



## **Developing The River Catchment Restoration Fund**

## Workshops Summary Report<sup>1</sup>

## November 19<sup>th</sup>/21<sup>st</sup>, December 7<sup>th</sup> 2024



This report is one deliverable of the FIRNS supported project "Developing a portfolio of river restoration investment packages and delivery support measures for the Source to Sea Fund"

This project is supported by The Facility for Investment Ready Nature in Scotland (FIRNS). Delivered by NatureScot in collaboration with The Scottish Government and in partnership with the National Lottery Heritage Fund.

### 1. Introduction

Three workshops were held to provide stakeholder input to developing The River Catchment Restoration Fund being led by Fisheries Management Scotland (FMS).

Two were in-person workshops. One for south Scotland based stakeholders on 19th November held in Larkhall, Lanarkshire. The other was held on the 21st November held in Inverness for stakeholders from the North.

The two workshops were each run along similar lines with exercises to engage participants repeated for each group of North and South participants.

A third workshop was a shortened online version held on 7<sup>th</sup> December that was held to attract participants who couldn't attend either of the earlier two workshops, including those who were held up from attending the Inverness workshop due to the inclement weather at that time. The online workshop was shortened and designed to provide a summary of the input received from participants in the earlier in-person workshops, and to invoke any further commentary and input to developing The River Catchment Restoration Fund and inclusion in this summary report.

### 2. Workshops' purpose

The workshops were designed to bring FMS members and stakeholders up to date with the development of a River Catchment Restoration Fund and to secure input from FMS members and stakeholders on the Fund's development. This stakeholder input helped to build on the engagement work conducted over the summer to strengthen the fishery management planning process in support of preparing a market-ready pipeline of river restoration focused projects.

• The workshop agenda is included at Annex 1.

### 3. Workshop outputs

In total, 59 participants took part from 33 stakeholder organisations comprising river and fishery trusts, district salmon fishery boards, estate managers, landowners, eNGOs and public agencies

- A full participant list is included in Annex 2.
- The slides used in the workshop are downloadable <u>here</u>. The slide images are available in Annex 3.

A series of sessions were run during each workshop with participants working together to answer questions in small breakout groups. The presentation slides mentioned in Section 2 above provides the context for the workshop sessions. The sessions were as follows;

- Addressing challenges in getting projects to delivery stage
- Desirable characteristics of a river restoration fund
- Necessary requirements of the river restoration fund monitoring framework

• Targeting the fund to corporate contributors

Each of these are addressed in the subsequent sections 3.1-3.5

The workshop sessions were self-documenting with participants making their own notes and comments on prepared templates. Summarised outputs are included in the following sections. Full transcriptions are included in the annexes.

The purpose of the outputs is to use these as a resource to draw from to help inform aspects of the river restoration fund's development.

### 3.1 Addressing challenges in developing deliverable projects

The challenges in developing projects are listed under the "challenge" headings in the table below. These are derived from the summer stakeholder engagement work and represent the most mentioned challenges that are faced while developing river catchment restoration projects. Workshop small groups were each given a challenge and were asked to brainstorm solutions for each. See below for a summary table.

Challenge	Description	Solutions
Organisational capacity	Lack of time and sometimes skillset to develop projects, especially for smaller organisations	<ul> <li>More development funding availability</li> <li>Support for FMS members to acquire more funding</li> <li>Skills building and training</li> </ul>
Effective partnership with SEPA	This challenge was mostly shared in the context of lack of support for barrier removal/easement and water quality enforcement which could undermine benefits from restoration work	<ul> <li>Open engagement, accountability and soft political pressure</li> <li>Build more formal working relationships</li> <li>RBMP 4 as an upcoming opportunity</li> </ul>
Agricultural land use dynamics	Concern from farmers about trade-off with basic payments; impacted by value of surrounding agricultural land; wider cultural difference with how farmers view rivers	<ul> <li>Finding common ground with farmers to build trust</li> <li>Subsidy payment incentives through new Ag Bill</li> <li>Regulation and pressure</li> </ul>

Challenge	Description	Solutions
Suitable available funding	Inflexibility and competition of current funding mechanisms	<ul> <li>Funds to allow bundling of full cost of projects; integrated outcomes</li> <li>Funds to adopt more adaptable mindsets</li> </ul>
Landowner willingness	Alternative land use interests; Not seeing the benefit; Wanting the project to be at least cost neutral	<ul> <li>Education, public hall and onsite events to communicate benefits</li> <li>Use existing Trust/Board relationships with landowners</li> </ul>
Deer management	Undermining native regeneration and growth	<ul> <li>Incentives to reduce deer numbers in an evidence- based way</li> <li>Share best practice examples to get stakeholder buy-in</li> </ul>

Annex 4 includes a full transcription of the workshop outputs for this workshop session.

