

A Rural Parliament for Scotland

Stakeholder

Workshop

Tuesday August 21, 2012

Birnam Institute, Dunkeld

Report

Compiled and edited by Vanessa Halhead

A Rural Parliament for Scotland

Stakeholder Workshop

**21 August 2012,
Birnam Institute, Dunkeld**

REPORT

**Compiled and edited by
Vanessa Halhead
Rural Parliament Adviser**

August 2012

Contents

1	Introduction		3
2	Summary of recommendations		4
3	Report of the Workshop		10
3.1	Welcome and Introduction	Willy Roe (Chair)	10
3.2	Scotland's Rural Parliament : Identifying Next Steps : A Report for the Scottish Government	Dr Sarah Skerratt, Rural Policy Centre, SAC	12
4	Core Principles for a Rural Parliament	Work groups	15
5	Moving forward	Work groups	16
5.1	1. Mission and Purpose		
5.2	2. Governance		
5.3	3. Funding, resources and expertise		
5.4	4. Implementation and administration		
5.5	5. Risk		
6	Work Plan 2012-2013	Work groups	24
6.1	1. Governance		
6.2	2. Implementation and administration		
6.3	3. Funding		
6.4	4. Awareness and publicity		
6.5	5. Mobilisation and involvement		
6.6	6. Links to Government		
6.7	7. Event organising		
6.8	8. Monitoring and evaluation		
7	The Name		33
8	Final words	Willy Roe	34
	Appendices		35
	A Workshop Agenda		
	C Delegate List		

Link to Rural Parliament reports

All reports and information on the development of the Rural Parliament can be found at:

<https://www.ruralgateway.org.uk/en/rural-parliament>

1. Introduction

This report has been compiled as record of the stakeholder workshop which took place in Dunkeld on August 21, 2012. The workshop was organised to advise on the governance and implementation process of the Rural Parliament, with a view to commencing work in September 2012. The workshop was the final step in the early consultation process assessing the merits of establishing a Rural Parliament for Scotland.

The proposal to develop a Rural Parliament in Scotland is a commitment in the 2011-12 Programme for Government, to ensure the voice of rural Scotland is heard and to enable rural communities to engage more effectively with Government.

A 'Rural Parliament' is a process that takes place over a two-year period, culminating in a high profile event, bringing together all sectors of rural society and interests to highlight rural issues and to discuss rural priorities with each other and with Government. It is not a formal part of government, nor is it a parliament in the sense of a legislative or decision making body. It is a 'bottom-up' process of involvement and debate between the people of rural Scotland and policy makers, to enable better understanding, improved policy and action to address rural issues. The concept of a Rural Parliament was first developed in Sweden and subsequently inspired similar initiatives in other European countries.

The workshop was organised by the Scottish Government and was attended by 28 invited delegates, comprising members of the interim steering group and other stakeholders representing diverse rural interests and who have expressed an interest in assisting the development of the Rural Parliament.

The process so far

The Scottish Government initiated the process to examine the relevance of a Rural Parliament model for Scotland. So far this has involved:

- commissioning a report from the Rural Policy Centre of the Scottish Agricultural College, to look at the models and achievements of Rural Parliaments in other countries,
- contracting an adviser with experience of both the European Rural Movements and their Rural Parliaments and of rural development in Scotland, to advise and assist in the work,
- inviting a range of rural stakeholder organisations to discuss the proposal, from which an interim steering group formed to support and organise the first seminar,
- organising a seminar on May 29, 2012, at which over 100 delegates from Rural Scotland and speakers from other European Rural Parliaments discussed the opportunities that a Rural Parliament may present for Scotland,
- undertaking a post-seminar on-line survey of the participants to establish responses to the event and to the proposal for a Rural Parliament,
- holding a steering group meeting to assess the outputs from the seminar and survey and agree the next steps,
- commissioning a short consultative study, from the Rural Policy Centre of the Scottish Agricultural College, to identify options for progressing the Rural Parliament, to inform a stakeholder workshop.
- Holding the stakeholder workshop on August 21, 2012, to make recommendations on the governance and implementation of the Rural Parliament, with a view to commencing work in September 2012.

2. Summary of recommendations from the Workshop

Key areas

The discussions and outputs of the workshop are focussed under the following key areas:

1. Core Principles
2. Characteristics
3. Mission and purpose
4. Governance structure
5. Implementation and administration structure
6. Funding and resources
7. Awareness and publicity
8. Mobilisation, participation and involvement
9. Links to government
10. 'Rural Parliament' event organising
11. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting
12. Risk

The points listed below provide only a superficial summary of the discussions. It is important to read the full report to gain an understanding of the thinking and detail. Where ideas overlapped from different groups these have been collated under the appropriate headings in the following summary of recommendations:

1. Core Principles

- Rooted in and empowering of rural communities
- Engaging of all interests that contribute to the vitality and sustainability of rural Scotland
- Geographically, culturally, and socially inclusive
- Independent and politically neutral
- Inspiring and celebratory
- Ambitious, strategic, connected and influential on government at all levels
- A driver for positive change

2. Characteristics

- Open, enlightened and outward-looking
- Engaging and welcoming
- Networked and transparent
- Focused on new ideas and positive solutions
- Known for quality, value and resource efficiency
- Respectful and involving of existing networks and organisations
- Evolving strategically and operationally
- Connected nationally and internationally

3. Mission and purpose

- Making the lives of all rural people in Scotland vibrant and sustainable
- Allowing the voices of rural Scotland to be heard and counted
- Enabling rural people to influence policy, decisions and spend

- Attracting and involving all sectors of the rural community
- Celebrating success and building confidence in rural communities
- Promoting connections and knowledge exchange among rural communities in Scotland and internationally.
- Developing into a rural movement.

4. Governance structure

Interim arrangements until September 2013:

Independent Steering Group

The work of developing the inaugural Rural Parliament in 2013 should be the responsibility of an independent, interim steering group. Questions of legitimacy will require consideration.

- The agreed position was for the existing steering group to be expanded to reflect a reasonable representation of stakeholders, geography and skills, based on the core principles.
- It must have a clear remit and should operate under an agreed statement of principles and operational procedures.
- It should have full authority for the governance of the project, and be responsible for developing and approving the project plan and budget, taking strategic and management decisions, appointing and procuring contractors and overseeing the work of the Secretariat and other contractors.
- The interim steering group will also lead planning for the post-2013 period.
- It may be expedient for a smaller management group, drawn from the steering group, to take responsibility for oversight of day to day management and the secretariat.
- Steering group members may be asked to sit on one or more task specific working groups in order to maintain co-ordination.

Independent Chair

The steering group should have an independent chair, who is not part of the Government or other partner organisations, and has good knowledge, connections and standing in rural development.

Advisers

Advisers may be appointed as required to support the steering group with expertise on key issues.

