



Chairman:
Richard Cooke Esq
Dalhousie Estate Office
Brechin
Angus
DD9 6SG

Tel: 01356 624566
Fax: 01356 623725
E-mail: rc@dalhousieestates.co.uk

Our Ref. RMJC/MJF

2 April 2014

RAE Research Strategy Consultation 2016-2021
RESAS
Scottish Government
1-C (South)
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

Dear Sir/Madam,

ADMG Response to Rural Affairs and Environment Strategy 2016-2021.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and respond to the consultation which sets out the future direction of the research to be supported by RESAS.

We attach the questionnaire but would also like to make the following comments.

1. The consultation document is a high level statement of the themes relevant to SG policy and as such does not outline specific lines of research.
2. The three broad themes seem relevant to deer management and related issues of integrated land management but it is notable that there is no mention of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem function which underpins the benefits land provides to society.
3. The ADMG is broadly supportive of these three themes and in particular welcomes initiatives that a) explore approaches to managing land and natural resources in a

more integrated way, and b) bring together policy makers and practitioners with researchers to develop relevant and practical tools to achieve landscape scale collaboration over the delivery of both public and private interests.

4. There should be a competitive mechanism available for the provision of funding to research projects initiated by public, private and third sector partnerships in order to bridge the gap between policy goals and practical action and understand how the public interest is delivered from different land management approaches.

The ADMG looks forward to contributing constructively and in more detail in subsequent stages of the planning process for the 2016-2021 strategy.

Yours faithfully



Richard Cooke
Chairman

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

See also the attached letter.

Question 1: Do the 2011-2016 strategic priorities remain robust and relevant for the period 2016-2021?

The consultation document is a high level statement of the themes relevant to SG policy and as such does not outline specific lines of research.

Question 2: Do these 'enabling principles' set the right context or should additional principles be adopted?

Comments

Question 3: Are the high level outcomes sufficiently clear, if not, what changes would you propose?

Comments

Question 4: Are the three broad themes identified an appropriate way of structuring our work? If not, what alternatives should be considered?

The ADMG is broadly supportive of these three themes and in particular welcomes initiatives that a) explore approaches to managing land and natural resources in a more integrated way, and b) bring together policy makers and practitioners with researchers to develop relevant and practical tools to achieve landscape scale collaboration over the delivery of both public and private interests

The three broad themes seem relevant to deer management and related issues of integrated land management but it is notable that there is no mention of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem function which underpins the benefits land provides to society.

Question 5: How can the SG maximise the benefits of on-going investment in the MRPs to build and benefit from connectivity with the wider science base?

Question 6: What are your views of the performance and operation of the CoEs to date, are there any additional areas that would benefit from such support?

Comments

Question 7: Do you agree with the SG's proposal to end support for SPs and to explore alternative mechanisms to strengthen engagement between its investment in research and the business sectors it aims to support?

Yes (see Q8).

Question 8: Do you have any proposals for how the research portfolio can better link to the business community to deliver the desired outcome?

There should be a competitive mechanism available for the provision of funding to research projects initiated by public, private and third sector partnerships in order to bridge the gap between policy goals and practical action and understand how the public interest is delivered from different land management approaches.

Question 9: Is the purpose and value of underpinning capacity sufficiently clear, if not how can it be improved?

Comments

Question 10: Do you have any views regarding the performance and use of the Contract Research Fund including how it could be improved?

See Q8

Question 11: Could the overall delivery model be further simplified in a way which still enables SG to meet its strategic priorities for the portfolio, if so how?

Comments

Question 12: Do you have specific suggestions as to how the RESAS research strategy can contribute to the delivery of the objectives of the CAMERAS partnership?

CAMERAS partners are in a position to identify research needs with the private sector and need a funding stream to support these needs. See Q8.

Question 13: Do you have any suggestions for developing the partnership with other research funders?

Comments

Question 14: Do you have any particular suggestions as to how greater engagement with the HEI sector might be achieved?

Comments

Question 15: Are the research outputs from the RESAS portfolio of research readily accessible or can this be further improved, if so how?

Research is often not easily accessible or is often not obviously relevant to current and mid-term needs. A mechanism to feed in requests for research briefs to the SRP or CoEs by the private sector is needed

Question 16: Is the current performance management approach fit for purpose or can it be improved, if so how?

Comments