### 3.2 Desirable characteristics of a river restoration fund

The session was designed for participants to think about characteristics that come to mind when they think about an accessible and high-quality river catchment restoration fund. A summary of the key points is included in the table below:

	Must have	Nice to have	Shouldn't have
•	Baselines & assessment of outcomes/benefits Holistic and flexible funding (full cost recovery, multi-year funding, upfront payments, development cost) Flexible budget spending	<ul> <li>Capacity within the fund to support project teams (dedicated fund manager, application guidance, stakeholder engagement assistance)</li> <li>Community benefits (i.e. education, employment)</li> <li>Maintenance and monitoring costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lengthy application form</li> <li>Onerous or rigid reporting requirements</li> <li>Unachievable outcomes</li> <li>Support poor quality projects with possible negative impact</li> <li>Greenwashing</li> </ul>

	Must have	Nice to have	Shouldn't have
•	Clear benefits for rivers/biodiversity/wider ecosystems		
•	Streamlined & flexible application process		

Annex 5 includes a full transcription of the workshop outputs for this workshop session

# 3.3 Necessary requirements of the river restoration fund monitoring framework

This session focused on the emergent monitoring framework that was in development by a consultant contracted to the project. A short presentation to introduce the monitoring framework was followed by the breakout groups addressing five questions relating to what are the necessary requirements for the river restoration fund monitoring framework? A summary of the results of this exercise follows

### 3.3.1 What outcomes or benefits will investors want to see?

- Business resilience and improved environmental impact (e.g., water quality, biodiversity).
- Positive public perception and enhanced reputation.
- Measurable and tangible impacts, showing success in specific outcomes.
- Alignment with climate change resilience and community/social benefits.
- Simple and relatable messages that are easy to communicate and sell.

### 3.3.2 How prescriptive should the monitoring framework be?

- Needs standardization, but flexibility to accommodate project-specific details.
- Balanced approach, ensuring scalability and adaptability across different projects.
- Should enable comparison across projects but allow for context-specific metrics.
- Monitoring tools and methods should be flexible and based on established methods and aligned to established datasets.
- Monitoring plans and methods should be proportionate in relation to the nature and scale of the projects.

### 3.3.3 Should some methods or indicators always be used?

- For projects that have similar objectives such as water quality improvements, biodiversity, flooding, or barrier removal some standardisation in method selection across similar projects could be beneficial
- Indicators should be project-specific but aligned with national data sets.
- Use of baseline data consistent with datasets that already exist for the river catchment.
- Ensure proportionality in range or complexity of indicators in relation to project scale and objectives.

### 3.3.4 What protocols or templates should FMS provide for monitoring?

- Clear best practice protocols and existing guidance for established methods.
- Digital tools for data collection, presentation, and integration.
- Guidance and principles for consistent monitoring strategies.
- Training and skill-building initiatives for members.
- Ecosystem service calculators to show impact and value for investors.

# **3.3.5** What framework elements/aspects of monitoring contribute most to 'high integrity'?

- Transparent, consistent, and replicable methods across projects.
- Strong baseline data and continuous integration of pre-existing datasets.
- Use of qualified professionals and peer-reviewed techniques.
- Statistically robust design and long-term monitoring, including control sites where required.
- Verifiable reporting that is adaptable to project outcomes.

The full list of workshop groups' outputs from this session are included at Annex 6.

### 3.4 Targeting the fund to corporate contributors

The final session focused on how to market the fund and specifically to draw on participants knowledge of potential contributors to the fund who might be operating in their geographic area, and who FMS might approach for potential funding. The results are include in the following table.

Sector	Interest / Key words	Companies and trade bodies
Aquaculture	Environmental impacts,	Mowi, Scottish Sea Farms, Loch
	(Mowi 3 farms, 2 lochs, 1	Duart, Scottish Salmon
	shore)	Producers, Salmon Scotland,
Whisky	Temperature, image of	Scottish Whisky Association
distilleries	Highlands, whisky, water	