Working Groups

Working groups with appropriate expertise should be established to handle the specific tasks associated with the work programme.

- Working groups may focus on operational tasks (eg. participation and involvement, venue and event management), geographical tasks (eg. regional mobilization) or on the key themes identified for discussion at the Rural Parliament.
- Working Groups may comprise appropriately skilled individuals or partner organisations.
- Each group would involve a member of the Steering Group for co-ordination and feedback.
- Working groups may work with contracted experts to deliver their tasks.

Partner organisations and interests

The Rural Parliament would seek to involve a wide range of 'partner' organisations and interests, in order to expand the involvement, inclusivity and expertise available for its work, now and in the future.

Post 2013 arrangements:

It is envisaged that the 2013 Rural Parliament will establish a more permanent organisation, and that proposals for the constitution and governance would be put to the 2013 event for adoption. This will involve prior work by the steering group to develop proposals.

5. Operational implementation and administration

Interim arrangements until September 2013:

Principles

- Ownership of and responsibility for the establishment of the Rural Parliament should be as wide as possible
- The approach to delivery of the work required should be as inclusive and decentralised as possible
- Where possible, the implementation of the work plan at a local and community level should be by those already active there, either through contracted work or voluntary and in-kind contributions of time and resources.

Assumptions for the period to Autumn 2013

- The project will be principally resourced by the Scottish Government, with funds being held by an independent organisation
- Governance responsibility will lie with an independent steering group or interim board
- Operational responsibility for co-ordination and project management will lie with a secretariat contracted by the steering group
- Specific elements of the work may be contracted out as work packages, to engage the most appropriate expertise.

The arrangements for implementation involve:

An appropriate fund-holding body

The Rural Parliament requires an appropriate legal structure and constitutional status through which to raise, hold and disperse funds, issue contracts and employ staff. Three possible options were identified:

- To establish a shadow/ interim independent organisation, to give the Rural Parliament independence and its own personality. Because of time constraints, this would be an unincorporated association in the short term, whilst registering as an incorporated association. (Preferred option of Governance Group)
- To contract a third party organisation as a fund-holder / 'midwife', whose responsibilities would be limited to the technicalities of banking and dispensing funds and issuing contracts, as approved by the Steering Group.
- To continue with the Government as the fund-holder and contracting body

The Steering Group was asked to consider any other more innovative options.

An Independent Secretariat

- The secretariat should be accountable to the steering group and function independently of any other organisation.

- The Secretariat should be appointed by the steering group, with legal arrangements put in place by the agreed fund-holding body/ organisational structure. Contracting is recommended over employment due to time constraints and flexibility. Contractors must have the requisite skills and knowledge to hit the ground running.
- The principal function of the secretariat is to provide central co-ordination and management, with a limited implementation role regarding specific areas of the work plan. The main tasks of the Secretariat will be:
 - Co-ordination, management and administration
 - Financial management
 - Contracting and supervising specialist contractors
 - Reporting and monitoring
 - Partnership development

Task specific Contractors

- It is anticipated that the majority of the implementation work will be carried out by a limited number of task specific contractors, with appropriate expertise. This may include partner organisations.
- Contractors will be appointed by the Steering Group and procured by the fund-holding body.
- Examples of task specific contracts may include:
 - Event organising
 - Participatory process design
 - Local mobilisation and facilitation
 - Baseline research
 - Publicity

6. Funding and resources

The financing of the Rural Parliament is interdependent with the issues of budgeting, fund-holding, resource priorities and work plan. Rapid definition of these issues and of the budget available for the Rural Parliament is now imperative, and must be the subject of early discussion between the Government and steering group.

Tasks to be undertaken include:

- A work/ business plan and budget for Sept. 2012 – Dec. 2013
- Clarification of Government funding available for 2013
- A funding strategy for 2013
- Identification of additional sponsorship / in-kind contributions
- Fund-raising and management of funds
- A business plan and funding strategy for post 2013

7. Awareness and publicity

Given the short time and lack of current awareness, this task will require rapid and effective implementation.

Many ideas were raised as to possible methods including (full details are included in the report):

- Developing an awareness and publicity strategy
- Promoting a clear message
- Developing a Rural Parliament brand
- Taking an innovative approach
- Utilizing social media fully
- Working with the media
- Identifying ambassadors

- Focused interviews
- An 'Olympic torch' type process
- Roadshows
- Showcase event

8. Mobilisation, participation and involvement

This was identified by several groups as the most critical task needed to make the Rural Parliament work. Many creative ideas were raised around the main areas of:

- Identifying potential participants
- Mobilising participation
 - Through existing networks
 - Trained local/ regional facilitators
 - Develop dynamic processes (eg. travelling slate)
- Building the agenda and themes for the Rural Parliament
- Encouraging attendance
- Encouraging enthusiasm and desire to participate in future

9. Links to government

A number of ideas were put forward for establishing and developing links to government at different levels:

- Steering group links
- Observer status on steering group
- Information flow
- Strategic meetings
- Plan on-going liaison post 2013
- Publicity and promotion
- Recommendations of 2013 Rural Parliament

10. 'Rural Parliament' event organising

Many interesting and creative ideas were raised by this group (see section below). In addition to which are the more practical necessities of:

- Contracting an event organiser
- Identify and booking the best venue
- Developing the programme – speakers/ seminars/ cultural events/ field visits/ market place/ etc.
- Organizing accommodation and travel arrangements

11. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Baseline:

- There is need for objective baseline information on rural Scotland from which to measure outcomes.

Outputs:

- Measuring the practicalities of delivering the pilot Rural Parliament

Outcomes:

- Short-medium term - Measuring the implementation of Rural Parliament recommendations and policy impact
- Long term - Measuring contextual change – policy application on the ground – is the Rural Parliament making a difference?

12. Risk

The following areas of risk were identified, along with some possible mitigation measures:

- Lack of definition of what 'rural' / 'parliament' is.
- Not having the right people involved
- Possibility of becoming a political football
- Danger of being overly bureaucratic
- Lack of clarity about how are priorities to be decided
- Issues being pushed aside because they are being 'addressed' by the Rural Parliament
- Too many issues, which would impede progress and nothing happening as a result
- Ensuring inclusiveness and the need to monitor this
- Lack of involvement of younger people
- Danger that it will be 'steered' in a particular direction by the Secretariat etc.
- Loosing time by having the same conversations over again
- Too much planning and nothing happening as a result
- Not having the right expertise of participation
- Seeing it as an event rather than a process

3. Report of the workshop

3.1 Welcome and Introduction

Willy Roe – Workshop Chair

A very warm welcome to everyone and thank you very much for coming this morning to this outstandingly successful social enterprise here in the heart of Birnam.

So why are we here today?

