

## **Agenda Board and Council Away Day**

02 November 2018

Sheraton Grand Hotel & Spa, 01 Festival Square, Edinburgh EH3 9SR

<b>0900</b> 30m	<b>ARRIVAL, TEA &amp; COFFEE</b>
<b>0930</b> 10m	<b>1 OVERVIEW, WELCOME AND CONTEXT SETTING</b> Dan Cook CEO, Facilitator Christine Armstrong
<b>0940</b> 15m	<b>2 PRESIDENT'S REPORT</b> Adam White FLI
<b>0955</b> 1h	<b>3 POLICY &amp; INFLUENCING SESSION 1</b> 3.1 IEMA presentation - Spencer Clubb, Policy Lead 3.2 Q&A 3.3 LI Policy Strategy
<b>1100</b> 15m	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>1115</b> 1h15	<b>4 POLICY &amp; INFLUENCING - SESSION 2</b> Workshop
<b>1230</b> 30m	<b>5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS &amp; BRANCH/COUNCIL INITIATED ITEMS</b> 5.1 Code of Conduct and Regulation 5.2 Agenda setting 5.3 Standing committee activity
<b>1300</b> 45m	<b>LUNCH</b>
<b>1345</b> 15m	<b>6 OTHER DISCUSSION TIME IF NEEDED</b> 6.1 Key Dates
<b>1400</b> 1h15	<b>7 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY</b> 7.1 Exercise – Debate 7.2 Report back
<b>1515</b> 15m	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>1530</b> 45m	<b>8 LI90<sup>th</sup></b> Presentation and workshop
<b>1615</b> 15m	<b>9 SUMMARY &amp; ROUNDUP</b>
<b>1630</b>	<b>CLOSE</b>

Agenda Item 3	Creating an LI Policy and Influencing Strategy
Paper author:	Ben Brown and Poppy Smith With input from PCC, Dan Cook
Summary of paper:	Describes our plan to create a long-term policy and influencing strategy and to develop our plans, outcomes and impact in this area.
Financial implications:	No direct implications
Council is asked to:	Note the direction and provide insight and suggestions on key policy or influencing outcomes achievable over the next 3 years in line with our corporate strategy.

## 1 Purpose

We have seen many successes in our policy work over the years, with staff and members driving key projects. With a relatively new team and a new corporate strategy, we wish to build upon this success and develop policy and influencing strategy to improve the way we work in this area, and formalise much of the work we currently do in this field.

This follows on directly from the Landscape Institute Corporate Strategy 2018-2023, in which we stated that we would: *“Raise the profile of landscape and place with the public and decision makers”*.

This project has two main strands:

- 1 Creating an **internal framework**, which will guide our current and future work in this area to ensure that we are working as best that we can. It will cover all aspects of policy and influencing, from how we use data and evidence, to how we partner with other organisations on thought leadership through to working with volunteers and committees.
- 2 A **three-year strategy** for the Landscape Institute’s policy and influencing activity.<sup>1</sup> This will flesh out the aims set out in the Corporate Strategy. Some of the projects we have been working on for this year will feed into this new strategy.

The aim is to ensure that we are a relevant, expert, and trusted professional body. This means making the best use of the resources that we have; being confident in our processes; and always striving for higher quality. These two strategy strands should directly contribute towards sustainable, inclusive growth of our organisation and the sector.

## 2. Scope

Policy and influencing is made up of a number of different activities: from agreeing what we care about (policy) to telling people about it (external comms). At the heart of all this is our membership, who are our key asset: it is their views that we are representing, and on whose behalf we act. The more influential we are, the more influential our members will be, and vice versa.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Some definitions:** By “policy” we are referring to things in the external world (especially related to government) that we care about, and want to see changed or improved. This is also sometimes called “public policy”. (It does not refer to our own internal policies, such as our IT or HR policies). By “influence” we mean the process of informing decision-makers (especially in government) of those things that we care about. This is usually called “public affairs”, “external affairs”, or “advocacy”.

The goal for policy work is to advocate for topics the membership care about in order to seek change and improvement. These improvements can range from very specific public policy amendments (e.g. improved legislation), to simply raising awareness amongst key decision makers.

The following is a summary of the seven key areas that make up “policy and influencing”. Many of these areas are delivered in collaboration with or by other parts of the organisation (e.g. comms, governance, business development). This strategy will provide clarity and certainty for all areas in which P&I work, and ensure we’re not working in silos.



### 3 Updating our internal processes

The first strand to this project is creating an internal strategic framework, guiding our current and future work, to ensure that we are working as effectively as we can. It will cover all aspects of policy and influencing, from how we use data and evidence, to how we partner with other organisations on thought leadership through to working with volunteers and committees.

Underpinning this work are 10 key principles (see Appendix 1) that have instructed our thinking, and that will guide how we work in the future. These new principles have been developed in conversation with the Policy and Communications committee.

