

Draft response to Institute of Fundraising guidance on Outdoor Fundraising in the UK

Purpose

1. This paper presents a draft NAF response to the consultation draft guidance on Outdoor Fundraising produced by the UK Institute of Fundraising.

Action

2. **Members are invited to consider the draft response and highlight any changes that might be required.**

Background

3. The Institute of Fundraising has developed guidance on Outdoor Challenge Events in the UK (including the Three Peaks). The Forum made an initial input to this process during 2009 - and the Secretary fed some general comments into the Steering Group that was leading this work.
4. The Institute has now circulated a draft for wider consultation. Following discussion at the last Forum meeting, this was copied round the Forum's contact network to seek members' views, with the aim of compiling a response on behalf of the Forum. A draft response is attached.
5. The consultation period formally closes on 19 February, but the Institute has kindly agreed to accept a response from the Forum immediately after the present meeting.
6. Comments were only provided by a few Forum members, in some cases through informal discussion. These points are presented as a compilation of comments (rather than an agreed consensus view) in a short annex to the letter. A general qualification in the letter indicates that these are the views of individual members and will not necessarily be shared by all.

Mark Wrightham
Secretary

Draft response

(NAF letterhead)

Caroline Howe
Policy & Codes Manager
Institute of Fundraising
Park Place
12 Lawn Lane
London
SW8 1UD

25 February 2010

Dear Caroline,

OUTDOOR FUNDRAISING IN THE UK

Thank you for consulting Scotland's National Access Forum on the Institute of Fundraising's draft guidance on Outdoor Fundraising events. Thank you also for agreeing to accept a final response from the Forum slightly after your formal closing date.

As you will be aware, the Forum is currently developing guidance on the organisation of large outdoor events in the context of the Scottish Outdoor Access Code (SOAC). We have also contributed to development of the Institute's guidance at an early stage through the Steering Group which supported this review. The Forum therefore has a close interest in this topic and warmly welcomes the Institute's draft guidance.

A number of Forum members have provided individual comments which are compiled as an annex to this letter, although the Forum has a broad membership and these points should not necessarily be taken to represent a consensus view.

It is clearly a challenging task to develop concise guidance which is appropriate to the very different access contexts in different parts of the UK. With this in mind, the clear references to the SOAC are probably, from the Forum's perspective, the single most important element of the guidance. It would be helpful to note (perhaps in Section 2.1) that the Forum is developing further guidance set in the Scottish access context, which will be made available in due course on the Scottish access rights website at www.outdooraccess-scotland.com. It would also be helpful, perhaps in the second bullet of 2.1, to refer to the local guidance that has recently been developed for the Cairngorms National Park (available at www.cairngorms.co.uk).

Finally, I should provide some background information about the National Access Forum. The forum has been established by Scottish Natural Heritage to advise on national issues linked to Scottish access rights (conferred by the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003). There are currently 24 full members and 72 corresponding members encompassing all of the recreation, land management and public bodies with close interests in outdoor access, along with a number of other relevant organisations. A full list of members is enclosed.

Please do not hesitate to get back to me (mark.wrighttham@snh.gov.uk; 01463 725316), if you would like to discuss any of the above in more detail.

With best wishes,

Mark Wrighttham
Secretary

Annex: Specific comments on draft guidance received from Forum members

- The format of the guidance was welcomed. One contributor noted that the guidance is very comprehensive and emphasised that the level of organisation required will depend on the nature and scale of the event (a point which is broadly reflected in the SOAC). Another contributor suggested that the guidance should refer to the need for events to be appropriate to their countryside settings.
- Some members suggested that the significance of the SOAC is underplayed by the suggestion that the Code *ought* to be observed (Section 2.1; bullet 4). The guidance in the Code does not have statutory weight and *ought* is thus strictly correct using the definitions adopted by the IoF guidance. The Code is, however, the statutory reference point for responsible access in Scotland and has been approved by the Scottish Parliament. The onus to adhere to its guidance is therefore at least as great as for site-specific local Codes (2nd bullet), and on this basis it would be more appropriate to use *must* in this context.
- The final bullet of 2.1 should also refer to the historic environment and Historic Scotland has forwarded some specific amendments to you separately. One contributor highlighted a need to clarify who should make judgements about environmental impacts – and this point will be addressed more specifically in the guidance that the Forum is currently developing (see covering letter).
- Section 2.2: bullet 2 should include National Park Authorities among the list of bodies to be consulted, as these have lead roles in access management, within their areas, in Scotland. It would also be important to consult with local communities with respect to larger events.
- Section 2.3 could suggest that organisers consider the use of penalties (such as points docked or disqualification) to encourage participants to follow advice aimed at protecting the environment – such as to stay on paths.
- The suggested use of signage to provide advance notice of events (2.4) was supported.
- As a general point re. Section 3, one contributor suggested that Three Peaks events should be rotated around different peaks in each country on an annual basis in order to reduce their impact.
- The guidance on toilet provision cited in 5.1 is produced by the Mountaineering Council of Scotland (MCofS), which is distinct from the British Mountaineering Council. The MCofS website also includes other relevant guidance such as *Wild Camping: a guide to good practice* (<http://www.mcofs.org.uk/assets/pdfs/wildcamping.pdf>), and this reference list could be modified accordingly.