

## Meeting Minutes for Cleaner Air for Scotland Governance Group

**Location:** Dundee House, 50 North Lindsay Street, Dundee, DD1 1NB  
**Date:** 6 April 2016  
**Time:** 10:00 – 16:00

### Present

Graham Applegate (SEPA)	Martin Marsden (SEPA)
Aileen Brodie (Aberdeen City Council)	Vincent McNally (Glasgow City Council)
Janet Brown (City of Edinburgh Council)	Janice Milne (SEPA)
Lorna Bryce (SEPA)	Eleanor Pratt (SEPA/Transport Scotland)
James Curran (Scottish Environment Link)	Andrew Taylor (Scottish Government)
Colin Gillespie (SEPA)	Stephen Thomson (Transport Scotland)
Emilia Hanna (Scottish Environment Link)	Iris Whyte (Dundee City Council)
Drew Hill (Transport Scotland)	

### Chair

Martin Marsden (SEPA)

### Apologies

Bruce Kiloh (Strathclyde Partnership for Transport)  
 Colin Ramsay (Health Protection Scotland)

Item	Title	Action
1.	<p><b><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></b>                      MM welcomed everyone, and introduced new members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lorna Bryce (SEPA) – chair of the CAFS Communications working group.</li> <li>- Janet Brown (City of Edinburgh Council) – replacing Gavin Martin as City of Edinburgh Council and South East Local Pollution Control Liaison Group representative.</li> <li>- Bruce Kiloh (SPT - not present, apologies made) – has agreed to represent the Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs) on the CAFS GG.</li> </ul> <p>Given that the previously-existing group has been joined by a number of new members, the purpose of this extended meeting was to ‘get to know’ each other and develop a common view and understanding of the task ahead.</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>Key CAFS Objectives</u></b></p> <p>AT provided an overview of the key CAFS objectives and when they need to be delivered.</p> <p>The overarching CAFS vision is that Scotland’s air quality will be the best in Europe.</p> <p>A number of headline CAFS actions have been prioritised up front:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CAFS Communication Strategy (currently being finalised)</li> <li>- National Modelling Framework (data collection to be complete by mid-2017, with delivery by 2018)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Low Emission Framework (under development)</li> </ul> <p>There are a host of other actions in CAFS, some with well-defined timelines, some vague, and some with no timeline at all. Little time has previously been devoted to prioritising when and how to achieve these other actions – as a group we need to ensure these non-headline actions aren’t ignored.</p> <p>We are currently about mid-way through the reporting year (CAFS progress report due in November at STEP Conference). There are 3 significant subsequent time markers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mid-2017 (NMF data collection complete)</li> <li>- End 2018 (NMF/NLEF framework delivery)</li> <li>- End 2020 (compliance with EU air quality legislation and significant progress towards revocation of all AQMAs).</li> </ul>							
3.	<p><u>Working Culture</u></p> <p>The previous meeting established a need to consider group dynamics and how we work together. A session on working culture was held, designed to further develop trust, understanding and coherence to create more of a team ethic within the group, and to better understand each other’s drivers, constraints and perceptions.</p> <p>It was suggested that this group needs to not be afraid to think more radically/disruptively/ambitiously, with parallels drawn to the new ‘mindset’ around climate change thinking.</p> <p>It was also highlighted that there is an opportunity for the CAFS GG to work jointly with those working on climate change to achieve win/win solutions where these have been missed out on in the past. Climate change has stronger political drivers than air quality, and CAFS offers a good opportunity to bring these together, and get those driving climate change work to acknowledge the multiple benefits presented by air quality improvements.</p> <p>The need for honesty and transparency in this work was also highlighted.</p> <p><u>Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of engagement/ability to influence on air quality</li> <li>- Within organisations – lack of action on policies</li> <li>- Lack of connectivity</li> <li>- Lack of funds/resources</li> <li>- Air quality battling with other political priorities</li> <li>- Lack of understanding of ‘actors’ and organisational remits/detail</li> </ul> <p><u>Test results</u></p> <p>DISC Personality Test:</p> <table data-bbox="295 1915 766 2038"> <thead> <tr> <th>DISC</th> <th>Group Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dominant</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Influential</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DISC	Group Total	Dominant	44	Influential	41	
DISC	Group Total							
Dominant	44							
Influential	41							