Sector	Interest / Key words	Companies and trade bodies
	security, No clean water no whisky	
Automotive Trade	Mitigation, pollution	Arnold Clark
Shipping		Free Port
Tourism	Ecotourism, habitat quality, aesthetics, wilderness experience, North Coast 500, sustainability, beauty, Loch Ness, canoes	Jacobite cruises, Cobbs Hotels, MacDonald Hotels, Active Highs, In Your Element, Council, tourism groups
Aluminium and steel		
Commercial forestry	Forested area, less deer more trees	RTS, Forest and Land Scotland, CONFOR, Tilhill, Scottish Woodlands
Oil and gas		
Angling	fish abundance	local communities and companies, Andrew Wallace of Fishmongers.
Retail including outdoor equipment shops	ethical production, angling supplies	Tiso, Nevis Sports, Patagonia, Go Outdoors, Mountain Warehouse, British Retail Consortium
Renewables hydro	renewables, use of rivers for hydro and storage, Restoration, mitigation and water quality	SSE, Green Highland, RWE, Eon, SPEN, Northwind Power (offshore), OFGEM, Drax,
Renewables wind	public relations,	SSE, Green Highland, RWE, Eon, SPEN, Northwind Power (offshore), OFGEM
Renewables solar		
High Net Worths	biodiversity crisis, billionaires with a conscience	
Big charities		
Agriculture including dairy	incentives, livestock containment	NFUS, Quality Meat Scotland,
Scottish	Agri-Environment support	
Government		
Developers	infrastructure,	One Group Construction,
Transport	railways, aviation	Scotrail, British Travel Association, DFDS, Network Rail, Calmac, Stena Line; Aberdeen, Glasgow, Inverness and Edinburgh airports; Prestwick Aerospace;
Landowners		Scottish Land and Estates, Church, MOD, Crown Estate.

Sector	Interest / Key words	Companies and trade bodies
Food and drink	venison, beer	Food and Drink Federation
		Scotland, Brewdog, Tennents,
		National (brewing) Association?
Housing		Scottish Association of Landlords
Financial		KPMG,
Services		
Port authorities	dredging	Allied British Ports
Pharmaceuticals		Glaxo Smith Kline, Beechams,
Quarrying		Breedon (Tillycoutry), Hillhouse
		Quarry Group.
Water Company		Scottish Water
Events (sports)	water sports, MTB, golf,	Football clubs,
	sustainable impact 'glow'	
Paper mills		
Woollen Mills		Edinburgh Woollen Mill,
General	Nature positive, biodiversity	
	friendly, ESG, social licence,	
	public relations, compliance,	
	"cold clean water",	
	community benefits, local	
	amenity, geographical area,	
	guilt, land management	
	practice, water quantity,	
	water quality, greenwashing,	

#### Annex 1 In person workshop Agenda







### Workshops Developing The River Catchment Restoration Fund

South Scotland 19th November, Radstone Hotel, Ayr Road, Shawsburn, Larkhall, ML9 2TZ North Scotland 21st November, SRUC, 9 Inverness Campus, Inverness, IV2 5NA The two workshops will be repeated for each group of North and South participants.

#### Workshop purpose

The workshop is to bring FMS members up to date with the development of a River Catchment Restoration Fund that is currently underway by FMS. To secure input from FMS members to its development through workshop discussions, and to build on the work that took place over the summer to strengthen and prepare a market-ready pipeline of river restoration focused projects.

#### **Outline Agenda**

Time	Session	Lead	Content
09:30	Arrival and refreshments		
10:00	Welcome	Paul/	Introductions, housekeeping, today's format
		Alan	Workshop objectives
			What we want from participants
			Why River Catchment Restoration Fund?
10:10	Introduction	Paul	Background to the fund
			How the fund will work
			Where we are in the process
			Discussion
10:30	Projects	Leah	Engagement findings
			The project pipeline
	includes break		Restoration process, challenges and solutions
			Discussion and workshop
12:30	Lunch		
13:30	Monitoring	Julia	The Monitoring Framework purpose
	Framework		Baselines, indicators and monitoring
			Impact reporting
			Discussion and workshop
14:45	Break		
15:00	Marketing	Paul	Source/s of funding
			Identifying corporate sectoral interests
			Developing a pitch/es
15:30	Summary and	Leah/Paul	Final thoughts
	next steps		Next steps
			Wrap up
16:00	Depart		

This project is supported by The Facility for Investment Ready Nature in Scotland (FIRNS). Delivered by NatureScot in collaboration with The Scottish Government and in partnership with the National Lottery Heritage Fund.

