

Rethinking Wellbeing Seminar – Wednesday 19 September 2012

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDING

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Aileen McLeod MSP Scotland's FF Director</p> | <p>Good evening everybody and I am delighted to welcome everyone to the Scottish Parliament this evening on behalf of Scotland's Futures Forum.</p> <p>For those of you who don't know who I am, my name is Aileen McLeod and I am a list MSP for the South of Scotland having been elected to the Parliament for the first time at the elections last year in 2011.</p> <p>And I am also, as Donald said, I am one of the new Futures Forum Directors having been appointed to it last year and I am absolutely delighted to be part of the Forum and have the opportunity to participate in many of its discussions and seminars which allows us, as Parliamentarians, to engage informally with other policy makers, the academic community in Scotland and beyond, businesses and the wider community of Scotland in looking beyond the immediate day-to-day policy issues to some of the very real challenges and opportunities that we face in the future.</p> <p>Now this event tonight is part of series of seminars hosted in the Parliament by the Futures Forum in collaboration with Scottish National Heritage, The Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Scottish Government focusing on the environment to the economy and society as a way in which to rethink our approach to wellbeing and to hopefully open up a discussion on how Scotland can find different and better solutions to solving intractable and challenging problems of environmental and social sustainability.</p> <p>And what we would like to do as a Forum, through the seminar series, is to challenge our perceptions and preconceptions of the environment and wellbeing and the way that it relates to economic and social interests.</p> | |
|---|---|--|

Now this is the first in the series and tonight's is entitled "Rethinking Wellbeing Thinking About the Environment". Now we are hoping to examine a range of issues in how the environment interacts with decision making, how it can create wealth and rebuild a more sustainable economy, improve community wellbeing and why it is so often placed solely in its own separate category.

And very often when we discuss the economy, the environment and society we tend to do so as sort of 3 distinct silos and however as we all know that they are all interdependent. The economy is a subset of and dependent on society which is a subset of and dependent on the environment.

So what we in the Futures Forum are keen to do with this seminar series is to try and build a bridge and link holistically the environment, the economy and society together.

And indeed this is very much in keeping with the discussions that are presently ongoing in Brussels right now, predominantly through the European Commissions.

And during a debate at the Economic and Social Committee in July this year on the outcome and follow up of the Reo + 20 UN Conference on Sustainable Development that took place earlier in June, the EU Environment Commissioner, Janes Potocnik, stated that Reo + 20 has given a stronger social angle to sustainable development on matters such as decent work, green jobs and social protection.

And this is very important because it has helped to link up all 3 dimensions of sustainable development and strengthen the message that growth should not be not only economically and ecologically sustainable but also fair just and equitable.

And it is also interesting to note that in an earlier speech last March the Commissioner stated that the question is not – how do we get a green economy and provide flanking measures to deal with poverty and social equity. The green economy is itself central to delivering sustainable growth, social equity and poverty eradication.

The Commission is doing a lot of work around this area in trying to develop a green economy approach to its policy areas though they call this “resource efficiency”.

And while I think it is generally accepted that Reo + 20 did not go as far as most people would have wanted, as the Commissioner pointed out – success from Reo + 20 will not be achieved by Governments alone and the challenge will be to achieve a real commitment on action from non state actors at the International, National and Sub National levels. Civil Society and the private sector will have a key role to play in delivering green growth and promoting sustainable consumption and production

And there is certainly a real challenge to implement in full the potential of the Outcome Document that was agreed in Reo in terms of the concrete actions and specific recommendations for the setting of the sustainable development goals. And also to ensure that Reo + 20 leads to real action towards sustainable development an inclusive green economy and poverty eradication.

Now given this challenge, I think there is a real need for us to be thinking about the synergies, the measures, the strategies and frameworks that Scotland could and should have in place in order to ensure that we continue to make progress on sustainable development working together with our colleagues across the UK and our international partners. And certainly there is much that Scotland can contribute to the ongoing

debates and discussions in this area.

So the Forum is, therefore, hopeful that such a seminar series will contribute to the business of Scotland's Parliament so that we have identified some major pieces of Committee business that will be relevant to the series, including improving the regulatory framework in areas such as environment regulation which will no doubt play a key role here tonight, maximising the benefits of preventative spending, as well as understanding and improving quality of life issues.

Now each of these seminars features expert speakers and tonight we are extremely fortunate to be joined by Tom Crompton, Change Strategist, WWF-UK and Professor Chris Spray MBE, Chair of Water Science and Policy, Dundee University. So given their expertise and experience this should make for an extremely interesting discussion.

However, before I pass on to the Chair for this evening, I must remind everyone that we are operating under Chatham House Rules, this is to aid debate, discussion and allow everyone here to speak franking and freely.

So without further ado I would like to introduce our illustrious chair for the evening Tim Birley. We are extremely grateful that he is able to be here this evening.

Tim is a former Senior Civil Servant and is now a leading independent advisor and facilitator on sustainable development in Scotland. He advised a wide range of bodies in Scotland and beyond on many aspects of public policy and this has included mainstreaming sustainable developments in European Structural Funds and in structure and local plans and also work with Sustainable Development Scotland Network and SNIFFER. Tim is also the author of many reports including Guidance on Best Value, the Mourne National Park

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>Working Party and for WWF Scotland.</p> <p>So I think given all of their expertise and experience we can safely say this promises to be an extremely interesting discussion this evening.</p> <p>Thanks very much.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley Chair</p> | <p>Thank you very much indeed Aileen for that generous introduction and indeed our first speaker I think setting out the agenda.</p> <p>I have just a couple of housekeeping points to add because my job is to look after you this evening.</p> <p>The proceedings are being recorded but not on video just on sound and as I have to write the report of the proceedings I would be grateful for your patience when it comes to questions to make sure that you have got a microphone.</p> <p>There will be a photographic record please let the photographer know if you don't wish to be included. And then finally can I remind people to put their mobiles to silent and actually the top table if you can go to flight mode because apparently it can interfere with our microphones.</p> <p>Now we have a tale of two parts to this evening's seminar two top rank speakers and then a chance for a question and answer with the panel.</p> <p>Without any further ado I will go straight now to the first</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| | <p>speaker Tom Crompton who is a Change Strategist, he has extensive experience Governmental, Inter Governmental issues and environmental issues, his current work examines the role of cultural values in shaping public responses to social and environmental challenges.</p> <p>Tom.</p> | |
| Tom Crompton | <p>Thank you Tim</p> <p>I wanted to say something in the next few minutes about what shapes, what matters to people. And in particular within that the world of government inescapably I think in contributing to what shapes, what matters to people.</p> <p>I think this is really important because when confronted with the scale, not just in environmental but the social challenges that we are currently em.... creating a political space as the active public acceptance for more ambitious change. And indeed the active public demand for more ambitious change seems to be critically important.</p> <p>And I hope I will demonstrate internally lies importantly what it is that collectively matters to us, both as individuals and as a society.</p> <p>So em... I am not a Scot. I have never lived in Scotland. I turn to Scottish friends to ask at the outset – what is it that Scottish people themselves see as mattering to them, particularly in the context of their Government. And the world of Government in helping to shape their sense of National identity.</p> <p>Canon Kenyan Wright who I think was the Chair of the Scottish Constitutional Convention back in 99 foresaw then an</p> | |

opportunity, once in many generations he said, there comes to people a chance to take their destiny into their own hands to say with confidence who they are and what they want to reshape their society in line with their vision – that time has come for Scotland.

And he and others printed about it 30,000 brochures or so, distributed them right across Scotland inviting groups of people to come together in their communities on the basis of their common interests to answer a series of 2 or 3 questions about what they valued as being important in living in Scotland, and those aspects of Scottish identity that they felt would be well strengthened by the New Scottish Government.

So Kenyon Wright summarised the study of those 450 responses and this is his distillation of what came out – “there is he wrote a profound longing for a new kind of politics in society that listen to, care for, respect and share with all our people, rooted in a strong sense of national identity and community in the vision of a renewed nation in which all count and none are excluded”.

That Society if it has been built, I want to argue, will be built because of an awareness of the values upon which you would be premised. Because values connect issues, I think, really importantly and it is values that infuse public commitment to create the political space for action on public health issues or social mobility issues, equality issues. Or for that matter, yes, environmental protection.

I think that is something that the environment movement has tended to overlook to its cost, pretended to try to compartmentalise environmental issues and then sanitise them, as it were, from the values which infuse public commitment to them. Have been led, therefore, to propose what? - That times are important in sophisticated policy interventions or suggestions for technological solutions to environmental problems.

All important. But all also I think at times overlooking the importance of what it is that we hold collectively to be important and the extent to which that that infuses and underpins a commitment to taking action on environmental problems.

I am not actually going to say very much about the environment. And I am not going to say much about the environment because my contention is that actually the values which underpin, concern about public health, social mobility or equality are to a large extent overlapping the common consolation of values which infuse concern, not just about those issues, but also about environmental issues.

