


From:



TO: Ms Sarah E. Duncan, [redacted]@gov.scot)
Family and Property Law Team, Civil Law and Legal System Division,
Justice Directorate, Scottish Government,
St Andrews's House, Regent Road,
Edinburgh EH1 3DG

Date: 17th July 2018

Ref: AB to GRA Review Panel, 20 February 2018 Full document. (N.B. *as per instructions in the Consultation.*)
As no acknowledgement of above follow up letters were sent to the First Minister 28/03/2018 including copy of document, and another as no response by 13/05/2018. See attached. No responses from the First Minister to date.
Sarah Duncan (SD2) to AB, 17 May 2018 (and a repeat copy of the same letter from SD2 received June, 2018)

Subject: **Scottish Government Consultations and the recent GRA change proposal consultation.**
FOI Request.


Dear Ms Duncan,

With reference to your reply. Unfortunately I could not identify you or your section, your responsibilities or expertise, or any of the following responsibilities, via your letter or through the Scottish Government website. Please provide answers to the following questions and do please provide full names, titles, position, main qualifications, and names of superiors along with accurate organisation relationships and addresses.

1. A) What is your position and what are your responsibilities on the GRA Review Panel?
B) What was your position, and what were your responsibilities, on the recent GRA consultation?
C) To whom do you report?
2. A) Who is in charge of the GRA Review Panel?
B) And, to whom do they report? And to what Minister?
3. A) Who was responsible, i.e. who had overall responsibility within the civil service, for the delivery of the GRA Consultation documentation?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who was responsible for the identification of stakeholders and the 'development of the list'? And to whom do they report?
C) And who had overall responsibility for all legal facets? And to whom do they report?
D) And who was the decision maker with overall responsibility for the scientific and medical facets; inputs (consultations inter alia) and empirical data, and most particularly medical evidence? And to whom do they report?
4. A) Who in the Scottish government's civil service has accountability (financial/cost/benefit) for all consultations?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who in the Scottish Government has highest level responsibility for civil service Quality and Professional Standards? And, for professional standards of service vis a vis the public?
5. And most importantly, with reference to my follow up letter of 13th May, 2018 who in the Scottish Government is the chief scientific officer/official with accountability for evidence and scientific method; data quality and integrity, review and acceptance of statistics, methodologies and analyses; i.e. ensuring a solid peer reviewed and substantive empiric base of supporting evidence? And who is the Chief Analyst with oversight of analytical quality and standards?


Thank you for your immediate attention. I await your full and speedy response.

Yours sincerely,



To: First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, SNP
Bute House
No 6 Charlotte Square
Edinburgh

From:



Subject: No response from the Gender Recognition Review Panel re. Concerns and criticism 20 February, 2018.

Date: 13/05/2018

Dear Ms Sturgeon,

With reference to my letter of 20 February, 2018 documenting high level criticisms of the Consultation on changes to the GRA (2004) to which I neither received acknowledgement or response from the Gender Recognition Panel, and with reference to my letter of 28 March, 2018 asking you to personally expedite the matter and ensure I received a full and well considered response in good time.

Ms Sarah Duncan acknowledged my letter some weeks later on the 17 April, 2018 stating I would "receive a response shortly". It is now the 13th of May, 2018, three months have passed, and to my dismay I still have not received a response. My concerns re. Annex K and the consultants used and contacted for this consultation were serious and significant including but not limited to;

1. The underrepresentation of women, of parents, and of expert bodies most particularly those with medical, psychiatric and legal expertise; important sections of society were not consulted either directly, or via Annex K. On such significant changes I would have thought relevant, independent and expert input should have been of primary import, and particularly input from those not reliant on government funding (unlike the 'T' groups, associates and affiliates) and not those potentially motivated by private profit (for example, foundations associated with medical research, supply and provision, banks, Big Four; corporations and organisations).
2. Recommendations on much needed enhancements to Annex K including the full listing of all consulted and all contacted, stating their purpose, status, their input (when and where involved), and their major funding sources.
3. **Data Quality and Integrity - to which I would like to make a clear and strongly emphasised addition; the studies referenced in the consultation documents were all of inadequate quality and relevance. To develop good policy and law the Scottish Government must require empirical evidence of the highest standard and it does not do so. I believe this lack of appropriate empirical research must be taken very seriously at the highest level of government, and immediately with respect to the Gender Recognition Act.**
4. **The proliferation and promulgation in Scotland and the UK of 'gender' as a replacement for sex. This is foolish and must be reversed. I should not have to detail why biological sex is needed and gender an imprecise and illogical substitute. Any intelligent person knows the importance of biological sex in life, in medicine, in law, in scientific studies and for statistics.**