	<p>Steady 49 Conscientious 44</p> <p>Belbin Team Roles Test:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Belbin</th> <th>Group Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Shaper</td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coordinator</td> <td>178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plant</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resource Investigator</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitor Evaluator</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Implementer</td> <td>131</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Team Worker</td> <td>156</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Completer-Finisher</td> <td>92</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>A CAFS GG key attribute shown to be in the Coordinator function. Weaker overall scores were seen for the Resource-Investigator and Influencing areas which are key functions of this group, and could be areas targeted for improvement. Certain individuals scored particularly highly as Resource-Investigator, Monitor-Evaluator, Team-Worker and Completer-Finisher.</p> <p>It was felt that this session was helpful in beginning to build more of a group dynamic, and to identify some of the core strengths of the group's make-up, as well as areas to target for improvement. There was feeling that it would be useful to include a short slot at each meeting where the group can return to this reflective way of thinking about the group dynamic and working culture - how did the meeting 'feel', was everyone listened to, what were the outcomes etc.</p> <p><b>Action 1: EP to include 10-15min 'reflection' slot on agenda at end of each CAFS GG meeting.</b></p>	Belbin	Group Total	Shaper	93	Coordinator	178	Plant	61	Resource Investigator	65	Monitor Evaluator	100	Implementer	131	Team Worker	156	Completer-Finisher	92	
Belbin	Group Total																			
Shaper	93																			
Coordinator	178																			
Plant	61																			
Resource Investigator	65																			
Monitor Evaluator	100																			
Implementer	131																			
Team Worker	156																			
Completer-Finisher	92																			
4.	<p><u>Prioritisation of Actions</u></p> <p>The group was asked to prioritise CAFS actions, outside of the 'headline actions' (CCS/NMF/NLEF) mentioned above. Each group member was given 5 post-it notes numbered 1-5 and asked to identify their 5 'priority' actions, with 1 = least important and 5 = most important. The total number of 'points' assigned to each action was calculated, and the actions ranked (see Table 1 below). Actions receiving an equal number of total points were ranked according to the number of 5's, 4's etc. they received. Actions which did not receive any points are included in Table 2 below. Actions related to the NMF and NLEF (which have already been prioritised and are being progressed) are not included – it is worth noting that a number of the other actions in Table 2 (e.g. LP3, H1 and P4 are also well progressed).</p> <p><u>Table 1</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Prioritised Actions</th> <th>Rank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P1 (Ensure updates and revisions to SPP and NPF take account of</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Prioritised Actions	Rank	P1 (Ensure updates and revisions to SPP and NPF take account of	1															
Prioritised Actions	Rank																			
P1 (Ensure updates and revisions to SPP and NPF take account of	1																			

CAFS)	
T7 (Review guidance and legislation on powers of local transport authorities re: bus services by 2016)	2
T3 (Work with partners to deliver shared vision of Cycling Action Plan for Scotland – 10% of everyday journeys by bike)	3
T14 (Review guidance on regional & local transport strategies during 2016, in light of refreshed National Transport Strategy)	4
P2 (Expect planning authorities to review LDPs at next scheduled update and revise in line with CAFS and local AQ action plans)	5
T4 (Review support for green buses by 2016, including scope for supporting retrofitting existing vehicles)	6
CC1 (Ensure future updates to Low Carbon Scotland' publication take air quality impacts into account)	7
T9 (Review Switched on Scotland 'Roadmap' and develop a post-2015 plug in vehicle action plan)	8
H2 (NHS boards and LA partners include reference to AQ and health in next revision of joint Health Protection Plans)	9
T5 (Evaluate Bus investment Fund in 2016 to learn from supported projects and inform decisions on options for future support)	10
C1 (A Scottish AQ indicator will be developed to assist in assessing compliance with AQ legislation and delivery of CAFS objectives)	11
CC2 (Expect any LA developing a Sustainable Energy Action Plan to ensure AQ considerations are covered)	12
T15 (Review trunk road impacts on AQMAs & implement mitigation where trunk roads are primary contributor to air pollutants)	13
LP1 (Implement a refocussed Local Air Quality Management system)	14=
LP2 (Establish PM2.5 monitoring network)	14 =
LP8 (Identify requirements and undertake data collection for additional urban areas within 3 years of implementing CAFS)	14=
T6 (Review Bus Operators Grant by 2016 including options to incentivise the use of low emission buses)	16
C3 (Develop a national air quality public awareness campaign)	17=
T1 (LAs to ensure they have a corporate travel plan which is consistent with any air quality action plan)	17=
T11 (Continue to engage partners on the role less carbon intensive fuels can play in the transition to a near-zero emission road transport sector by 2050)	17=