first name 💌	last name 💌	Organisation 🗸	workshop location 斗	
Martyn	Haines	Annan DSFB	Larkhall	
David	McColl	Clyde River Foundation	Larkhall	
Alan	Wells	Fisheries Management Scotland	Larkhall	
Jenny	Fergusson	Kilkerran Estate	Larkhall	
Toby	Miller	Clyde River Foundation	Larkhall	
Chloe	Grant	Fisheries Management Scotland	Larkhall	
Pat	Hunter Blair	Girvan DSFB	Larkhall	
Fiona	Simpson	Crown Estate Scotland	Larkhall	
Lawrence	Ross	Dee DSFB	Larkhall	
Bob	Younger	Fisheries Management Scotland Board Member	Larkhall	
Peter	Landale	Nith DSFB	Larkhall	
Jamie	Ribbens	Galloway Fisheries Trust	Larkhall	
Jonathan	Louis	Forth Rivers Trust	Larkhall	
Stuart	Brabbs	Ayrshire Rivers Trust	Larkhall	
Ann-Marie	MacMaster	Esk Rivers and Fisheries Trust	Larkhall	
Benjamin	Townsend	Tweed Forum	Larkhall	
Willie	Yeomans	Clyde River Foundation	Larkhall	
Helen	Feenan	Fisheries Management Scotland	Larkhall	
Luke	Scott	Galloway Fisheries Trust	Larkhall	
Jamie	Stewart	Tweed Foundation	Larkhall	
Alison	Baker	Atlantic Salmon Trust	Larkhall	
Struan	Candlish	Ayrshire Rivers Trust	Larkhall	
Craig	MacIntyre	Esk DSFB	Larkhall	
Andy	Sides	Tay Rivers Trust	Larkhall	
Elle	Adams	Findhorn Watershed Intiative	Inverness	
David	Allison	Grosvenor Estate	Inverness	
Daniel	Amos	Grosvenor Estate	Inverness	
Sunny	Bradbury	Cromarty Fishery Trust	Inverness	
Sandy	Bremner	River Dee Trust	Inverness	
Chris	Conroy	Atlantic Salmon Trust	Inverness	
Chris	Daphne	Ness DSFB	Inverness	
Richard	Davies	Outer Hebrides Fisheries Trust	Inverness	
Richard	Fyffe	Don DSFB	Inverness	
Sarah	Hadfield	Lochaber Fisheries Trust	Inverness	
Jim	Henderson	Nith DSFB	Inverness	
Andrew	Johnson	West Sutherland Fisheries Trust	Inverness	
Robert	Laughton	Findhorn, Nairn and Lossie Rivers Trust	Inverness	
Clementine	Leemans	Kyle of Sutherland Rivers Trust	Inverness	
Ben	Mardall	Grosvenor Estate	Inverness	
Richard	Miller	Deveron DSFB	Inverness	
Mira	O'Donnell	Kyle of Sutherland Rivers Trust	Inverness	
Debbie	Parke	Nith Catchment Fishery Trust	Inverness	
Chris	Perkins	Scottish Marine Environmental Enhancement Fur	Inverness	
Rob	Pitkin	Lochaber Fisheries Trust	Inverness	
Brian	Shaw	Ness DSFB	Inverness	
Julia	McCarthy	McCarthy Ecology	All	
Leah	Reinfranck	Fisheries Management Scotland	All	
Paul	Sizeland	Fisheries Management Scotland	All	
Will	Marshall	Urr DSFB	online	
John	Fraser	Ugie DSFB	online	
Graeme	Anderson	Argyll Fisheries Trust	online	
Richard	Miller	Deveron DSFB	online	
Alan	Kettle-White	Argyll Fisheries Trust	online	
Ashe	Windham	Kyle of Sutherland Rivers Trust	online	
Shona	Marshall	West Sutherland Fisheries Trust	online	Lkhall 30
Richard	Bellamy	Urr DSFB	online	Invnss 21
Keith	, Williams	Kyle of Sutherland Rivers Trust	online	online 8
h		•		

### Annex 2 Participants

Annex 3 Workshop slides (PowerPoint version available here)















# Annex 4 Workshop output: Addressing challenges in developing deliverable projects.

3.1.1 Organisational Capacity				
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes		
Availability of development	Key aspects of future fund			
funding	Nature Restoration Fund			
	FMS push for this in other			
	funding pots			
Advice/guidance for Board	FMS			
members/Trustees/staff	SEPA/NatureScot?			
	Alignment with national			
	strategies			
Skillset/governance on DSFBs.	Wild Salmon Strategy	What are existing policies that		
Broader funding base for	Workstream	are looking at capacity - advice		
DSFBs + Trusts		and guidance, long-term		
		confidence, skillset diversity		
National support for bid	FMS (increased capacity)			
development	SEPA, NatureScot?			
	Alignment with national			
	strategies			
National Lottery Heritage Fund	Director of DSFB applied to fund			
Benchmarking	Other fishery trusts + boards to			
	provide experience with previous			
	funding projects			
Training	Sharing internal industry			
	expertise			
	Regulatory or governing bodies			
Funding to include specialist	Industry specialists			
project support				
Building funding for ongoing	Project fee to sustain restoration			
project pipeline	officer's role			
Knowledge sharing	SEPA - centralised form of	Training and staff for small		
Shared employment?	training	organisations, funds for full-		
	FMS expertise > big consultancy	time staff		
	(a Ben Townsend but for	Hard to take on someone if you		
	geomorphology)	don't know if we can do		
		projects - we only do		
		electrofishing, we can't do		
		geomorphology		