I am sincerely worried by the lack of acknowledgements and the complete lack of proper responses from my representatives and ask again that you expedite this, immediately.

However, I expect you as leader of the Scottish Government to make appropriate moves to enhance the consultation process, its integrity and transparency and involve more experts and garner far more expertise. In service to the Scottish people and the better use of public monies, this is desperately required. I hope adequate consideration will be given to all the points I raised in my original letter when considering the responses received on the GRA.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,



From:



TO: Ms Sarah E. Duncan, [redacted]@gov.scot)
Family and Property Law Team, Civil Law and Legal System Division,
Justice Directorate, Scottish Government,
St Andrews's House, Regent Road,
Edinburgh EH1 3DG

Date: 17th July 2018

Ref: AB to GRA Review Panel, 20 February 2018 Full document. (N.B. *as per instructions in the Consultation.*)
As no acknowledgement of above follow up letters were sent to the First Minister 28/03/2018 including copy of document, and another as no response by 13/05/2018. See attached. No responses from the First Minister to date.
Sarah Duncan (SD2) to AB, 17 May 2018 (and a repeat copy of the same letter from SD2 received June, 2018)

Subject: **Scottish Government Consultations and the recent GRA change proposal consultation.**
FOI Request.


Dear Ms Duncan,

With reference to your reply. Unfortunately I could not identify you or your section, your responsibilities or expertise, or any of the following responsibilities, via your letter or through the Scottish Government website. Please provide answers to the following questions and do please provide full names, titles, position, main qualifications, and names of superiors along with accurate organisation relationships and addresses.

1. A) What is your position and what are your responsibilities on the GRA Review Panel?
B) What was your position, and what were your responsibilities, on the recent GRA consultation?
C) To whom do you report?
2. A) Who is in charge of the GRA Review Panel?
B) And, to whom do they report? And to what Minister?
3. A) Who was responsible, i.e. who had overall responsibility within the civil service, for the delivery of the GRA Consultation documentation?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who was responsible for the identification of stakeholders and the 'development of the list'? And to whom do they report?
C) And who had overall responsibility for all legal facets? And to whom do they report?
D) And who was the decision maker with overall responsibility for the scientific and medical facets; inputs (consultations inter alia) and empirical data, and most particularly medical evidence? And to whom do they report?
4. A) Who in the Scottish government's civil service has accountability (financial/cost/benefit) for all consultations?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who in the Scottish Government has highest level responsibility for civil service Quality and Professional Standards? And, for professional standards of service vis a vis the public?
5. And most importantly, with reference to my follow up letter of 13th May, 2018 who in the Scottish Government is the chief scientific officer/official with accountability for evidence and scientific method; data quality and integrity, review and acceptance of statistics, methodologies and analyses; i.e. ensuring a solid peer reviewed and substantive empiric base of supporting evidence? And who is the Chief Analyst with oversight of analytical quality and standards?


Thank you for your immediate attention. I await your full and speedy response.

Yours sincerely,



To: First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, SNP
Bute House
No 6 Charlotte Square
Edinburgh

From:



Subject: No response from the Gender Recognition Review Panel re. Concerns and criticism 20 February, 2018.

Date: 13/05/2018

Dear Ms Sturgeon,

With reference to my letter of 20 February, 2018 documenting high level criticisms of the Consultation on changes to the GRA (2004) to which I neither received acknowledgement or response from the Gender Recognition Panel, and with reference to my letter of 28 March, 2018 asking you to personally expedite the matter and ensure I received a full and well considered response in good time.