We are here to move forward the idea of a 'Rural Parliament' for Scotland. This has moved from being an idea for which Vanessa Halhead, who is an expert on rural parliaments across Europe, and others have been advocating for many years, to a potential reality. Those of you who came to Edinburgh in May you will remember the four countries who came to speak to us about their rural parliaments.

This idea has moved forward steadily, and you have been part of moving it forward, to a point where the Scottish Government and Richard Lochhead, who came to our May seminar in Edinburgh, want to make the first Rural Parliament happen in September 2013. We have the privilege today of helping to co-design what will happen between now and the date in September next year when the first Rural Parliament takes place.

The earlier work through the spring and summer was exploratory and consultative. We have been exploring what it might be like if we wanted to make it happen. But we have turned the corner over the summer and the first 'Rural Parliament' for Scotland is going to happen next year. The Scottish Government is going to help finance it and we are charged today with doing a day of "sleeves rolled up" to help make this happen.

The mind-set we need to be in today is designing what has to happen so that next September is very successful and the process between now and then is all that you would want it to be in terms of engaging the people of rural Scotland, shaping up the way it is going to work, making sure that we have got a good plan in place for how the 'Rural Parliament' is going to culminate in September next year.

We have moved beyond proposals and notions into really quite firm ideas about how to move forward. That is not to say that everything is going to be easy or that everyone is going to agree with everything. We know from the work so far and from SAC's individual interview research that there are a number of real concerns that people have about how to make this most effective. Not everyone is agreed about everything to the same extent. We don't want to ignore, far less suppress, concerns and risks. In fact, we want to hear you describe the concerns and risks that you have with a view to helping make sure that we can understand and tackle them in the course of the next year.

Although we are not going to solve everything in the course of today, what I do guarantee you is that all and any of the concerns and risks that you express, whether in plenary sessions or at the table work will be captured and fed into the process, so that we can work on them in the weeks and months ahead.

We are going to do a lot of group work and we are going to give you opportunities to choose which aspects you would like to work on today. We are going to apply participative democracy, if you like, in the course of this workshop.

We are going to record the plenary sessions, as we did in May, so that we have a good record, both for history and for the record of what people said, what they expressed as their ideas, concerns and so on. But we are not going to record the table work, except in written form.

All of us have some experience, some of us have a lot of experience, of this kind of thing - about mobilising community spirit, about listening to community voice, about enabling communities to be more influential and even in control. We want to draw on all of that experience and knowhow. But I want to add a bit of spice into today, which is that we don't need to do the 'Rural Parliament' just like we have done everything else. That is not to say that everything else isn't good, but here we are in the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century and things are possible in terms of engagement with society, engagement with communities, sharing voice and so on, that simply weren't possible 10 years ago, including the power of technologies, social networks etc.

We would like to invite you, to give you absolute licence today, to offer ideas which may be radical, different, innovative, even dangerous, maybe beyond what we have already done in Scotland. We haven't had a 'Rural Parliament' in Scotland before, although we have had and have many other forms of rural engagements with communities and others. We don't have any conclusions at this stage about what kind of innovative method might be possible to engage Rural Scotland in this work. But you can offer them as ideas, as ideas with risks attached, you can offer them as things to try out once but maybe not commit to for longer. We would like to encourage you to do that, thinking of the best of technologies, the best of the techniques you are aware of that have succeeded.

I would like to invite you to think of younger people and their contribution to this whole process and what would turn on and motivate younger people, so that they are big contributors to the idea of the future of rural Scotland.

All of that is in the melting pot for today and we hope we have created a programme which you will find productive as we go on.

I would now like to introduce Sarah Skerratt from the Rural Policy Centre at the Scottish Agricultural College, to report to us briefly about what has emerged from their recent study, so that we all have a common foundation from which to go forward into the day.

3.2 Scotland's Rural Parliament: Identifying next steps

A Report for the Scottish Government

Dr Sarah Skerratt, Rural Policy Centre, SAC

The study and report had been undertaken by: Dr Sarah Skerratt, Dr Jane Atterton & Dr Mike Woolvin of the SAC Rural Policy Centre. All delegates were sent a copy prior to the workshop.

The full report of this study can be accessed at:

<https://www.ruralgateway.org.uk/en/rural-parliament>

http://www.sac.ac.uk/downloads/120336/thriving_communities

The aim of the short study, commissioned by the Scottish Government following the May 29th Seminar, was to identify specific next steps towards the establishment of a Rural Parliament in Scotland in 2013. The study took into account the May 29th Seminar findings, the post-event online survey, the lessons learned from the European experience and added 26 in-depth stakeholder interviews with people who had been involved in the developmental work and had participated at the Seminar, most of whom also attended this workshop. The main focus of the report was on the outputs of the stakeholder interviews, which provided perspectives on the following questions:

- What do you think the mission, or main job, of Scotland's Rural Parliament should be?
- How do you think the Rural Parliament should be structured so that it is effective and influential?
- How do you think decision-making processes should take place, so that the Rural Parliament is inclusive and democratic?
- What do you think the priority next steps should be, and when should these happen between now and September 2013?
- Where do you think the funding should come from?

The views expressed in the report are not our views as researchers, these are your views the stakeholder views.

The main points arising are as follows:

Does rural Scotland need a Rural Parliament?

1. Broad agreement around the need for **national, influential rural representation** within national and regional policy dialogue.
2. Such representation **would not marginalise rural, but raise its profile.**
3. **Many questions and concerns** exist, e.g.
 - How was the mandate decided, and is that mandate established in rural communities?
 - How will the Rural Parliament sit alongside existing networks and structures?
 - How does it fit into wider Scottish Government policy?
 - Will resources be diverted from other activities to fund the Rural Parliament?

These need to be addressed through a deliberate process, particularly in rural communities, where the mandate for national, rural representation has yet to be built.

What should be its main mission or job?

- A **voice** for rural communities to **influence policy.**

- For **networking** and to **overcome fragmentation**.
- To **broaden the range of rural voices** being represented and heard.
- To **help rural Scotland**, and to present **evidence** on rural issues.

What should it be called?

- **Majority: it should NOT be called a Rural Parliament** –
 - You have to explain what it's not
 - It is misleading (implies: representative democracy, decision-making powers, legislative, people standing for election)
- **Alternatives** (all with reservations):
 - Scottish Rural Assembly, Rural Forum, Scottish Rural Communities Forum, Congress, Gathering, Tryst

How should a Rural Parliament be organised?

It should be neutral and new:

- **New organisations** need to be brought in – at institutional level and in communities.
 - move beyond the “usual ways” of doing things and talking about things
 - come to the table differently...
- Need to include **private, public and third** sectors
- **Plus** those who don't necessarily see themselves as “rural” but live/work in rural areas (schools, churches).