Much of this simply codifies existing practice, however in some places we are proposing to make shifts in the way we work. For instance:

- i. We are intending to be much more **outcomes-led**: working on projects to achieve identified results
- ii. We intend to make much better use of **evidence and data**, to ensure that our policy positions are as credible and robust as they can be
- iii. We intend to be more precise about the **core policy interests** of the LI, which will not change year-on-year, so that it’s clearer what we as an institute stand for. (See Section 4 below.)

Explanations of these, and other principles, can be found in Appendix 1.

**App1**

## 4. Project plan

The second half of this project is to develop a multi-year strategy and work plan for our policy and influencing activity. This follows on directly from the Landscape Institute Corporate Strategy 2018-2023, in which we stated that we would: *“Raise the profile of landscape and place with the public and decision makers”*.

The landscape profession is especially broad: straddling the built and natural environment. Our members care about many different topics, several of which are significantly different across the four nations of the UK and internationally. Our policy work must reflect our full and diverse membership, and respond to the issues our members care about most. As part of our overall strategy we also want our work to link more closely to the [UN sustainable development goals](#).

However, with a small team and limited resources, we always need to take a focused approach by prioritizing topics effectively. This will ensure that we create the strongest impact.

In order to do this, we need to understand the key policy priorities for the profession, we want to better understand:

- i. What key problems the profession are experiencing in their professional life which needs to be changed/addressed, and why?
- ii. What opportunities exist for our profession to solve major public policy issues?
- iii. Where do members feel the LI can have the most impact, and be most instrumental in effecting change
- iv. What issues are we (or can we be) the “go to” expert on? What territory do we “own”?
- v. Where are there major gaps in knowledge that the LI can help to fill?

By answering these questions, we can plan tangible outcomes to be working towards. These outcomes may be specific changes to public policy, undertaking research to better understand an issue, or to increase the awareness of our sector amongst key decision-makers. For instance:

- Ensure that landscape outcomes are embedded in Defra/MHCLG’s environmental net gain (ref: **natural capital**) proposals
- Research how green infrastructure is/isn’t embedded in **local plans**, and how this could be improved
- Better communicate the value of landscape to **health and wellbeing** professionals

This does not mean that we cease working on other core policy priorities, or that we are unable to react effectively to new opportunities and changing government agendas.

It also does not mean that we will be working in new areas. We will continue to be influential in the things that the LI has always cared about: planning, design, green infrastructure, rural landscape designations, infrastructure, etc.

These may grow or shrink in importance: for example, this year we put more resources into the areas of natural capital and rural landscapes to reflect current government/market priorities. Government priorities change and we will work nimbly to be able seek new opportunities when required.

We will continue to undertake various activities to achieve these outcomes. Measuring success in policy and influencing work can be very difficult, but we can use activity indicators to know whether we are being successful. For example:

- More landscape professionals appearing at major conferences and events related to policy priorities
- Greater references to landscape in strategic plans, procurement standards, economic development strategies, etc.
- Approaches from other organisations wanting to collaborate with the LI on policy

## **5 Action: During the session we will be giving Council members the chance to:**

- 1) Have their say on priorities for the policy strategy**
- 2) Share experiences of problems they see in their professional life and possible solutions**
- 3) Ensure regional and national issues are raised and included in the strategy**
- 4) Suggest tangible goals and outcomes that we could work towards for potential inclusion in our next plans**

Please note: The insight gleaned from today's council session will help inform the work plan for the next three years and beyond. However this meeting is not your last and only chance to feed into the LI's policy strategy, or the activity within it! As part of improving the way we work (Section 3), we intend to get better at how we engage with members on the issues that they care about, and find (light-touch) ways of gathering member intelligence, as part of normal day-to-day practice.

## **6 Timescale**

Below is a draft timetable for the development of this strategy:

- **September:** Development of plan and consultation with PCC
- **November:** Consultation with Council/Board of top-level framework, approach and three-year strategy
- **December:** Board to sign off proposed strategy priorities
- **February:** Council to be presented strategy and support on actions. Policy and Influencing feed practical activity into 2019/20 Business Plan
- **April 2019:** Strategy in operation
- **Post-April:** Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of strategy by PCC, 2019-2020 Business Plan in operation with usual monitoring

