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8th Report, 2012 (Session 4)

Public Services Reform and Local Government - Strand 1: Partnerships and Outcomes

The Committee reports to the Parliament as follows—

BACKGROUND

1. At its meeting on 26 October 2011, the Local Government and Regeneration Committee agreed to prioritise the broad areas of Single Outcome Agreements, Benchmarking and Community Planning Partnerships for its inquiry work beginning in January 2012.

2. Further to that, at its meeting on 7 December 2011, the Committee agreed that this would take the form of a three strand inquiry into public services reform. The strands agreed were as follows:

   • Strand 1: partnerships and outcomes
   • Strand 2: benchmarking and performance measurement
   • Strand 3: developing new ways of delivering services

3. The purpose of breaking the inquiry up into three strands, was to provide a framework within which the Committee could operate in a highly flexible manner, making and revising decisions about the future direction of the inquiry work in response to what it had heard and discovered during earlier phases.

4. The Committee will undertake work on strands 2 and 3 in the coming months, informed by the work it has undertaken to date and the lessons it has learned from strand 1. This report is, however, solely concerned with strand 1, and as such, this report focuses on partnerships and outcomes in the context of public services reform.

Evidence taking

5. So as to inform the inquiry, the Committee agreed to hold five evidence sessions, as well as to undertake two fact-finding visits. The Committee began its
inquiry with a visit to Kelso, on 29 February 2012, to witness the partnership work being undertaken there by Scottish Borders Council, NHS Borders and the voluntary sector. A note of this visit is included at Annexe A.

6. The Committee began the process of formal evidence taking on 7 March 2012. The Committee took evidence from Dr Stephen Sinclair, Lecturer in Sociology and Social Policy, Glasgow Caledonian University and Professor Richard Kerley, Queen Margaret University. At the same meeting, the Committee also took evidence from Joe Simpson, Principal Strategic Adviser, Local Government Association.

7. On 14 March 2012, the Committee took evidence from Bob Jack, Chief Executive, Stirling Council, Gavin Whitefield, Chief Executive, North Lanarkshire Council, Hugh Robertson, Assistant Chief Executive, Angus Council and Stuart Crickmar, Strategy and Performance Manager, Clackmannanshire Council. On the same day, the Committee also took evidence from Dr David Farquharson, Medical Director, NHS Lothian.

8. The Committee undertook the second of its fact-finding visits on 21 March. The visit was to Livingston to see the partnership work being undertaken in West Lothian. A note of this visit can also be found at Annexe A.

9. On 28 March, the Committee took evidence from the three panels of witnesses. Firstly, the Committee took evidence from Graeme Downie, Communications Manager, Scotland and Northern Ireland, NESTA. Secondly, the Committee received oral evidence from Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive, NHS Orkney. Thirdly, and finally, the Committee took evidence from Martin Bruce, Managing Director and Derrick Thomson, Director Urban Projects, Scotia Homes and Dave McDougall, Chief Executive, West Lothian Chamber of Commerce.

10. The Committee took evidence from four panels on 18 April 2012. The first panel consisted of Ken Dunbar, Chief Executive, Aberlour Childcare Trust, Duncan Thorp, Parliamentary, Policy and Communications Officer, Social Enterprise Scotland and Hugh Cairns, Chairperson of the Scottish Mental Health Cooperative and, Lanarkshire Association for Mental Health. The second panel comprised Hugh O'Donnell, Parliamentary Officer, BEMIS and Dr Marsha Scott, Convener. The third panel was Andrew Laing, Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland and Neil McFarlane, Chief Fire Officer, Fife Fire and Rescue Service. The fourth and final panel comprised Rosaleen Brown, External Relations Manager, Jobcentre Plus and Danny Logue, Director of Operations and Katie Hutton, Head of National Training Programme Policy and Integration, Skills Development Scotland.

11. Finally, on 25 April 2012, the Committee took evidence from two panels. Firstly, the Committee received evidence from Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning and Councillor Pat Watters, President of COSLA. The final panel comprised David Martin, Chief Executive of Renfrewshire Council, Chair of SOLACE Scotland and Chair of the National Community Planning Group, Professor Fiona Mackenzie, Chief Executive of NHS Forth Valley, and NHS Chief Executives Forum, Member of the National Community Planning Group, Lewis Ramsey, Assistant Chief Officer, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue Service and Chief
Fire Officers Association of Scotland, Member of the National Community Planning Group, Assistant Chief Constable Bill Skelly, Lothian and Borders Police, Member of the National Community Planning Group, Bob Christie, Outcomes Programme Manager, The Improvement Service, and Member of the National Community Planning Group and Mark McAteer, Director of Governance and Performance Management, The Improvement Service.

Context setting

Structure of local government in Scotland

12. Local government in Scotland is organised through 32 unitary authorities.

13. Prior to 1929, local government consisted largely of Royal Burghs, small towns and villages that organised basic services within communities. Scottish local government was first reorganised in 1929, when a complex structure consisting of county councils, large and small burghs and district councils was established.

14. It remained unchanged until 1975 when, following the recommendations of the Wheatley Commission, the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 was passed. Post 1975, Scottish local government became a two-tier system, consisting of 9 regional councils, 53 district councils and 3 all-purpose island councils (Western Isles, Shetland and Orkney).

15. The current Scottish local government structure was the result of the 1996 reorganisation, the legislative basis for which was The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1994. The 1996 reorganisation resulted in the 9 regions and 53 districts being abolished, although the 3 island councils remained unchanged. The district councils and regional councils were replaced with 29 single tier (or unitary) bodies. All 32 councils are responsible for delivering services such as education, leisure and recreation, planning and building standards, social work, housing, street cleaning, and refuse collection.¹

16. In 2004, the Scottish Parliament passed the Local Governance (Scotland) Act. This provided for Scottish local government elections to be conducted under the single transferable vote system.

17. Each local authority in Scotland is governed by a council, which consists of councillors who are elected every four years. The administration is headed by the Leader of the Council, typically the leader of the largest single political grouping in the council. In addition, each local authority elects a civic leader, the Provost or Convenor, who chairs council meetings and acts as a ceremonial figurehead for the area. In the cities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee, the Provost is known as the Lord Provost.

18. The full council meeting is the sovereign body of the Council, where all councillors meet to debate and take the key decisions of the authority. These include electing the convenor and deputy convenor, appointing councillors to all committees and panels, deciding on strategic objectives and corporate policies and setting the annual budget and council tax.

¹ http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Government/local-government/localg/history
19. Local authorities in Scotland must take corporate decisions: there is no legal provision for policies being made by individual councillors. Provisions in the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 allow local authorities to devolve most decision-making to a committee, sub-committee or officer of the council. Traditionally, authorities have tended to operate through a structure of committees and sub-committees.

20. In recent years, reviews of local democracy sponsored by the Scottish Government have prompted a number of local authorities to streamline their decision-making structures, in attempts to achieve more efficient, accountable and transparent arrangements. There is no requirement for councils to adopt a particular political decision-making and scrutiny structure: it is a matter for each council to decide what is the most appropriate structure for its particular circumstances and context.

**Establishment of community planning partnerships**

21. Community planning is the process by which councils and other public sector bodies work together, with local communities, the business and voluntary sectors, to plan and deliver better services and to improve the lives of people who live in Scotland.

22. Community planning and partnership work is not a new approach, however, it was given a statutory basis by the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 (“the 2003 Act”). Under the 2003 Act:

   - councils have a duty to initiate, facilitate and maintain community planning
   - NHS boards, the police, the fire and rescue services, and the enterprise agencies (Scottish Enterprise and Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE)) have a duty to participate in community planning. This duty was later extended to Regional Transport Partnerships
   - Scottish ministers (through the Scottish Government and its agencies) have a duty to promote and encourage community planning

23. Councils can invite other bodies such as colleges, higher education institutions, business groups, voluntary organisations and community groups to take part in community planning, although these are not statutory partners.

24. All councils have established a community planning partnership (CPP) to lead and manage community planning in their area. CPPs are not statutory committees of a council, or public bodies in their own right. They do not directly employ staff or deliver public services.

25. CPPs are required to engage with communities, report on progress, and publish information on how they have implemented their duties and how outcomes have improved as a result.

26. Councils are the only public bodies that are statutorily held to account for the exercise of their community planning functions. This is carried out through the Best Value audit process. Since 2006, Audit Scotland has published Best Value audit
reports for each council, which include an assessment of how well they are leading and facilitating community planning.

27. The 2003 Act is not prescriptive about how community planning should be carried out, recognising that what is appropriate will depend on local circumstances. CPPs are operating in all 32 local authority areas with a variety of themes, structures and mechanisms for political involvement.

28. In addition to those with a duty to participate, organisations such as Jobcentre Plus, further and higher education institutions, Scottish Natural Heritage and business representatives are involved in a number of partnerships. The Third Sector is also involved, represented in a variety of ways in partnerships, often as advocates of community and interest groups or through involvement in the planning and delivery of services. Below the high-level partnership there are often a number of themed groups, which deal with the practical business. Some CPPs have organised their work around geographical areas or neighbourhoods in Local Community Planning Structures, to help in planning services and community engagement.

29. As an example of the structure of a CPP, Argyll and Bute Council provided the Committee with a breakdown of the approach taken there—

“The Full Partnership provides governance, overall leadership and representation to ensure that the different groups and organisations that make up the partnership are focused on its priorities. The Full Partnership meets three times a year and is chaired by the Leader of the Council.

The Management Committee is the decision making body for the partnership. Partner organisations chair the Management Committee on a rotational basis. The Management Committee meets six times a year and brings together the organisations with the most significant influence on service delivery in the area.

Thematic Groups were approved in 2008 to monitor the activities of relevant partners to ensure that the agreed Action Plan is delivered. There were originally three Thematic Groups; Economy, Environment and Social Affairs, these have been augmented by the addition of the Third Sector and Communities Group in 2011.