**Table 2**

<b>Unscored Actions</b>
C2 (Support ongoing Greener Scotland communication campaigns)
LP3 (Produce revised and updated Scottish action plans)
H1 (Include WHO guideline values for PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> in legislation as Scottish objectives)
T2 (Finalise and deliver the National Walking Strategy Delivery Plan by 2016)
T8 (Continue delivery of actions contained in Switched on Scotland: A Roadmap to Widespread Adoption of Plug-In Vehicles)
T10 (Work with key partners to investigate the use of hydrogen as a transport fuel and energy applications)
T12 (Encourage LAs with AQMAs to create Freight Quality Partnerships)

	<table border="1" data-bbox="311 94 1145 461"> <tr> <td data-bbox="311 94 1145 170">T13 (Encourage Freight Quality Partnerships to extend activities to include consideration of environmental impact of freight)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="311 170 1145 241">P3 (Work with Environmental Protection Scotland to produce updated guidance on air quality and planning)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="311 241 1145 315">P4 (Work with SEPA to introduce AQ training for local authority spatial and transport planners)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="311 315 1145 387">P5 (Support SEPA in revising its guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment to bring into line with CAFS)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="311 387 1145 461">CC3 (Forestry Commission Scotland to publish updated guidance on impact of biomass on air quality)</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="292 495 1302 813">If we take the highest priority actions to be those ranked 1-10, then there are actions under the Place-making, Transport, Climate Change and Health objectives which need to be given further consideration immediately. A number of the Transport actions ranked as 'priority' are already being progressed by various Transport Scotland policy leads, although further work is required to track/feed into developments on these actions (see 'Transport' update below). Likewise action H2 is under progression by HPS. However actions P1, P2 and CC1 should be highlighted for further short-term discussion.</p>	T13 (Encourage Freight Quality Partnerships to extend activities to include consideration of environmental impact of freight)	P3 (Work with Environmental Protection Scotland to produce updated guidance on air quality and planning)	P4 (Work with SEPA to introduce AQ training for local authority spatial and transport planners)	P5 (Support SEPA in revising its guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment to bring into line with CAFS)	CC3 (Forestry Commission Scotland to publish updated guidance on impact of biomass on air quality)	
T13 (Encourage Freight Quality Partnerships to extend activities to include consideration of environmental impact of freight)							
P3 (Work with Environmental Protection Scotland to produce updated guidance on air quality and planning)							
P4 (Work with SEPA to introduce AQ training for local authority spatial and transport planners)							
P5 (Support SEPA in revising its guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment to bring into line with CAFS)							
CC3 (Forestry Commission Scotland to publish updated guidance on impact of biomass on air quality)							
5.	<p data-bbox="292 853 608 884"><u>Working group chair tasks</u></p> <p data-bbox="292 920 1230 992">Each of the current working group chairs provided a summary of the key tasks required to deliver their group' actions.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1028 612 1059"><b><u>Legislation and Policy - AT</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="292 1095 1286 1373"><u>LP1 (A refocussed LAQM system will be implemented)</u> - The PM<sub>2.5</sub> objective came into force last week. New policy and technical guidance (PG/TG16) has now been published. Other elements are coming in over the next few months, with LP1 due for completion by <b>June 2016</b>. It was highlighted that LP1 will need continuous review as the various elements come online; the next review will take into account NMF and NLEF – when this happens will depend on the development of these frameworks.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1408 1283 1606"><u>LP2 (A PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network will be established)</u> - Ricardo have reviewed the existing monitoring network to identify priorities; a report is being produced and should be available shortly, with a decision on how to proceed made over next 2-3 months. A start will be made by <b>June 2016</b>, but it will be a gradual process to establish the PM<sub>2.5</sub> network - completion expected by the <b>end of 2018</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1641 1286 1839"><u>LP3 (Revised/updated Scottish action plans will be produced)</u> – These plans were produced in December 2015, SG now waiting to see what the response is from the European Commission; difficult to put a time line on that but feedback is expected autumn this year. Likely <b>Oct-Dec 2016</b> to confirm if anything else needs to be done to Scottish action plans.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1874 740 1906"><b><u>National Modelling Framework - CG</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="292 1942 1054 1973">3 main work-streams have been identified for the NMF actions:</p>						