So how are values structured and what are they important? I don't know if you can see this but it is actually on page 67 of the book that you have on your seats. The social psychologists have asked people – what do you value in life? And they find that in asking that they get a repeated set of responses coming back. It seems that there is a finite universe of things that matters to us, which isn't to say that the same things matter to everybody equally, of course. But within that entire universe of things that matter to us the same values keep coming up.

This is a map that shows the relationship between a series of values of people we thought as being important to them. So up here in the sort of the North and North East Sector of this map you have values like broadmindedness, equality, unity with nature. Down in the South and South East a sense of belonging, social recognition, preserving public image or authority.

This map is based on asking I think about 65,000 people in nearly 70 countries what matters to them. And relationship, the special relationship between these values reflects the probability that a person in saying that one value is important

to them will also say another value is important to them.

So if, for example, I hold a varied life up here at about 10 o'clock to be important. It is likely, not deterministically just as a statistical observation and probability, that I will hold an exciting life to be important, or important to be daring.

And similarly if I hold, I don't know, respect for tradition to be important, it is likely I will hold detachment and devoutness and moderation to be important as well. So values cluster in that way.

But it seems as well that there is an antagonism between values and the further apart any two values are on this map, the less likely it is in examining and asking 65,000 people what matters to them, the less likely it is that they will attach simultaneous importance to those two values. And this is kind of intuitive. So if I hold "respect for tradition" to be important, it is unlikely that I will attach great importance at the same time to "an exciting life, or varied life or being daring". You get this picture.

So there is a commonality a likelihood that values clustered together will appear at the same time or be held important at the same time and this antagonism between values that are further removed from one another.

Just to make things easier psychologists have grouped these into 10 values groupings and what I am going to say for the next few minutes is going to focus importantly on values here in the North and North East segment, universities and benevolent and perhaps self direction values and values down here in the "achievements and power" area. It is that polarity that I am going to be talking about.

Other studies, other psychologists refer to those values at the

top there as being intrinsic values, values down here as being more extra intrinsic and it is that language I am going to use.

So intrinsic values are values like affiliation, to have satisfying relationships with family and friends to feel competent, or tell myself to feel competent and autonomist em.... community feeling, benevolence looking after those with which one is in regular contact. And universalism, understanding appreciation tolerance and protection for welfare of all.

And those are situated in this antagonistic relationship, the extrinsic values which I have put down there on the right hand side. So if you look, for example, the financial success it seems to be almost exactly 180 degrees opposed to community feeling. I will show you one or two brief studies which I will point out in a moment.

So why is that important? Well it is important because values it seems are important, certainly not the sole determinants of our attitudes or behaviour but important determinants of our attitudes and behaviour. They are associated with our attitudes towards immigration, our levels of concern about global politics, our attitudes towards human rights, our interests. And similarly with behaviours related to how much we walk or cycle, how empathic we are, our ecological footprints, our purchasing decisions, how much we spend and on what.

It seems that these intrinsic values are repeatedly associated with greater concern about social and environmental issues, wide range of social environmental issues and greater motivation to adopt behaviour in line with that concern.

And as a corollary, it seems that extrinsic values are associated with lower concern about social and environmental issues and lower motivation to engaging behaviour consistent

with that.

I want you just to bear in mind that these aren't personality types we all have all of these values all the time. So throughout the course of a day or a lifetime you can imagine that any one of those values maybe important to you. It is not that these are defined in particular groups of people.

So I am going to show you one study which shows this antagonist relationship. But also I am going to em... that that relationship em... I am going to highlight that that relationship happens not just in terms of peoples' preference for particular values in a dispositional way, in a more durable way, but also that values can be activated, they can be engaged in the moment. And it seems that repeated engagement in activation of values strengthens them over a course of time. It is very important.

So here is a study that shows this. It is a trivial study in itself but it is typical of a large number which corroborate this type of result.

An American Psychologist a women called Catherine Rose invited people into her lab and she split them into two groups. One half she gave a set of sentences all jumbled up that had something to do with money. So, for example, high is how you pay. She asked them to unscramble that to make a meaningful sentence.

The controlled group she gave people jumbled up sentences which were value neutral, cold that is how it is.

And then she gave them a spurious activity it had nothing to do with her study but people imagined that was a point of being invited into the lab. She said "Thank you very much you can go now. Oh as you leave I am running another study

next week would you mind volunteering your time to come back and help” and she scored people according to how much time they volunteered. She also paid people \$2 for participating in loose change and she had an actor who would stand at the door and invite people to donate some of the \$2 back to help support a local charity.

What she found was that those people who had simply been asked to rearrange sentences with money in them offered less than half the amount of time to help in the follow up study than the controlled group. And that those who had been rearranging sentences with money donated almost just a half of what controlled group donated when they were invited to donate to a charity.

So this see-saw relationship it seems that engaging concerns about financial wealthier groups by psychologists in grouping called “Power to engaging those values” depreciates here the importance that a person places on values of universalism of helping others and therefore suppresses, reduces the incidents of helping behaviour. That is the explanation that is offered for this.

I haven’t got time now to go into the evidence for this you will find it in the book. But it seems that repeatedly engaging values overtime strengthens them, a bit like a muscle this is how Michael Sandel, you may have come across his book What Money Can’t Buy, if you haven’t I urge you to read it, but he says altruism, generosity, solidarity and civic spirit are not like commodities that are depleted with us, they are more like muscles that develop and grow stronger with exercise. To renew our public life we need exercise it more strenuously.

So strengthening values – to the extent that we are concerned about addressing some of those social environmental challenges, to the extent to which we are concerned about building the type of society which those 450 groups of Scottish people identified as being important to them, I think

we need to ask “how do we begin to strengthen those values”. Recognising actually that all government activity, consciously or otherwise, has an impact on values and that, therefore, that seems to suggest the necessity to bring that into the open and ask collectively “well what are the values that we seek to strengthen”.

I want to suggest there are two say, well many ways, but two ways in particular I want to pick out but that might be done first of all more in terms of how we talk, and secondly, in terms of what we do.

These examples are all from Westminster by the way. I am adjectively ignorant about Scottish politics, I would never have the temerity to begin to venture to frame these in terms of Scottish Political Debate. I feel far freer to do so in terms of Westminster Debate. So how we talk.

It seems that asking people to participate in a study referred to as a Consumer Reaction Time Study produces an audience of people towards a set of values different to those when they are asked to participate in a Citizen Reaction Study. Just that one word at the heading of a test has an important impact in terms of the values they then subsequently hold to be important.

In this study simply referring to them as consumers led to about a fivefold increase in the importance they attached to wealth, image, success, power and competitiveness. And as you might anticipate, therefore, when they are asked when they could imagine co-operating in a naturally resource dilemma, perhaps as a water scarcity and they have to co-operate with other people in the course of conserving that water, they tend to say that they would be less trustful of other people and they would be less likely to partner with other people in addressing that challenge.

But look – reflect on the frequency with which we refer to

ourselves as consumers in society as a large. This is one indicative graph which shows the frequency of use of word “consumer” in The Times over the course of the last half century, relative to use of the word “citizen” there is a gap here because I think the Times wasn’t published in 1979 because there was an industrial dispute. [laughter] it would be before Murdoch as well I think. There is almost a seven fold increase in the use of “consumer” whereas “citizen” has more or less flat lined. What would be the impact of that repeated saturation public discourse in terms of framing us as “consumers” rather than “citizens”?

And the environment movement is I think partly culpable here this is my mia culpa moment. This is a screen graph taken from a video which WWF put together riding on the vogue at the moment to try to encourage commitment by diversity conservational on the basis of its financial value.

Studies of simply flashing dollar signs up on the screen leads people then socially em.... looked to be less likely to help other people. So there is a real potential collateral cost, collateral damage associated, I think, with this sort of message.

Here is the Government’s response to it, the Westminster’s response to it. Although there is, I spotted this on the train, there is a Scottish Flag down there I am sorry about that it is not entirely impartial. But ? press release that hidden value of nature of value revealed in ground breaking study, the true value of nature can be shown for the very first time thanks to ground breaking research which reveals that nature is worth billions of pounds to the UK economy.

Something which percolates into public debate. I know, for example, because I read on the front page of The Metro in London that there is a plane tree in Mayfair which is worth £800,000. This isn’t a perspective which can sort of be hermetically within Government Policy Circles.

But don't just think about the environment. The values that that type of communication connects with and over the course of time will reinforce, are precisely the sort of values which David Cameron and Nick Clegg in their introduction to the Schools White Paper tapped into and over time would reinforce in the context of education.

This is what they said, the first two sentences the Foreword to the White Paper – So much of the education debate in this country is backward looking, have standards fallen? Have exams got easier? These debates will continue. But really matters is how we are doing compared with our international competitors, that is what will define our economic growth and our countries future.

An estanciation of a set of values which were inimical to a strengthening of environmental concern and also inimical it seems to strengthening a set of social concerns. Therefore, the impact of this may in many terms be parallel to the impact of communications which tend to focus singularly on the commercial value of em... by adversity.

This would likely have an impact on public attitudes towards the environment, much in the way by diversity evaluations are communicated may have an impact on public attitudes towards education policy or other policies.