Local Area Community Planning Groups are local partnerships, also approved in 2008, made up of local representatives of community planning partners and local communities. There are four Local Area Community Planning Groups representing the four administrative areas of Argyll and Bute.”

Establishment of Single Outcome Agreements
30. The Concordat between the Scottish Government and COSLA agreed in November 2007 set out the terms of a new relationship between the Scottish Government and local authorities. This involved the establishment of Single Outcome Agreements, where local authorities would agree a single outcome for their area, and develop and deliver joint programmes towards achieving that outcome. This was intended to provide a framework for partnership working, and to ensure that services were delivered in an integrated manner.

2 Argyll and Bute Council, Written Submission
Government and local government, based on “mutual respect and partnership”\(^3\). It underpinned the funding provided to local government over the period 2008-09 to 2010-2011.

31. A central element of the new relationship was the ending of most ring fencing of local government funding and the creation of a Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) between each council, initially, and the Scottish Government, based on the 16 National Outcomes. All SOAs from 2009-10 onward are between the relevant CPP and the Scottish Government. An SOA is the means by which CPPs agree their strategic priorities for their local area and express those priorities as outcomes to be delivered by the partners, either individually or jointly, while showing how those outcomes should contribute to the Scottish Government’s relevant National Outcomes.

32. The National Outcomes are part of the Scottish Government’s National Performance Framework. Through the Concordat, local government is committed to supporting progress at national level through improvement in outcomes at local level.

**Reform of public services**

33. The reform of public services has gathered pace in recent years, partly as a result of continuing reductions in budgets following the financial downturn and the impact it continues to have on public spending.

34. In 2010, the Scottish Government established the Review of ICT Infrastructure in the Public Sector in Scotland, led by John McLelland. This review reported in June 2011. It found, amongst other things, that the public sector (including local government) was “progressing but still lagging where it should be” in terms of ICT infrastructure. It concluded that a “complete paradigm change” was required.\(^4\)

35. Meanwhile, an inquiry by the Scottish Parliament’s Finance Committee on preventative spending during session 3 of the Parliament helped to set the agenda for future consideration of how public services should be delivered. There was also some progress around the country towards the development of shared services, with eight councils in the Clyde valley area working together to achieve financial savings through shared services, following the 2009 review by Sir John Arbuthnott, which recommended a move to a model of integrated service delivery in certain key areas over the following five years. Work also continues in exploring the potential to share services and work collaboratively across local authority boundaries in a number of other areas including Midlothian and East Lothian, Clackmannanshire and Stirling, and Orkney.

36. Towards the end of 2010 the Scottish Government established the Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services, under the chairmanship of the late Dr Campbell Christie. The report of the Christie Commission was published in June 2011, and the Scottish Government published its response in September 2011, at the same time as it published its draft budget 2012-13. Key themes that emerged both in the Christie Commission report and in the Scottish

---


Government’s response included a decisive shift towards preventative spending, greater integration of public services at a local level, enhanced workforce development and effective leadership and improving performance through greater transparency, innovation and use of digital technology.

37. Although the Christie Commission report identified a number of broad priorities and included some recommendations for change, the Commission’s report does not, in the main, offer specific recommendations to the Government on how to progress the proposed programme of reform. Instead, the report concludes by calling on the Government to provide political leadership in taking its proposals forward.

Statement of ambition
38. The Christie Commission recommended a review of community planning and this has been undertaken by the Scottish Government, Accounts Commission and COSLA. At the centre of this work is a statement of ambition for community planning. Derek Mackay, the Minister for Local Government and Planning (“the Minister”) explained to the Committee the purpose of the statement of ambition—

“A really important part of the review is the document “Community Planning Review— Statement of Ambition”, which describes how community planning should look in the future, including the introduction of more hard-edged single outcome agreements that will make a difference in local communities. The statement of ambition sought to ensure that we addressed a number of issues that your committee and other committees have raised about all the public sector working not only together but with the third sector and other partners, and it is with a sense of reassurance and excitement that we have established the statement and its framework as we head into the local government elections.”

39. The statement of ambition focuses on partners acting collectively to deliver outcomes for the community—

“CPPs must be genuine Boards with all the authority, behaviours and roles that implies for them and constituent partners. That will mean clear joint and collective accountability for delivery, and CPPs will be expected to hold all partners to account for their contribution to local planning and the delivery of those plans. Where this review identifies blockages to the effective participation of some partners, systemic issues or other changes required to ensure that this responsibility is exercised, these changes will be made to ensure that full participation in the CPP happens.”

The Committee’s inquiry
40. In agreeing to undertake the inquiry, the Committee recognised that there was a considerable amount of work already ongoing in relation to public services
As such, it was critical that the Committee, in undertaking the inquiry, focussed its work on areas where it could add value.

41. The Committee agreed to undertake an inquiry that was complementary to work that was already under way, rather than duplicating it. By taking this approach, the Committee believed that it could add value to work already planned or underway by other organisations. Furthermore, the Committee sought, in undertaking the inquiry, to define the landscape and influence the future policy direction of these issues, while also carrying out its scrutiny function of holding the Scottish Government and its agencies to account on areas within the Committee’s remit.

**Community planning partnerships**

42. CPPs have now been in existence for almost 10 years. Over the course of the inquiry, the Committee considered what they were established to do; whether they have met these ambitions; what obstacles there are to meeting these ambitions; and how community planning partnerships could be more effective.

43. Drawing on these considerations, this section considers the efficacy of community planning partnerships and makes recommendations for the improved future operation of community planning partnerships.

*What was the ambition for community planning partnerships?*

44. Under section 18 of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 (“the 2003 Act”), the Scottish Ministers were required to produce guidance on community planning.

45. Section 15 of the 2003 Act places a duty on local authorities to initiate and facilitate community planning in their respective areas. Section 16 of the Act places a specific statutory duty to participate in community planning on enterprise, health, police, and fire bodies and on the Strathclyde Passenger Transport Authority.

46. Guidance was produced in 2004 by the Scottish Ministers, with a view to informing the way in which these bodies should undertake the process of community planning.

47. The guidance establishes an ambition that community planning partnerships should—

- Develop and set out a joint vision with agreed objectives for the area, normally in the form of a community plan.
- Set out challenging outcomes of performance for the partnership along with the contribution expected from individual partners towards delivering these key outcomes.
- Identify and allocate the resources necessary to achieve the agreed outcomes.
• Monitor, evaluate and report on progress with regard to the agreed outcomes, and what is being done by way of Community Planning.

• In light of monitoring, evaluation and reporting, set out revised actions and outcomes normally as a supplement to the Community Plan.

• Streamline the arrangements for the planning and delivery of services to ensure a connection between strategies and with other partnerships, the removal of any wasteful overlaps and the improvement of efficiency and effectiveness.7

48. As the National Community Planning Group noted in its submission—

“This statutory guidance expected Community Planning to promote a strong focus on outcomes, on partnership working, on the use of total resources and on the co-ordination of other activity.”8

Have these ambitions been met?

49. In the following sections of the report, some of the barriers to the effective operation of CPPs are considered, looking at the ways in which some of these ambitions may not have been met fully and looking at how they could be fulfilled. Before considering in detail whether these ambitions have been met, however, the Committee considered whether, in general terms, the ambitions and expectations are being met and therefore whether CPPs are proving a success.

50. In evidence to the Committee, COSLA expressed the view that CPPs had been a success, but that there were improvements that could be made and that partnership work could be stronger.

51. The National Community Planning Group also stressed its belief that CPPs were travelling in the right direction—

“What most community planning partnerships are doing right now is having a good look at local needs—they are making a strategic assessment, if you like. That is taking place in an inclusive way, which involves discussions not just with the partners who are represented here, whom you would expect to be involved, but with the community, the voluntary sector and, in many areas, the private sector.”9

52. SOLACE also contended that improvements could be made in terms of the integration of partners—

“Although most public agencies do participate in community planning structures, there is a sense that community planning can be parallel to the actual policy

7 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2004/04/19168/35271#0
8 The National Community Planning Group, Written submission
and budget planning carried out by partners away from formal community planning meetings.”

53. From a business perspective, Dave McDougall, Chief Executive of West Lothian Chamber of Commerce and Derrick Thomson, Director of Urban Projects for Scotia Homes reflected that there could be considerable benefits to business being involved in CPPs, but for the most part, in his experience, business was not involved.

54. A number of local authorities highlighted that the purpose of integration must be clear – Falkirk Council, for example, suggested that integration should be seen as a way of achieving better services and outcomes, rather than an end in itself. Likewise, Highland Council noted that, “...the value of doing this must first be recognised, involving putting the needs of the person or community before the needs of the organisation.”

55. The Committee recognises that the ambitions for community planning partnerships have not been fully realised. Moreover, the Committee recognises that there remain barriers to improving the efficacy of community planning partnerships and will explore these in the next section of the report. In the meantime, however, the Committee notes that on the basis of all the evidence received, CPPs have been a qualified success.

56. It is critical that the value of partnership work is recognised. This message needs to be conveyed to partners in CPPs and the outcomes this approach can realise need to be stressed. To that end, the Committee welcomes and endorses the affirmation of CPPs and partnership work contained in the Statement of Ambition as prepared by the Scottish Government and COSLA.

Integration and effective partnership work

57. The Committee considered how CPPs could be more effective in realising improved outcomes. In particular, the Committee considered how partners within community planning partnerships could integrate more effectively and in turn work better to deliver improved outcomes.

58. The majority of witnesses conceded that the picture across Scotland was a mixed one in terms of integration of partners on community planning partnerships.

59. In evidence to the Committee Stirling Council, Clackmannanshire Council, Angus Council and North Lanarkshire Council all recognised that improvements could be made, but were generally positive about the extent to which integration had been achieved and the benefits this was delivering for their communities.