## Appendix 1

Principle	Brief explanation
1. Our policy work is targeted and outcomes-led, not activity-led	In order to make the best use of resources, we will prioritise those areas where public policy change is needed, and where we can best help to affect that change. Our time will be spent on activity (publications, partnerships, etc.) that achieves a specific outcome, not just done for its own sake.
2. We agree on our core organisational policy focus, with long-term policy priorities	Our fundamental policy focus will remain stable. The LI will always care about the built and natural environment, better places, the health of the landscape profession, etc. We will ensure these are written down and that they underpin all future policy development. New/changing priorities (e.g. to increase our work in rural/land management) will be multi-year objectives guided by our members.
3. We are able to respond nimbly to changing priorities	Although our core focus does not change, policy priorities will ebb and flow in importance, in accordance with changing markets, government priorities, etc. There is no reliable way to predict what opportunities for influence will exist in 12 months' time (ref: Brexit!) so we will ensure we are equipped with the evidence and insight to respond in an agile way to these.
4. Our policy is based on evidence, data, and expertise	Our reputation as a professional institute requires us to be professional in our approach to policy development. That means our policy must be evidence-based, in order that it be credible, defensible, and transparent. This principle should guide all of our policy work, and evidence should always be preferred to opinion. (However, see #5 below.)
5. We have clear, defined processes for gathering member insight	The on-the-ground insights of our membership is our primary and most unique evidence asset. We will ensure we are using it as wisely as possible. We will have clear, transparent approaches to gathering this intel, and ensure that we are representing the widest possible views of our membership.
6. We make best use of the knowledge and insight we already have	The LI has a 90-year history of evidence and insight gathering. We will make best use of previously published work (guidance, research, etc.) to ensure we are not repeating old ground or – worse – accidentally disputing ourselves. New knowledge management processes will bring together policy and technical.
7. We favour working in partnerships rather than working alone	Our profession straddles the built and natural environment sectors, and we must work with others to be successful. Partnerships can help us to plug gaps in our expertise, or to ensure other organisations endorse our campaigns. At the least, we must always ensure that landscape is “in the room”.
8. Our policy development is locally appropriate and joined-up across the four nations.	We are an (inter)national body, and many of the areas we care about (e.g. planning) are devolved matters. We will ensure that our policy development is applicable to each nation and balance resources to do so. We will support our branches to respond to local policy issues (e.g. strategic plans) where there is capacity/interest, and ensure that our messages are joined-up.

<p>9. We seek opportunities to undertake paid work which has a clear benefit to our members</p>	<p>When they arise, we will explore opportunities to deliver paid-for policy or research services to government – as long as they help deliver our core priorities and are market-making for our members. Direct delivery can provide valuable insights, and ensure that the views of the landscape sector are directly inputted into the policy process.</p>
<p>10. We have a clear and transparent approach to working with volunteers on policy development</p>	<p>Gathering member expertise is critical to our success, however the LI also occasionally benefits from volunteers undertaking practical policy work (e.g. writing consultation responses). This flexible approach has worked well, but volunteer work must be seen as value-added, not an expected resource on which key organisation processes depend.</p>

Agenda Item 5	Other Business – raised by council members
Paper author:	Dan Cook (with input from Emma Wood) Contributions from: London Branch - Hanna Salomonsson Yorkshire + Humber - Mark Smeeden South West Branch - Brodie McAllister
Summary of paper:	Issues raised by branches: Conduct Panel, Agenda Setting, Standing Committee Activity
Financial implications:	n/a
Council is asked to:	Note the paper and consider the recommendations

## 1 Submission from Hanna Salomonsson - London Branch

### 1.1 Conduct Panel

The Landscape Institute has a Code of Conduct and the Pathway to Chartership emphasizes how members should comply with it. The introduction to the 2012 Code of Conduct states that:

*“The fact that a course of conduct is not specifically referred to in this Code does not mean that it cannot form the basis of disciplinary proceedings. Members are expected to be guided in their professional conduct and professional work as much by the spirit of the Code as by its express terms. ‘Disciplinary proceedings may be brought in respect of the professional conduct or competence of a member whether or not practising or carrying on business under any name, style or title containing the words ‘Landscape Architect, Landscape Manager or Landscape Scientist’ “.*

The Code’s Standard 3 also states:

*“... You should therefore report to the Chief Executive any serious falling short of these Standards on the part of any other member of which you are aware (it is not necessary to report facts that have been widely reported in the media).”*

So that is clear. What happens then?

The Institute has a Professional Conduct Panel, (or rather “Disciplinary Panels under the title of the Screening Panel, the Professional Conduct Panel and the Appeal Panel”) and the guidelines (as revised in 2012) are on the members’ website, at <https://members.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Disciplinary-Procedures-July2012.pdf>

On the public area of the website is a page headed Professional Conduct which has a link to the Code of Conduct and advice to use the Code in determining grounds for a complaint. If a member of the public wishes to pursue a complaint against a member they should write to Emma Wood.

The Institute can reprimand, suspect or expel members. So how many cases does it consider a year? Note particularly the clause in the guidance, in the section headed:

#### ***“6.0 Notification of Decision to the Membership...***

*6.2 After the expiry of 14 days following the decision of the Professional Conduct Panel to suspend or expel a member (the period available to trigger an Appeal), the Chief Executive will publish such notice in such manner as the Professional Conduct Panel Decision Hearing Notice may direct”.*

However, where are such notices published? An example of good practice is the Architects’ Registration Board, whose Professional Conduct Committee findings are available publicly ref.



