - Climatic Factors (page 46): while Climate Change Committee Reports are listed on the left hand side, a link to the CCC site could be added.
 - Add in the UK Climate Risk national summary for Scotland.
219. Finally there were very small numbers of points made about how difficult it is to assess environmental impacts, and about the document being vague, needing clarity and needing more language in plain English. Similar numbers felt they were not qualified to assess environmental impacts.

Final Comments

220. Respondents were offered an opportunity to provide any additional comments in support of their response. Q27 asked:

Q27: Do you have any final comments on the draft strategy?

221. A total of 78 respondents across all sub-groups opted to provide a response to this question. Many of the comments echoed points made in response to earlier questions. The following paragraphs outline these points.

222. A small minority of respondents across most sub-groups were supportive of the draft strategy and a few welcomed the opportunity to respond to this consultation. Small numbers noted they would like to be involved in any discussions going forward.

223. A significant minority of organisations across all sub-groups felt this **strategy should be realigned with the original Our Place in Time priorities of Understand, Protect and Value the historic environment**⁷. It was felt these priorities are fundamental to the management of the historic environment and therefore to the draft strategy.

224. There were a number of queries over where **funding will come from to meet the strategy**, with a suggestion from an organisation in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose that there is need to address the shortage of capital in many privately owned properties within the historic environment. An organisation in the 'other professional' sub-group noted concerns that if organisations do not deliver on the three priorities, they will not get funding in the future. They also asked for clarification that the three priorities are not the only priorities that will drive HES sector funding and planning decisions. Another organisation in the charity or third sector and with a heritage purpose felt the strategy needs to address the chronic lack of strategic funding in the sector.

225. Allied to this point, there were also a few concerns that the **strategy places too much onus on local authorities** (cited primarily by local authorities and planning authorities), and they are unlikely to commit to anything that cannot be delivered due to the current economic circumstances and that there is a need for the strategy to be realistic about what local authorities or other third parties can deliver. This comment was made primarily by local authorities or planning authorities.

⁷ Op cit

226. Once again, the **language used** in the strategy was seen to be divisive by a small minority of respondents, all organisations. A planning authority felt the language used does not portray a collaborative approach or relationship between national and local bodies. An organisation in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose commented that the language needs to embrace a broader collective approach. Another organisation in this sector asked for clarification over 'we' as they felt Our Place in Time is for the whole sector but 'we' seems to refer to Historic Environment Scotland. A small number of organisations also felt the tone of the document is too downbeat and the wording should be changed to reflect a more positive, aspirational and collaborative tone.
227. A small number of organisations in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose also felt the strategy should be renamed so as to differentiate itself from HES's own strategy.
228. A few respondents, mostly organisations in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose, commented that the **roles and responsibilities** attributed to different organisations **need to be outlined**, so that there is clarity over which actions HES will deliver and those it will support other organisations in the sector to deliver.
229. **Timescales** were mentioned by a small number of respondents, with a perception that the five year timescale is too ambitious. One organisation in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose noted this would be better laid out as a ten year strategy.

What is missing from the draft strategy?

230. Many of the comments made in response to this question focused on elements or topics missing from the draft strategy. The following paragraphs outline these.
231. A small minority of respondents – almost all organisations and across most sub-groups – commented on the need for a **better definition within the strategy on what is meant by 'historic environment'**. One organisation in the charity or third sector with a heritage purpose noted that the terms 'historic environment' and 'heritage' are used interchangeably. Allied to this point, there were a small number of comments of a need to link the strategy with other policy areas, particularly that of planning and the NPF4 so as emphasise the historic environment does not operate within a vacuum.
232. A significant minority of respondents, primarily organisations within the third sector with an interest in heritage, commented that the **draft strategy emphasises buildings more than other parts of the historic environment and that it needs to reflect the wider historic environment** beyond

buildings so that the draft strategy reflects the whole of the historic environment and how it is understood, managed and enjoyed. Areas cited by respondents that need to be referenced in the strategy included:

- Archaeological sites and inclusion of 'Strategic Drivers: Scotland's Archaeology Strategy'.
- Heritage databases and issues of management of collections in museums and archives.
- Monuments.
- Museums.
- Gardens and designed landscapes.
- Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).
- National Scenic Areas (NSAa).
- National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and national parks.
- Gaelic and the National Gaelic Language Plan.

233. Regardless of the level of support expressed for the draft strategy, a significant minority of respondents felt there is **need to include baseline data and available statistics, so as to be able to measure its success**; as well as having targets and deliverables. It was felt that there need to be formal metrics in place so as to quantify the success of the strategy and the outcomes of each KPI. A small number of these respondents also felt that timescales should be imposed against each of the actions. Linked to this point, a small number of respondents noted the KPIs should all be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART), Evaluate, Revise (SMARTER).

234. Other comments made by small numbers of respondents included:

- There is a need to articulate support for skills development more clearly, with a separate KPI for this.
- There is a need to reopen all sites that were closed due to COVID-19.

How to access background or source data

The data collected for this <statistical bulletin / social research publication>:

- are available in more detail through Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics
- are available via an alternative route <specify or delete this text>
- may be made available on request, subject to consideration of legal and ethical factors. Please contact <email address> for further information.
- cannot be made available by Scottish Government for further analysis as Scottish Government is not the data controller.