60. The Committee also saw in practice the extent to which community planning partners have integrated to deliver improved outcomes in the course of its visits to Livingston and Kelso. In Livingston, the Committee saw how partners across the public sector and beyond worked together to deliver improving outcomes for

---

10 SOLACE, Written submission
11 Highland Council, written submission
communities across West Lothian. In Kelso the Committee saw how NHS Borders, the Social Work department of Scottish Borders Council and the third sector had collaborated to support older people to enable them to remain in their own homes. This partnership work was on smaller scale to that seen in Livingston, but the Committee was impressed with both examples.

61. From a third sector perspective, Social Enterprise Scotland and Aberlour Child Care Trust both intimated that there were partnerships in which they were intrinsic and valued partners, but that this was not universally the case across Scotland. This view was echoed by Jobcentre Plus.

62. This mixed experience of partnership work was also reflected by equality groups. BEMIS noted that only in Lanarkshire, both North and South, was there a specific link between the authority and ethnic minority groups.

63. The evidence the Committee has taken would suggest that there are partnerships where partners have integrated effectively. As set out in some of the examples above, there are partnerships where public, private and third sector partners have worked effectively together to deliver the desired outcomes for the communities they serve.

64. Equally, the Committee has also heard evidence from the public, private and third sector that there are improvements that could be made in terms of integration, that there are areas and CPPs where integration is less embedded and where partners are not working collaboratively to deliver outcomes.

65. In seeking to understand why partnership work has not been adopted as enthusiastically in some CPPs as in others, the Committee explored with witnesses some of the issues hindering greater integration and some measures which might overcome these issues.

66. Professor Richard Kerley argued, “There are huge advantages in integration if we get it right, but we need to overcome the barriers to that.”

67. In this section of the report, the Committee considers the barriers that exist to effective integration and partnership work, and examines how some of these might be overcome.

Cultural challenges
68. Much of the evidence the Committee received argued that for there to be genuine and effective partnership work, the cultures of the organisations involved needed to change. Evidence presented to the Committee set out what these cultural challenges were. The Minister captured in his evidence to the Committee, what these cultural challenges encapsulated—

“I have seen that from the evidence that many people have given the committee about the silo mentalities, departmentalism and protectionism that might exist in some parts of the public sector. Those are

---

barriers to integration, joint working and the focus on outcomes. There are a few ways in which community planning can help to address that.”

69. Dr Stephen Sinclair noted that “There has been a shift in belief, but it has not been translated into a shift in culture or in operational practice.”

70. In oral evidence to the Committee, Graeme Downie of NESTA, also stressed the significance of cultural challenges to the effectiveness of community planning partnerships—

“No matter how many strategies the Government has and how many things are put in place, if we do not change the fundamental, underlying culture, we will not achieve the radical transformations that will be required in the coming years, not only to meet the financial challenges that we expect to face but to provide the different types of services that the public now expect and the social challenges that we face.”

71. Cultural challenges were also recognised by Gavin Whitefield, Chief Executive of North Lanarkshire Council, as being an obstacle to integration. He also, however, underlined the challenges associated with personal relationships across different bodies—

“Getting buy-in is not just about structures, processes and systems; it is about relationships and people showing commitment to a shared vision for the area while not being precious about organisational boundaries. That is about building up trust between the different players, not just through the meetings of the partnership board and the other structures but through meetings outwith those structures and through people getting to know and trust one another.”

72. Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary in Scotland (HMICS), Andrew Laing, reflected his experience that levels of integration in CPPs are mixed and he too contended that it can be effected by the challenges of personal relationships at a local level.

73. The importance of personal relationships was also reflected by Joe Simpson, Principal Strategic Adviser for the Local Government Association—

“In local public services, there has been a problem that has come about because of the culture that we have had for a long time. For example, we find four people who really like one another—regardless of the jobs they do—and they just say, “Let’s do it.” They get together and make things happen because they have absolute trust in one another and just get on with it. What then tends to happen is that within two years they are all promoted in their respective organisations and, three years later, it has all gone away. That is because we

---


have never captured the “How do we do it?” What we have captured is the outcome, but we have to invest as much in the “how” as in the final outcome, because that is how we begin to capture the change.\textsuperscript{16}

74. The cultural challenges to be overcome were also redolent in the Minister’s comments to the Committee where he stressed the challenges of bodies moving beyond boundaries, perceived or otherwise, to work more effectively together.

75. The Committee recognises that there are a number of factors which contribute to a silo mentality and an unwillingness to participate in partnership work. Although individuals within an organisation can contribute to this culture, it can also be result from a risk averse organisational outlook where there is concern about sharing information or resources. The Committee also recognises that this culture can stem from different lines of accountability for the various partners and will explore these aspects later in the report.

76. It was clear to the Committee, however, from the evidence it received that the cultural challenges pose the greatest test to partnership work and in turn the effectiveness of CPPs. Bodies, and individuals within those bodies, who are unwilling to break out of a silo mentality and work with other bodies to deliver shared outcomes through the sharing of resources and information, evidently present a considerable, if not insurmountable, challenge to effective partnership work.

77. Associated with these cultural challenges, a number of witnesses contended that the lack of a shared vision and engagement with partnership work at all levels within bodies also hindered effective partnership work.

78. Graeme Downie of NESTA noted that for this culture of partnership work to be fostered, there must be a sense in which change is not “foisted on people from the top” and there is engagement at all levels.

79. The Committee notes these concerns and recognises that where individuals within an organisation are not bought into the importance of partnership work, it will be challenging to get them to engage with this process.

80. As set out in the previous section of the report, the cultural challenges to effective partnership work are seen to be the most formidable to overcome. In the evidence received by the Committee, there were a number of suggestions made as to how these challenges could be overcome.

81. As previously noted, the Minister also recognised the cultural challenges to effective partnership work. In doing so, however, he noted that many CPPs had overcome these perceived obstacles. To assist in the process of encouraging other CPPs to break down cultural barriers, he indicated that the Scottish

Government would be providing further guidance to CPPs on how they may operate.\textsuperscript{17}

82. The issuing of guidance to CPPs was welcomed by the National Community Planning Group.

83. The Committee welcomes the Minister’s commitment to provide guidance to CPPs on how they may operate as a way to seek to overcome some of these cultural barriers.

84. The Committee, however, recognises the concerns expressed by some of those who gave evidence that CPPs and SOAs must not become an end in themselves or be seen simply as another box to be ticked in the planning and delivery of public services.

Sharing good practice

85. The evidence received by the Committee from local authorities provided a predominantly positive impression of the work being undertaken by CPPs. The Committee acknowledges, however, that there will be examples both of good and less effective work by community planning partnerships. Good examples of effective partnership work included the work the Committee saw on its visits to Kelso and Livingston.

86. The Committee is keen that where there is good practice, such as that which the Committee witnessed in Livingston and Kelso it is shared more widely. In stating this, however, the Committee recognises that what works in one part of Scotland will not necessarily work in another part and this must be kept in mind when CPPs consider adopting an approach used elsewhere.

87. The Minister stressed the importance of partner organisations such as the Improvement Service in disseminating good practice.

88. The Committee welcomes the Minister’s suggestion. There are very good examples of partnership work and it is important that there is a wider appreciation of what is being done and what can be done by CPPs. The Committee agrees with the Minister that bodies such as the Improvement Service should be disseminating good practice where it exists. The Committee also believes that there should be more innovative approaches to sharing of best practice and invites the Scottish Government to consider this when providing guidance to CPPs.

Leadership

89. The Committee was also presented with a considerable volume of evidence as regards the importance of leadership in ensuring effective partnership work. For example, Bob Jack, Chief Executive of Stirling Council, asserted the importance of leadership in ensuring that partnership work is prioritised—

\textsuperscript{17} Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee. \textit{Official Report, 25 April 2012}, Col 925
“...it is down to how seriously the relationships at political and senior executive levels take partnership working. If there is commitment at those levels in a partnership, it is possible to respond to the different agendas—to the partnership agenda and the various measures that require that attention be given to service delivery.”

90. These sentiments were echoed by Dr David Farquharson of NHS Lothian—

“I do not think that legislation or budgets are the whole answer, and I hope that, if the appropriate senior staff are involved in the discussions, the CPPs will have the overall vision of what we are trying to achieve.”

91. Evidence to the Committee also highlighted the importance of vision in the leadership of CPPs. Aberlour Child Care Trust in particular stressed the importance of vision in making CPPs effective—

“You should bear in mind that, in some cases, we are dealing with generational outcomes. It will take longer than a four or five-year political term to improve the lives of children, young people and their families and, if we are going to make that significant shift in resources from, say, potholes to the early intervention work that we have been talking about—I do not want to get into that discussion just now, but it is all about seeking to transform society—we will need partnerships to have real vision and, indeed, to be brave. That is brave stuff that needs to be tackled by partners and the right people around the table who are prepared to go the extra mile. We must understand how to present that in forums.”

92. Amongst others, Neil MacFarlane, Chief Fire Officer of Fife Fire and Rescue Service, also set out the necessity for vision and leadership—

“The issue comes back to the principle of leadership and how leaders of organisations communicate their commitment to the community planning agenda and align their service planning process accordingly.”

93. Dr Sinclair of Glasgow Caledonian University stressed to the Committee the significance of instilling the importance of partnership work at all levels and not just at senior levels. To that end, he proposed that commitment to partnership work should be incorporated in performance appraisal—

“One or two things could perhaps be done with regard to the process of translating the strategic senior-level commitment to community planning into operational and front-line service delivery, such as having performance appraisal as part of the annual
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... appraisal and monitoring or auditing systems that reflect the greater emphasis on partnership working.‖22

94. Rosaleen Brown, giving evidence on behalf of Jobcentre Plus, reflected on how partnership work is instilled at every level of Jobcentre Plus—

“Partnership working is not something that happens while other people in Jobcentre Plus are getting on with their work. All staff, from advisers who engage daily with our customers who are residents in each of the local authorities, right through to our district manager, understand how important partnership working is. The job that we do in Jobcentre Plus can focus very much on the client who is in front of us, and the contribution that we make can be a one-off. In the main, however, most of the work that we do depends on how we refer that person on to whatever they need.”23

95. The Committee also noted on its visits to Kelso and Livingston that there appeared to be a very real commitment to partnership work at all levels. In Kelso, the Committee visited an intermediate care unit. There was a very real commitment to partnership work amongst staff there in the drive to meet the desired outcomes.