1: Regional NMF (identifying cross-regional issues)

2: Local NMF (defining local issues)

3: Developing an online resource for hosting model outputs and action scenarios

LP4 (Design/develop/implement a 2 –level modelling system) – This action is essentially ‘the NMF’, which will be developed over the next 2 years. City modelling will be complete by **mid-2017**. Regional model might take longer as the current focus is at city level, and requires more strategic-level work- likely **end 2017**. This regional model will be the one that has the larger influence on planning.

LP5 (Evaluate requirements of regional model and support its development) – Evaluation of requirements (agreeing concepts and data to be fed into regional model) hopefully to be complete **by end 2016**, allowing sufficient time to build model and develop reporting processes **by end 2017**. Completion of this model should allow an agreed position on the scale of the problem and a common view on how to describe it.

Discussion followed around the ease of adjusting the model in the future once more information on emissions factors is available. The model should be updated annually as the emissions factors change, together with new information on vehicle movements etc.

A national delivery/working group should be set up to go through these issues, develop ideas and drive forward the development of the regional approach. As with the local model the regional model can be sent for peer review independently, but a delivery group will also help take concerns into account, be aware of new things coming online etc.

Discussion on how to engage with those who may oppose the route under which these models have been developed. It was suggested that a presentation be provided at the STEP conference to showcase the quality of the evidence used for the models to help engage users/decision makers. Need to consider in terms of comms – lines to take in response to objections, launch of NMF etc. Opportunity for wider meeting later in the year to get mandate on the quality of the evidence.

Concerns were expressed that the local model may not match up to local monitoring data – how to overcome this as a LA will always go with their monitored data rather than modelled data? This has been dealt with in the Aberdeen work – lots of post-model data analysis was carried out to validate the model against monitoring stations and the diffusion tube network. Then went back and re-modelled certain monitoring locations to double check and ensure the model is a true reflection of the situation.

The Aberdeen work is under peer review currently, and will be built into the Glasgow work. Each area will be modelled in close conjunction with the LA for the detailed modelling, so that the LA is assured that outputs are as accurate as possible. The NMF is not designed to replace monitoring of air quality; it is extrapolating from air quality monitoring sites to provide a wider picture of the

issue.

LP6 (Develop guidance/support network) – the local model will be developed over the next 1.5 years, with data collection and city modelling carried out in the same way, so LAs know there's consistency in approach across the country but with city-specific actions. This will require close working relationships between transport, air quality and planning people in each city.

It was queried whether the same level of data is available across all the cities? This is why CG's team are working with individual LAs to build the data set as they go. Currently there is a huge traffic data collection project happening in Glasgow, building on the Aberdeen work – will provide a baseline which can then be used for Dundee etc.

The point was made that through this process Glasgow City Council have found out about additional sources of data sets e.g. from SPT and TS which they didn't know existed - this process is providing much more detailed and up to date data than they've ever had before.

It was queried whether the model is able to predict exposure to individuals based on their movements/lifestyle? The NMF models won't be able to take people's movement into account to determine their exposure (would require a different model), but there are other projects doing this e.g. ADMS and Qcumber are looking at 'synthetic' people movement and exposure. TS are linking up at a strategic level on these projects.

It was suggested that while the discussion on exposure is interesting, and is likely to be important in getting political buy-in from decision makers and help facilitate spending on transport measures etc., that it is vital that this group keeps its focus on meeting the air quality targets themselves, and reducing the number of AQMAs.

The only way to demonstrate improvement is to measure against compliance within the system we have (i.e. the air quality standards), so 'other' types of modelling re exposure and workplaces etc. could be considered 'nice to have' but not essential. However the importance of showing the benefits of less exposure/improved quality of life to messaging around this topic was acknowledged.

It was queried what the model is going to be used for? If for comms, then it needs to tell the story about exposure. The modelling will be used to provide evidence for the NLEF, which is based on transport decision making, sitting alongside LAQM. The detailed city model provides the basis for scenario testing of 'hard' ground-based actions (e.g. transport actions), which are designed to achieve the air quality targets. The model won't deliver 'soft actions' e.g. around comms. The model will support evidence-based decision making processes: tell LAs which streets/types of transport to focus on, and provide evidence to support that. Will also help remove inconsistencies from procedures currently used by different consultants across different LAs. It provides confidence behind the scenarios being put forward to LA committees, and is therefore a valuable tool.