To achieve this:

- A **process of mobilisation** is needed:
 - Deliberate **investment of time and resources** in building representation from within communities
 - **Outreach**: work through networking and membership organisations
 - Need a better idea of who does what, where, and **build on** that

To enhance policy influence:

- Also a type of **mobilisation**:
 - Establish **links into Scottish Government** through building **relationships**
 - Invite **high-level politicians** and **civil servants** to Rural Parliament in “**listening mode**”
- Establish credibility:
 - So that the Rural Parliament **cannot be ignored**
 - Produce **papers** and “**track**” these to see how the Government has responded over 2 years

National meetings:

- **When and where**:
 - Every **2 years**
 - In a **rural venue**, potentially rotating its locations
 - PLUS **smaller regional or themed sub-meetings** in between
- It's a **working** event, not only a get-together:
 - **Shaping up of themes** needs to happen
 - **Influential papers** should be produced
 - **People need to come prepared** to discuss, debate and make decisions

Who's to pay?

- **Up to Sept 2013:**
 - An interim pump-priming phase
 - **Scottish Government**, with potential additional sponsorship e.g. for event
- **After Sept 2013:**
 - **Core activities** funded by Scottish Government
 - Important to identify **other sources**, while recognising fears that money could buy influence

Who's to help deliver?

- New, resourced **secretariat** to:
 - keep momentum & engagement
 - organise the Sept 2013 event
 - clarify initial governance, decision-making & finance arrangements
- Independent '**shadow**' **board**:
 - interim
 - formalities & ratification take place Sept 2013
 - representative & inclusive

Next steps identified by stakeholders:

1. **Address** the many **questions and concerns**, particularly at local level
2. Choose **alternative name**
3. Identify & articulate **purpose & mission**
4. Create **new, neutral space**
5. Establish **interim secretariat and board**.
6. Begin **preparations for Sept 2013** event
7. Mobilise **participation & 2-way communication**
8. Establish **influential relationships** with Govt.
9. Identify and confirm **funding** sources

4. Core Principles for a Rural Parliament

Starting with the list of possible principles emerging from the May Seminar, working groups were asked to consider and propose a set of core principles upon which the 'Rural Parliament' should be built. The core principles will be important in providing the foundations and shaping the decisions as to how all aspects of the 'Rural Parliament' is designed and run.

Initial ideas from the May seminar:

- ambitious with scale
- Influential and a route to government
- independent and neutral
- a process within a wider movement
- 'bottom up' and rooted in the rural communities
- involving, transparent and open to all
- empowering of rural communities
- enable co-production
- strategic, forward looking and long term
- focused on positive solutions not problems

The Core Principles and Characteristics proposed by the workshop were:

Core Principles

- Rooted in and empowering of rural communities
- Engaging of all interests that contribute to the vitality and sustainability of rural Scotland
- Geographically, culturally, and socially inclusive
- Independent and politically neutral
- Inspiring and celebratory
- Ambitious, strategic, connected and influential on government at all levels
- A driver for positive change

Characteristics

- Engaging and welcoming
- Networked and transparent
- Focused on new ideas and positive solutions
- Known for quality, value and resource efficiency
- Respectful and involving of existing networks and organisations
- Evolving strategically and operationally
- Connected nationally and internationally

5. Moving Forward

Work Groups – morning session

The workshop participants were set five questions to address in the morning workshop session. Each question addressing a key area required to develop and deliver the pilot Rural Parliament in September 2012.

This session was run using a 'World Café' method, with one initial group leading the discussion on each theme for the first half of the time, and all participants having the option of contributing their ideas to a second theme during the second half. Each group provided its recommendations and ideas on post-its. These are documented in the sections below.

The questions posed for the five groups were:

1. What should be the mission / purpose of a Rural Parliament (build on the responses to the question 'what should it seek to achieve?' from 29 May)
2. What governance arrangements will be required to make it most effective?
3. What funding, resources and expertise will be required, and from which sources?
4. How should the implementation and administration of the first 'Rural Parliament' be organised including, for example, the establishment of an independent secretariat, contractors, advisers, work groups etc.?
5. What will be the most significant risks and how can they be mitigated?

Delegates were asked to imagine that they were the team working to create a really effective process leading to the first Scottish Rural Parliament in September 2013 and charged with making sure that the arrangements for all this to work are really good, legitimate, appropriate, and actually using the principles and characteristics developed earlier.

Group 1 **Mission and Purpose**

The group identified a number of key points:

- Making the lives of all rural people in Scotland vibrant and sustainable
- A voice to influence policy, decisions and spend
- Democratic to allow the voices of Rural Scotland to be heard and counted
- Engaging and welcoming
- Involving of all age groups
- Celebrating success and building confidence
 - Showcase for rural Scotland
 - Supporting rural entrepreneurship
 - An 'Olympic torch' routine to tell and inspire rural and island folk
- Magnet for the un-usual suspects and new ideas
- Movement / voice

Group 2 Governance

Summary

The question of legitimacy informed much of the discussion, and the group tried to relate this to principle and practice, producing a range of both practical and high level questions. The group looked at governance in respect of the interim arrangements required to get this to September 2013 and a set of questions to consider in terms of governance post September 2013.

In terms of governance up to 2013, there is a need to refresh and consider how representative a steering group is in place up to 2013. What constitutional status that might have, whether it is unincorporated, questions about its ability to raise funding, employ staff and have some legal personality. Also the steering group providing accountability for the Secretariat function, and the requirement for that work to include drafting the objects, constitution, the kind of governance shape of a Rural Parliament.

The group discussed a number of ways these issues can be addressed, but tended to look at it in a more traditional sense in terms of the governance of an organisation, rather than anything particularly innovative in terms of governance structure post 2013. However, the group encouraged the Steering Group to come up with something more innovative.

Some key questions were about who ultimately attends a Rural Parliament, where legitimacy comes from and how to ensure it is representative, whilst involving individuals who aspire to be part of it.

The group touched on a number of practical questions, including: what kind of structure does the Rural Parliament have, does it have office bearers, does it have committees, is it like the General Assembly and how does that work?

There was also some interesting discussion about establishing / appointing an organisation to run the Rural Parliament in the long term. With questions about how you appoint the directors, who votes for them, do you pay them, how do you ensure that questions of loss of earnings, expenses, location, etc. are not barriers to participation?

Recommendations

1. An interim arrangement to Sept. 2013

Organisation

- Shadow organisation till 2013 to give the Rural Parliament independence and its own personality
- Best interim structure would be an unincorporated association
- Draft objectives / constitution reflecting the core principles

interim Steering Group

- Must have a clear remit
- Consider question of legitimacy
- Propose re-casting current steering group with additional membership
- Identify the size of the steering group and its membership to provide reasonable representation
- Is coverage wide and representative enough – geography, age, gender, etc. ?

- Establish effective link to community councils
- Steering Group may seek funding beyond its life – motivation etc.