96. The Committee considers that leadership and vision are critical to effective partnership working as well as to effecting a radical change culture to the way partners engage in community planning. For CPPs to be effective, there is, in the opinion of the Committee, a need for strong leadership – at all levels in the organisation, but particularly at the senior management and political leadership levels – across the partners in CPPs as well as a willingness to work collaboratively. The importance of a shared and clear vision is also critical to ensuring that there is buy-in to the aims and work of the CPP.

97. The Committee finds considerable merit in the suggestion to incorporate commitment to partnership working into performance appraisal, so as to measure the performance of staff in relation to partnership work. The Committee invites the Scottish Government to consider this proposal when drawing together guidance for CPPs.

Information sharing

98. Increased sharing of information was also highlighted as a driver for more effective partnership work and breaking down cultural barriers. Graeme Downie of NESTA noted the benefits that accrue from data sharing—

“The more people share information, the more organisations will naturally have to interact with each other and change. We are keen on having as far as possible what we and others call a tell-us-once system, whereby information can be given from the public into the system, but also within the system, so that


if a problem changes, particularly when families or others are facing a complex issue, it does not take weeks or even months to go round an entire system but becomes part of a common file and shared information to which different agencies can respond.\(^{24}\)

99. HMICS Andrew Laing recognised the value of information sharing and argued that a culture change is required to facilitate the wider sharing of information—

“My experience is that organisations are risk averse when it comes to sharing information. They are hesitant to do it in case they are challenged and the challenge leaves them somewhat exposed. The flipside is that there is a disbenefit to the community and to members of the public, because information is withheld from other organisations. If the culture was that we were risk positive and willing to share information in the context that it would benefit the public and provide added public protection, and that we would face challenges when they arose, that would free up information sharing.”\(^{25}\)

100. Neil McFarlane, Chief Fire Officer for Fife Fire and Rescue Service, also recognised the benefits of data sharing and drew attention to the work being undertaken in Fife in that regard—

“Obviously, in this day and age, we understand that there are compatibility issues when you use different data sets. In the Fife context, we have tried to bring everything into a single data set called the KnowFife data set, which allows people to view the various software applications and try to tease out and analyse the information that they need. More important, we are now using that data at the operational level. It is important that the people who are required to deliver the service take the data, put it into a local context and understand what it means in the local area.”\(^{26}\)

101. Aberlour Childcare Trust identified the incentivisation of sharing data between public sector bodies and the voluntary sector as a key issue which would enable better management of long term outcomes and “encourage and enhance collaboration”.

102. The Committee recognises the value of data sharing in encouraging closer partnership work and delivering improved outcomes. The Committee saw the benefits of information sharing in its visits to Kelso and Livingston. As before, where there are good examples of data sharing, this information should be disseminated more widely. The Committee recognises that there exists a risk averse attitude in many areas of the public sector as regards data sharing. At the same time, the Committee appreciates that it is not always possible or clear what information may be shared. The Committee invites the Scottish Government, in the guidance it is producing for CPPs, to


provide greater clarity on what information can or should be shared, and where possible, to encourage greater sharing of information. In producing guidance on information sharing, the Committee recommends that the Scottish Government work closely with the Scottish Information Commissioner and consider promoting formal sharing agreements between partners.

**Co-location**

103. The Committee also considered the benefits of the co-location of services in terms of improving the levels of integration, breaking down cultural barriers and improving outcomes for communities.

104. As set out in the annexed paper on the Committee’s visit to West Lothian, the Committee visited the Civic Centre and saw how effective co-location can be in fostering partnership work and engendering improved outcomes. The Committee saw the benefits of co-location, for example, in relation to the response to domestic violence. Police, social work, third sector and court staff were all physically next to one another, enabling them to communicate routinely and work closely together to provide an effective service to those who had suffered domestic violence.

105. Danny Logue, giving evidence on behalf of Skills Development Scotland, asserted the benefits of co-location. He advised the Committee that Skills Development Scotland, Jobcentre Plus and other partners were looking to share accommodation where possible, because, generally speaking, they shared clients and provide shared services.  

106. HMICS Andrew Laing, acknowledged the considerable benefits of co-location, but reflected that it was not necessary to imbue a culture of partnership work—

“…good partnership working can happen when the partners are in isolation, too. Partnerships do not have to sit in the same room all the time. For example, under the arrangements for the management of sex offenders or MAPPA— the multi-agency public protection arrangements— organisations often come together for a short period. In the award-winning youth justice initiatives in Fife, siloed organisations come together for a meeting on a Wednesday morning, they have a good operational meeting to discuss individual cases and then they starburst and go out and do their work. So there does not have to be co-location.”

107. The Committee recognises the benefits of co-location and notes that it has led to closer partnership work in some areas. The Committee considers that although co-location is not essential for partnership work, where it is appropriate, it can foster partnership work. The Committee recognises that where a history of partnership work does not exist, or where it is an option

---

because of new office or services bases or units being developed, co-location should be a tool in helping to create and reinforce that culture.

108. A further barrier to effective partnership work highlighted to the Committee was the perceived complexity of CPPs. It was suggested to the Committee that partners, and in particular, third sector partners, found it challenging to engage with CPPs due to this complexity.

109. However, the complexity of community planning partnerships was considered to be necessary by others. In oral evidence to the Committee, Dr David Farquharson of NHS Lothian contended that given the number of challenges they are required to meet and the areas with which they are concerned, community planning partnerships are necessarily complex.

110. Like Dr Farquharson, the Committee was not persuaded that the complexity of a CPP was a barrier to integration. CPPs are bodies involving a variety of different bodies, working together to deliver on an array of outcomes. As such, the Committee is of the opinion that CPPs are necessarily complex.

Budget sharing
111. Sharing budgets is often seen as a route to “real” integrated working between community planning partners.

112. City of Edinburgh Council highlighted the need for shared and equal accountability as being “an absolute imperative for the sharing of budgets and other resources to achieve the necessary results.” But it went further, stating that—

“More fundamentally, community planning partnerships need to be re-cast as formally constituted and legal entities with powers to manage pooled resources in the pursuit of shared objectives. As well as levering in mainstream budgets, formal partnerships would also be in a position to manage directly specific funding streams such as European grant, the Change Fund and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) funding. At present, budget holding responsibility and authority for expenditure sits mainly within the Council.”

113. Hugh Cairns, Chair of the Scottish Mental Health Co-operative, outlined some of the benefits that he considered the sharing of budgets could deliver—

“Pooled budgets bring down barriers. Sharing resources, knowledge and experience ultimately leads to people singing from the same hymn sheet and trying to achieve the same outcomes, and it brings people out of their silos.”

114. Hugh Robertson of Angus Council recognised the benefits of single line budgets, but reflected that efforts to affect this had, in the past been unsuccessful, drawing on the experience of an abortive attempt to do so in Fife.
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115. From a health perspective, Dr Farquharson, Medical Director of NHS Lothian, advocated the benefits of “bundles of care” for particular diseases or conditions and looking at how the budget could be spent across partners to provide services to people with such conditions or diseases.

116. Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive of NHS Orkney, advocated budget sharing, but intimated that directives may be required to persuade the constituent parts of CPPs to share budgets in this way. She further noted, however, that in Orkney budget cycles had been aligned and that this had delivered benefits.

117. From a police and fire perspective, neither HMICS Andrew Laing nor Neil McFarlane, Chief Fire Officer for Fife Fire and Rescue Service advocated shared budgets. Instead, they focussed on the importance of sharing resources, and not necessarily just financial resources, in order to deliver the desired outcomes.

118. HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland (HMICS), in its written submission, argued that even if issues around governance arrangements were resolved, for some areas of service, sharing budgets would still be problematic and that—

“while it may seem logical for Health and Social Work to share budgets around common themes such as services for the elderly, it is hard to see how the same could be applied to agencies such as the police whose response ethos, multiple disciplines and functions do not lend themselves to such a model.”

119. Gavin Whitefield of North Lanarkshire Council articulated the benefits of shared budget cycles—

“It is recognised that there is a lot of good shared asset management planning work going on across community planning partners, but because of different budget cycles we are at different stages of firming up in capital programmes, which can create difficulties that we need to work around. Consistent budget planning across the sectors that are involved in community planning would be an improvement.”

120. Katie Hutton, giving evidence on behalf of Skills Development Scotland, drew attention to the developments being made in terms of budget sharing in relation to the post-16 reform work—

‘As part of its post-16 reform work, the Government announced that it would consider a piece of work on what is called the local employability funding project, the ethos of which is about how we can work together more to share and pool resources.’

---
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121. Mindful of the different views expressed by witnesses as regards how and whether budgets should be shared, the Committee invited the Minister to express a view. The Minister did not advocate a particular approach, but stressed the importance of ensuring that partners commit sufficient resources to enable community planning to work.  

122. The Committee echoes the sentiments expressed by the Minister about the importance of partners committing sufficient resources to CPPs. Whilst the Committee is not convinced that for effective partnership working there is always a need for budget sharing, it recognises that in some instances this may be one way of achieving effective partnership working.

123. The Committee recognises that budget arrangements alone cannot affect the cultural change required to engender real partnership work.

124. That said, it will go some way to engendering a culture of partnership work if senior individuals within the partners making up the CPPs empower individuals at the right levels within the partners to commit resources, financial or otherwise, to ensure partnership work.