## Transport – ST

The CAFS Transport actions can be divided up into 4 different groups:

### 1: NLEF Actions

LP10 (Develop NLEF criteria, tests and processes), LP11 (Standard appraisal process) and LP12 (Develop NLEF software, tools and guidance)

**April – June 2016:** consider the various potential enforcement regimes (cameras/stickers/something else).

**April – May 2016:** develop brief for consultants to produce NLEF packages and document process (stage 1-5)

**June-Sep 2016:** Production of NLEF tools/guidance by consultants.

**Oct-Dec 2016:** Period of reflection and testing.

**End of 2018:** Define LEZs/CAZs and where.

ST needs people to help develop the consultant brief, or will struggle to keep to timescales.

**Action 2: ALL to contact ST to offer assistance in developing NLEF consultant brief.**

The need to keep continually engaged with DfT and Defra on their CAZs action plan was highlighted. Should ensure they are given options to dial into/attend certain meetings; periodic updates from DfT/Defra should be included every 6 months on the timeline.

### 2: Actions being progressed by Transport Scotland policy leads - T1 – T14

This group of actions is being progressed under existing work-streams/timelines by policy leads within Transport Scotland. We need to ensure we have opportunities to feed in and target air quality within these policy areas. For example ST has been invited to several meetings on CNG (Compressed Natural Gas), which are relevant to actions T10 and T11.

The need to target funding prioritisation for monies held by those policy offices was highlighted. Currently difficult to gather sufficient evidence to support funding decisions in advance (1-year spending review). It is however vital to consider monies and how to prioritise/redirect existing funding streams – should be doing this by **Nov 2017**.

**Action 3: ST to get rough timelines for this group of CAFS actions from the various policy leads.**

### 3: Action T15 (Review trunk road impacts on AQMAs and implement mitigation where trunk roads are primary contributor to air pollution)

ST is leading on this action. There are currently 2 trunk roads which are the primary contributors to poor local air quality. One is in Aberdeen, which is likely to be de-trunked by the A90 dualling/AWPR. ST has been focussing on the other in Crieff (A85). A meeting with Perth and Kinross Council regarding the air quality action



plan for Crieff, and a steering group are being set up. Between now and **April 2017** an air quality action plan will be put in place and mitigation options tested.

#### 4: Topics for 'further investigation'

This group of 'potential' CAFS actions includes the DfT/Defra links and the further research section of CAFS (s6.32).

#### **Action 4: ST to provide a rough timeline for 'further investigation' actions.**

The need for engagement with bus companies was highlighted. They want to know what's going to be required in terms of LEZs/CAZs etc. so they can plan ahead; important that operators have an idea of what will be expected. NMF will provide support on what buses (model/age etc.) should run where. However we are unlikely to be able to provide operators with any concrete information before the end of 2016, by which point we will be beginning to see the modelling outputs, know what framework is being used to define LEZs etc. The STEP Conference in November is a good time to put out these messages. Need to be careful not to provide notice on something that may not happen but still provide sufficient notice to develop grant funding for retrofitting/fleet upgrades/operator improvements etc. Will be fed into comms plans.

Concerns were raised that a large number of the Transport actions are not being delivered by the Governance Group, but by Transport Scotland - how do we ensure our air quality interests are incorporated if they not being delivered by this group? It was commented that we don't, as a Governance Group, have a final say on the direction of these policies, we only have seat at the table.

#### **Action 5: Governance Group to produce 1 pager for each of these TS-led CAFS Transport actions to define our minimum 'ask', for TS officials to use when engaging on these policy areas by April/May 2016.**

#### **Place-Making – NM by correspondence**

Actions P3 (Work with EPS to produce updated guidance on air quality and planning) and P4 (Work with SEPA to introduce air quality training for planners) are both well progressed. Actions P1 and P2 were identified as priority actions in the previous exercise.

The air quality training will be delivered through the EMAQ programme (i.e. through Ricardo) so will be free to LAs. It is targeted at development/transport planners, and is due to be trialled shortly. There was some feeling expressed that this package could be called a 'learning and development' rather than 'training' package – discussion passed to package leads.