3.1.2 Working in partnership with SEPA			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Open and honest engagement	SEPA		
	FMS Members		
Educations + knowledge	Data share + acquisition	Trusts/Boards are local experts	
exchange on catchment/fish	Consultation (formal + informal)	for catchment	
protection		Tokenistic consultation	

3.1.2 Working in partnership with SEPA			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
RBMP Assessment re- prioritisation	IEMA (EIA advice) Env Standards Scotland ScotGov Cab Sec for SEPA	Balance for economic, environmental, and social Holistic decision criteria	
Enforcement accountability	Press Social media		
SEPA resourcing + governance (addressing deficiencies)	Env Standards Scotland		
Build local relationships with SEPA - personal, strong, sharing info	Trust and Board staff Local SEPA officers/Staff Get to the right person	Someone mentioned that SEPA fast-tracked a CAR license for risk analysis for a weir removal. It's a weir that has been planned to be removed for 15 years. They engaged their local contact to get this done	
Political pressure (softly)	FMS Feedback from local board/trusts Change policy	Unclear who SEPA contact can be, they've been centralised	
Build formal working relationship £	Trust/Board> SEPA (charge a fee) Sea lice sampling Water quality - subcontract water quality? Genetics/juv. Salmonids Habitat SEPA> Trust/Board Geomorphology?	FMS facilitation. SEPA is not at these workshops. They need to be part of the solution.	
Engagement and empathy	Trusts/DSFBs Catchment partnership NFU, JHI, NatureScot	Regulator, Trust, landowner have different understanding on what good looks like	

3.1.3 Agricultural land use		
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes
Policy	Updates to policy in line with	
	biodiversity objectives	
Incentives	Allowance for payments for non-	Red Tractor equivalent for
	agri production/change land use	farmers
	Development funding /	
	engagement	
	Accreditation/certification to	
	show support / sustainability	
Regulation	Tougher regulation on offenses	
	Clearer rules/regulations give	
	current ineffective regs	
Use of other models from	(nothing was written here)	
adjacent sectors		

3.1.3 Agricultural land use			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Build trust with farmers	Identify common ground - local		
	DSFBs and Trusts		
	Neighbourly. Approved of shared		
	success.		
	Ensure local skill sets are		
	present and sustained (i.e. no		
	misinformation)		
	Bring all parties to the table		
Pressure from SEPA	Assessment (independent) of		
	cost-benefit analysis		
Gov't agencies playing catch-	Regulatory bodies need to drive		
up requires rapid evolution	this		
	New agricultural payment		
	system		
	Strategic identification of aligned		
	objectives		
Two-way education	Next generation of farmers &		
	existing landowners		
	Schools & universities upskilling		
	& driving interdisciplinary		
	research		
Conflict resolution forum /	Follow 'common ground' model		
communication	of deer management groups		
	Forestry, SEPA, Local DSFBS,		
Free die state operation	Neignbours Dublic is gringets from die g		
Funding the currently	Public + private funding	Admin funding for smaller	
develop preisets and recriter	DSFB Assessment levy limits	trusts?	
aevelop projects and monitor	Income. Limitation of structure		
outcomes	LO IUIIU.		
	FGS, Nature Restoration Fund,		
	SG - AEUUS, Maille Fullu		
	Scouldill, SEPA WEF, Clown		
	Horitage Lotton Funds		
	Charitable Foundations, Wind		
	Chantable Foundations, Wind		
	Farms, private tandowners		

3.1.4 Suitable funding		
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes
Encourage innovation + creative solutions to be funded (reduce perceived risk)	FMS Government regulation BNG Universities and research bodies	
Fencing off riverbanks to remove stock but still allow alternative access to water source	Landowners, Trusts, Private funders for new technology	