Interim Secretariat

- Needs accountability
- Need to identify how the Secretariat will be paid for and who they will be employed by

2. At 2013 event (and beyond)

Establishing an organisation post 2013

Rural Parliament event:

- Adopts constitution
- Appoints board

Issues to resolve:

- A legal personality?
- A board of directors?
- Where does the power reside?
- How to vote? (online/ proxy/ postal/ in person)
- Who qualifies as a member? (age/ location/ etc)
- Full members/ associate members/ advisory members/ voting or non-voting members?

Delegates

- Status of participants at event?
- Nominated by an organisation (criteria operates in rural Scotland)?
- Minimum criteria for a body identifying delegates – open membership / AGM voting etc.?
- How can an interested individual be part of this? Must you always be part of a group?
- How do agencies/ private sector organisations or ex-pat community members get involved?

Some practicalities

Does a Rural Parliament (event, process, organisation) have :

- Office bearers
- Spokes people
- Committees
- Focus groups
- Sounding boards
- Study groups
- Networks
- Is it like the General Assembly / TUC / etc. in structure and practice?
- Or does it make films/ plays and host visits to raise issues?

Post 2013:

- Establish a board of directors
- Consider remuneration / loss of earnings paid
- Rural Parliament should deliver a valuable product for Scotland

Practical issues:

- Loss of earnings in voluntary participation
- Expenses – travel, accommodation, caring costs
- Locations, timing and technology

Group 3 Funding, resources and expertise

Summary

The group considered the different aspects of the work needed, before considering the funding implications.

The main items identified were:

- A Steering Group, an Advisory Group to support the Steering Group and a Project Management function.
- Participatory engagement is critical from the outset, supported by expertise in participatory methods, to mobilise and involve rural communities and organisations.
- A strong communications strategy, including use of social media
- Event management expertise
- A funding strategy, including identification of potential funding partners in the public and private sectors

The initial funding up to the 2013 event would predominantly be Government. Obtaining funding from other sources, given the tight timescales, would be difficult. However, this should not be ruled out, and a funding mix would be preferable.

Recommendations

Governance and management:

- Establish an independent interim Steering Group
- Led by an independent Chair (with knowledge of rural development and participation)
- Establish an Advisory Group to support the Steering Group
- Contract an operational / funding manager
- Develop a forward project plan
- Identify and monitor outcomes - ensure baseline
- Need to bring in new players to help implement the Rural Parliament

Communications and engagement and visibility strategy:

- Engage expertise in participatory engagement from the outset – on steering group and contractor (eg. International Association of Public Participation)
- Build capacity for participation locally - animate and energise
- Outreach – go to communities
- Build the audience and network through skilled use of social media and all other kinds of media
- Find out what's already going on at community level – build on this
- Contact with wider networking groups
- Mobilise organisations involved in rural Scotland
- Look at the Scottish Youth Parliament as a model and for advice

Need for objective evidence based research:

1. Who does what where in rural Scotland in 2012 – map
2. Taster to celebrate rural Scotland in 2012
3. Baseline audit of rural Scotland in 2012
4. What needs to change, improved or started to enhance sustainability vibrancy of rural Scotland, and the suggested role within that for the Rural Parliament
5. Always need to manage and review expectations

Sept 2013 issues:

- Too soon to be informed by effective research possibly but need to have forward thinking agenda
- Ensure not duplicating what is already taking place / being well voiced
- Allocating adequate research / policy resource to create excellent papers for 2013

Funding strategy

Develop a funding strategy for post 2013 core activities

- Funding post 2013 should be 49% government and 51% multiple sources
- Look at potential private sector sponsors – eg. Food and drink

Identify sponsorship for Sept 2013

- timing of commencement of funding applications is important in relation to funding cycles
- potential danger of delay through procurement process

Develop awareness of potential for future funders – what's in it for them - link to communications strategy

Group 4 Implementation and administration

Summary

The group identified the main tasks for implementation and explored how this might work in terms of practical arrangements. The recommendations were guided by central principles relating to ownership, responsibility and involvement. This produced a model in which implementation is dispersed rather than centralised, with the governance and implementation functions inter-related through the steering group and secretariat, closely linked to task specific working groups and contractors. The structure was imagined as the spokes of a wheel, with a 'hub' having a basic management and co-ordinating function, and all other implementation tasks dispersed to topic focussed work groups and contractors. In this way, it is intended to involve different people and organisations across Scotland, with the appropriate skills and connections, thus spreading involvement and build ownership and capacity for the future. This approach also mirrors that used in other European countries.

Principles

- Ownership of and responsibility for the establishment of the Rural Parliament should be as wide as possible
- The approach to delivery of the work required should be as inclusive and decentralised as possible

- Where possible, the implementation of the workplan at a local and community level should be by those already active there, either through contracted work or voluntary and in-kind contributions of time and resource

Assumptions for the period to Autumn 2013

- The project will be resourced by the Scottish Government, with funds being held by an independent organisation
- Governance responsibility will lie with an independent steering group or interim board
- Operational responsibility for co-ordination and project management will lie with a secretariat contracted by the steering group

Recommendations

- The steering group must be elected or appointed as soon as possible in a way that confers authority for governance of the project
- There must be the earliest possible discussion and negotiation between the Scottish Government and the steering group to clarify and resolve the interdependent issues of budget, fund-holding, resources, priorities and workplan
- The workplan should be developed by the steering group and largely implemented through contractors appointed or procured by the steering group
- An independent secretariat will be responsible for project management, co-ordination and administration of the work required, as well as delivery of some aspects as appropriate
- Task specific contractors and expertise will be appointed to undertake different work areas
- The steering group should structure and organise itself appropriately to manage responsibility for different areas of work, using working groups as appropriate and taking account of the European experience of organising Rural Parliaments
- A clear and effective communications strategy must be in place as early as possible, as a foundation for promotion, engagement and awareness-raising activities

Activity areas

Fund holding and dispersal

- Through a third party organisation, contracted by Scottish Government
- Has no direct involvement in or responsibility for implementing the work
- Steering Group responsible for use of funds (allocation, approval, accountability, reporting to funders)
- Secretariat responsible for day-to-day management and reporting of funds.

Independent Secretariat

- Co-ordination, management and administrative function only
- Dispersing work / organisation through contractors/ external organisations
- Contracting this work is recommended over paid staffing, because of timing, flexibility and skills
- Contractors will need to have the appropriate knowledge and skills to hit the ground running.

Mobilisation, participation and involvement

- Recommend the 'Angel' model from the Seminar
- Work through existing organisations / networks where possible
- Needs independent animation and facilitation – preferably through existing networks

- Recommend training in participatory methods for organisations/ animateurs delivering this
- 2-way process of participation – cautious about roadshows
- Reaching a large audience
- Raising the profile of the Rural Parliament
- Involving existing organisations

Communications, awareness and publicity

- Critical part of the work programme

Rural Parliament event organising

NB. The event is only part of the process

- Involve organisations local to the venue in the process (local authorities/ LEADER/ third sector/ as in other countries)
- Look for funding/ resourcing from a range of sources (some local)

Group 5 Risk

This group identified potential risks and presented some ideas for mitigation.