## **1.2 Recommendation for consideration by Council**

That the Board ensure the findings of the Professional Conduct Panel are reported to the Board and that the Chief Executive publish the findings to the whole membership.

## **1.3 Landscape Institute – Executive Response**

Case Review of Disciplinary Action in Response to London Branch Paper

On receipt of the submission above digital case summaries for the last 10 years were reviewed and their outcomes noted

We can only investigate matters that relate to breaches of our rules or regulations and cannot:

- Deal with concerns or complaints about anyone who is not a member of the LI
- Determine whether a member or firm has acted negligently (this is for the courts to decide)
- Interfere with or become involved in court action against a member or firm

Having reviewed the cases considered since 2008 I can confirm that between 2008-2018 there are no recorded expulsions or suspensions and as such no cases to publish.

### **1.3i Case frequency**

We are contacted throughout the year for guidance and often find that the individual being complained about is not actually a member of the LI. When we receive initial queries we always recommend that the complainant makes every attempt to resolve the issue with the member direct and encourage the use of negotiation, mediation, arbitration etc. This is often enough and the potential complaint is resolved

Most contacts are regarding a contract dispute and we do not accept a case until such time as any potential legal proceedings have been concluded. We recommend legal advice and potentially recourse to the courts. We confirm that if any legal proceedings are initiated then once they have been completed the complainant can then decide whether it is appropriate to make a complaint against the member under the Code of Conduct

On average we consider 1 case per year and these are usually a minor breach generally resulting in a letter of reprimand, required CPD etc. The Hon Secretary and CEO have roles throughout the complaints process and the Board of Trustees are notified of any conduct case findings

Under the current regulations for a serious breach resulting in suspension or expulsion we would expect to publish quite widely via the journal, website, Vista, local press, employer etc as appropriate

### **1.3ii Case instigation**

The LI can only consider potential unacceptable professional conduct if we are made aware of the issue either through a complaint or through direct experience. The role of effective regulation is to bring back into compliance rather than pursue strictly an enforcement or policing type model.

The Board, Council etc have always demonstrated a belief in the professional conduct of the membership, with an early stage notification process common to many other professional bodies.

We currently sample approximately 3% of members for CPD compliance every year, but in the future as has been discussed with Council we will have the ability for all members to record CPD using an online system. We will be looking to pilot this new system during 2019.

Our self-regulation model should be viewed as a critical and core function of the LI upholding its public interest responsibilities. It needs to be robust at all times.

At present we get few complaints, meaning low regulatory risk compared to other professions, and thus we have appropriate resource dedicated to regulation reflecting that low level of complaints. As we move toward all members reporting CPD this may increase the need for regulatory resourcing over the medium to longer term from 2021 onwards.

We could of course take further steps for the LI to actively regulate the membership but this would require:

- Identification of areas of risk that warrant additional regulatory action
- support from the wider membership
- changes to the governance structure and disciplinary process
- increased resourcing (both staff and budget)
- Improved communication
- Development of more CPD content in the arena of professional standards

#### **1.4 Planned Action**

Our Code of Conduct is due for review and updating. We will be embedding principles from the International Ethical Standards Coalition (IESC) that we are a signatory to. As IFLA also want to update a code of conduct for all members we intend to do this jointly so that if we both agree together it can apply to the profession globally.

A new online CPD recording portal linked to our members' area of our website will be introduced in 2019. Our longer term intention is to also introduce more CPD content and communication related to issues such as ethical standards and other related professional skills areas balancing our mix of technical and professional skills development for our membership. For instance in 2019 we are planning a Human Skills CPD day in Birmingham.

#### **1.5 Suggested Response**

- 1) We support the importance of effective regulation and believe that current policy as outlined supports the publication of suspension and expulsions as raised by London Branch.
- 2) It is suggested that it may be timely, now that we have a new Director of Professional Standards in post, to have other matters linked to the LI approach to regulation looked at again to ensure it is up to date. This work could engage members during early 2019, report back for discussions and workshops with Council next July and if any major changes are needed looked at November 2019 Strategy Session with a view to consideration as part of business planning for the 2020-23 cycle.

## **2 Submission from Mark Smeeden - Y+H Branch**

### **2.1 Agenda Setting**

Laudable as I find many of the initiatives being promoted by our board, committees and secretariat, the promotion of our profession is largely the result of the action of practitioners within their areas of work. I am sure that supporting LI members to become the best representatives of the profession they can be is in everyone's interest and to do this the LI needs the maximum engagement with members. My perspective is that this engagement is limited to too few members. If we are to build a balanced organisation with a strong and active membership base part of any strategy is to maintain focus on branch involvement and local initiatives for members.