3.1.4 Suitable funding			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Policy + funding integration between to allow stackable + sustainable requirements	ScotGov FMS Sector bodies		
Balance - consultancy versus project work. Build reputation of organisation.	Trusts + Boards - knowledge sharing country-wide. Skilling up. Professional accreditation - national body		
Funders willing to engage at landscape-scale (rather than piecemeal basis) and with integrated target outcomes (e.g. woodland peatland in one scheme)	Be open to hybrid funding models + flexibility NatureScot SEPA Landowner(s) FMS Contractors		
Project stakeholders and funders adopt mindsets which are adaptable and holistic - reflecting nature (not just financial years, for example)	ScotGov and agencies - be more holistic FMS Members - keep feedback + pressure advocating for better approaches		
River specific funding pots (NRF etc more competitive)	FMS nature finance team Corporate funders FMS members		
New land use funding opportunities - figure out how to make the most of them (e.g. wind farms)	Windfarm developers Council/planning authorities Developers with NPF4 net gain Requirements - work with local trusts for high impact offsets		
Vital to bundle full cost of schemes including: development, ongoing maintenance and monitoring	Contractors are able to provide full costings, multi-year Trusts and DSFBs are building relationships and trust over the long term Funders appreciate full cost value of projects	Recognising social capital and need for ongoing maintenance	
Greater clarity on potential benefits for landowner/farmer	Political lobbying - re subsidy change Practical demonstration sites - costs and benefits (via SRUC, FMS, SFU, SLE) through an agreed approach Involve landowner interest groups Involved communication with members and identify synergies	Politicians to align objectives and show wider benefits	

3.1.5 Landowner willingness			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Developing associated revenue streams/subsidy regimes (e.g. riparian management)	Scottish Forestry Dept of agriculture/rural affairs and rural economy directorate Coordinated lobbying 2026 Opportunity		
Research & education - re Catchment Management + appeal to landowner	Landowner involvement Consultation NFU, SLE understanding promulgation of new technologies and working methods	Synergies	
Use current DSFB staff + contacts	Bailiffs etc Board members Engage with all owners. Provision of professional agents, How will this affect me in future years (funding). Duration of contract.	DSFBs know the owners Volunteers to engage the owners	
Use current Trust directors/staff	FMS	There was a recommendation to create a GIS map of landowner sentiment overlaid with other data for planning strategic locations for restoration work	
Use current/completed projects to extol experience + get rid of fears	Landowners/farmers at public events	Use current projects, people look next door if something is done well	
Events in local public halls. Onsite talk and walk	Project coordinators Professionals in the sector Landowners (key)		
Explain practical benefits - cost benefits	Give landowner input to plan	Take cost out - we have at best buy-in at no cost but also sometimes landowners have more buy in if they throw a few thousand ££ in	
Boost the venison market	Supermarkets to support supply chain to the public		

3.1.6 Deer management			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Incentivise deer management with per deer payment	ScotGov	There was a consultation / pilot earlier this year from NatureScot around deer management We need the carrot more than the stick.	

3.1.6 Deer management			
Solution	Who should be involved?	Notes	
Financial penalty for those that have responsibility but don't act	ScotGov		
Right to hunt legislation?	ScotGov Landowners		
Shared stalkers for communities/zones	Deer management groups		
Evidenced based deer	Landowners	Varied targets by land (fitness	
management. Ecological	Stalkers	of herd, evidence of regen)	
assessment of deer catchment	Crofters	NatureScot resistance to fund	
capacity	Farmers	fencing	
	NatureScot		
	National Parks		
	Deer management groups		
Examples of progress and	Best practice examples		
measures across estates, herd			
fitness, quality of stalkers, peatland condition.			
Economic model to reduce	Larders for local venison		
deer numbers	schemes		
	Change the stalker model quality		
	vs quantity		
Engage to achieve culture of	Stalkers, farmers, estate		
change at every level	managers, landowners,		
	government		