1. Lack of definition of what 'rural' is / what 'parliament' is.
Mitigation: very clear remit and definition in order to get sufficient 'buy in' and understanding, and to loose the bias from the start. Good PR / planning essential.
2. Not having the right people involved
Mitigation: Use all existing networks. Ensure sufficient resources are available to enable people to be involved in administration of the Rural Parliament and attendance (eg. travel allowances). (ensure sufficient resources to achieve the aims and objectives set out, and that funding is not diverted from existing initiatives.)
3. Possibility of becoming an SNP political football
Mitigation: The Rural Parliament needs to be politically neutral and it needs to be a safe environment where people feel that they can criticise the Government.
4. Danger it will be overly bureaucratic
Mitigation: needs to focus on outcomes and ouputs rather than just processes.
5. Issue of how are priorities are decided
Need to avoid duplication of issues, yet avoid marginalising individuals and groups.
6. Difficulty that issues might get pushed aside because they are being 'addressed' by the Rural Parliament.
7. Too many issues, which would impede progress and nothing happens as a result.
Mitigation: ensure remit isn't too wide.
8. Need to monitor the involvement and the outputs to ensure inclusiveness.

9. Time – losing time having the same conversation over again.
10. Involvement from younger people.
Mitigation: learn lessons from Youth Parliament and exploit social media
11. Danger that it will be ‘steered’ in a particular direction by Secretariat etc.
12. Too much planning and nothing happens as a result
13. Not having right expertise of participation
14. Seeing it as an event not a process

6. Work Plan – 2012 - 2013

The meeting worked in groups to create the basis for a Work Plan for the 13-month period September 2012 to September 2013, including strategic planning and preparation for the 'Rural Parliament' event planned for September 2013. Eight work-streams were identified at this stage, eight work groups volunteered to populate these with proposals, scheduled over the 13 months in order to create the Work Plan.

The eight work-streams were:

1. Setting up of the **governance structure**
2. Establishing **implementation / administration structures and contracts**
3. **Funding strategy and fund raising** to build a strong funding partnership, including **non-financial resources and expertise**
4. **Awareness and publicity** strategy
5. **Mobilisation, participation and involvement process** to gather support, involvement and issues for the 'Rural Parliament'
6. Process for **developing and maintaining links and relationships with the Scottish Government and Local Government**
7. **'Rural Parliament' event organising** including venue, programme, market place, field visits, speakers, cultural events, food events, etc
8. **Monitoring, evaluation and reporting** process

Participants were offered a choice of the work-stream they would most like to join, and where they felt they could make their best contribution. After about 45 minutes participants were able to move to a second choice for the remaining time.

The following are the ideas put forward by the groups.

Group 1 Governance

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<p><u>Oversight & Management</u> The Steering Group of stakeholders must re-constitute itself (ideally with a broader membership) and agree/ produce a statement of principles and a set of operating procedures</p>	<p>Steering group membership: Ask for volunteers from existing stakeholders and cast net wider. Meet Develop and finalise principles and operating procedures</p>	<p>Oversee / manage / steer work of secretariat. Meet as required</p>	<p>Oversee / manage / steer work of secretariat. Meet as required</p>	<p>Oversee / manage / steer work of secretariat. Meet as required</p>
<p><u>Delivery</u> An adequately resourced (time, money) staff team is required to deliver the practicalities of the 2013 event, and report to the steering group.</p>	<p>Once identified, and appropriate resources allocated, delivery of the event will be delegated to this group</p>	<p>The main logistical issues should be settled by the end of Q2: Location / venue(s) IT solution / website</p>	<p>Continued work on delivering event</p>	<p>Continued work on delivering event</p>
<p><u>Resources</u> The 2013 event requires resource commitments from partner organisations (esp SG)</p>	<p>A draft business plan is required asap with an indicative expenditure budget</p>	<p>Detailed and accurate budget available, partner resource commitments agreed</p>		
<p><u>Membership & Structure of the SRP</u> Work is required to refine membership criteria, structure and operating procedures for the RP</p>	<p>Further discussion and drafting of proposals for membership criteria, structure and operating procedure</p>	<p>Consultation on draft proposals</p>	<p>Finalise proposals Seek delegates!</p>	<p>Seek delegates!</p>
<p><u>Content of the SRP</u> Work is required to identify key areas of focus and if possible develop policy positions / proposals for discussion / voting at the event</p>			<p>Identify(via consultation?) areas / themes Develop policy positions / proposals for voting</p>	
<p><u>Long-term structure of SRP</u> Work is required to secure the future development of the SRP</p>			<p>Initiate a transition process from interim to long term organisation, including developing the post-2013 business plan and identifying / securing funding</p>	

Group 2 Implementation and administration

NB. Budget/contract/ work plan are interlinked and MUST be the subject of early agreement between the Government and Steering Group

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Decision making and accountability	Establish management structure: Steering Group Unincorporated association?	Quarterly review (Secretariat and Steering Group)	Quarterly review (Secretariat and Steering Group)	Quarterly review (Secretariat and Steering Group)
Fund holding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prepare budget –Sept 2012 - Dec 2013 (small working group and Government) - Steering Group to agree fund-holding body with Government - Government contract third party organisation to hold and dispense funds 			
Independent secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop job description/ contract brief - Tender or appoint secretariat - Interim management function until contract let needed 			
	Functions of secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project management/ co-ordination - Administration - Partnership development - Communications - Co-ordination of activities/ sub-groups/ in-kind/ voluntary contributions - Sub-contracting procedures 			

Group 3 Funding

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Community engagement				
Agree strategy (Steering Group)	x			
Commission external	x			
or arrange internal	x			
Funding				
SC stage (SG?)		x		
Funding applications for event		xxx		
Steering/ Advisory Groups				
Agree membership	x			
Agree governance				

Group 4 Awareness and publicity

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development and planning - Develop clear message/ communicate - Decide on poss. funding sources (sponsorship etc) - Think about on the communication channels - Who is going to take ownership of communications/ the message? 	Communicating the message <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numerous channels - Exploring social media - Organising regional events 	Communicating the message <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numerous channels - Exploring social media - Organising regional events 	Culminating in a showcase event (roadshow etc.)
Media outputs Press covering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Screen machine 'film' - Advert - U tube 	Culture involvement 'multi'		

Consistent message				
Website promotion				
Twitter				
Focus interviews Information roadshows	Regional events - target audience	Involve: - local activists - local government - youth parliament - local children – schools/ colleges/ youth clubs - Federation of Small Businesses		
	Sponsorship: - Banks - Food producers/ produce - Identify a possible patron			