One of the small steps that we might take is to give local members better engagement through their branch representative to the advisory council by facilitating better consultation. To enable branch reps. the opportunity to do this we need to insist at the forthcoming November meeting on at least two agreed changes to the circulation of agenda items and background papers; firstly 'confidential' items should be restricted to only those where it is essential for confidentiality, and secondly, we need a drop-dead date six weeks before each Advisory Council meeting when the agenda should be closed (although there could be extraordinary exceptions) and circulated to Council members to allow for Branch consultation.

### **2.2 Recommendation**

These areas of discussion have been aired before, on this occasion I would like us to press the matter to a resolution and firm recommendation to the board to instruct the secretariat accordingly.

### **2.3 Landscape Institute – Executive Response**

Since the last Council meeting we have instituted:

- i. Distributed an early synopsis of topics & key questions for next Council meeting a month before the meeting for branches to share
- ii. Trialled use of a simple survey tool to assist gain member insights on key issues
- iii. Asking for Branch initiated agenda Items
- iv. Held telephone conference with Branch representatives 4 weeks before the Council meeting.

Final papers we are endeavouring to move to a 2 week window, though where we are reliant on other boards and committees for decisions and input sometimes it's impossible to achieve as we do prefer to send full agenda packs, if at all possible.

### **2.4 Recommendation**

Ask Board to consider the following at their December 12 Meeting:

- 1) Continue agenda briefings during a 4-6 week window
- 2) Put in place a 2 week distribution of papers date going forward
- 3) We also would like to suggest further exploration of introducing a clear process for agenda setting for Council with the leadership of the institute both members and employees and bring this to board for discussion and decision in December.

### **3 Submission from Brodie McAllister – SW Branch**

#### **3.1 Standing Committee Activity**

It has been suggested that it would be very informative if the standing committees could report in some way to Council on their activity and progress, as they used to previously. This would help non Board members of Council to be well informed when performing their function of advising, holding to account, showing concern, prescribing business etc.

#### **3.2 Landscape Institute – Executive Response**

Performance and outcomes from all work of the Institute including committees are reported to the July Council meeting each year. This is the main opportunity for Council to question performance – fulfilling its oversight responsibility.

The February Council is the session at which forward plans are shaped. And as such our technical and policy committee proposed agendas for the following year are now shared at this session. We also include member engagement at this session. That is Council's chance to shape and inform our annual work programmes.

In moving Council to a more strategic and forward looking role its vital its focus remains on helping shape the institute's agenda. The standing committees do report to the Board and as such it's vital that we don't duplicate Board and Council responsibilities. For instance prescribing business is very much the primary domain of Board. It's vital that there are clear lines of accountability from a governance perspective.

We do believe though that there is room for improvement on reporting activity not just for Board and Council but also for the wider membership to know about key activity at the institute that they may wish to be involved in.

#### **3.3 Recommendation**

We believe this proposal has merit to progress but would benefit from engagement with key parties as part of our RACI work (our ongoing governance project) with some key options how this could be progressed returned to a future Council session – most likely the next one in February where both technical and policy committees will be sharing their forward programme.

We should look at

- 1) What type of reporting is required for Board and Council
- 2) What type of reporting is needed for wider membership

<b>Agenda Item 6</b>	<b>Key Dates</b>
Paper author:	Emma Wood
Summary of paper:	An update on the proposed governance cycle for 2018-19
Financial implications:	n/a
Council is asked to:	Note the paper

## **1 Annual General Meetings**

### **1.1 AGM 2018**

The 2018 AGM will be held in London in January 2019, currently planned for Thursday 24 January subject to venue. This is later than usual to allow time for the Entry Standards project but is within the allowed timeframe. Notices are required to be circulated by 02 January but it has been agreed that they will go out earlier in December to allow additional time for members to consider the issues over the Christmas / New Year break

### **1.2 AGM 2019**

We intend to return to the normal cycle and are aiming to hold the AGM around 31 October 2019 with Jellicoe and the Board/Council Strategy day. Whilst we are currently aiming for the same time as this year (last week October/ first week November) dates can only be confirmed once venues have been sourced but members will be notified as soon as the events have been booked

## **2 Governance Cycle 2019-20**

The planned governance cycle for the next sessional year is attached at appendix 1, please note **App1** these dates are very much draft at this time. We are currently reviewing the programme to take into account a number of important external events together with other commitments for both the President and CEO. One option under consideration is to move Council (1) to week 3 or 4 July and move Board (1) to early September, this would balance the other commitments as well as give us more time between elections, Council & Board

Once Board confirms the programme it will be circulated to Council asap

## 2019-20 Session Key Dates

### JULY 2019

- 01 2019-20 session start
- 04\* Council induction. Council meeting (1). Focus: Oversight (education, finance, regulation)
- 30\*\* Board (1)

### OCTOBER 2019

- 31 AGM, Jellicoe (Proposed venue: East Midlands)

