

T: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]@gov.scot

By email to: [REDACTED]@mail.com

27 March 2018

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email of 5 March following on from your meeting with officials from the Scottish Government on 22 February.

You have asked for information on the number of responses. We have received around 15,500 responses to the consultation. The responses are currently being collated. Where we have the respondent's permission to do so and subject to the redaction of defamatory material or offensive material, we will publish the responses at Citizen Space (<https://consult.gov.scot/>). All responses will also be analysed and an analysis report published.

Angela Constance is aware of the concerns about "hate speech" which you raised when we met and also about the points you raised on freedom of speech. The Scottish Government is committed to the rights to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and freedom of expression. You are welcome to write to Ms Constance setting out your concerns in this area.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sarah E Duncan
Scottish Government Family and Property Law Team

[Redacted]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 03 April 2018 15:12
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Stockwell SW (Simon); [Redacted]
Subject: Review of Gender Recognition- Craigforth

[Redacted]

Further to our meeting this morning, we undertook a number of actions.

1. I will get back to you regarding the responses of:

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]; and
- The two responses which states that they were from Women's Spaces in Scotland. I will be emailing our contact there to raise this.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

Sarah

[REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 03 April 2018 15:42
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Subject: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

[REDACTED]

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [REDACTED]. The response uses the email address [REDACTED]. I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [REDACTED] was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team
[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)

Sent: 03 April 2018 15:12

To: [Redacted]

Cc: Stockwell SW (Simon); [Redacted]

Subject: Review of Gender Recognition- Craigforth

[Redacted]

Further to our meeting this morning, we undertook a number of actions.

1. I will get back to you regarding the responses of:

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted] and

- The two responses which states that they were from Women's Spaces in Scotland. I will be emailing our contact there to raise this.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted text block]

Sarah

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: 03 April 2018 22:18
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: Re: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hello Sarah,

Thank you for getting in touch and offering an opportunity to resolve this.

I believe the second submission was written by one of our representatives in Edinburgh on behalf of and in consultation with the group based here. The first one was submitted by the group based in the North/East (Dundee to Aberdeen region).

Does that help resolve anything?

As a lot of work was put into both responses, it would be unfortunate to lose either one.

Please let me know if this is a satisfactory compromise.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

On 3 Apr 2018 3:42 p.m., [REDACTED]@gov.scot> wrote:

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [REDACTED]. The response uses the email address [REDACTED]. I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [REDACTED] and was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team



This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadachd a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 09:36
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hi Sarah,

I'd be happy with what Simon has proposed. Either way, one of the responses wouldn't be "lost" as [REDACTED] seemed to infer below as it could be revised to an individual rather than organisational response.

Given Women's Spaces Scotland is a new organisation, we should give them a bit of leniency in terms of their submission in this instance.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

From: Stockwell SW (Simon)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:53
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Sarah

My view is that we accept this. It seems to me that we treat one of the responses as Women's Spaces Edinburgh and the other as Women's Spaces North East Scotland. If needs be, perhaps a short explanatory note could be put on the website when we publish them.

Simon Stockwell

X [REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:46
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Can we accept this? [REDACTED] does appear to be stating that these are 'different' groups. Not sure (given that these are online responses), that we can change their names prior to publication to distinguish them but perhaps [REDACTED] knows? I don't believe the edit function would allow for this to be changed.

Thanks,

Sarah

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@gmail.com](#)
Sent: 03 April 2018 22:18

To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: Re: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hello Sarah,
Thank you for getting in touch and offering an opportunity to resolve this.
I believe the second submission was written by one of our representatives in Edinburgh on behalf of and in consultation with the group based here. The first one was submitted by the group based in the North/East (Dundee to Aberdeen region).
Does that help resolve anything?
As a lot of work was put into both responses, it would be unfortunate to loose either one.
Please let me know if this is a satisfactory compromise.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted]

On 3 Apr 2018 3:42 p.m., <[Redacted]@gov.scot> wrote:

[Redacted]

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [Redacted]. The response uses the email address [Redacted]. I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [Redacted] and was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team

[Redacted]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the

addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadichte a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 09:57
To: [REDACTED] Stockwell SW (Simon); Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Cc: Digital Engagement
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hi Sarah,

You're correct that organisation names cannot be edited. There are a couple of options:

- You can upload a file to the existing response that explains that the response is on behalf of Women's Spaces Scotland. This file would sit alongside the response.
- You can remove the original response and resubmit it with the correct name.