125. Furthermore, the Committee notes the success that some CPPs have had in aligning budget cycles. The Committee also recognises the benefits of pooling budgets for specific projects. The Committee invites the Scottish Government to consider these matters further in the preparation of its guidance for CPPs.

Engaging third sector

126. As previously noted, third sector organisations reflected a mixed experience in terms of their engagement with CPPs.

127. More effective use of the third sector was recognised as critical to the improved effectiveness of community planning partnerships. Amongst others, Dr Farquharson stressed their value.

128. The Coalition of Care Providers in Scotland reflected on their experience of engagement with CPPs—

“The voluntary sector provides more than 30% of all care services in Scotland registered with the Care Inspectorate. However rather than harness the experience and expertise of the sector in redesigning care and support, public authorities still tend to treat the relationship as one of ‘buyer/supplier’ rather than a strategic partnership.”

129. Aberlour Child Care Trust also reflected that the third sector was not seen as a full partner in CPPs—

“There is great variety within CPPs in Scotland; there is also variety in the way they relate to local authority planning. Coupled with the fact that in most cases

---
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voluntary sector representation on CPPs is confined to a representative from the local Council of Voluntary Service, who tend in the main to represent small community organisations rather than a cross section of the sector, and even then not always at board level- this represents a considerable bottle neck for individual third sector organisations to have a meaningful engagement with the drafting process. This problem is compounded when cost cutting means that voluntary organisations do not have the capacity to engage in planning and networking.

130. Both COSLA and the Minister argued that the third sector had a critical role to play in CPPs as a full partner and not merely a consultee.

131. Dr Stephen Sinclair also articulated the importance of the role of the third sector—

“The areas in which the third sector feels that it is involved in an effective partnership and makes an effective contribution often reflect a history of investment and support on the part, largely, of the public sector and reflect the fact that the community planning partnership is drawing on that legacy. When third sector organisations feel that they do not have capacity or a voice, they need to be involved, and steps will need to be taken to ensure that they can get involved.”

132. Witnesses recognised the challenge of dealing with an amorphous third sector, but Duncan Thorp, giving evidence on behalf of Social Enterprise Scotland, drew attention to how this challenge had been met in Glasgow—

“It is not possible for every voice to be heard on a TSI [Third Sector Interface] or a CPP, because of the sheer number of organisations involved. However, an interesting development is that there is now a Glasgow third sector forum, which is in effect a local voice for the third sector. That could be replicated in other communities in Scotland. The aim is to get every single voice heard in that forum. The forum is a body like Social Enterprise Scotland or the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations that provides a voice for the local sector in Glasgow. Glasgow is clearly a huge city with lots of third sector organisations.”

133. David Martin, Chair of the National Community Planning Group, contended that there was a key role for the third sector in supporting CPPs’ engagement with the third sector.

134. In its evidence to the Committee, Aberlour Child Care Trust articulated the key role for the third sector as a contractor delivering services on behalf of the local authority.

135. The Committee believes that the involvement of all partners is important to CPPs in operating as effectively as possible, by drawing on all

---
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resources available to them. Third sector involvement is, in the opinion of the Committee, of considerable value. The Committee appreciates the challenges of engaging with a disparate and amorphous third sector and welcomes the work undertaken in Glasgow to develop a third sector forum to make it easier for bodies to engage with the third sector.

136. The Committee considers that given the third sector’s role as a conduit for the views of communities as well as a service provider, the third sector should have an appropriate voice in CPPs.

Engaging communities

137. More considered and effective community engagement was advocated in evidence received by the Committee as critical to improving CPPs and in turn outcomes.

138. Graeme Downie of NESTA stressed the benefits community engagement can bring—

“Communities can be seen simply as those to whom services are done. Ironically, if you engage them at the earliest possible stage of policy development, you always end up with the best outcome.”

139. The Committee saw for itself how benefits could be derived from community engagement in the course of its visit to Kelso. There NHS Borders and Scottish Borders Social Work engaged with the local community to design a service to support older people in the community that met with the local communities’ needs. Given this engagement, a service was designed that met the needs of the community and achieved buy in from the local community.

140. In its written submission to the Committee, North Lanarkshire Council stressed the importance of community engagement and set out some of the ways it had sought to foster this engagement—

“Services should be built around people and not the agencies responsible for delivering them. A thorough understanding of residents and service users, needs and expectations is essential in designing cost-effective services. Practical steps include:

- ‘Co-production’ – further investing in the capacity of communities to design and deliver their own services supported by all partners;
- A ‘needs based’ approach to community engagement, recognising that different approaches will be required in different areas or with different service groupings (“what works where?”);
- Ensuring that evidence of community engagement can be demonstrated in all actions/initiatives and measured accordingly before resources/activity are agreed;
• Support and better inform planned engagement by partner agencies by mapping existing key community hubs and community groups in each of the localities; and

• Greater emphasis on using partnership resources to support community autonomy and resilience to deliver service improvements.  

141. Falkirk Council in its written submission recognised the benefits of community engagement and stressed the importance of focus in this engagement—

“Community engagement must be focused on what needs to be asked when with a commitment to reporting the results back to participants. Efforts should also be made to avoid duplication of community engagement activity across different Community Planning partners.”

142. NHS Lothian echoed Falkirk Council’s concerns about community planning partners duplicating engagement work. NHS Lothian’s written submission also highlighted the significance of the National Standards for Community Engagement.

143. The National Standards for Community Engagement set out best practice guidance for engagement between communities and public agencies. The standards were commissioned by the Minister for Communities, through Communities Scotland and were first published in 2005.

144. The Minister stressed the benefits of community engagement. In promoting the statement of ambition, he argued that it was not a top-down approach, rather he saw that partnership work was most effective where the approach and desired outcomes for the CPP had been drawn from the local community.

145. The Committee considers that more effective community engagement is an essential element to improving the operation of CPPs and the outcomes they help to deliver. Understanding what communities require and seeking their involvement in designing the services to be delivered at the earliest possible stage ensures community buy-in and an assurance that what is being delivered responds to the communities’ needs.

146. The Committee recognises that there is good and innovative practice in terms of community engagement. It is important that this good practice is captured and shared. To that end, the Committee commends the National Standards for Community Engagement as a tool in capturing and promoting good practice.

Role of MSPs
147. In the course of evidence taking, the Committee explored with witnesses whether there would be value in a greater role for MSPs in the oversight of CPPs and if so, what that role would be.

---
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148. Gavin Whitefield, Chief Executive of North Lanarkshire Council, recognised there could be merit in a more defined role for MSPs in relation to CPPs and that this could contribute to increased alignment between the different tiers of government in Scotland.

149. Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive of NHS Orkney, set out the role she saw for MSPs—

“I do not want to see the elected members every day, but I want to see them every so often to hold us to account... It keeps up the importance level. If we get too familiar, that may not be a good thing.”

150. Bob Jack, Chief Executive of Stirling Council expressed similar sentiments to those expressed by Cathie Cowan. He did not envisage MSPs engaging with CPPs in relation to particular meetings or structures, but did see a role for MSPs in relation to matters of particular importance to the area covered by the CPP and MSP.

151. Drawing on her experience of working on a Community Health Partnership in Glasgow, Cathie Cowan reflected on the benefits that can accrue from the involvement of MSPs—

“To be fair to our MSPs, we sometimes had that in Glasgow, where the MSPs would be observers or participants. My Govanhill experience is that cross-party MSPs played a particularly important role. Their involvement pushed up the importance of the CHP, which as an officer I found extremely useful. It gave me resources to help to bring the community and partners together. If MSPs had not got involved I might not have got those resources.”

152. The Committee recognises that MSPs cannot be involved with CPPs on a day to day basis, but considers that there should be a greater opportunity for MSPs to engage with CPPs. The Committee considers that there may be merit in the papers for CPP Board meetings being provided to MSPs, so as to keep them informed of the work being undertaken by the CPP and enable them to engage where relevant. The Committee also considers that there may be merit in annual or biannual meetings of the CPP to which MSPs are invited to attend. The Committee invites the Scottish Government to consider these suggestions in the course of preparing guidance for CPPs.

Accountability and responsibility for CPPs
153. Accountability structures were recognised in evidence as being a barrier to more effective partnership work. HMICS Andrew Laing reflected concerns about the scope for effective partnership work when the bodies within a CPP are accountable as individual organisations, not collectively for the outcomes of the CPP—

“On inhibitions and barriers, a public sector service that is set up in a functional area such as policing, social work or housing has a difficulty in dealing with a collective partnership that provides services to individuals in the community, because the governance structure always takes us back to
the individual organisations. Community planning partnerships are statutory, but they rely on voluntary co-operation between the partners, which presents a difficulty."\(^{44}\)

154. This lack of a shared sense of responsibility was also noted by the Minister for Local Government and Planning—

"People might feel that it is their responsibility to meet their own objectives. For example, health will feel responsible for health improvement, efficiency, access and treatment targets, and local government will feel responsible for its statutory indicators. In other parts of the public sector, the police might feel more responsible for crime statistics, for example."\(^{45}\)

155. The Committee notes the concerns raised about the accountability of CPPs. The Committee considers that for CPPs to be effective there must be a greater sense of shared responsibility amongst partners. To that end, there must be improved accountability for CPPs and the contribution of partners to the outcomes of CPPs.

Duty of community planning

156. As previously noted, at present the duty of community planning is only placed upon local authorities. In the course of evidence taking, a recurring theme was the support for extending the duty of community planning to other public sector partners on community planning partnerships. As set out in the previous section, a perceived barrier to the effective operation of CPPs was the lack of shared responsibility for the work and outcomes of CPPs. It was suggested to the Committee that extending this duty of community planning would mean that local authorities would have a greater sense of responsibility for the CPP and its outcomes.

157. Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive of NHS Orkney, expressed her support for extending this duty to other partners as this power would lead to a more equitable sense of power and responsibility amongst partners and this, in turn, would lead to more collaborative leadership and work.\(^{46}\)

158. HMICS Andrew Laing argued that—

"...the duty should be extended to all public sector partners. If the strategic objectives for Scotland have to be based on communities’ and individuals’ needs, the silos must get the clear message that they must contribute to the process. I would go further and say that the duty should extend to their including in their annual strategic plans a clear statement of what their contribution will be. That would allow regulators, those who bring them to account and those who govern to tie that directly to what their contribution has been and to monitor


it. That would significantly strengthen the role that all public sector authorities have to play in the community planning agenda.\(^{47}\)

159. North Lanarkshire Council suggested how this duty might be extended—

“This need not require further legislation and could be accommodated by appropriate Ministerial Direction to public sector agencies to co-operate with councils in them performing their community planning duties and responsibilities. It is further recommended that Sections 20 and 22 of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 be amended so that there is clarity about the circumstances in which the power of well-being can be exercised confidently by councils.”\(^{48}\)

160. The Minister recognised the support for extending this duty and intimated to the Committee that the Scottish Government was mindful to support this extension—

“...the Government is considering the request to extend the legal duty to all public sector partners. I am sure, convener, that you would not want me to make an announcement that might upset people, but the issue is very much being considered; indeed, the forthcoming community empowerment and renewal bill could be used to deliver in that respect.”\(^{49}\)

161. The Committee believes that for CPPs to be effective there needs to be a greater sense of shared responsibility amongst partners for their operation. The Committee considers that extending the duty of community planning to other public sector partners could engender this shared sense of responsibility and in turn improve the effectiveness of CPPs. The Committee welcomes the Minister’s indication that the Scottish Government is considering extending the duty in this way.

162. Related to these concerns was a sense from the evidence that given that local authorities are the only partner with a statutory duty to participate in community planning, CPPs are local authority centric. This view was expressed by a number of witnesses, including Aberlour Childcare Trust.

163. As one way of achieving a greater sense of balance and equality to CPPs, Ken Dunbar, Chief Executive of Aberlour Childcare Trust, argued for the benefits of an independent chair of CPPs—

“I will go a step further and say that, in my experience—I have experience of three or four partnerships and I have carried out a few peer reviews of partnerships south of the border— partnerships that operated with an independent chair performed immeasurably better than a number of others that were dominated by a public sector lead. There is no guarantee that that will be the case across the board—I know about dysfunctional partnerships from my
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review work— but the work that was being done by a number that were independently led, by a business or voluntary sector representative, was immeasurably better than the work that was being done by a number of the public sector-led partnerships.”

164. The Committee notes the concerns that CPPs are weighted too much in favour of local authorities and considers that it is critical for effective partnership work that there is an equality of responsibility amongst partners and the balance is not weighted too heavily toward the local authority.

165. The Committee considers that there is merit in the suggestion to have an independent chair of the CPP and invites the Scottish Government to consider this suggestion further when producing its guidance for CPPs.

**Incorporation**

166. As a further means of improving the accountability of CPPs, the Committee considered whether there would be merit in the incorporation of CPPs.

167. Under Section 19 of the Local Government in Scotland Act, it is possible for the CPP to establish the Partnership as a legally distinct corporate body. This would be done by application to Scottish Ministers, detailing what the corporate body would do and providing evidence that CPP members were broadly in agreement. A Ministerial order making power could then be triggered.  

168. The Committee considered whether there would be any value in incorporation. There was, however, very little evidence of such an approach either being pursued or being advocated. The Committee wrote to each of the CPPs in Scotland asking them whether they had considered incorporation. None of those who responded to the request indicated that they were actively considering incorporation.

169. However, Duncan Thorp of Social Enterprise Scotland, suggested that incorporation could raise the accountability of CPPs—

“Incorporation certainly increases accountability; after all, the key question is who or what CPPs are accountable to. The common phrase used in relation to CPPs is—dare I say it—“democratic deficit” and it is felt that there is a lack of democracy in the structures. Basically, people wonder who elected CPPs.”

170. Bob Jack of Stirling Council, however, argued that it was an unnecessary step—

“At the end of the day, what you have in CPPs is a consensual collaborative partnership, each constituent part of which is required to get decisions through its own governance machinery. The system is a little clunky at times, but I agree with others that if the political level—by which I mean elected members in local
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authorities and board members of other agencies—and the senior executive level are committed to the partnership process, we can have the parallel governance and accountability that are required to get decisions through."

171. The Minister for Local Government and Planning was similarly unconvinced of the value of incorporation—

“We do not require incorporation or community planning partnerships to be delivery bodies. If they are working effectively as a board and as a collection of public sector leaders, with each partner delivering individually and collectively, the legal structure is not the big issue. The change maker will not be the structure, but what the partners in community planning partnerships actually do.”

172. It would appear to the Committee that incorporation offers little additional value in terms of the accountability and operation of a CPP. The Committee further notes the lack of enthusiasm amongst existing CPPs for incorporation. In order for a CPP to incorporate, it would appear that there would need to be agreement amongst partners to do so. Where that agreement exists, it would seem to the Committee that there is already a level of partnership work and joint vision and as such, incorporation would seem unnecessary, particularly given the significant increase in bureaucracy it would create. With these points in mind, the Committee does not at the moment see a strong argument for incorporation.

Accountability
173. The Committee notes from the submission from the Accounts Commission that the Commission has been invited by the Scottish Government to develop a process for external audit of CPPs with a view to improving the outcomes CPPs deliver. The submission sets out what the Commission is developing—

“This work will involve designing, piloting and evaluating an approach to assessing how well community planning partners are working together to deliver improved outcomes for their local communities. This will include:

- developing and testing an approach to assessing the effective delivery of outcomes at the level of community planning partnerships
- developing an approach to assessing how effectively resources are being used across the partnership (with a particular focus on linking relative spend to outcomes)
- developing an approach to assessing how well the CPP is engaging with local communities.”
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174. The Minister explained further in oral evidence the role he saw for the Accounts Commission in evaluating CPPs—

“The community planning partnership, outcomes approach is harder to do if we do not evaluate what is delivered and its impact on the community. That is why I talked about having Audit Scotland on board, to look at how CPPs work. Up to this point, Audit Scotland’s problem has been that we have all been working to different targets. It can look at health, local government and other parts of the public sector, but when the sectors come together under a community planning partnership it cannot evaluate the success of our delivery, because we all have different targets.”

175. The Committee welcomes the work being undertaken by the Accounts Commission. For CPPs to be more accountable and to improve partnership work and the outcomes they deliver, it is vital that the integrated work of a CPP can be evaluated rather than simply the work of its constituent parts in isolation. The Committee looks forward to seeing the outcome of the work being developed by Audit Scotland in due course. The Committee recognises, however, improving accountability and evaluation will not alone ensure the effective operation of CPPs.

Preventative Spending

176. Witnesses reinforced the importance, if CPPs are to be effective, of a continued move toward a culture of preventative spending.

177. There is no one universally agreed definition of preventative spending. However, Health England defines it in the following terms—

“A clinical, social, behavioral, educational, environmental, fiscal or legislative intervention or broad partnership programme designed to reduce the risk of mental and physical illness, disability or premature death and/or to promote long-term physical, social, emotional and psychological well being”

178. In January 2011, the Scottish Parliament’s Session 3 Finance Committee published its report on the findings of its 2010 inquiry into preventative spending, which firmly supported the preventative and early intervention approach. The report concluded that focus must be shifted towards preventing social problems rather than simply responding to them and that public bodies must “work more closely together on tackling the root cause of social problems rather than merely managing them”.

179. It was in this context that the Committee considered preventative spending and the progress that CPPs have made toward embracing this approach.

180. In its written submission to the Committee, the Scottish Government reasserted its commitment to preventative spending.

181. To support this shift in emphasis, the Scottish Government committed £500 million for three change funds over the three-year period to 2014-15 to encourage joint working across the public sector in adult social care, early years and tackling re-offending.

182. Pat Watters, President of COSLA, explained to the Committee the significance of preventative spending—

“Early intervention is not only an opportunity; it is essential for the wellbeing of Scotland. For instance, in a child’s life in education, it might be 10 years before we can evaluate exactly what the outcome is. However, if we are examining how many people we get out of hospital early, we can measure that annually. There will be different measurements. However, the one important thing is that we are very determined to establish a system with Audit Scotland that enables us to measure the impact of the outcomes that we are trying to drive forward.”

183. The Committee experienced first-hand how some CPPs had engaged with this approach. The Committee noted, and was impressed with the extent to which, working together, Scottish Borders Council and NHS Borders had moved to a model of preventative spending in relation to the care of elderly people, seeking to support older people to remain in the community rather than in long-term care.

184. SOLACE stressed the importance of a long term commitment to preventative approaches from CPPs and from the Scottish Government—

“Successful implementation of preventative approaches will require real and sustained commitment between the Scottish Government and community planning partners to long term objectives. By the nature of preventative spend, tangible results may not be demonstrable in the short term, while communities may experience a reduction in resources to previously available, but less prioritised services.”

185. Ken Dunbar, Chief Executive of Aberlour Childcare Trust, however, recognised that there are significant challenges in moving toward a preventative spending approach. He reflected that it means having a long-term outlook and not necessarily responding to the issues to which the local community is seeking an immediate response.

186. The Dundee Partnership, NHS Lothian, North Ayrshire council and others also noted the potential tension between prioritising longer term, preventative outcomes and the need to maintain services to those who need them in the immediate term, although the Scottish Government’s change funds were identified as a useful tool in dealing with this. NHS Health Scotland stated that, while partnerships are often organised around sub-groups that are formed to respond to a particular theme (e.g. health, community safety etc), in terms of complex problems (e.g. tackling inequality) a “whole system” or “whole neighbourhood” approach would be more appropriate.