### NOVEMBER 2019

- 01 Council (2), Leadership Retreat. Focus: Strategy (key themes, risks, opportunities)
- 02 Board (2)

### DECEMBER 2019

- 10 Board (3)

### FEBRUARY 2020

- 06 Council (3). Focus: Influencing (Policy, Technical and member engagement)

### MARCH 2020

- 17 Board (4)

### APRIL 2020

- 01-30 Br AGMs

### JUNE 2020

- 16 Board Leadership Event
- tbc* President's Reception
- 30 2019-20 session end

*\*This meeting may move to July week 3 as per paper item 2*

*\*\* This meeting may move to September as per paper item 2*

<b>Agenda Item 7</b>	<b>International Strategy Discussion</b>
Paper author:	Dan Cook CEO with contributions from Brodie McAllister, Andrew Tindsley, Lionel Fanshawe
Summary of paper:	International activity strategy issues for discussion
Financial implications:	n/a
Council is asked to:	Note the paper and discuss the issues

## 1 Introduction

Our corporate strategy includes the following sub-goal:

**“Grow our international activity to offer a recognised professional credential and by encouraging the sharing of expertise and standards across borders”**

The next Council and Board combined strategy session will look at ‘Why would we do this and what is the business case’ for the LI to do more internationally. This would also help identify how much of a priority to give this area of work compared to other activities of the LI

## 2 What would we like to get out of this session at Council.

- i. Is there a strong enough case for doing more internationally?
- ii. How important is this to our membership?
- iii. What is the pace members wish to proceed at?
- iv. What is our level of ambition?
- v. What are some of the key principles that might guide our future decision making?

## 3 Key decision

Does Council wish to see this area commence being developed to be considered as a priority during the next 3 year business plan of the institute – allocating money, staff & volunteer time to this pursuit?

## 4 Our current state

Around 10% of the LI chartered membership live outside of the UK with significant clusters of members located in Greater China & the Middle East.

At present we do not allocate 10% of either our mindshare or resource as an organisation to international concerns, though much of our work to underpin standards, guidance & thought leadership is why people from around the world who already have attained our CMLI/FLI credential.

From insight we have gained over the past few years we know that:

- i. Our standards and guidance that are freely available are regularly used by other associations
- ii. International universities are interested in our university accreditation
- iii. Our CMLI/FLI credential is of interest to senior professionals operating globally
- iv. Our training/CPD when made available online has international audiences

Things we are already planning to provide greater support to existing LI members working internationally this business year by:

- v. Create an international area on our website
- vi. Support creation of an LI Humanitarian working group
- vii. Working to create new entry standards intended to be jurisdiction neutral to be more open to candidates from different nations & countries
- viii. Start to identify members with an interest in international activity

- ix. Start to explore options for the creation of an online international members forum (or similar) for those working internationally

## **5 Demand from our existing members**

A number of practices have indicated that they would like to see the LI doing more internationally.

A group of LI members has approached the LI to help create a forum for those interested in humanitarian & international development activity (this is being supported)

Members we have met from across Asia operate at a very senior level and are willing to assist the LI do more in their respective regions.

Members have commented that they would like to see more international content e.g. our President's recent electronic update about the World Congress in Singapore had an open rate of 55%

## **6 Building landscape capability around the world**

Many international landscape associations struggle with both recognition from government and small numbers of members. A few areas eg USA & Philippines, have government licensing. Some examples of key markets in Asia Pacific and estimated memberships of local national associations include:

- i. CHSLA (China) 300
- ii. ISOLA (India) 700
- iii. SILA (Singapore) 80

Apart from USA, Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand very few national associations offer recognised credentials or qualifications. It is clear that many developing and emerging markets in particular are seeing demand from governments and clients for more landscape and green infrastructure led development. Too few people though are being trained. Our LI delegation to IFLA (International Federation of Landscape Architects) discussed this with national associations from India, Philippines

There are few specific landscape architecture and related disciplines market size reports. Here are a few that all show stable growth in established markets – with any new growth mostly attributed to residential housing for landscape services:

UK- <https://www.ibisworld.co.uk/industry-trends/market-research-reports/professional-scientific-technical-activities/architectural-activities.html>

USA- <https://www.ibisworld.com/industry-trends/market-research-reports/professional-scientific-technical-services/professional-scientific-technical-services/landscape-design.html>

The website World Landscape Architecture has looked again this year at some of the trends they are seeing from our industry around the world:

<http://worldlandscapearchitect.com/revisiting-landscape-architecture-trends-of-2017-and-looking-to-2018-and-beyond/#.W8jCamhKg2w>

As founding members of IFLA we tend to look to them to lead on major global matters like justice, poverty, climate change. We will defer to them for United Nations and EU Commission activity. We suggest members for their policy groups. We have recently offered our help to IFLA and their members with Code of Conduct & Professional Standards updates we are doing over the next 2 years and also with our #choose landscape activity that is easy to share.