Happy to discuss.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Digital Engagement Manager
3W St Andrews House

[REDACTED] | [REDACTED]
[Digital Engagement Blog](#) | [@scotgovengage](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 09:36
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hi Sarah,

I'd be happy with what Simon has proposed. Either way, one of the responses wouldn't be "lost" as [REDACTED] seemed to infer below as it could be revised to an individual rather than organisational response.

Given Women's Spaces Scotland is a new organisation, we should give them a bit of leniency in terms of their submission in this instance.

Thanks,

From: Stockwell SW (Simon)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:53
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice); Grieve KB (Karen)
Cc: [REDACTED] Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Sarah

My view is that we accept this. It seems to me that we treat one of the responses as Women's Spaces Edinburgh and the other as Women's Spaces North East Scotland. If needs be, perhaps a short explanatory note could be put on the website when we publish them.

Simon Stockwell

X [REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:46
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Can we accept this? [REDACTED] does appear to be stating that these are 'different' groups. Not sure (given that these are online responses), that we can change their names prior to publication to distinguish them but perhaps [REDACTED] knows? I don't believe the edit function would allow for this to be changed.

Thanks,

Sarah

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@gmail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com)
Sent: 03 April 2018 22:18
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: Re: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hello Sarah,

Thank you for getting in touch and offering an opportunity to resolve this.

I believe the second submission was written by one of our representatives in Edinburgh on behalf of and in consultation with the group based here. The first one was submitted by the group based in the North/East (Dundee to Aberdeen region).

Does that help resolve anything?

As a lot of work was put into both responses, it would be unfortunate to loose either one.

Please let me know if this is a satisfactory compromise.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

On 3 Apr 2018 3:42 p.m., [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@gov.scot)> wrote:

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [REDACTED]. The response uses the email address [REDACTED]. I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [REDACTED] and was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team
[REDACTED]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadachd a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 13:39
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice); [REDACTED] Stockwell SW (Simon)
Cc: Digital Engagement
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Good idea. It also means less risk of entering something incorrectly.

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 11:47
To: [REDACTED] Stockwell SW (Simon)
Cc: Digital Engagement
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

[REDACTED]

Thanks for this. I think I'll go for the former option and upload a document. I think the second requires me to replicate the response manually and I may want to avoid that.

Sarah

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 09:57
To: [REDACTED] Stockwell SW (Simon); Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Cc: Digital Engagement
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hi Sarah,

You're correct that organisation names cannot be edited. There are a couple of options:

- You can upload a file to the existing response that explains that the response is on behalf of Women's Spaces Scotland. This file would sit alongside the response.
- You can remove the original response and resubmit it with the correct name.

Happy to discuss.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Digital Engagement Manager
3W St Andrews House
[REDACTED] | [REDACTED]
[Digital Engagement Blog](#) | [@scotgovengage](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2018 09:36
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hi Sarah,

I'd be happy with what Simon has proposed. Either way, one of the responses wouldn't be "lost" as [REDACTED] seemed to infer below as it could be revised to an individual rather than organisational response.

Given Women's Spaces Scotland is a new organisation, we should give them a bit of leniency in terms of their submission in this instance.

Thanks,
Karen

From: Stockwell SW (Simon)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:53
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Sarah

My view is that we accept this. It seems to me that we treat one of the responses as Women's Spaces Edinburgh and the other as Women's Spaces North East Scotland. If needs be, perhaps a short explanatory note could be put on the website when we publish them.

Simon Stockwell
X [REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 08:46
To: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Can we accept this? [REDACTED] does appear to be stating that these are 'different' groups. Not sure (given that these are online responses), that we can change their names prior to publication to distinguish them but perhaps [REDACTED] knows? I don't believe the edit function would allow for this to be changed.

Thanks,

Sarah

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: 03 April 2018 22:18
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: Re: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hello Sarah,

Thank you for getting in touch and offering an opportunity to resolve this.