So that is how we talk.

What about what we do?

I just want to em... well this is a quote from a guy called Richard Titmuss, who did some work in the late 60s on the impact of paying people to donate blood. He did a

comparative study in the UK were people were unpaid and in the US were people, in some states at least, were paid to donate blood.

He concluded that the way in which society organises and structures its social institutions, and particularly its health and welfare systems, can encourage or discourage the altruistic in man. Such systems can foster integration or alienation.

A sentiment or an insight which I think is exactly echoed by something Margaret Thatcher said on the second anniversary of her election she was interviewed by the Sunday Times in 1981 she said - It isn't that I set out on economic policies it is that I set out to really change the approach. And changing the economics is a means of changing that approach. If you change the approach you are really at the heart and soul of the nation. Economics are the methods, the object is to change the heart and soul.

I think, at one level an admission of what is inevitable. Of course, economic policy has an impact on who we are, who we see ourselves as being. But it is perhaps unusual to hear a politician express that so openly.

So how might that happen? Well just to take one example and I take this example because it is fairly parochial in a sense. It is certainly far removed from a lot of social and environmental policy. Particularly salient issue politically in England at the moment – Planning Law.

Planning Law I think is in many ways an example of a sense of collective responsibility. My collective responsibility, or my obligation not to be able to extend my house in any direction I might like because that might have an impact on other people. So the fact that we live and accept planning policy in some ways reinforces the norm that it is right and proper and normal to consider other people in terms of own em... what we want to do with our own land.

And, in fact, Phillip em.... I don't know how to pronounce that, but I guy who wrote a seminal text on planning theory made much the same point. To become a planning academic is to enter into a world where the common good is raised by the individual. So Planning Policy maybe quite important in terms of shaping values with wider social and environmental implications.

And I take this example also because, a slight aside here, I want to underscore that I don't think what I am saying sort of decomposes neatly onto a left/right spectrum. I think there is a lot in traditional conservative thinking for example that resonates with some of those intrinsic values. A point we made in a report that we wrote with the Centre Right Think Tank called Res Publica. So many of these values up here of true friendship, of helpfulness or forgiveness, honesty or loyalty, or irresponsibleness, seem to resonate quite strongly with traditional conservative perspective.

But back to the planning. Here is what David Cameron said 3 weeks ago, a little less than 3 weeks ago, as a rationale for reopening the Planning Debate in England. "The Nations we are competing against don't stand for this kind of paralysis, the paralysis he was arguing was imposed by a restricted planning policy and neither must we". Something which Paul Goodman, the Editor of Conservative Home was flinging down the gauntlet to much of middle England including massive Tory Councillors and MPs who represent those area.

So I think what we can see is that Cameron was framing the imperative for dismantling planning, or at least making planning more permissive down here, Paul Goodman was reacting, I mean OK he may have been reacting in parts about the value of his own house if his neighbour put up a conservatory or something [laughter] but I think there is more to it than that. I think there are traditional conservative values which are up there.

So I said, I talked about 3 different, and I think quite eclectic policy areas by diversity, conservation and education policy and planning policy and I have deliberately chosen ones which were quite eclectic because the theme that I wanted to draw out is that almost irrespective of a policy area. Peoples' experience of those, both of the way they are communicated and also people that lived experience of living under a government which articulates particular policies, has an impact on our values and, therefore, in turn has an impact on the extent to which, on our collective identity in the extent to which together we want to begin to step up to tackling the social, the profound social an environmental challenges that we confront.

But I want to just in closing, I want to introduce one more here.

All those examples that I gave, when I was speaking about them in terms of the extrinsic values they may have helped to have strengthened in some framings, I was drawing attention to the importance for political importance accorded to GDP or em... International Economic Competitiveness.

And that I think can be traced in part to the primacy that we accord a measure of GDP as an indicator of national progress. I think the primacy that we accord GDP as an indicator of national progress can be seen to percolate through many areas of public debate, many areas public policy. And, in fact therefore, both justifies and propels forward some of those em... the rationale for framing by a diversity conservation in terms of the money that might be made. Education Policy in terms of international competitiveness or Planning Policy again in terms of international competitiveness.

So I want to suggest that actually one of the first places to start if we are going to begin to work, if Scotland for example is going to begin to work towards the type of vision that Kenyon

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Wright was articulating, then maybe national progress indicators isn't such a bad place to start.</p> <p>And there is something serendipitous about this because it seems that those intrinsic values up there, the ones which seems to underpin stronger public concern social and environmental issues. Also to the extent that people hold those to be important they also tend to report a high level of subjective wellbeing. High level of happiness.</p> <p>So it seems that there is a double dividend as it were, in working to strengthen those values. Both in terms of people's report of their own wellbeing and the extent to which we can begin to muster the appetite to step up to environmental and social problems.</p> <p>I think that vision which Kenyon Wright encapsulated there is one which, as I see it as I read it, is routed in those intrinsic values and one which will only really be pursued by asking in the broadest possible of terms – how is it that we em... what is the fabric upon which our collective cultural values are premised. And what is the role political rhetoric and public policy in terms of serving to reinforce those values which infuse this vision.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Burley</p> | <p>Thank you very much indeed Tom that's an outstanding opening presentation.</p> <p>I am, in order to catch up with our time, am going to move straight on now to Professor Chris Spray. We will have a chance as soon as we have had our second speaker to have a panel discussion and any points which either speakers</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | <p>raise should come up then.</p> <p>Chris is going to speak on local governments for Ecosystem Services, Professor Chris Spray is Chair of Water Science and Policy Dundee, formerly Director of Environmental Science. His current research includes Wetlands Ecosystem Services, flood risk, water quality, habitat. And he sits on many and, in fact, he was here today on behalf of an environmental link giving evidence to the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee.</p> <p>Chris</p> | |
| Chris Spray | <p>Thank you very much. Thank you indeed to Aileen and Eilidh for inviting me.</p> <p>Yes interestingly we did sit in a different meeting room earlier on today discussing the Water Resources Bill with that Committee. And the number of times that we actually talked about value of water and about catchment, about participation was really quite heartening.</p> <p>I would like to start actually quite close to home here and that's with the quotation that is undoubtedly my favourite quotation about water and wetlands and because it speaks to values and it speaks to the heart. – “What would the world be once bereft of wet and wildness, let them be left” or “let them be left wildness and wet, long live the weeds and the wilderness yet”.</p> <p>Now that actually was written by an English Jesuit Priest. But were you to borrow through that wall there you will find it engraved in the outer stone of this building and I think that is fantastic. Every time I come in here I look at that as it is written in the stones outside and think – yip this Parliament</p> | |

has its heart in exactly the right place.

So with that, why in heck should we be interested in ecosystem services? I don't suppose that Gerard Manley Hopkins ever did. He was quite good on dappled falcons and wind hovers but he never actually put that through into ecosystem services.

And quite clearly I think the answers are very clear. One is the state of our planet, there is only one I would like stay living on it as I am sure most of us would also do. And what these habitats do for us and indeed for our wellbeing and that the crux of this, the services the ecosystem services that they provide.

I am going to say a little bit about the UK's National Ecosystem Assessment which was actually paid for by the Scottish Government as well, I am pleased to say, fully signed up member thereof, and what's causing this decline.

And then lastly I want to talk about a few strategic options and events and things that are happening in Scotland to show that we are moving towards an Ecosystem approach.

So let's start with the doom and gloom if you like, which is the world wetlands and wildlife are clearly disappearing however you want to look at it, whether you are a Mekong Dolphin or anything else.

And the WWF have over the years provided us with a depressing but accurate index of change of species and of what is happening to our planet.

And in 2005, we had the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment the beginning if you like of this very active debate about

ecosystem services that really highlighted this.

And wherever you go you can quite clearly see that habitats are physically disappearing. You don't have to worry about anything else, you can measure this from the maps, this the Aral Sea in 40 years shrinking to that small area of blue.

But what is important is not just that the Aral Sea is going by diversity but it is that ecosystem that is dependent upon it. It's the goods, it's the services, it's the livelihoods. It is those fishing boats that are there that no longer have any fisherman that have got to go somewhere else, that are migrating themselves to somewhere else to try and find a livelihood of their own.

And that is the key point, it is loss by adversity, it is loss of wildlife that is really happening at a major scale and sometimes we can see it and in many cases we can't.

But you might argue that there are lots of legal protection out there and indeed there is and Wetlands have had some of the best protection since the Ramsar Convention globally for many, many years for decades. And that cascades down through the European Directives to where we sit right now here in this Parliament. And there are some very good aspirational Acts of Parliament, that again we were discussing this morning, that talk to holistic looking catchments, that talk to climate change, that talk to the whole idea of getting people involved and increasing to Eco systems and I might have added the marine one there as well and the eco system approach.

And yet despite all of that, and it has been there quite a long time, things continue to disappear. So clearly whatever it is we value and however we do it, we are not actually stopping that rot, we are not stopping the loss of habitat and here is just again some stuff taken from NASA looking at Lake Chad

gradually disappearing.