## **7 Brexit**

It would be remiss not to mention the potential impacts of Brexit in this discussion paper. As there is freedom of movement for workers who hold professional credentials and the Landscape Institute is a recognised body. The UK Government and the EU have prepared the following sets of advice:



<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/providing-services-including-those-of-a-qualified-professional-if-theres-no-brexiteal>

[https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file\\_import/professional\\_qualifications\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/professional_qualifications_en.pdf)

The advice shows that a no-deal scenario would impact professionals based in the UK providing services across the EEA. Equally, European based professionals currently providing services in the UK Should this occur the LI may need to consider a range of future scenarios to help members impacted:

- i. Partnering with an EU recognised body/qualification
- ii. Establishing in another EU location

## **8 Arguments on the case for doing more?**

- i. If we don't we become irrelevant to many existing members operating in multiple sectors
- ii. Most landscape national associations are very small and the UK is viewed in our sector as a leader over a very long period of time in the field of landscape
- iii. If we have downturns in the UK having more members in other places helps offset some of that risk
- iv. Key figures from our Institute's history – leaders like Jellicoe, Crowe, Moggridge and more have taken a leading role in international issues and promoting the profession internationally.
- v. Universities from overseas are interested in our accreditation of their courses
- vi. Our sector is growing in many parts of the world and are desperate for skills, standards and thought leadership.
- vii. We are larger and more experienced and so have an obligation to assist the profession outside of our home country

## **9 What is the case against / not yet ?**

- i. We have a number of important areas that the LI is focused on to update digital systems and entry standards that should be main focus.
- ii. There is limited benefit to UK only practices.
- iii. There are major risks to operate in some markets.
- iv. There are financial and regulatory risks
- v. The LI is too small to do this on its own.

## **10 Future options**

Many professional bodies based in the UK operate internationally. There are many different models that can be pursued each depending on the level of risk and pace of growth being sought. A likely range of options for the LI to explore in the future include:

- i. No Change
- ii. Provide an expanded range of digital only services to international members
- iii. Licence particular people or organisations to operate on our behalf in certain markets
- iv. Enter into commercial agreements with other closely related professional organisations in other countries who have expressed an interest to work with in key markets
- v. Identify larger strategic global organisations already operating in many places to establish a strategic partnerships and agreements
- vi. Formally set up operations in another country/ies (this could be done alone or with partner organisations).

#### Future range of new activity

- vii. provide more services in China, the Middle East and ASEAN where demand for landscape skills are high
- viii. engage more with international students & re-establish student networks for the LI
- ix. work more with other landscape national bodies
- x. consider formation of branches in the Middle East, China, perhaps even Singapore etc. We could look to partner with other bodies
- xi. Make P2C more user friendly to overseas candidates. Less jargon and emphasis on local bureaucracy. Enable examinations in other countries and/or languages

### **Options for the Landscape Institute / profession internationally – a few thoughts**

The international nature of BDP's work has provided us with an insight into the workings of the landscape profession in a number of overseas locations. In countries such as India, we have had the opportunity to establish a permanent landscape studio, whilst in Christchurch NZ we had the chance to set up a local team on a temporary basis. In the Netherlands, through acquisition, our Rotterdam landscape team is a recognised member of the Dutch landscape design fraternity. In all our travels, which currently take us from Ho Chi Minh City in the east to Toronto in the west, the work of landscape architects is now sought after and respected. In much of our international masterplanning work, our landscape architects are frequently leaders of multi-disciplinary design teams, quickly gaining the confidence and respect of client bodies as they bring together complex solutions. We believe that this bodes well for the profession in general and in particular for the UK, whose landscape architects are well respected. Anecdotally, our London landscape studio currently employs almost 30 landscape architects, the majority (58%) of which are from overseas. Many start with us as graduates and without exception, whatever their long term plans may be, they are keen to become Chartered Members of the UK's Landscape Institute. They see this as a qualification that will stand them in good stead wherever they may end up practicing around the world.

Whilst quite rightly we continue to challenge the work and practices of the Landscape Institute, when compared with bodies representing landscape architects in other countries, the LI provides a model of excellence in the way in which it deals with education, professional training, continuing professional development and as promoter of design excellence and forward thinking.

In India, the number of landscape architects is growing quickly and has ISOLA, the Indian Society of Landscape Architects. Only established in 2003, the Society has around 350 members, a significant number but tiny in country of 1.3billion people that is currently undergoing rapid urbanisation. Our studio in Delhi has several members of ISOLA and through them there is the chance for the LI to build a strong relationship with ISOLA. In turn this may perhaps expose more opportunities for UK landscape architects to collaborate with their sub-continent colleagues but more importantly will enable both professions to learn from each other.