I believe the second submission was written by one of our representatives in Edinburgh on behalf of and in consultation with the group based here. The first one was submitted by the group based in the North/East (Dundee to Aberdeen region).

Does that help resolve anything?

As a lot of work was put into both responses, it would be unfortunate to lose either one.

Please let me know if this is a satisfactory compromise.

Kind Regards,

On 3 Apr 2018 3:42 p.m., [REDACTED]@gov.scot> wrote:

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [REDACTED]. The response uses the email address [REDACTED]. I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [REDACTED] and was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team
[REDACTED]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadachadh a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo

sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 11:44
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your quick response. This is indeed a satisfactory compromise. We'd propose to treat the earlier response as being from Women's Spaces in Scotland (North East Scotland) and the second from Women's Spaces in Scotland (Edinburgh), and will work out a way of making this clear when responses are published.

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@gmail.com](#)]
Sent: 03 April 2018 22:18
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: Re: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation responses

Hello Sarah,

Thank you for getting in touch and offering an opportunity to resolve this.

I believe the second submission was written by one of our representatives in Edinburgh on behalf of and in consultation with the group based here. The first one was submitted by the group based in the North/East (Dundee to Aberdeen region).

Does that help resolve anything?

As a lot of work was put into both responses, it would be unfortunate to loose either one.

Please let me know if this is a satisfactory compromise.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

On 3 Apr 2018 3:42 p.m., [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@gov.scot](#)> wrote:
[REDACTED]

The consultation responses are currently being analysed. We are also resolving some apparent duplicate responses submitted by the same individual or organisation.

You may recall that when we met on 22 February I mentioned to you that we had already received a response which said that it was submitted by the organisation Women's Spaces in Scotland. Since you had already implied at the meeting that a response had still to be sent to us, I mentioned this to you. That response was submitted on 10 February at 23:49 and was allocated the reference [REDACTED]. The response uses the email address [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] I recall you saying at the time that this may have come from a colleague/colleagues of yours at Women's Spaces in Scotland.

A response submitted on 1 March 2018 also states that it is from Women's Spaces in Scotland- this one was allocated the Response [REDACTED] and was received at 11:06. The email associated with this response appears to be that of an individual.

We cannot count responses from the same organisation as more than one response. We are considering what to do- for example, we could treat the second response as being from an individual given it does not appear to use an organisational email as the contact. If Women's Spaces wish to withdraw one of the responses, this can also be done. However, we would like to seek your views, before we reach a decision on proceeding.

I would be grateful for your comments before we do so.

Many thanks,

Sarah
Scottish Government: Family and Property Law Team
[REDACTED]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.
Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadachd a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 04 April 2018 12:06
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Stockwell SW (Simon); [REDACTED]
Subject: Review of Gender Recognition- consultation analysis

[REDACTED]

You will recall our discussion yesterday regarding the two responses from 'Women's Spaces in Scotland'.

We've been in touch with them and identified that these are from different geographic groups. We will treat the earlier response [REDACTED] on line 3457 of the spreadsheet as being from Women's Spaces in Scotland (North East Scotland). The later response [REDACTED] on line 13764 of the spreadsheet will be treated as being from Women's Spaces in Scotland (Edinburgh). I will make arrangements to upload a document to each in Citizen Space to clarify this later.

Sarah

Extract from draft briefing dated 10 April 2018

4. Summary of respondents' concerns about reform

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2. A number of women's groups and campaign groups opposing reform, such as [REDACTED] Women's Spaces in Scotland [REDACTED] express concerns about impacts on women's rights, women-only spaces, prisons, statistics and sport:

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Extract from draft briefing dated 17 April 2018

4. Summary of respondents' concerns about reform

A self-declaration process

[Redacted]

2. A number of women's groups and campaign groups opposing reform, such as [Redacted] Women's Spaces in Scotland [Redacted] express concerns about impacts on women's rights, women-only spaces, prisons, statistics and sport:

- [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Extract from briefing dated 18 April 2018

4. Summary of respondents' concerns about reform

A self-declaration process

[REDACTED]