---
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187. Gavin Whitefield of North Lanarkshire Council also expressed the challenges of moving to a preventative spend agenda—

“A key challenge in the short term that we have been considering is the exceptional financial challenge that we face. The council and health, police and fire services are all dealing with that challenge, but we are trying to do so as a partnership so that we avoid compounding some of the issues by cost shunting between organisations. The council has shared the approach to our savings strategy with the community planning partnership—that has been a standing item at the community planning partnership board for some time. That issue is as important to address in the short term as the issue of how we get the drive and commitment to move to preventative spend.”  ^59

188. In his evidence to the Committee, Professor Richard Kerley noted the small percentage of CPPs budgets currently dedicated to preventative spending. However, he argued that change funds could affect behaviour of CPPs, particularly if the money was apportioned on the basis of outcomes. ^60

189. The Chief Executive of Stirling Council, Bob Jack, welcomed the investment of the change funds, but questioned whether the approach to preventative spending could be maintained after the change funds had been discontinued.

190. The National Community Planning Group questioned the effectiveness of change funds in shifting emphasis to a preventative spend approach—

“In particular, the three change funds which should be overseen by CPPs amount to just a fraction of one per cent of the spend of Community Planning partners. It is also hard to see how these funds could achieve their intended levering of mainstream funding toward prevention within current public service arrangements.”  ^61

191. However, while the National Community Planning Group recognised the challenges of moving to a preventative spending approach, it argued that it was necessary—

“The situation now is that we will be unable to prevent worsening outcomes for many of our communities, let alone help in achieving improved outcomes, without that decisive shift in our national and local priorities and resources toward prevention and early intervention, hard though that will be. These hard decisions about investment in public services - and about disinvestment, let alone any real shift of resources between partners or to other providers – require an agreed evidence base of what works and what does not work, together with a political will to make the shift to integration and prevention, and a legislative basis for doing so.”  ^62


^61 National Community Planning Group, written submission
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192. The Committee supports the shift toward a preventative spending approach. The Committee recognises that moving toward this approach is challenging and will involve making decisions that will not necessarily be welcomed in the short term. The Committee welcomes the Scottish Government’s investment in terms of change funds.

193. In welcoming change funds, however, the Committee stresses that the move to a preventative spending and early intervention must occur in mainstream services for there to be real change in approach to the delivery of services and must not be reliant on change funds.

Future challenges

194. During the course of the inquiry, the Committee reflected on two particular future challenges to the operation of community planning partnerships going forward. Firstly, the Committee looked at the impact of the move to a single police and single fire service and its impact on partnership work, and secondly, the Committee considered the impact of the move toward joint health and social care.

195. During the course of the Committee’s inquiry, the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Bill continued its progress through the Parliament. The Bill provides for the establishment of a single police force and fire service. This change in structure will necessarily lead to a change in the relationship with the CPP. The Committee explored the potential impact, challenges and benefits of the new structural arrangements.

196. From a fire service perspective, Neil McFarlane, Chief Fire Office of Fife Fire and Rescue service, argued that a single service would enable resources to be deployed more effectively to the areas where they were required. In his view, it was critical that resources continued to be dedicated to CPPs. In addition, he stressed the importance of educating elected local members that although this was a national service, it was still very much focused on local delivery.

197. HMICS Andrew Laing also expressed confidence that strong relationships would be maintained between local police commanders and CPPs, although he acknowledged that there would be challenges associated with the fact that some local commanders would have responsibility for more than one local authority area. He noted, however, that HMICS was developing a performance framework that would audit performance in each of the 32 local authority areas, including the relationship between the local commander and CPP.

198. In its written submission to the Committee, the National Community Planning Group noted the challenges a single national police force could present to local commanders in terms of meeting local outcomes while at the same time responding to national outcomes—

“However, the duty to ‘participate’ in Community Planning has already been shown to be inadequate for effective partnership working, and the status of the council and CPP appears to be that of a consultee rather than a decision-maker. The local commander will be under the control of the chief constable and working within the requirements and priorities of a national service plan
and of a nationally determined distribution of resources for the delivery of that plan. So clarity will be important on how a single national service, led by a chief officer accountable to a national authority appointed by Ministers, will support local prioritisation of outcomes, resource use and service delivery by each of 32 CPPs.\textsuperscript{63}

199. However, in oral evidence, Assistant Chief Constable Skelly, giving evidence on behalf of the National Community Planning Group, reflected that these challenges are not insurmountable—

“When discussions take place at the local level—under the SOA and community planning arrangements and the policing arrangements that are envisaged under the bill—between the local area commander, the local authority and other partners, we hope that they will recognise the national outcomes, just as the national priorities will recognise what is fed into the process from the 32 areas, or however many there are.

There will be an ability to identify where there might be conflict, and those who are involved in the discussion will be able to manage and resolve that conflict before people find that they have to escalate it or there is a pull in different directions and people do not understand why they are not finding the resources in the places where they want them to be.”\textsuperscript{64}

200. Pat Watters, President of COSLA, highlighted the opportunity that the move to a single police force provided to embed the relationship between police and CPP—

“...the change from regional police and fire services to a national service gives us an opportunity to build in arrangements for their interaction with the CPP. Yesterday, I met the Cabinet Secretary for Justice and discussed this very issue and the fact that, in designing the new service, we have an opportunity to examine how the police interact with the community. Of course, they are a full partner at the moment; with the change, their involvement should not be any less. Indeed, we have an opportunity to make it better. We have still to discuss whether an area or regional commander will interact with the local CPP but, with the change that is being made next April, we have the chance to ensure that our co-operation with the police is better than we have ever had.”\textsuperscript{65}

201. The Committee asked the Minister for Local Government and Planning whether there would be competing demands upon local commanders from national and local perspectives. The Minister, was content, however that there would not be and that, while in some circumstances, officers may be abstracted to meet national priorities, resourcing would be a matter for the local commander.

202. The evidence presented to the Committee reflected the view that rather than impacting negatively on partnership work, the move to single services
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could offer an opportunity to enhance partnership work. Whether this entrenchment of partnership working comes to pass, is yet to be seen, however, the Committee is assured by the evidence presented to it, that it will be prioritised.

203. At the end of 2011, the Cabinet Secretary for Health set out the Scottish Government’s plans to integrate adult health and social care. The Committee explored with witnesses whether this would detract from the effectiveness of CPPs.

204. In the course of its visit to the Shetland Isles to inform its consideration of the Local Government Finance (Unoccupied Properties etc.) (Scotland) Bill, the Committee also took the opportunity to meet with representatives of its CPP. In the course of these discussions, the Committee was informed of the work undertaken to integrate social work and health. The Committee was informed that the integration of health and social care had been largely successful. Integration of services had begun about four years ago and joint posts between health and local government had been in place for about two years. Delayed discharge was no longer a significant issue. Although joint budgetary arrangements had not yet been developed, work was taking place on this.

205. The Minister for Local Government and Planning saw this change as an opportunity to augment partnership work rather than to undermine it.

206. As in relation to the move to a single police and single fire service, the Committee considers that this could enhance rather than detract from partnership work.

Single Outcome Agreements

207. The evidence the Committee received in relation to CPPs’ commitment to SOAs, in relation to their performance in terms of their operation, effectiveness and integration of partners, would suggest that the picture is a mixed one.

208. Oral evidence from Aberlour Childcare Trust presented a mixed impression of how effective CPPs are in thinking in a long-term strategic fashion.

209. Dr Stephen Sinclair urged caution in the appraisal of SOAs and the extent to which SOAs can affect these outcomes—

“The extent to which local authorities and community planning partners can deliver outcomes is questionable. For example, although councils and community planning partners can create the conditions to address a complex issue such as obesity in the long term, any outcome requires behavioural change on the part of citizens. The councils and CPPs can improve the nutritional quality of free school meals, but the extent to which those are taken up, and the extent to which various other necessary factors for the outcome to
be manifest come into play, are beyond the power of community planning partners.”

210. Furthermore, both Professor Richard Kerley and Dr Stephen Sinclair stressed that it was too early to make any judgement of single outcome agreements.

211. Professor Kerley highlighted the challenges presented in moving to outcome based approaches from a culture which has traditionally been focused on inputs—

“The greatest challenge is the enthusiasm in some policy areas, in Government and among many elected representatives, for reverting to emphasising inputs. Unpopular as it will be with some of you, I repeat the example that I think that I have used previously at parliamentary committees, which is that if 17,234 is absolutely the right number of uniformed police officers in Scotland, that tells us that Government at least attaches more importance to the input—the number of uniformed police officers—than it necessarily does to the output.”

212. The Minister conceded that there was a tendency amongst politicians to focus on inputs to the detriment of outcome based approaches.

213. In its written evidence HMICS also recognised the persisting tendency to focus on inputs rather than outputs.

214. President of COSLA, Pat Watters, also conceded that it was easier to focus on inputs—

“For a politician, nothing is simpler than looking at inputs. We find it comforting to be able to say that we will have 56,000 teachers, or 1,000 extra policemen. It is easy to evidence that we have delivered in that regard, and it is comforting for politicians to have such a nice wee cot blanket and say, “That’s lovely.” However, we want to know what is happening on the ground as a result of what we are doing. I am the first to admit that what is proposed is not the easiest approach. The easiest approach would be to say, “We’re going to spend £10 million doing X”—we can tell people that we spent the £10 million, but we do not know what it delivered.”

215. Pat Watters, continued, however, that the outcome based approach must be the one to be followed and set out how CPPs should be held accountable—

“The community planning partnership, outcomes approach is harder to do if we do not evaluate what is delivered and its impact on the community. That is why I talked about having Audit Scotland on board, to look at how CPPs work. Up to this point, Audit Scotland’s problem has been that we have all been working to different targets. It can look at health, local government and other parts of the public sector, but when the sectors come together under a community planning

partnership it cannot evaluate the success of our delivery, because we all have different targets.