In the Netherlands, NVTL represents landscape architects and garden designers, in many ways, landscape architects of my own generation gained much in our early careers from the work our Dutch colleagues were undertaking. Some thirty or forty years later the Dutch still produce good work, but with a few notable exceptions I feel that the UK has overtaken them and in a design and professional capacity we have much to offer them. Whilst I'm sure that through IFLA there are strong connections between the UK and the Netherlands, through our own landscape colleagues there is a chance to establish other lines of communications to share knowledge and help strengthen both professional groupings.

Our recent involvement in New Zealand was relatively short, extending for around 18 months, but there, not surprisingly we found a profession that in many ways was similar to our own. The New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects has a much smaller membership but has goals and aspirations we can all share. Given the number of Kiwi landscape architects who come to the UK to practice and in many instances gain their Chartership (we currently have two), we see much scope to develop strong ties with them at an institutional level. Whilst much larger in number, similar parallels can be drawn with the profession in Australia.

Whilst India has the potential to grow a substantial landscape profession, China is the location where landscape architecture is growing most rapidly. Little more than a decade ago, governing bodies saw landscape architecture as an unnecessary profession but this situation has changed with many

schools of landscape now established and huge numbers of students travelling overseas to gain qualifications. The UK is a frequent destination but many more travel to the US. In both countries many students then try to gain experience with local practices before heading home. We have taken the opportunity to employ a number of Chinese landscape architects following completion of their UK courses. Generally they are very talented, assisting us in the preparation of projects in their home country, or just using their design and technical skills to assist us with projects elsewhere. Again, they are keen to gain Chartership of the LI and currently we have several colleagues on 'the Pathway'. From our knowledge, whilst there is a rapidly growing body of landscape architects in China, the professional body is still small and relatively young. With many UK landscape architects working in China, the opportunity for the LI to establish strong links, perhaps through the talented Chinese designers working here would seem significant.

Our landscape architects are also working in Canada, the Emirates, France, Mexico, Malaysia, Slovakia and Vietnam, not to mention Ireland. Whilst our knowledge of each location is varied we sense a global situation where the skills of UK trained landscape architects are welcomed. We also believe that there is the opportunity to do much more and hopefully 'travelling practitioners' can play a part in helping share knowledge between well established and emerging professional bodies.

## APPENDIX 2

At *terra firma* we have made it our business to really 'get out there' and reach as many parts of the world as we possibly can. For a relatively small practice, without any significant backing, this has been a labour of love. Along with all the fascination travel brings there are the pitfalls of alien working environments and we have had more than our fair share of late payments, non payments and a very difficult disentanglement from a Middle Eastern local partner. In spite all this I wouldn't have wished to miss these opportunities to explore the world, share our knowledge and learn so much from it ourselves in the process.

I would hope that it goes without saying that anyone considering overseas projects needs to think clearly on what they are to bring to the project. As well as the correct skill set, there should be a good dose of humility as it is a two way process. We find workshops with the client team work well so as to bring out the local cultural narrative and context while giving an objective view that can often surprise the host party. It is no accident that the recurring theme in most talks and articles I might give is providing green infrastructure with a sense of place.

*terra firma* have certainly headed for the conventional overseas hotspots for our profession with an offshoot office in the Middle East since 2006 and a team just returned from a masterplanning exercise in China but perhaps it is the eccentricity of seeking work in lesser known areas that has proved most rewarding.

Residing temporarily in Beirut for the Millennium I chanced upon a visiting UK Trade Mission who, interested in my being there and the almost incidental accumulation of new work in that glorious city, suggested that, since I preferred uncharted waters, I might consider joining them on a mission to the Baltic States the following year. What transpired was a long term friendship and working relationship with a Latvian planning consultancy that has been involved in the most massive changes in the region. In turn, this prepared us well for the formation of our own landscape practice in next door Lithuania 4 years ago with a returning national who had worked with us for over 8 years in the UK. We now have 5 kms of continuous projects leading into the city centre of Vilnius.

There are many practices and organisations working overseas from UK and I believe 10% of LI membership are actually located overseas. I am sure many more are interested in doing so. I have been pressing an initiative to reinstate an LI International Working group (something I used to sit on before its quiet dissolution during troubled times nearly a decade ago) and really hope this may come about before long and become a focus to discussions such as are being aired in this issue of the journal. I am aware that Rhys Jones will be explaining the emerging Humanitarian working group and see this as very much an important part of this and renewed engagement with the international community at all levels and all parts of the world.

*Pic 1; Rosia Montana, Romania; terra firma were involved in large scale EIA and restoration planning exercises for this huge and controversial area of open cast gold mining in Transylvania. This involved some innovative methodologies to best communicate advice from complex assessment techniques unfamiliar in the region at that time.*

*Pic 2; Lionel Fanshawe is a Fellow of the Landscape Institute and heads up The terra firma Consultancy from its Petersfield base. The firm have offshoot offices in London, Dubai and Vilnius that have collectively worked in over 30 countries across 6 continents.*