2. A number of women's groups and campaign groups opposing reform, [REDACTED] Women's Spaces in Scotland [REDACTED] express concerns about impacts on women's rights, women-only spaces, prisons, statistics and sport:

- [REDACTED]
- "people may adopt a transgender identity for various nefarious purposes, often involving increased access to vulnerable women and child victims" (Women's Spaces in Scotland (Edinburgh));
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]

Under 16s

[Redacted]

8. Some of the common objections to children and young people obtaining legal gender recognition are :

- [Redacted]
- "they are too young to decide a permanent change" (Women's Spaces in Scotland (North East)); and
- [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 17 May 2018 08:48
To: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Subject: FW: Gender recognition: meeting with Women's Spaces: draft submission

Importance: High

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2018 13:29
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Gender recognition: meeting with Women's Spaces: draft submission
Importance: High

From: Stockwell SW (Simon)
Sent: 26 February 2018 12:17
To: [REDACTED] Communications CSSE; Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice); [REDACTED]
Cc: Marshall J (Jan); [REDACTED] Campbell J (Jeanette)
Subject: Gender recognition: meeting with Women's Spaces: draft submission
Importance: High



[REDACTED]

Comms

Sarah

[REDACTED]

1. I attach a draft submission to CabSec following last week's meeting at official level with Women's Spaces.
2. Grateful for comments by close tonight. I'd like to put up before the Equality Network reception in the Parliament tomorrow evening.
3. [REDACTED] will wish to note the reference to trans prisoners and that I would intend to copy the CEO of the SPS into the submission.

4. Could **Sarah** please update the stats on the number of responses to the consultation.
5. Are [REDACTED] aware of any existing briefing on what the SG does to support women? I think there's a lot we can say in that area, and it may be that there is some existing briefing on that which we could use.

Simon Stockwell
Family and Property
X [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 February 2018 10:31
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Gender Recognition Act 2004- consultation- meeting with Women's Spaces in Scotland

Just to keep track of the point re trans prisoners.

From: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Sent: 27 February 2018 09:35
To: Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities
Cc: First Minister; Cabinet Secretary for Culture, Tourism and External Affairs; Minister for Community Safety and Legal Affairs; Lord Advocate; Permanent Secretary; DG Education, Communities & Justice; Director for Children and Families; Director of Justice; Bird L (Lisa); [REDACTED] Marshall J (Jan); [REDACTED] Solicitor to the Scottish Government and PS; Coull AJ (Alison); [REDACTED] Calderwood C (Catherine); McConnell Colin; [REDACTED] Ellis T (Tim); [REDACTED] Stockwell SW (Simon); Communications CSSE; [REDACTED] Campbell J (Jeanette); [REDACTED]
Subject: Review of Gender Recognition Act 2004- consultation- meeting with Women's Spaces in Scotland



Coimleir

Coimleir

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

PS/ Cabinet Secretary,

1. I attach a submission in ERDM and word.
2. Submission is 4 pages.
3. Routine.

Sarah Duncan
Family and Property Law Team
Ext [REDACTED]

Subject: Meeting with Women's Spaces in Scotland
Location: SH Ground Floor Meeting Room D-1 (16)

Start: Thu 22/02/2018 14:00
End: Thu 22/02/2018 16:00
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Required Attendees: Stockwell SW (Simon) [REDACTED]
Optional Attendees: [REDACTED]
Resources: SH Ground Floor Meeting Room D-1 (16)

Please note **change of meeting location** to Saughton House, to accommodate additional two from group we are meeting.

Sarah
ext [REDACTED]

Subject: Canceled: Meeting with Women's Spaces in Scotland
Location: SH Ground Floor Meeting Room D-1 (16)

Start: Thu 22/02/2018 14:00
End: Thu 22/02/2018 16:00
Show Time As: Free

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Duncan SE (Sarah) (Justice)
Required Attendees: Stockwell SW (Simon) [REDACTED]
Optional Attendees: [REDACTED]
Resources: SAH Ground Floor Meeting Room GW.06 (12)

Importance: High

Please note **change of meeting location** to Saughton House, to accommodate additional two from group we are meeting.

Sarah
ext [REDACTED]