Musthavas	Nico to have	Shouldn't have
Full cost recovery; budget flexibility;	Loan to bankroll project cash	No restrictions on ability to
lots of cash; ethical moral values;	flow (placed between	match fund
maintenance costs; agile decisions	Must/Nice to have); Advanced	
making/rolling application process;	funding model - cash flow	
streamlined application process	(placed between Must/Nice	
	to have); scalable (placed	
	between Must/Nice to have);	
	accreditation process for	
	applicants	
Expression of interest; upfront/partial	Dedicated fund manager;	Lengthy application forms
payment; consenting agency	project tracking portal; clear	(no repetition); delayed pay
involvement; access to pre-	decision timeframes; simple	out; strict fund
application advice to make projects	post-project reporting	requirements
as strong as possible: expert		
assessment panel: clear fund		
guidance on qualifying projects: pre-		
fund cost recovery: transparent		
advice		
In order of importance: Clear fund	Government accreditation:	Greenwashing: encourage
objectives: Clarity of process for	standardising approaches:	noor projects
project (plan -> baseline data -> audit	community/public benefits:	
-> implementation plan -> monitoring	publicity/education: match	
-> reporting): Assessment of	funding: maintenance	
outcomes: measurable outcomes:	navments	
clear understanding of liability/risks	payments	
and who is responsible: clear		
understanding of problem to be		
addressed: industry engagement		
model: transparency (audit trail):		
support to develop proposal		
Open to range of trusts/boards and	Decision making criteria to	Over awarding to lower
types of projects: limitation on who	aim for geographical spread	quality 'ready' projects: do
could receive funding - 3rd sector	unfundable types of	not 'play the metric'
community groups: Work in	restoration: equitable	not play the methe
narthershin with	distribution to an extent:	
trusts/boards/landowners: Funds	compatibility with match	
capacity to deliver or guidance from	funding - public+private:	
EMS: outputs - levels of improvement	criteria set for development	
metrics	work	
Flovibility (multi year funding op not	Wider biediversity benefit:	Croopwoohing: orduouo
Flexibility (multi-year funding so not	flood rick monogement	Greenwashing; arduous
development: close bonefits to river	(motob funding2), further	reporting requirements
(biodiversity/presses/guality)	(match funding?), further	
(Diodiversity/process/quality),	maintenence Liebility for	
(proportionate reporting/manitaring)	this	
(proportionate reporting/monitoring);		
appropriate, mgn quality projects that align (where possible) with EMDs		
align (where possible) with FMPs		

### Annex 5 Desirable characteristics of a river restoration fund

Must haves	Nice to have	Shouldn't have
Staged payments (starred as most	Payment for all project admin	Shouldn't be limited by
important); adaptable/flexible; ability	(i.e. claims); support to build	other funding streams;
to fund overheads; development	long term sustainability within	complicated
work; easy EOI process; in line with	the org; ongoing payment	application/claim process;
real cost - full cost recovery;	scheme for duration of	to meet too many objectives
monitoring (baseline)	project; long-term monitoring;	(so that the main one is
	inflationary uplifts	diluted/fails)
Clear objectives; skill sets identified;	Not too many hurdles to	A need for novelty
appropriate monitoring; £	funding (placed between	
	Must/Nice to have); adequate	
	timescales;	
Multiple funders (diversity	Community benefit (placed	Onerous reporting; onerous
public/private); aligned to other	between Must/Nice to have);	application process
funding priorities; expert decision	flexibility, metrics for	
panel; recognition of unique projects;	success, recognition, online	
knowledge bank, multi-year funding	portal	
Wide scope (equipment, staff time,	All or nothing?	Lengthy application
delivery, monitoring, preparatory		process; straightforward
work); biodiversity/ecosystem-based		application process ->
scope if bridge gap between current		should be too complicated;
funds and NRF funds; multiple year		unrealistic time scales
funding		
Landowner's permission; measurable	B-DNG (placed between	No negative impact; no
realistic achievables;	Must/Nice to have);	unachievable outcomes; if
agreed/acceptable time scales;	community buy-in;	possible, no outside
wildlife benefits; good	educational benefit;	contractors
recording/feedback	employment benefit	
Holistic; flexible; streamlined	Feedback on application;	loo prescriptive or not
application process; data-led	interface with	flexible - allow shifts within
priorities; includes development	funders/corporates	budget line with good
maintenance+monitoring costs;	themselves - who+where	reason; silo mentality
stakenolder engagement ->	money is coming from;	
grassroots input from those who know	verbal/interview/viva element	
land+place; ecosystem approach big	to application process to	
picture trinking; open to innovative	contextualise paperwork;	
heading manitoring		
baseune+monitoring	contractors+community	
Common conce application form:	Flovibility on budget conited	No alow backs fixed conital
flovible financial periode: realistic		no claw backs; fixed capital
timescales	holding/guidanco	requirements
	stakeholder engagement	
	assistance	
	assistance	

## Annex 6 Necessary requirements of the river restoration fund monitoring framework

### What outcomes or benefits will investors want to see?

- Business resilience (improved water quality e.g., whisky)
- Positive reputational impacts
- Social license gain
- Biodiversity net gain development condition
- Environmental improvement relevant to their business
- Publicity (danger of greenwashing!)
- Measurable impact = success
- Improved public perception
- Taking leadership role
- Suitable framework
- PR levels of contribution
- Tie into legal strategies/outcomes
- Relatability
- Geographic area
- Simple positive messages that can sell (e.g., reduced catastrophic flooding, saving salmon, clean rivers (water quality), biodiversity, climate change resilience)
- Climate adaptation
- Social/community benefit
- Community economic benefit
- Catchment level

