

Redacted | Redacted

From: SEPA

Sent: 19 February 2024 20:29:38

To: [Tavish Scott](#)

Cc: [Paterson, Nicole](#)

SALMON SCOTLAND

Subject: RE: SEPA engagement on SLRF

Importance: Normal

Sensitivity: None

Redacted

Thanks for raising this with me. I don't know the background or reasoning and will look in to it. One general comment I would make is that the formal processes do provide the requesters with rights however it is not clear to me at this stage why this approach has been adopted in this case. Is there any more detail you could share about the meeting of the 19<sup>th</sup> that would help me?

Regards

Redacted

Redacted

Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Redacted

Redacted



Redacted

Angus Smith Building | 6 Parklands Avenue | Eurocentral | Holytown |

North Lanarkshire | ML1 4WQ



sepa

Scottish Environment  
Protection Agency  
Buidheann Dìon  
Àrainneachd na h-Alba

For the future of our environment

At the SEPA we work flexibly, so whilst it suits me to email you now, I do not expect a response or action outside normal working hours.

**From:** Tavish Scott <tavish@salmonscotland.co.uk>

66.0

**Sent:** Monday, February 19, 2024 4:28 PM

**To:** Redacted @SEPA.org.uk>

**Cc:** Paterson, Nicole <Nicole.Paterson@sepa.org.uk>; Redacted @salmonscotland.co.uk>

**Subject:** SEPA engagement on SLRF

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Redacted,

## Sea Lice Risk Framework

Salmon Scotland have received the attached email. We are very disappointed that SEPA has taken the decision to treat a simple follow-up email following a SLRF meeting as a formal FoI request. The questions posed in our email were raised during a SLRF meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> January. We were asked by your team to submit these questions in writing because SEPA's team were unable to provide answers on the day. This was not a formal FoI request – it was a follow-up as proposed by SEPA. Not only is it highly frustrating that our email has been mis-represented but we are now told that this FoI cannot be dealt with in the statutory timeframe. Therefore there will be a further delay in getting a response to questions that underpin the framework.

Could you please explain why SEPA have taken this action?

Unfortunately, we experienced a similar situation last year. We wrote to SEPA raising concerns about the SLRF and asked for our concerns to be presented at the next SEPA Board meeting. SEPA chose to treat interpret our request as a formal complaint. As we stated in follow up correspondence our letter was never submitted as a formal complaint.

SEPA's actions in these two examples are not helpful to developing a positive relationship. I hope you can appreciate the potential negative optics of these situations to external stakeholders. We have not opted to seek information through formal routes ie FoI, nor have we submitted a formal complaint. We have merely sought to raise legitimate questions following a meeting with SEPA colleagues. There is a real likelihood that external stakeholders will mis-understand our actions as a sector taking formal routes of engagement with SEPA, rather than seeing our attempts to foster a positive working relationship.

I will be raising this with the Salmon Scotland Board next week. I would appreciate some clarity on these matters by then. I remain hopeful that in the future SEPA can take a more pragmatic and balanced approach to correspondence received from Salmon Scotland.

Yours sincerely,

Redacted

M  
E  
Redacted



[www.salmonscotland.co.uk](http://www.salmonscotland.co.uk)

*The information in this e-mail is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful.*