And the critical thing is that along with it goes, as I said, those livelihoods. Whether it is the fish, whether it is fibre and the flax and the Phragmites, that is probably Papyrus actually looking at it from here, or whether it is the flamingos, they are all disappearing.

And this isn't something that just occurs in foreign places. This is early data from SEPA apologies it will be updated since then. Clearly how we measure our own ecological status of our own environment here shows that whilst nearly 50% of it is in good or high ecological condition status the rest of it isn't and indeed small parts of it are in very poor, or very bad condition. And we know why those as in those poor condition and we are working towards trying to actually counter all of that.

So this isn't something that is just happening elsewhere, and again I would remind you, we live in a country, I have to often explain to international students I am talking about, but 100 years ago we had removed 95% of our forest cover, that is a fairly amazing thought, we are planting an awful lot back I am pleased to say. But we really have dramatically changed our environment in a way that has had a huge impact on us.

I didn't actually put a picture of a Swan in this one, there is one later for those who are waiting for it, but actually, of course, there are some major successes in all of this and we mustn't forget that, this isn't all about doom. But even then actually there are clashes of Ecosystem Services, and those of you who are reading the papers this week will have looked at Scottish Natural Heritages plans in Orkney to try and deal with potential conflict there. Not of Barnacle Geese which we are a world success for but actually in this case, Graylag Geese. And there are clashes here between production from farmers and the inherent by diversity of these species. So there are successes and even occasionally our successes give us

challenges.

So what does this matter to us? Well clearly it is because habitats are what ecosystems are embedded in and that is what is producing, what we want to call services and ultimately that's what we rely on, that's our wellbeing.

And this diagram which has been loved and copied many, many times the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, basically tries to explain in this new language, which is difficult, about how it works in the new view, in the new vision. We look at our habitats and we look at the services that they provide and some of them are supporting that is the pollination, that's the soil formation, the primary production, the things you cannot do without. And then that provides for us the other services. And the key ones we are very aware of the provisioning ones, the ones that provide us with food and fibre and fresh water and fuel and a few other.

And then there are a whole series which are regulating. If you think about it the environment actually regulates climate, it regulates our flooding, it has an impact on water quality.

And then there is the spiritual, the cultural, the values, if we were talking to a group let's say in Australia somewhere like Ayers Rock has a value that isn't measured in provisioning, or regulating, or supporting, or economics. It's spiritual. It has got a value that is absolute inherent in all of us.

And together those help to produce these first constituents of wellbeing, whether it is security, whether it is actually basic material for good life, for building with, for eating, whether it is health, or whether it is our mental health and our good social relationships. And all of those, if you are very lucky, you have the freedom of choice and action as to how you access those. Many people don't have that freedom of choice

and action to how they access it.

So Ecosystems approach and the approach to land use as a concept what is really new about this, what you have to get if you like is that this approach extends consideration of the function of the system how the habitats work to the benefits that you and I actually get from it. We are part of the environment, we are part of this planet, we are a very dominant part of this planet. And it is through those processes that have been nicely divided up in this way into provisioning, regulating, supporting etc.

And the focus of this whole new approach to thinking about the environment is to actually then focus on planning of options for the future, let's try and control and think about what option we have. Let's have some scenarios and ultimately that comes down to what you and I value when we make choices for. You can't buy an alternative for air, what do you do when water runs out? You can't exactly dilute it.

Beyond all of that there is also the realisation that we must be looking for multiple benefits. This is not the silos, indeed that was mentioned earlier on in our introduction. It is about recognising there are multiple benefits and there are different people, different stakeholders and they wish to understand and they wish to be like look and recognise these multiple benefits.

So we are now talking about trying to map these Ecosystem Services which is the real complex idea. But ultimately again what comes through all of this is the need to understand you have got to involve local communities, you can't do that just from on high because it is their values on whether they wish to play the game, whether they wish to participate in participative management and it is their scenarios that is going to take us forward.

Just to be clear, what do we mean by provisioning services? Well it is these things, it's the food, the fibre and they are market driven, they are market costs and very typically they are what we have valued in the past because it is quite clear and easy to do so. But that field which is probably potatoes doesn't produce a lot else other than potatoes. It probably produces a nightmare run off when it rains in terms of sediment load and nutrients going into the water courses. It is not a great landscape from my personal value, I am sure some people think it is lovely. But it is obviously not doing a lot of other things in terms of Ecosystem Services. So there is an imbalance there. We have put a lot of market values and we have done very well, very well at improving provisioning services, we are feeding an ever increasing world.

The same for dams the produce hydro electricity but they also change entirely the whole sediments movements down the catchment. The stop migration of fish going past it. They have huge ecological impacts.

Then you have regulating services – this is an example here of flood regulation but that is a non market service, we don't really pay for that, you don't buy and sell, yet, flood regulation. This is the River Erne doing what it should do, flood on its flood plate, you can see the beanders that is exactly what it should do. There are a lot of nutrients going in there as well.

And a well manage Ecosystem helps in terms of regulating that, when it is not a where we build in the wrong place we have a lot of disruptive problems in terms of life and property.

And the difficult one is the Cultural Services. Occasionally we can put money on these. So it is a well known study in the Tweed that puts a figure of £18million of the annual value to the Tweed, the Scottish Borders and 512 jobs I think it is, dependent upon salmon and salmon running up that river.

But for a lot of other people it is actually just values that have existent values. You don't actually know the value of a Swan, and not even I can give it to you. I know how much they weigh but that is about it. We know how many there are. But there are an awful lot of people who still value swans in lots of way and I don't just mean the Queen.

But there is recreation, there is tourism, there is landscape. Just think the Whisky Industry trades on our landscape, our tourism trades on our landscape these are critical areas and yet they are non market we don't see them in the planning.

So the things to remember from all of that really is that it is the land use and the habitats that have the influence by diversity that, therefore, influences the Ecosystem Services and ultimately the economic value, the spiritual value as we get out of it. So they underpin everything and globally and nationally as I have said we radically changed what we have got here, largely to try and improve our take from those provisioning services.

So what about the UK National Ecosystem Assessment? Well it tried to do, or it did do in fact 4 different things in particular. It provided a high level, if you like, doomsday book account of where we are with the current status and trends. And it tried to do that for Ecosystem Services, most of what we measure is not services in fact, and it described the key factors, the key drivers whether economic or social there affecting us. And it looked to the future and it actually set up a series of scenarios going forward. And looked at response options, what should we be doing right now? And key it valued it and it recognised that there are a whole load of things, you are a clever economist, you can put a value on. You can ask people the willingness to pay, or forgone and things like that.

But then it also tried to do an non economic valuation where it

actually tried to work out what we meant by “wellbeing” and how that could be added in one way or another.

For those who don't know it, it deals with 8 very, very broad Ecosystems. And I am going to speak mainly about wetlands because I feel rather more competent to do so than anything else.

And the other things the reason for talking about wetlands is, we sit in Scotland here 90% of the volume of fresh water in Great Britain is in Scotland, 70% by service area.

We have got the largest loch, the biggest lochs, the deepest lochs, we have got the largest river, the Tay has a discharge equivalent to the Severn and the Thames added together.

And then we have got hugely important peat bogs at the top the Uplands Peat which must be included in here, memoed to the Committee earlier on today but also Lowland Raised Bogs as well. So we have got a fantastic resource there in terms of Wetlands.

But what we have been challenge is to think of these differently. Not to think of them as so many acres of Peat Bog or so many kilometres of rivers, or so many Lochs but actually about the multiple benefits and the integrated nature in which they fit in the landscape. So think of the whole catchment the whole landscape. And you have got the peat bogs – what do they do? Well they are holding carbon, carbon sequestration really important. You have got forests and you have got wetlands actually helping hold water up as it comes down the catchment as it goes down there. You have got nutrients and contaminations being caught up and being held there and you have obviously got vitally important food supply from the food chains.

So this is looking at them and valuing the environment in a very different way and it is a very difficult one for us to do. Because traditionally what we have done is we have measured states, we have measured the number of invertebrates, the number of areas where we damaged the environment, the level of a certain chemical and we can go and we have monitored wetlands, the best monitor of anything else in the United Kingdom any particular habitat. And we can show what the state is of all of these but we can say very much actually, yet, about the Ecosystems and the services that are flowing from them.

There is an assumption and there is a lot of research going on that a good state equals a good ecosystem flowing from it but we are not very good at actually knowing quite well good goes to bad in this case.

So if you look at that and you look at what has come out of the Wetland Assessment for Ecosystems from the UK and Scotland is here, it is very, very clear that in our own country here that the many, many, many of our lakes provide a lot of services, that the rivers, the ponds. But the benefits a very inadequately identified and valued, they are not providing things like a field for wheat does.

Clearly they are also very fragmented within the landscape and that is a huge challenge to people trying to regulate and trying to improve them. And there is probably no completely pristine, we are not pretending to go back to the wild and the wilderness with nothing at all we are part of this community ourselves and we have an impact but there are very few, if any, complete pristine areas.