Group 5 Mobilisation, participation and involvement

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Identify and approach all potential participants, through networks, groups and individuals.	Map existing organisations, some of which could be regarded as agents of the RP that would take responsibility for building a database in there are. These organisations would include those based in urban areas but operating in rural areas. Build the database of interested people.	Offer support to agents and other organisations to help them engage with members.		
Encourage participation.	Raise awareness through any	Engage the 'experts' to train	The 'Scottish Slates' are	Analyse results of the 'Slates'

	<p>agents, or direct to organisations, bearing in mind the need to encourage individuals too.</p> <p>Find one or more ‘experts’ in participatory engagement and build a national network.</p> <p>Agree the key messages, eg. ‘what’s in it for me/my community?’.</p> <p>Use websites and social media.</p>	<p>local networks/ network facilitators.</p> <p>Continue to find dynamic ways to get people involved.</p> <p>Herald the concept of ‘The Scottish Slates’, a means of gathering ideas and opinion from around the country using a material indigenously identified with Scotland. (<i>See the use of scrolls in ‘Rural Parliaments’, pub. PREPARE, page 31.</i>)</p> <p>The ‘Slates’ may be made from card or ‘virtual’ (to allow email circulation). They would now be a ‘clean slate’ but include some questions to assist evaluation and sifting.</p>	<p>issued, accompanied by a programme of local signing events.</p> <p>Local information events about the Rural Parliament are held, which should be participatory and having no restriction on themes.</p>	<p>and agree on the key themes and issues for the Inaugural Rural Parliament.</p> <p>Build an agenda reflective of these views and tell people which key issues have been selected.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Alternatively follow the Swedish model (Rural Parliaments, pub. By PREPARE, p31.) whereby the Inaugural Rural Parliament will have no pre-determined agenda but the participants shall meet to consider the content of ‘the Scottish Scrolls’.</p>
<p>Encourage attendance at the inaugural meeting of the Rural Parliament</p>	<p>Herald the month in which the inaugural RP will be held.</p>	<p>Announce the venue. Ask people to pre-register interest</p>		<p>Ask those who have pre-registered to confirm their attendance and release remaining places on a 1st come 1st served basis.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The alternative view also had support, viz. that the event should be unrestricted in number, similar to the National Mod and that folk’s</p>

				participation be ensured by using modern technology.
Encourage enthusiasm and desire to participate now and in the future.	Remind folk to bear in mind that that the RP will not be a one-off event and advise the timeframe for the next one, encouraging them to identify and work up ideas to have them ready for a future round. Decide what success from the RP process will look like, both to encourage participation and to limit expectations and publicise this.	Pre-involve rural people on what should be covered in RP		

Group 6 Links to Government

Actions	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Identify key person(s) from steering group to link to the main levels of government : COSLA / Scottish Government / Westminster/ European Commission	Identify participants of Rural Parliament with observer status (COSLA/ Scottish Government/ Westminster/ European Commission)	Strategic meetings with different levels of government	Start of Q4 – finalise plans with Steering Group
		Develop flow of information between Rural Parliament and different levels of government	Planning on-going liaison post-2013	Agree publicity and promotion
				Recommendations to Rural Parliament post 2013

Group 7 Event Organising

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Mapping possible opinion formers/ stakeholders/ ambassadors	Build cross-party political support for RP	Field visits to schools, RHET? Using existing organisations as vehicles	Fun marketing around Scottish stereotypes (Olympic torch relay) eg. stags, whiskey, squirrel (roadshow)
Strategic approach to programme	Marketing brand across all sectors: QMS, NFUS, SAOS, Eco-schools, farmers markets, etc.	Using cultural events such as Celtic Connections, music festivals to promote event	Rural Scotland is the lung for cities to breathe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visit Scotland - Rural tours - Free range weekend
Smaller events in lead up to main event	Swedish, Dutch, German, rural demonstration projects exchange visits	Engaging with universities to debate issues Linking into high profile lectures eg. Sabhal Mor lecture	Independent 'rural Scotland' focus What will independence mean?
Discussion on creating a RP brand	Encouraging steering group to feed back to board	Generate open discussion with schools to raise profile/ awareness of RP	Open to all
Scotland-wide approach to venues programmatic approach eg. must be accessible	Social media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twitter - Facebook - Building relationships 	Private sector sponsored run by ferry/ bike/ horse/ etc around rural Scotland Promoting through NHS: Eat less, move more Health drive Healthy RP means healthy rural pop.	
Event management Contracting out	Transport infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stickers - Boldly go 		
Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link to existing events/ activities to get best value for money - Independent approach 	Rural Scotland from perspective of sea and air <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - engage with marine and fisheries and airports - beaches 		
Draw on history and culture/ promote stories/ awareness and pride			

Group 8 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Outputs re. delivery of the first Rural Parliament Deliverables / targets Measuring the practicalities of delivering the pilot Rural Parliament	Outcomes Short-medium term impact Measuring the implementation of Rural Parliament recommendations and policy impact	Outcomes long term impact Measuring contextual change – policy application on the ground – is the RP making a difference?
Project management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business plan - Milestones - Work plan - Deliverables 	Tracking progress on the recommendations agreed by the Rural Parliament at national, regional and local levels.	First Rural Parliament to set a Sept 2013 baseline on the state of rural Scotland. Need to identify through a research / outreach strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do we not know? - What do we know already? - What do we need to know? - Toolkits to measure – new tools to be created?
Risk management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment - Continued business case 		
Monitoring framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who are we reporting to? - Lessons and issues log - Interim reporting - How is it logged? 		

7. The Name

The delegates were presented with a list of names that had been proposed so far, and asked to add any other suggestions. The final list, below, was then voted on in a secret ballot. The result was a tie between 'Rural Parliament' and Rural Assembly', with 'Thing/ Althing' in third place. The final vote was done on a show of hands between Rural Parliament and Rural Assembly. The outcome was that Rural Assembly received 2 more votes than Rural Parliament.

Possible Names proposed

11 possible names had been proposed for the ballot on what the 'Rural Parliament' should be called. The choices are listed in the table below (in alpha order).

Voting

Voters completed a ballot paper which allowed them to record their FIRST and their SECOND preferences
23 ballot papers were completed and submitted in a secret ballot.

22 papers included 2 preferences; 1 paper included only a first preference.

First preferences were counted first, the result of which showed the following:

A assembly	A-6
B congress	B-0
C forum	C-0
D gathering	D-2
E parliament	E-6
F round table	F-1
G space	G-0
H ting / thing	H-5
I tryst	I-0
J voice	J-3
K whisper	K-0

The papers from the lowest scoring choices were then redistributed to allow second preference votes to be counted.