Ms Sarah Duncan acknowledged my letter some weeks later on the 17 April, 2018 stating I would "receive a response shortly". It is now the 13th of May, 2018, three months have passed, and to my dismay I still have not received a response. My concerns re. Annex K and the consultants used and contacted for this consultation were serious and significant including but not limited to;


1. The underrepresentation of women, of parents, and of expert bodies most particularly those with medical, psychiatric and legal expertise; important sections of society were not consulted either directly, or via Annex K. On such significant changes I would have thought relevant, independent and expert input should have been of primary import, and particularly input from those not reliant on government funding (unlike the 'T' groups, associates and affiliates) and not those potentially motivated by private profit (for example, foundations associated with medical research, supply and provision, banks, Big Four; corporations and organisations).
2. Recommendations on much needed enhancements to Annex K including the full listing of all consulted and all contacted, stating their purpose, status, their input (when and where involved), and their major funding sources.
3. **Data Quality and Integrity - to which I would like to make a clear and strongly emphasised addition; the studies referenced in the consultation documents were all of inadequate quality and relevance. To develop good policy and law the Scottish Government must require empirical evidence of the highest standard and it does not do so. I believe this lack of appropriate empirical research must be taken very seriously at the highest level of government, and immediately with respect to the Gender Recognition Act.**
4. **The proliferation and promulgation in Scotland and the UK of 'gender' as a replacement for sex. This is foolish and must be reversed. I should not have to detail why biological sex is needed and gender an imprecise and illogical substitute. Any intelligent person knows the importance of biological sex in life, in medicine, in law, in scientific studies and for statistics.**

I am sincerely worried by the lack of acknowledgements and the complete lack of proper responses from my representatives and ask again that you expedite this, immediately.

However, I expect you as leader of the Scottish Government to make appropriate moves to enhance the consultation process, its integrity and transparency and involve more experts and garner far more expertise. In service to the Scottish people and the better use of public monies, this is desperately required. I hope adequate consideration will be given to all the points I raised in my original letter when considering the responses received on the GRA.


Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,



From:



TO: Ms Sarah E. Duncan, @gov.scot)
Family and Property Law Team, Civil Law and Legal System Division,
Justice Directorate, Scottish Government,
St Andrews's House, Regent Road,
Edinburgh EH1 3DG

Date: 17th July 2018

Ref: AB to GRA Review Panel, 20 February 2018 Full document. (N.B. *as per instructions in the Consultation.*)
As no acknowledgement of above follow up letters were sent to the First Minister 28/03/2018 including copy of document, and another as no response by 13/05/2018. See attached. No responses from the First Minister to date.
Sarah Duncan (SD2) to AB, 17 May 2018 (and a repeat copy of the same letter from SD2 received June, 2018)

Subject: **Scottish Government Consultations and the recent GRA change proposal consultation.**
FOI Request.

Dear Ms Duncan,

With reference to your reply. Unfortunately I could not identify you or your section, your responsibilities or expertise, or any of the following responsibilities, via your letter or through the Scottish Government website. Please provide answers to the following questions and do please provide full names, titles, position, main qualifications, and names of superiors along with accurate organisation relationships and addresses.

1. A) What is your position and what are your responsibilities on the GRA Review Panel?
B) What was your position, and what were your responsibilities, on the recent GRA consultation?
C) To whom do you report?
2. A) Who is in charge of the GRA Review Panel?
B) And, to whom do they report? And to what Minister?
3. A) Who was responsible, i.e. who had overall responsibility within the civil service, for the delivery of the GRA Consultation documentation?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who was responsible for the identification of stakeholders and the 'development of the list'? And to whom do they report?
C) And who had overall responsibility for all legal facets? And to whom do they report?
D) And who was the decision maker with overall responsibility for the scientific and medical facets; inputs (consultations inter alia) and empirical data, and most particularly medical evidence? And to whom do they report?
4. A) Who in the Scottish government's civil service has accountability (financial/cost/benefit) for all consultations?
B) And to whom do they report? And, to what Minister?
C) Who in the Scottish Government has highest level responsibility for civil service Quality and Professional Standards? And, for professional standards of service vis a vis the public?
5. And most importantly, with reference to my follow up letter of 13th May, 2018 who in the Scottish Government is the chief scientific officer/official with accountability for evidence and scientific method; data quality and integrity, review and acceptance of statistics, methodologies and analyses; i.e. ensuring a solid peer reviewed and substantive empiric base of supporting evidence? And who is the Chief Analyst with oversight of analytical quality and standards?