And there is a real challenge here to scientists in the sense that as I said there is huge uncertainty in this about how ecosystem services are really related to the structure. If you have got an ecosystem with 15 species and we lose one, does the ecosystem service that it is producing decrease by $1/15^{\text{th}}$ or is

it OK to take 2 out or 3 out. And at what point does the ecosystem suddenly collapse and go to a tipping point where you can go back. Unknowns we just really don't know and that makes it very difficult to take forward.

But despite that we know that they produce lots of benefits and yet they have been heavily degraded. And our approach to date as I said in terms of classification of mapping and managing doesn't actually take into account all of these other things that these wonderful Wetlands are doing for us.

So really just to sum up on that side. I mean it is quite clear that by diversity and the extent and the quality of UK habitats have been seriously declined over decades it is not new. And the provisioning services have increased substantially and that is fantastic, I mean that is very good and that is to the credit of the agricultural lobby and the agricultural production. I mean lobby the agricultural production and scientists and farmers, the increase is actually spectacular.

But it is at the expense of other services which we haven't really valued, they are non market and it has resulted, as we have seen in conversion of a lot of semi natural habitat over exploitation of resources and the North Sea would be another example, if you like, in terms of the number of cod that are left there. The potential introduction of pests increased levels of pollution and climate change is only going to make this harder.

So why then are we still losing and degrading our wetlands. I mean at every level clearly population growth and economic development is a key driver in that top right hand graph is population growth there.

At a more immediate level it is clearly that land use is driving this, its nutrient enrichment, its invasive species that are coming in, it is over harvesting and over consumption and its

climate change.

But I would actually argue that when we start thinking about this in a different way, referring perhaps to what Tom was talking about, one of the real reasons is we are getting very, very remote from the environment and by diversity and we have lost that local governance and local feeling.

If I were to ask you where the water from here came from and once you have said Scottish Water and I had asked you again where it came from. I mean how many of you would actually recognise that that is probably from the Tweed? And that the reservoirs at the top of the Tweed take their water, it doesn't go down the Tweed, large chunks of it comes down a pipeline by gravity which is very neat, down the Eddleston and into Fairmilehead and actually Edinburgh relies on a completely different catchment for an awful lot of its water. I don't think we pay for it in terms of payments for ecosystem services so as a fully paid up member of Tweed Forum I shall demand some of that collection you are going at the end, I will take anything going.

But we have become totally remote from this. So local governance has gone out of the window. You can get sugar snap peas anytime you like, you can have flowers flown in from Kenya, the footprint in terms of water is staggering. And the other thing is we don't value our ecosystem services at all beyond the provision ones.

So if you look at that. Folk now talk about virtual water to try and give you an idea of just how much water we are using without realising it. So that pair of jeans is the equivalent to nearly 11,000 litres of water. A cup of coffee is 104 litres. Indeed if you work it out Coffee is the biggest movement of water about the world. I don't mean actually in a cup, spilled on an aeroplane I mean actually what is embedded in coffee that is then moved around the world.

And clearly there is also a question about how much we use in over consumption and the worrying figure there is perhaps not the 778 from Canada but the 95 from China what that will go up to ditto for India just up above.

So we are very remote from this resource and our value of it. If you walked out of the house today and you left the electricity on the gas on and water on, assuming your house didn't blow up, your bill for two of those would go up dramatically. Your bill in lots of places for the water wouldn't change that is how bad we are valuing it as main issue. I think that is a sort of staggering thought there. And, of course, what is happening we are wasting a heck of a lot of energy moving that water around, pumping it all around the countryside.

You can put, and I am not going to go beyond this though, values onto to ecosystems and the clever environmental economists do this very well. On the left hand side the clever bio physical scientists can tell you all about water flowing through the catchments and everything else. But on the right hand side you have got the people, the well being the values there so they are trying to do that. And if you do add that up what I want to show is you can actually show and studies have shown that the value of certain environmental activities, like shrimp farming, is way, way more if you leave them in the natural state and they do all these other things as opposed to if you convert them into provisioning.

So what should our responses be then finally? Well the UK NEA identifies a whole range of possible responses in terms of policies and sectors. And there is also the question about how you balance different Ecosystem Services.

In coming out of this in Scotland there are a whole range of issues, and I think we are doing really well here. I put three in red I don't wish to say anything about river base and management plans they are going very forward and they are

having a lot of work being done on them.

But there is Rural Land Use Study which is going to have a look at the ecosystem approach and there is the potential for a series of pilot catchments. What we want is not people like me and Tom talking about this but actually evidence how you measure what happens on the ground.

And, therefore, I think the Rural Land Use Strategy provides us with a wonderful opportunity to do this, to apply an ecosystem approach. So as I said we have got some very good legislation there.

And I will flip through these quickly.

They focus very much on a new approach, talks about partnership with nature, it talks about public bodies encouraging, participation and it builds on existing initiatives. And there are fantastic initiatives there. The one I know best of all is the one going on in the Scottish Borders where they built upon a whole load of thinking about a different vision for water and wetlands and they have actually come up with a whole series of maps now. Starting with habitat maps because that is the basis for all of this and a large scale 5000 square kilometres. They are building a partnership, they are mapping indicative ecosystem services. They are involving people in doing it.

And this is the sort of thing that they are coming out with. This is a map of water regulation, a very draft one in the Borders. There is one for agricultural provision, there is one for soil carbon.

What I can't show you is one for cultural and for values because we haven't yet got there, we don't know quite how to do it but that is what you would like to do. And you would

like to stack all of those up as a planning but actually then is said to you “here is what we value in a different way for this area” and you can come out with opportunity maps on what you might want to do. So that is on a large scale.

Or you can go right down to an individual scale of a very small catchment the Eddleston in the Borders and you can look at just on issue flood risk reduction against anything else. And we have been working there in Dundee with a student who has basically taken a lot of the data there that we have got already, there is no new data taking the flood maps, taking the flood risk areas, looking at the habitat and doing a “what if” what if we were to re-meander the river, what if we were to put a different habitat in there that would improve flood risk reduction i.e. we are going to say that this landscape is going to have an ecosystem services here which is regulating floods and you can play that scenario through and you can look at the ecosystem services that come out of this and the dark and the light just show on the left hand side what would happen to agriculture. And what happens is that agriculture loses out dramatically but flood plain by a diversity and flood defence goes up dramatically. And you can look at that and you can actually go and ask people to score it and the yellow ones there are the productions of agriculture, food and fibre.

And in the constructed scenario our hypothetical one where we put the meanders back and we plant the whole area up with trees to stop the flooding, which works that is what the graph on the bottom actually shows in the model, this hasn't happened by the way.

But what also shows is that whilst that drops down a lot of the other ecosystem services that by diversity the water quality, the flood controls these all go up so you get multiple benefits in this hypothetical answer.

And, of course, what this raises the question is – how in heck do you balance that? And this is where finally you come back

to values. And what that rather awful graph attempts to show you is that at one stage on the left hand side you have a variety of provisioning, cultural, regulating and supporting services. And as we changed and we went through and we went into intensive agriculture clearly the provisioning went up, we got very good at producing what we wanted which was a lot of agriculture. But as a result are supporting and are regulating and our cultural went down.

And while we sit here now, we talk about a new future we are actually just talking values, what would we like. We know how to do this as bio-physical scientists we could put those rivers back in, we can plant things. But what are the values? What do you want?

Because if we reduce those provisioning ones then we have got to get the food from somewhere else and are we just hijacking our problem and our value and saying – we are going to fly it in from Kenya or somewhere else so that we can have the service that we want. So actually the balance of services at the end is a matter for local governance and it is a matter for local values. It is back to where Tom came in.

So I will finish with this one, it is what do we hope we have learned from that quick run through? Well I think what we have tried to do is we have tried to show that looking a Wetlands in a new way we want to value for what they do for us but what they also do within the landscape. And you have got to do this at a landscape scale you can't just do this for an individual field, life is too connected. And for water that is quite nice because we can talk about catchments as long as we don't worry too much about ground.