Once this process had been completed the final result showed the following outcome:

A dead heat between A (assembly) and E (parliament), each of which received 6 first preference votes and 3 second preference votes. Third place in the ballot was taken by H (ting / alting) which received 5 first preference votes and 0 second preference votes.

After the result of the vote was announced to the meeting, a final ballot was taken by a show of hands between the 2 dead-heat names. The result of this ballot was that 13 people voted for A (Assembly) and 11 voted for E (Parliament).

8. Final Words

Willy Roe

Thank you everyone for your work today. We knew this would be a demanding day in terms of the level of forward thinking and planning that we need to do to make a Scottish Rural Parliament happen. Your work today has taken us forward, and many valuable ideas have been added to the thinking on how to develop the Rural Parliament. Work still remains to integrate and expand on the findings of the different work groups.

Things have to move quite swiftly from here on. Vanessa will take the product of today's work and turn it into a report. The visit by a number of people from Scotland to the Swedish Rural Parliament will take place between Sept 5-9 and some people here today will be involved with that. The intention is to hold a Steering Group meeting in late September to take forward the work and report of today.

The role of the eight members of the Steering Group who have been leading this work does not technically continue beyond today. We would like to suggest that we move forward from here with an enhanced and strengthened Steering Group made up, if they are willing, of the existing Steering Group, enhanced by additional members. These should reflect areas of interest which would benefit from being strengthened on the group. We would like to ask the existing members if they together would help us identify such people.

We would like to invite the expanded Steering Group to come together for a working session in September, armed with the report, to identify the essential next steps. Some of these are for Scottish Government and some are for the Steering Group to take forward, others will emerge from the work of this afternoon.

From observing the work groups, it is clear that some of the work streams are a lot simpler than others to assemble, sequence and resource and some are major pieces of work, which will need to be well resourced in order that they can be done effectively and in a way that we would all be proud of.

One of the absolute priorities is that we need to clarify, as soon as possible, how the work is going to be financed and resourced. The support of the Scottish Government and many of you as volunteers has got us to this point, but to take it forward from here will need a different level of investment. This is not only for Scottish Government, who have already indicated their intention to support this financially but, as the group that was working on this topic today identified, there are a lot of other resources and expertise around. However, it will take time to negotiate them, broker them, meet their deadlines, get answers and follow them up.

So we will try, before the meeting in September, to take advantage of the work you have done today to put an aggregated work plan in place. That is no mean task, but it is an important next step. It may throw up some inconsistencies between the work groups which will need to be resolved.

You can always reach Graham and his colleagues and Vanessa. Some of you are going to be helping her as reference points for the reporting. We will be in touch as soon as we can about a date for the meeting of the hopefully strengthened, enhanced Steering Group.

Could I, on behalf of everyone who is involved with us, express my sincere thanks to you all for committing another day, for coming here and working so hard and creatively and for being such a willing audience. Have a safe journey home and I hope we will see you again before long.

Appendix A

Workshop Agenda

- 10.30 Welcome and Introduction, Willy Roe (Chair)
- 10.40 Scotland's Rural Parliament : Identifying Next Steps : A Report for the Scottish Government.
Dr Sarah Skerratt, Rural Policy Centre, SAC
- 10.55 Framework and working methods for the day: Willy Roe
- 11.05 Core Principles for a Rural Parliament
Table work (30 minutes) followed by plenary to agree the principles
- 11.50 Using the World Café technique, the meeting will work in 5 groups to shape the outcomes required to enable the first Rural Parliament to succeed
1. What should be the **mission / purpose** of a Rural Parliament (build on the responses to the question 'what should it seek to achieve?' from 29 May)
 2. What **governance arrangements** will be required to make it most effective?
 3. What **funding, resources and expertise** will be required, and from which sources?
 4. How should the **implementation and administration** of the first 'Rural Parliament' be organised including, for example, the establishment of an independent secretariat, contractors, advisers, work groups etc.?
 5. What will be the most **significant risks** and how can they be mitigated?

The first session of the World Café will last for 30 minutes, during which time the group should aim to make substantial progress in dealing with its brief. The next two sessions of the Café will be for 15 minutes each, to allow new participants to add fresh insights, improve the work already done, and express support (or otherwise) for the emerging ideas.

- 12.50 Feedback to the whole workshop

In this pre-lunch session, the meeting will be given five 3-minute insights on the emerging proposals from the World Café. During lunch, a small group will work on the material from the morning, and prepare a presentation for review at the start of the afternoon.

- 13.15 Lunch

- 14.00 Review and decide on the proposals from the World Café sessions.
Vote on the name to be selected for the first 'Rural Parliament'.

- 14.30 The Work Plan from August 2012 to September 2013

Following a brief introduction, the meeting will work in groups to prepare their proposals for the Work Plan that will be required to bring about a successful first Rural Parliament in September 2013. A common

template / framework is provided (which can be added to if required) but it will be up to members of each group to populate it with actions and timescales.

Workstreams:

1. Setting up of the **governance structure**
2. Establishing **implementation / administration structures and contracts**
3. **Funding strategy** and fund raising to build a strong funding partnership, including non-financial resources and expertise
4. **Awareness and publicity** strategy
5. **Mobilisation, participation and involvement** process to gather support, involvement and issues for the 'Rural Parliament'
6. Process for developing and maintaining **links and relationships with the Scottish Government and Local Government**
7. **'Rural Parliament' event organising** including venue, programme, market place, field visits, speakers, cultural events, food events, etc
8. **Monitoring, evaluation and reporting** process

16.00 Key issues and conclusions

16.30 Meeting close

Appendix C

Delegate List

Neil Ritch	Big Lottery Fund
David Green	Cairngorms National Park
Jennifer Wallace	Carnegie UK
Willy Roe	Chair
Carola Bell	Community Energy Scotland
John Hutchison	Community Land Scotland
John MacDonald	Community Transport Association
Jon Hollingdale	Community Woodlands Association
George Macdonald	Countryside Alliance
Alex Walker	Development Trusts Association Scotland
Sheila Armstrong	Dumfries and Galloway Council
Anne Macdonald	Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Kate Sankey	Loch Lomond & Trossachs National Park
Eilidh Nicholson	National Trust for Scotland
Vanessa Halhead	Rural Parliament Adviser
Sarah Skerratt	Rural Policy Centre
Bill Harvey	Scottish Churches Rural Group
Angus Hardie	Scottish Community Alliance
Norman MacAskill	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Patrick Krause	Scottish Crofting Federation
Alistair Prior	Scottish Government
Graham Kay	Scottish Government
Angela Morgan	Scottish Government
Jody Fleck	Scottish Government
Sandy Brunton	Scottish Islands Federation
Sarah Jane Laing	Scottish Land and Estates
Helen Rorrison	Voluntary Action Scotland
John Watt	