Heads of Planning Scotland have been contacted to provide representation on the CAFS Governance Group.

#### **Communications - LB**

The similarities between the air quality and flood risk management (FRM) work was

	<p>highlighted. It was acknowledged that initially there were concerns about the CAFS Communication Strategy (CCS) being too high level; it was reiterated that this is required, with more detailed plans sitting underneath. The CCS has been revised based on everyone's comments, and a meeting of the Comms Working Group will be held at the start of May to define the detail, start thinking about the annual comms plans, and to define a specific comms timeline. By time the Governance Group meets again, the comms plan and timeline for this year should be defined.</p> <p>The Comms Working Group is made up of the key organisations with regards to CAFS delivery (SG/TS/SEPA/HPS). The need to get LA comms representatives involved was acknowledged, but can be difficult - lots of lessons to be learned from the FRM process.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding resource/time. The amount of work required is equal in size to the FRM comms, but with a hugely reduced resource; therefore we may have to scale down what's being delivered in order to make it deliverable. Secretariat support for the Comms Working Group is hopefully being agreed.</p> <p>The need for a CAFS project manager (to keep track of the programme and ensure various projects knit together, rather than a <u>programme</u> manager) was highlighted – possible resources are being identified.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Terms of Reference</u></p> <p>The Terms of Reference have been redrafted according to comments received to date.</p> <p><b>Action 6: ALL to provide final comments on ToRs to EP by end of this week. Management Group to finalise TORs at next meeting.</b></p> <p>It was highlighted that it had been suggested by the SPCCC that we should consider inviting SOCOEH (Society of Chief Officers of Environmental Health) to the CAFS strategic-level meetings, to reflect the presence of HOPS/SCOTS.</p> <p><b>Action 7: EP to engage with SOCOEH.</b></p>	
7.	<p><u>CCS</u></p> <p>There had been some issues with the definition within the CCS of SG and TS as 'responsible for CAFS delivery'. It was clarified that TS and SG are agencies, with executive responsibility for delivering CAFS. The Governance Group is responsible for managing the programme of work etc. in order to achieve this.</p> <p><b>Action 7: Final CCS to be circulated with minutes from this meeting – attached to email.</b></p>	
8.	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p><u>Reflections on today and what to do next:</u></p> <p>The meeting was felt to have gone well, but there is a feeling that some items are side-tracked by technical detail, although it was acknowledged that there is value in</p>	

	<p>technical discussions, as there are varying levels of knowledge around the table. However we need to avoid getting bogged down during meetings and avoid people feeling marginalised.</p> <p>It was suggested that time could be set aside in a future meeting to discuss the technical details of e.g. the NLEF. It was agreed that there is currently a lack of common understanding within this group on the NMF and NLEF, and that a one-pager could be produced for each which provides clarity and a common language, which could be updated as the frameworks develop.</p> <p><b>Action 8: EP to speak to CG/DH re briefing notes on NMF and NLEF, and LAQM diagram.</b></p> <p>The value in a CAFS climate change sub group was highlighted, particularly given the short time frames to feed into the new Report on Proposals and Policies (RPP3)/Low Carbon Scotland: Meeting our Emissions Reduction Targets as per action CC1 in CAFS – also identified as a priority action in today’s exercise.</p> <p><b>Action 9: Management Group to progress idea of a CAFS Climate Change sub group further.</b></p>	
9.	<p><b><u>Previous Minutes</u></b></p> <p>Minutes from the meeting on 19 February 2016 were reviewed and agreed.</p> <p><u>Outstanding actions</u></p> <p><b>Previous Action: ST to draft letter to Local Authority Chief Executives requesting a permanent member to attend CAFS GG meetings.</b> A letter was drafted , but was felt to not quite have the correct focus. The group will have sight of this letter prior to it being circulated to LAs, with the ToRs.</p> <p><b>Action 10: EP to discuss further with AT how to progress this action.</b></p> <p><b>Previous Action: ST to produce NLEF consultant brief.</b> Superseded by Action 2 above.</p> <p><b>Previous Action: MM to provide clarity on Sniffer’s role/funding.</b> £20k has been identified for Sniffer to help support CAFS engagement events. Will be discussed further by the Comms Working Group and feedback provided to Governance Group.</p> <p><b>Action 11: AT to provide overview of funding/resources for next year at next meeting.</b></p>	
10.	<b>Thanks and Close</b>	