We need to clearly aim for multiple benefits, it is no good just going for one. You could have costs paid for by other people. Payments for ecosystem services I haven't gone into that. You clearly have to involve society in your solution because I am wanting a value balance at the end I need a democratic

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>mandate to do that I can't just do it on that.</p> <p>So it is massive partnership approach also needed in all of this and that will ultimately preserve the economic vitality of communities and their environment and I think that is the key message.</p> <p>Thanks very much.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Can I ask now we will go straight into our panel session so can I ask Jan and Susan to come up and join us here. Our two speakers are now joined by Professor Jan Webb who is going to be immediately on my left. Now Jan is a Social Scientist in the University of Edinburgh, she was a member of the RAC Enquiry on Facing Up to Climate Change. Her current work is on energy, policy and politics, including local energy systems.</p> <p>Susan Davis is SNH Director of Policy and Advice. Her main areas of responsibility include being Programme Director for Bio Diversity Action in the Sea, Wildlife Management and the Social and Economic Development Programmes.</p> <p>So that is your panel.</p> <p>First can I ask because I truncated it earlier, are there any particular points of clarification that anyone would wish to put to Tom or Chris on their presentations? Just any points of clarification. Please show your hands we have got two roving microphones that will go round.</p> <p>Any points of clarification to either of them.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>OK so any more general questions to the panel.</p> <p>Who would like to start me off?</p> | |
| Male | <p>I have got a question for the first speaker it relates spacial diagram of values were you were showing how the relative em... the clustering em...</p> <p>I guess the reason for asking the question is because I feel that the values, and in particular the contrast between those em... motivations for the individual. If you think of a farmer, for example, in terms of the ecosystem pressures on provisioning services as opposed to regulating or whatever.</p> <p>I am sorry I forgot the 3rd category em.... but it comes back to how we view what values we hold as intrinsic values or extrinsic values and so from that point of view I would be interested, from the survey materials that you used to produce that schematic, are there any patterns which place greater or lesser emphasis on the particular values which are expressed on that diagram? So is independence, for example, does that feature very heavily in terms of people's thinking relative to em.... and another one is – are these patterns do they vary with geography, do they vary with social context, are there things we can learn there from how we might achieve a balance.</p> <p>Intuitively you might expect it to be evenly spread across the piece but I suspect it is not. I suspect it changes with time.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | <p>Any other questions around that theme of Tom's presentation?</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| David Hawkey | <p>David Hawky from the University of Edinburgh.</p> <p>I thought it was a very interesting presentation about the role of political discourse in framing values. But I was left with the impression that that political discourse was em.... where there was a degree of kind of autonomy to it and I just wondered whether there is em... there is some more thinking to be done about why so much political discourse is framed in terms of trying to translate issues into monetary values. And I suppose not only monetary values but the various kinds of extrinsic values that you talked about.</p> <p>And I wondered if there are two kind s of areas that they might sort of push in that direction are the sort of the increasing scientific em... understanding and awareness of the environmental limits that human activity is facing up against.</p> <p>But also sort of the globalised nature of capital flows and the role of the nation statement in trying to manage those and that putting pressures towards a discourse of sort of competitive nation states.</p> <p>So I just wondered if you would be able to sort of reflect on the determinacy of those types of political discourses?</p> | |
| Tim Birley | Tom | |
| Tom Crompton | <p>Thank you two really interesting questions.</p> <p>Sorry I missed your name but absolutely yes.</p> <p>It seems that at a cultural level you can identify particular values that are of greater importance, in fact, if we had had</p> | |

more time I could have shown you distribution of values in the UK. And it seems there that it is those intrinsic values which most people hold to be more important benevolence and Universities and self direction, which in some ways is kind of counter-intuitive perhaps. But what is really interesting is that when you ask people what their own values are, what they hold to be important they say those intrinsic values.

When you ask them what you think other people take to be important, they say the extrinsic values, which suggests either that most people are adopting a set of values which they see in some way as being counter-cultural perhaps. Or somewhere anyway a bias creeps in there which may have something to do with the values we choose to highlight it and build upon.

I take real heart from that. It seems even that those people who are more extrinsically em... still hold the intrinsic values to be more important it is just that the difference between them is a little more squeezed.

David – to your question. I mean it is absolutely em.... that's it's absolutely a key where in this circle do we best intervene.

What I was hoping to demonstrate was that government and policy makers inescapably have an impact on cultural values. That some are aware of that, that some aren't but that we would all be better off if we were more publicly aware of that and aware of the mechanisms by which that influence is excerpted.

But I hope that I didn't at any point infer that I was imagining that it was entirely within the gift of political leaders to bring intrinsic values more to the fore and I see there a crucial role, for example, from the Third Sector, I see a crucial role from business. I think so much of the CSR debate at the moment about business responsibilities focused on the material impacts

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>sort of businesses has.</p> <p>At Unilever for example can go to great lengths to green its supply chain in terms of sourcing more sustainable palm oil but it is advertising Lynx Deodorant in a way which may actually serve to reinforce a set of values which does more environmental harm than they do good through their direct environmental programmes – hypothetically.</p> <p>So I think hard questions need to be asked of business and the multi/various ways in which business impacts on values. And, of course, right down to individuals as well.</p> <p>So where in that circle do you begin to intervene I don't know but I suppose we need to be intervening at all those points but absolutely there are opportunities for political leaders to begin to seize the initiative I think.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | Joan do you want to comment on that as someone who is involved governance issues? | |
| Joan | <p>I think em....</p> <p>I am very much in agreement with the kinds of points that Tom has been making but perhaps we could add that the prospect of the point of intervention could be at regional level amongst local governments, municipal authorities where I suspects local politicians are very well connected to the important issues in their areas, things that matter to their local constituents.</p> <p>And also are facing perhaps the most difficult period of their recent lives certainly as councillors and elected representatives in severe cuts in public services and public spending. And yet having also to deliver perhaps significant change in their local</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>economies and to find a means of rebuilding local economic strengths.</p> <p>So I would suggest there is an opportunity that perhaps we are not using to best effect at present in trying to enable local governments to take em... to give greater discretion to local government, to raise more funding locally and to rebuild local economies in ways that would also value those local environments that Chris Spray spoke about.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | OK we have got another two questions on that side and then I will come to the other side. | |
| Female | <p>Antje Brown from the University of Aberdeen</p> <p>You mentioned Reo + 20 before and you mentioned local government involvement and all this reminds me of themes that I have come across before. Such as local agenda 21 and the first Reo Conference of 1992 and so forth.</p> <p>And I have also studied and taught on intrinsic values and extrinsic values at the Holistic perspective or approach that we are hoping to achieve.</p> <p>Can you tell me whether we are right now just reinventing the wheel or whether we are actually developing something new here that moves away from the monetary values to perhaps a different approach or a different perspective on sustainability?</p> <p>Because sustainable development Broadland report and so on has existed the whole principle has existed for quite some time now and I am here to hear whether we are in the process of developing something that is perhaps more effective. Because when we look at em... environmental qualities, not just in Scotland but elsewhere, have we seen some proper progress</p> | <p>Didn't have micro at the beginning</p> <p>1.13.18</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| | <p>and have our ideas been effective or put into practice effectively.</p> <p>So that is my question</p> | |
| | | |
| Tim Birley | Was there another one behind? | |
| Mark Hudson | <p>Mark Hudson from Edinburgh Napier University.</p> <p>I am a Wetland Scientist and I am involved in trying to put economic value on some of those ecosystem services. And the reason that I am doing that, along with I think most ecological scientists, is not because we think those monetary values actually represent anything real about the ecosystem but it is because our experience is that nobody listens to us if we talk about giga tons of carbon, or other ecological processes.</p> <p>So it is a tactical move by ecologists to try and get people to listen to us. It is a worrying possibility that that tactical move is self defeating but I recognise that that is a possibility so I am kind of interested from those people who are privileged to spend their time talking about policy, which I am not I am a humble scientist, whether actually politicians and policy makers really need to speak about money all the time, which is the impression that we get on the other side. Or maybe that is a tactical mistake that we are making as scientists.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | <p>I shall take another one from this side.</p> <p>At the back</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | |
| Charlie Woods | I think related to that I suppose more specifically to what extent do we need to rebalance the tax system so that you are reflecting the taxation of things you don't want as opposed to the taxation of things you do want in trying to link the value of the ecosystems with the values that you are calculating for them. | |
| Tim Birley | <p>Thanks very much</p> <p>Chris do you want to answer</p> | |
| Chris Spray | <p>I will start on that last one.</p> <p>I think you are absolutely correct. I mean we live obviously in a society where the cap is one of the most important things as in the Common Agricultural Policy about half the whole budget for the European Union and clearly what happens on our land is driven by subsidy and to a lesser extent by incentives.</p> <p>That balance between what we want from a public point of view and what we expect to get from the market is absolutely key to changing things.</p> <p>I mean the hypothetical example we gave is just that it is hypothetical. We weren't doing it. We have been talking with farmers about what it might take for them to change what they are doing now to something else. And it is that whole role of where we put incentives and where we put the opposite I guess the taxes one way or another.</p> <p>I think the other thing well I got this just talking to em... the comment from I forgot your name from Edinburgh Napier.</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>The key I think is not so much that em... ecologists or environmentalists shy away from, or don't shy away from trying to put economics on this.</p> <p>It is that if one goes out and talks with local communities they don't necessarily see life in that way so one tries to get a "bottom up" view of what they would like the landscape to look like by GIS participatory means or wherever else.</p> <p>You have a very different debate. I think that starting points gives a very interesting light which I think is very difficult then, I agree with your entirely, to mesh with the "top down" economic green treasury book view of life.</p> <p>I think that is what we have to move to, to try and think our way through and the way that you gain the aid is to actually say well what are the options, what are the scenarios you would like us to go towards as opposed to saying what the costs are straight away. It is difficult.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>It seems to me that the central issue that is coming out in the discussion is putting values on things in a monetary sense that nobody listens unless there is money expressed and yet that may as Tom set out, have a negative impact and be shooting ourselves in the foot.</p> <p>Susan you are a policy maker, do you find that in the fields for which you are responsible being able to put a monetary value on things is seen as critical to effective delivery of policy.</p> | |
| <p>Susan</p> | <p>I think there is a need to have the balance in terms of the range of values that we are actually attaching. We certainly found that being able to put an economic value on some of the</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>contribution that National Heritages makes to the economy is a powerful communication tool for us and helps actually to mainstream some of what we are trying to achieve for the natural environment into other policies and actions. But there is a risk associated with that as well so it is important to also understand some of the social and cultural values associated with that.</p> <p>So I think what we are looking to do and we do through the development of an actual capital index is to actually bring those range of values together to show what the contribution actually is.</p> <p>If I can maybe also just make a remark in terms of the question that was raised about whether or not this is a new approach or whether we are just reinventing the wheel. I think it is a little bit of both. Everything that has happened before isn't bad and shouldn't be thrown out but I think we are learning from that and building on that.</p> <p>I think that it is important that in the context of Scotland we have got a wide range of policies and frameworks and strategies now and the key things for us to do, and Chris was starting to draw some of that out, is turn that into really making things happen on the grounds and at the right spacial scale at the right scale where you can bring in community involvement, where you can see what the range of values are.</p> <p>So I think the challenge we have all got to rise to is actually making things happen on the ground now.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Tom you had some of those comments impinged on what you presented.</p> | |
| <p>Tom Crompton</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |

Is this anything different to sustainable development? Em... I don't know I think it depends how widely sustainable development is construed.