### How prescriptive should the monitoring framework be?

- Needs to be standardized but not too rigid that indicators aren't project specific or are too difficult/not possible to demonstrate
- Support standardization/prescription, but selected tools proportionate to the scale and nature of project
- Prescriptive enough to allow scaling to portfolio monitoring (overall impact of the fund)
- Has to be prescriptive to maintain repeatability between projects
- Provide a monitoring toolbox that can be tailored/employed to suit specific projects
- Monitoring needs to be proportionate (based on scale of project)
- Not prescriptive but guidance based on principles of best practice
- Needs to be well thought out
- Suite of monitoring optional metrics, each project to provide data on one or more but not all
- Balancing core metrics everyone measures for benchmarking, but also space for context-specific metrics to demo place-based impact too.
- Adaptable rather than prescriptive
- Agreed criteria to suit funders and project delivery staff
- Depends on scale/objectives
- Established or novel technique
- Matrix based
- Wide range of projects requires flexibility
- Methods should be standardized and should align to existing national data sets (e.g., NEPS, StRMN, SFCC)
- Need to be flexible enough to allow development/takeup of new (better) methods

- Must be focused (objective) and hypothesis based i.e., not monitoring for monitoring's sake
- Not so that it delays or inhibits existing (or new) monitoring plans
- Not too prescriptive
- Focus on project difficulty (outputs) rather than results (outcomes)
- Selectable protocols that can be adaptive to landscape and expected outcomes
- Suite of resources available

### Should some methods or indicators always be used?

- Standardized methods for assessment factors, e.g., for bank erosion, for barrier removal, for riparian projects.
- Need to account for outcomes that have low environmental signal
- Perhaps drawing from a suite of standard indicators, choice depends on nature of project
- Yes where projects are of similar scale/nature
- Before and after photos
- Log of activities
- Phase 1 habitat survey @ baseline and repeat over project duration
- River habitat or morph survey (aspirational)
- Nutrient monitoring
- Impact on local economy (i.e., local contractors used)
- Consider WFD targets/assessments
- Best practice for 'types' of projects e.g., peatland restoration ,riparian tree planting, barrier removal)
- Recognize size/scale/cost of project to ensure proportionate
- Small increased numbers of macroinvertebrates/salmon/eels/etc.
- Improved water quality metric? Water temperature matching the STR requirement for data
- Industry best practice depending on outcome e.g., deer %/km
- Flood resilience and natural flood management wider outcomes from projects
- Investigate existing data availability and consistency with methods/data already employed within the catchment
- Similar projects in different geographical areas should be the same
- Length or area
- Water quality and quantity
- Biological indicators, e.g., fish/inverts/INNS/biodiversity
- Fixed point imagery
- Geomorphology
- Bang for buck
- Indicators need to be identified at a national level
- Yes, but depends on outcomes/objectives
- No, may be a waste of time/resources for certain projects
- Stick to project scope
- Number of trees
- Structure removed Y/N
- Video/photo
- -

### What protocols or templates should FMS provide for monitoring?

- Best available techniques
- Assessment protocols
- Best practice
- SOPs for suite of monitoring approach keep this under review (regular timescale)
- Don't reinvent the wheel where guidance already exists.
- +SFCC to coordinate training to upskill survey skills across members
- Digital platforms for collection and presentation of data
- FMS should provide a best practice guidance/principles to inform monitoring strategies
- Multiple benefits calculator demonstrating ecosystem services and metrics to demonstrate impact/benefit to investors of use of new technologies for monitoring.
- Time frequency

### What framework elements/aspects of monitoring contribute most to 'high integrity'?

- Research into impacts of particular interventions is important to improve knowledge building on.in adaptive methods and contributing to evolving monitoring metrics
- Replicability/consistency of deliverable outputs at portfolio level
- Baselining
- Draw on pre-existing datasets the network holds (e.g., inverts, habitat, vegetation, geomorph)
- Integrates ecological socio-cultural and economic outcomes/returns
- Third party verifiable
- Transparent
- Consistent approach to monitoring
- Approved criteria at start and maintain throughout
- Starting with good quality baseline
- Capability of monitoring staff
- Repeatability same monitoring over time
- Statistically robust
- Compare control sites
- BACI
- Best practice
- Qualified, experienced individuals
- Peer-reviewed
- Should encompass the main outcomes/objectives
- Standardized survey techniques
- Point source photography/drone/video/visual
- Consistency across the board
- Robust experimental design
- Holistic not restricted to fish
- Dissemination dependant on audience
- Acknowledge that things take time long term
- Use industry standard
- Consistent and universal protocols
- Repeatable

### Annex 7 Workshop photo gallery