Thank you for your immediate attention. I await your full and speedy response.

Yours sincerely,



To: First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, SNP
Bute House
No 6 Charlotte Square
Edinburgh

From:



Date: 28/03/2018

Dear Ms Sturgeon,

I attach below my complaint to the Gender Recognition Review Panel of 20 February, 2018 having followed the instruction in the consultation documentation on how to complain.

This letter has not been acknowledged. I have had no response.

I believe my criticisms were justified and that changes and enhancements are seriously required in the short term.

Ignoring my letter and its contents is rude and I require a full considered response and I hope you will expedite this.

I believe this Public Consultation was sub-standard in all its parts and a waste of public money.

It was not a genuine Scottish Public Consultation and is substantially invalidated by its limited dissemination and the use of certain sites, only Trans lobbying sites, to put out a simplified version soliciting responses from what is in effect a self-selected 'worldwide' audience.

The lack of involvement of the appropriate professional expert bodies and organisations and the under-representation of women and parents generally must be unacceptable in Scotland today.

I hope you will read the attached as we do need much improved transparency, and the funding and profit motivations behind transgenderism and gender identity do require disclosure and attention.

Women's representation must be enhanced and misogyny must not continue to be given substance in Scottish law.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,



And as no response received ...again to the First Minister....highlights added....

To: First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, SNP
Bute House
No 6 Charlotte Square
Edinburgh

From:



Subject: No response from the Gender Recognition Review Panel re. Concerns and criticism 20 February, 2018.

Date: 13/05/2018

Dear Ms Sturgeon,

With reference to my letter of 20 February, 2018 documenting high level criticisms of the Consultation on changes to the GRA (2004) to which I neither received acknowledgement or response from the Gender Recognition Panel, and with reference to my letter of 28 March, 2018 asking you to personally expedite the matter and ensure I received a full and well considered response in good time.

Ms Sarah Duncan acknowledged my letter some weeks later on the 17 April, 2018 stating I would "receive a response shortly". It is now the 13th of May, 2018, three months have passed, and to my dismay I still have not received a response. My concerns re. Annex K and the consultants used and contacted for this consultation were serious and significant including but not limited to;

1. The underrepresentation of women, of parents, and of expert bodies most particularly those with medical, psychiatric and legal expertise; important sections of society were not consulted either directly, or via Annex K. On such significant changes I would have thought relevant, independent and expert input should have been of primary import, and particularly input from those not reliant on government funding (unlike the "T" groups, associates and affiliates) and not those potentially motivated by private profit (for example, foundations associated with medical research, supply and provision, banks, Big Four; corporations and organisations).
2. Recommendations on much needed enhancements to Annex K including the full listing of all consulted and all contacted, stating their purpose, status, their input (when and where involved), and their major funding sources.
3. **Data Quality and Integrity - to which I would like to make a clear and strongly emphasised addition; the studies referenced in the consultation documents were all of inadequate quality and relevance. To develop good policy and law the Scottish Government must require empirical evidence of the highest standard and it does not do so. I believe this lack of appropriate empirical research must be taken very seriously at the highest level of government, and immediately with respect to the Gender Recognition Act.**
4. **The proliferation and promulgation in Scotland and the UK of 'gender' as a replacement for sex. This is foolish and must be reversed. I should not have to detail why biological sex is needed and gender an imprecise and illogical substitute. Any intelligent person knows the importance of biological sex in life, in medicine, in law, in scientific studies and for statistics.**

I am sincerely worried by the lack of acknowledgements and the complete lack of proper responses from my representatives and ask again that you expedite this, immediately.

However, I expect you as leader of the Scottish Government to make appropriate moves to enhance the consultation process, its integrity and transparency and involve more experts and garner far more expertise. In service to the Scottish people and the better use of public monies, this is desperately required. I hope adequate consideration will be given to all the points I raised in my original letter when considering the responses received on the GRA.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,