My starting point I suppose is that from the position of bad news is that I don't see the prospect for us being able to tackle climate change by working solely on climate change. But for that matter I don't see the possibility of us being able to tackle problems of social mobility by working solely on social mobility.

And the good news is that I think when you view these things through the lens afforded by values you find that actually those synergies between the ways in which you would, at a systematic level, begin to engage those two sets of problems.

I don't know whether that is em.... I think that is probably an extension at least of what we usually mean by sustainable development.

And Mark your point is really well taken and I am aware of it I speak to a lot of economists who do what you do and who make the same point that this is tactical. And certainly what I was em.... I don't want us to focus unduly on putting a financial value of by a diversity. Of course, in the grand scheme of things in terms of what collectively we hold to be important simply desisting from leading as ?did in their press release on the financial value attached to by diversity is going to be a drop in the bucket, it is going to make very little difference.

What I was trying to em... the argument I was trying to construct was that looked at across the board to see a very wide range of ways across very wide range of different policy interventions where we pick at and reactivate the sense that it

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>is a set of financial concerns which takes pre-eminence over others. And that I think we need to begin to work systematically to reverse.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks very much</p> <p>Quite a lot of hands going up.</p> <p>I have got one in the front here and one at the back where you are I will take those two.</p> | |
| <p>Alan Hampson</p> | <p>I mean the ecosystem services the language I mean it is highly seductive at one level. I mean it provides us with the basis for making that links between the natural environment and wellbeing.</p> <p>I think the challenge really is, and the test ultimately is – how well we can make it relevant at a practical level. I mean I think that is particularly true in relation to land managers.</p> <p>There has been some talk of public interventions in terms of tax regimes and incentives and all the rest of it but I mean you always get more out of a willing horse and I wonder to what extent there has been thinking about that side of things.</p> <p>To take a practical example if there are to be political focus areas delivered as part of the reform of Pillar 1 of the CAP how can we encourage farmers to view them in a positive way rather than them being seen as a restriction on the production.</p> <p>I mean perhaps positive in terms of some of the challenges and issues that farmers themselves face, defuse pollution, increasing fertilisers costs etc. So it is really is em.... I</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>suppose my question is about how can we, at a practical level, engage with those who have greatest influence on the sort of the services that are being delivered.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks Alan</p> <p>David here in the front</p> | |
| <p>David Sommerville</p> | <p>My name is David Sommerville from the University of Edinburgh.</p> <p>I have been fascinated this evening to see these two, Tom you used the term lens, to almost polarised view points or perspectives being shared with us. And it is almost like there are two languages, two em... it is like French and German or some completely different language is being spoken here.</p> <p>I am slightly concerned myself in this Parliament where policies are evolved and changed and developed. Or em... turn it into a question – Is anybody else worried that the single purpose of government, or the over-riding purpose of government in this government and the last one is sustainable economic growth which is this rather curious em... mantra.</p> <p>And by bringing everything down and commoditising nature are we not em... are the politicians failing us and are policy makers failing us because they are not actually addressing those intrinsic values, which Tom set out his case for, and are we in danger of em... I would echo what Mark is saying, are we in danger of simply commoditising everything and then everything can be sold.</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Let's take those two because they are both big questions.</p> <p>One is about how to engage at a practical level with ecosystem services</p> <p>And then the other is – are we talking, do we have two languages being spoken with our two presentations and is the single purpose of government sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>How do you react to that Chris?</p> | |
| <p>Chris Spray</p> | <p>I will start with the first one.</p> <p>I think the answer to Alan's point is fundamentally one has to understand farming businesses and how they operate as well as farmers, the two obviously are interlinked.</p> <p>If one wishes to change what we get out of our landscape whatever reason one still has to have the ability as a farmer to have a long term view to have, you know, a farming business that works.</p> <p>And if you take, for example, the instance the hypothetical one of the flood line that we converted to forest. If you actually did that in the farms, in the valley where we were hypothetically working, although you took 10% of farm you actually completely removed the viability of the farm because it was a fundamental part of the farming system.</p> <p>So until you actually understand that one can't actually start thinking about ecosystem services and flows because it is so critical. So I think the only way one can get into that is to</p> | |

work with the farmers and their businesses to see how and what it will be that encourages them to change. You are quite right. And it is back to this debate between what the public is paying for and what the private i.e. the market should pay for.

The language one – I don't think we are actually that dramatically speaking different languages, or I hope we weren't, if so, I have failed both in French, Germany, Gaelic and English in one go there.

The key thing that it comes down to it is however much one tries to commoditise nature, one still ends up with value decisions and that hypothetical graph I gave you know of the ultimate point – how far do we restore the environment. That's fundamentally in a democracy a value decision because our farmers for instance vote for the government or local authority who decide that they are going to take all their productive wheat fields and turn them into forests to stop floods or something else like that. So it is a value.

I quite agree the concern of just saying that one can monetarise everything worries me intently because, as I said, there is difficulty to find an alternative to things like pollination and water and fairly important things like that.

And people among them who may have huge intrinsic beliefs and values that will irrationally place above all sorts of other things. And most of us are irrational, I am pleased to say in terms of how we make economic decisions and makes life for economists very, very difficult.

So I don't think we are speaking fundamentally different languages. We maybe using, I quite agree, some horrible terms about the ecosystem services and going back to our colleague from Edinburgh Napier I think the more that we can produce costs as opposed maybe to values and comparisons

| | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>the better will go forward.</p> <p>So the alternative would be we could do that with our landscape, we could do this with our landscape. The cost of doing this i.e. £.s.d. is x,y and z for doing it. The value is then something that society wishes to take it em... but I can at least tell you that to convert that forest back into I mean convert that flood lane into a forest would cost X hundred thousand quid and it would save Y hundred thousand pounds in terms of avoiding damage to floods of urban people further down.</p> <p>Whether then that is a value we wish to take forward because we have lost our production of agriculture I think we are now into values and we can't get away from those absolutely but we can get a bit more information as well.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | Janice | |
| Janice | <p>There is perhaps a very well known saying which we have maybe falling into the background which is – that we devised a society where we all know the price of everything but the value of nothing mainly.</p> <p>And there is a huge elephant in the room it is probably in the middle of that table there somewhere that is undoubtedly about the way that, certainly over the last let's say 30 years now in Britain, we have actively stepped back from the kinds of universal value of sharing perhaps politically at least and in public life and in public values. And we have deliberately engineered all kinds of markets across areas of our lives to try to improve, often with the idea of improving the efficiency with which we live. The efficiency with which we use our resources.</p> <p>But, of course, I think as both speakers have show, we have lost a lot, we have lost a lot of the more common</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>understanding of shared value, of public value of the common good in going down that route. Undoubtedly some of us have also benefited we have, as I say, certainly learned the price of everything [laughter] but it is then it needs, amongst other things, some incredible brave politicians I think. And some different thinking.</p> <p>I understand from one of the people in the room that it's the em.... somewhere in this building tonight there is some very active people working on the Scottish Budget for the next period. It actually needs some really difficult decisions about how we use that budget.</p> <p>We have become very good at developing performance measurements, auditing performance but I am not so sure about the substance behind some of those.</p> <p>Just one comment on Tony Juniper as well I am aware that as a former leader of Friends of the Earth in England, Tony Juniper recently was heard saying that he has started using the language of ecosystems services and putting a price on ecosystems because he thinks it is the last chance that we have. So I guess that shows how far we have travelled down that road of putting a price on everything.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks Jan</p> <p>Right we have got some more questions on that side a lot of hands going up.</p> | |
| <p>Dan Barlow</p> | <p>Dan Barlow WWF Scotland</p> <p>Just following upon a point there David made about the preoccupation with sustainable economic growth.</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>I think some credit there for the Government with their National Performance Framework because they have identified a broad range of outcomes that Scottish Government is seeking to achieve.</p> <p>I think the challenges that despite that we still seem to simplify and reduce that sustainable economic growth even although the document itself has a broad range of things that in a sense you want to achieve.</p> <p>The purpose itself says we should be seeking a flourishing Scotland and that is difficult, very difficult to argue against. But that then in most documents reduces to the challenge of the purposes sorry the purposes of systemic economic growth and we see that appearing in lots of consultation documents. The purpose of this consultation on water policy is sustainable economic growth, the purpose of this consultation on the marine environment is sustainable economic growth. And we even see that appearing in the kind of Corporate Strategies or bodies like SEPA and SNH.</p> <p>So my question really is – is that a challenge for SEPA and SNH the fact that it seems that they have to adopt that within their corporate strategies as a purpose of their organisation rather than being protecting the environment or supporting a flourishing Scotland itself.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks Dan</p> <p>Can we take another one in that area?</p> | |
| <p>Louise McDonald</p> | <p>Louise McDonald from Young Scot.</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>I am neither a humble scientist nor a policy maker. I work with young people.</p> <p>I am quite interested in the thinking about, or the rethinking of wellbeing around our young people in Scotland, our children and young people. And also very interested in how we support young people to engage with the environment differently.</p> <p>So there are a couple of things I would be interested in:-</p> <p>One is in terms of what we have been discussing this evening, has there any work been done around young peoples' values, or the point where young peoples' values do they become fixed. I mean it is pretty clear where the influences would come from but where are the opportunities to influence those and have a different conversation with young people around values.</p> <p>But also in terms of this kind of Wellbeing Agenda and thinking about the environment different – where are the kind of opportunities particularly around learning, and I don't just mean in school, young people only spend about em.... less that 40% of their time in school, so where else can we actually kind of do some work about supporting young people to think about the environment in a different way.</p> | |
| Tim Birley | One more right from the back please. | |
| James Trawland | <p>I wrote this down quite a while ago but the speakers have moved on. It was to do with values.</p> <p>John Muir the local guy at this end of the world basically said – the more we find things disconnected they are actually</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>connected. So it is not new.</p> <p>Then we go into a language of total asset management which comes out of the North Sea, where they use tangibles and intangibles. Intangibles is – nobody knows what they are.</p> <p>Then we go into values at community level versus values at government or political parties so it might be a good idea at the bottom to fix the burn, but the government says there is not enough money so therefore, you get down to the sustainability of an urban community or a socially deprived area. So if we are rethinking wellbeing where should we be starting – with you guys or out in the communities?</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks very much</p> <p>Shall we start with Susan because that first question.</p> <p>Do you feel that a body with S&H has to adopt sustainable economic growth as its purpose rather than that being the means because the purpose, of course, is enabling Scotland to flourish?</p> | |
| <p>Susan</p> | <p>I think inevitably with an organisation which is publicly funding it is right and proper that we demonstrate how our work is helping shape and deliver some of the National Performance Indicator Targets. But I think we are also very careful to frame that in terms of the environmental contribution to that and still to recognise the intrinsic value of the environment there.</p> <p>So it is about improving the resilience of the environment, it is about some of the wider values and experience that people get from the environment and also about better places so the social dimension for people living and working in Scotland.</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>So I think whilst the sustainable economic growth agenda is one which we can hang quite a lot of our work, I think when you delve a bit deeper, and I think Dan understands this some of those intrinsic values are still there.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Two other questions</p> <p>One about young peoples' values influence and learning and then with tackling the interconnected nature of values – where do we start? Do we start with social deprivation matters of that kind?</p> <p>Tom do you want to have a go at either of those?</p> | |
| <p>Tom Crompton</p> | <p>I can have a little go.</p> <p>I mean there are at least two people in the room who know far more about education and the link between education and values than I do, Morag Watson and Betsey King. So I am not an educationalist so I really hesitate to jump into this.</p> <p>But it does seem that, as you might anticipate, that peoples' upbringing is particularly important in shaping their values that they are parenting and that their early educational experience is important, that there is evidence, for example, that children who are exposed to more commercial television tend to attach greater importance to extrinsic values.</p> <p>And certainly there are things that might be done to help to redress that. There is, I find it em.... really em... it really enthuses me that there is growing awareness within the Environment Movement about the importance of nature, what has been called Nature Deficit Disorder, the importance of connecting kids with an natural environment. And I think that is something that more far sighted environmental</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | organisations are going to do well to continue to work with here. | |
| Jim Birley | Issues of social deprivation? | |
| Tom Crompton | Sorry what was the question on social deprivation? | |
| Jim Birley | The question is where do you start with getting the [talking over one another] | |
| Tom Crompton | <p>Oh yes sorry.</p> <p>Well, of course, you start everywhere.</p> <p>I see these challenges as being so interlinked and I hope that nothing that I said in terms of focusing on the opportunities that I see political leaders as having for beginning to reverse the trend for us to seemingly place ever greater importance on extrinsic values.</p> <p>I hope that isn't seen to detract from the importance, of course, of working em.... at a community level as well. Em... we need it all. Yeah</p> | |
| Chris Spray | <p>The first one sustain the economic growth I share Dan's concerns on that indeed we said so this morning in the Environment Link in the Committee Enquiry on the water resources.</p> <p>The economy in Scotland so fundamentally relies on a healthy</p> | |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| | <p>environment. You can do the maths on that one in terms of tourism and salmon and whisky is you want. But I think we are arguing here about intrinsic values as well. So I absolutely share the concern about sustain economic is not the same as sustainable that we need to shout about more often and loud.</p> <p>The young one is a point very well made the only thing I would add to that Louise, is that the way to try and tackle this maybe to look at generational aspects of scenarios going forward. So one of the things you would have to do working with local communities and I think that is the answer to the good point about John Muir.</p> <p>Is if one provides local communities with what the option to say what they would like to have, but not necessarily economically about their environment, what do you want in it, do you want safety security these things about wellbeing. One of the things you have to say is OK think inter-generationally, sustainable development is about intergenerations and I think that is clearly one way of picking up the young folk. How you do it otherwise I don't know my wife would say that I have to mention that she runs a Watch Club and things like Watch Clubs that the Wildlife Trust do are fantastic but that is very small numbers.</p> | |
| Janice | <p>I am not sure how we are doing on time.</p> <p>A last word then is that I would certainly say that arguably the place to begin is with those who have nothing to lose at the present time and we are creating significant groups in Scotland, much less the rest of the UK who have very little to lose from challenging the ways that priorities are currently set and who are desperately going to need ways of being more resourceful in their own communities in the areas that they live in order to get by.</p> <p>Because we are also seeing a bit rebalancing of states around</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>the world and learning that we are a state that is in some deficit, not just in economic but in ecological and perhaps also in social terms and that, therefore, what we are facing is reinventing our own forms of wellbeing. It is a huge challenge but it is also a huge opportunity.</p> <p>And I think in Scotland we have got a vehicle in the Scottish Parliament which was set up with huge aspirations which are potentially within our grasp we can certainly make a significant contribution to that and I hope that we will.</p> | |
| <p>Tim Birley</p> | <p>Thanks Jan</p> <p>Thanks to everyone.</p> <p>I have got impossible and unpopular task of drawing proceedings to a close because I know that there are a lot more questions that people would have wished to ask and I have the challenge of doing so in two minutes.</p> <p>My task was to try and sum up. I have seen sustainable development rise and fall over the years from the kind of high point of the 1992 Rio Summit falling away, coming back again. There is a sense that it is coming back and I think coming back a bit differently. And have others have said there has been something of a learning process so that while we don't want to reinvent what we have already learnt, certainly I think tonight has shown that the challenge of getting smarter understanding of some of the deeper issues about what motivates people and what drives them on.</p> <p>I think we have also heard that we need to be better informed, we need to involve local governance, local understanding, more effective participation.</p> | |

I am very pleased that with Parliamentarians here it hasn't been always for Central Government to do everything but, in fact, it has to be a partnership between the different levels because only they can drill down into local communities and tackle those resources.

Language is also crucially important as we heard from Tom how just presenting something. I hate being called a customer when on a train I am a passenger and that whole linguistic thing that has come in. Which I think is all part of a theme that it is right that we understand the cost of things, economic analysis is very important, but it should not be the sole driver of decision making. And I think that is the key distinction perhaps between sustainable economic growth, which in one sense is a rather limiting concept and Scotland flourishing which, of course, is far, far broader.

So wind up now can I thank you all for participating can I remind you we have two further seminars Thinking About the Economy differently on Thursday 15 November when we have Professor Dieter Helm and Miriam Kennet.

And then they will be thinking about society and communities differently in the new year Wednesday 20 February 2013.

Finally, can I give very sincere thanks to all of our speakers, including Aileen who introduced the session with her own presentation, to the panel who have sat alongside here, to all the organising bodies and the Steering Group, especially to Eilidh MacDonald and Donald Jarvie at Scottish Parliament and to all of you for taking part and attending this event.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | So thanks very much safe journey, good night | |
|--|---|--|