That is why work has been done and Audit Scotland will produce a report—in June, I think—on how it will interact with community planning partners, to consider what we are delivering and its impact, in relation to the outcomes that will be set. That is not an easy option. The easy option for both the Government and local government would be to say, “Meet the target.” However, as you know, we never take the easy option; we always take the option that means the most.”

216. Bob Jack, Chief Executive of Stirling Council, advocated a move toward more long-term thinking in terms of SOAs—

“If we look just at SOAs, their first two iterations had a one-year focus. The iteration that we are about to go into has a five-year focus. We should be looking towards a longer-term focus because it takes somewhat longer than a year to demonstrate real progress in respect of many outcomes.”

217. Bob Jack expanded on his view as to how SOAs could be a more effective tool—

“As I said, the single outcome agreements should be longer term, because some outcomes are not achieved in a year. With preventative work in the early years, some outcomes will not be achieved until a generation moves through the system. Therefore, we need fewer, clearer and smarter outcomes in which success is more clearly defined. That will allow us to be clear about the actions and interventions that will take us towards that.”

218. Dr Marsha Scott, Chair of Engender, criticised SOAs, arguing that equalities considerations have not been embedded within them—

“Community planning partnerships are challenging structures for embedding things such as equality-sensitive budgeting, and that has been grossly exacerbated by the failure of the partnerships and in the national structuring of community planning to embed equality outcomes in the high-level priority areas of work. Consequently, equality work is very much siloed. I suspect that it is still in the heads of many people across all levels of government that equality is something that we think about when we have our equality hat on and not when we think about taxation, revenue raising, transport or all the other things that will actually make a difference to equalities in general and gender equality in particular.”

---


219. The Minister expressed his view of what should be expected in terms of SOAs under the new council administrations, following the local government election on 3 May 2012—

“There is an expectation that the single outcome agreements that are devised for the new administrations will be more hard edged and will be able to evidence the issues, how they will be tackled and what each public sector partner will do, individually and jointly, to address targets. Single outcome agreements should be open and available for interrogation by local democratically elected politicians, as well as the public, third sector partners and others. There could also be a national focus.”

220. The Committee recognises that moving toward a more long-term, outcome based approach is challenging. The Committee recognises that to date, there has continued to be a focus on inputs rather than outputs. However, there appears to be consensus across political parties and policymakers that the outcomes-based approach, coupled with the move towards preventative spending, is essential if long-standing social problems are to be addressed. The Committee considers, therefore, that the efforts that have been made in this respect over the recent years must be sustained and developed in future years. In this regard, the Committee welcomes and supports the Minister for Local Government and Planning’s statement of expectations for the new council administrations.

221. If the single outcome agreement approach is to be dominant in the future, it would be helpful if the outcomes agreed upon were smart and effective. The Committee reflected on the extent of consultation that takes place in shaping and drawing up these outcomes.

222. In evidence to the Committee, Aberlour Childcare Trust, Social Enterprise Scotland and Scottish Mental Health Co-operative all advocated more third sector and community engagement in shaping SOAs. Duncan Thorp, giving evidence on behalf of Social Enterprise Scotland, proposed that SOAs could be put to a public vote—

“I am not sure whether this already happens in local authority areas—I know that there is a lot of community engagement and consultation—but I wonder whether one solution might be to put the draft SOA to public vote in each area. As an Edinburgh citizen, I have had no input into our SOA. I know that there is a consultation or community engagement process, but I am not quite sure what it is. These documents are so important that that level of public engagement might work quite well.”

223. Aberlour Childcare Trust noted that in the development of SOAs, only 15 local authorities had engaged with the CPP.

---
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224. Amongst others, Aberdeen City Council drew attention to the extent of its engagement in shaping SOAs—

“The development of local outcomes and metrics has been bottom up, both through engagement with and input from the community as well as data, analysis, priorities and activity developed and filtered through the existing, and extensive, network of partnership working. It should also be noted that communities are also involved in the priority setting for the SOA so that the document is about what matters to the City.”

225. The Committee considers that to have effective and deliverable outcomes, it is essential that there is engagement with all partners, including local communities, in their shaping. The Committee notes that some local authorities have undertaken this kind of engagement and commends their efforts. The Committee considers it essential that all local authorities and their partners develop effective ways of engaging with their communities. However, the Committee also recognises that, although it is easy to talk about engagement, it is much harder to carry out in practice. Specific skills are required to engage effectively and these may not always exist within the staff responsible for developing SOAs. The skills may need to be developed internally or bought in – either way there is a resource implication. In some councils, some of the skills required might be available in the staff of some council services – perhaps this presents a challenge to councils to find ways of developing cross-cutting ways of working that enable skills in one part of the organisation to be used in other parts in relation to public engagement.

226. Although this issue is perhaps peripheral to the main thrust of this strand of the Committee's inquiry, it is central to the future development of SOAs. There may be a need for funding to be made available to support the development of skills and other resources to support the engagement process in councils and their partners, and the Committee invites the Scottish Government to consider how it can support the development of better engagement.

227. At the start of the third Session of the Scottish Parliament, as part of the 2007 Spending Review, the Scottish Government introduced a new outcomes-based National Performance Framework (NPF) to underpin the delivery of its agenda.

228. In December 2011, the Government published its first refresh of the NPF, which contains five levels—

- The Purpose – sets out the direction and ambition for Scotland;
- The 11 Purpose Targets – high level targets that show progress towards the Purpose;
- The 5 Strategic Objectives – describe where the Scottish Government will focus its actions;

---
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• The 16 National Outcomes – describe what the Scottish Government wishes to achieve over the years to 2017; and

• The 50 National Indicators – enable the Government to track its progress towards the Purpose and the National Outcomes.

229. The Committee considered the link with the outcomes of CPPs and the National Performance Framework.

230. Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive of NHS Orkney, believed that that link (between SOAs and the NPF) existed, but stressed the importance of focussing on a small number of outcomes—

“The short answer is yes. I think of the purpose as a triangle of the five strategic objectives, the 15 national outcomes and the 45 indicators. Community planning partners sometimes lose that sense of purpose. How do they make that connection? Some things matter more to a community than others: for example, it might matter more to a community to be healthier than to be smarter. That is where we must prioritise. We try to do everything, but we need the flexibility not to need to do everything. We need to decide on our top three priorities, which are shaped by feedback from the community and by our needs assessments, and we need to invest time, energy and resources into those priorities. We try to do too much.”

231. There was a recognition from witnesses that there are challenges in meeting SOAs given possible conflicts between local and national priorities as set out in the NPF.

232. Amongst others, Aberlour Childcare Trust noted that there was a challenge in responding to the aspirations and desires of local communities and also achieving nationally determined priorities.

233. Social Enterprise Scotland reflected upon the challenges presented for partners in CPPs in terms of their lines of accountability—

“The issue is who national and local organisations are accountable to. National health service boards are accountable to the Scottish Government and third sector bodies are accountable to their local communities. The conflict possibly relates to accountability for the national and the local.”

234. The Minister did not see, however, a discrepancy between local and national priorities—

“There is rarely conflict between national and local outcomes. I do not think that any member could give me an example of an objective, an indicator or a performance measure that is not right. I cannot think off the top of my head of anything that local government has set out to do that we would object to. There

is sometimes disagreement about what is the greatest priority. Some councils will have different priorities from others, or indeed from the Government, because of what matters the most to them locally.”

235. The Committee recognises that there is a potentially difficult balance to be struck between meeting local and national priorities. The Committee recognises this challenge, but believes that although some local authorities will have different local priorities from others, as a result of local circumstances, and political and ideological differences might mean that some councils will have differing perspectives in relation to national priorities, with goodwill it should be possible to reach a balanced position that enables councils and their partners to devote appropriate levels of effort and resource towards locally determined priorities while still contributing significantly, on a local basis, to nationally determined ones.

236. The Committee also considered the link between outcomes and spending priorities.

237. Aberlour Child Care Trust highlighted the importance of this link—

“The premium attached to Single Outcome Agreements will be further devalued, particularly if it can be shown that neither the single outcome agreement nor the process by which it was arrived has led to any actual or meaningful change in the direction of funds spent by the local authority. If such a devaluation were to occur then it is likely that Single Outcome Agreements would very quickly become irrelevant to local authorities in terms of intent or expenditure and would in turn become obsolete.”

238. The CCPS suggested there was an absence of a link between outcomes and spending decisions—

“In our experience, it was frequently very difficult indeed to detect any link between strategic outcomes as set out in SOAs, and spending decisions made by the relevant public authorities. For example, CCPS members working in the field of criminal justice, with strong track records in reducing reoffending, experienced dramatic funding cuts in many areas of Scotland despite the fact that outcomes relating to reduced crime rates and reoffending figured prominently in most (if not all) SOAs. Committee members will perhaps appreciate the frustration experienced by CCPS members who spend considerable time, money and staff resources gathering data and compiling evidence of their effectiveness, and thus their potential to contribute to the goals set out in SOAs, when it appears to make no difference at all to decisions made about their funding.”

239. The Committee agrees with Aberlour Child Care Trust that for outcomes to be genuinely effective, the outcomes the CPP has sought to pursue must be reflected in the spending decisions.
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240. A number of written submissions to the Committee expressed concerns about the challenges presented by competing priorities. Amongst others, Bob Jack, Chief Executive of Stirling Council, reflected on the challenges presented by being accountable for other measures and other priorities.

241. From a policing perspective, HMICS, Andrew Laing contended that there was a tendency among police authorities to view SOAs as a matter for CPPs and to focus on their own governance and accountability as opposed to a wider partnership perspective.

242. As regards the involvement of the NHS boards in CPPs and their commitment to SOAs, it was suggested by some that the boards focussed on their requirements in relation to HEAT targets over SOAs.

243. However, Dr Farquharson, Medical Director of NHS Lothian, argued that meeting HEAT targets did not mean that the health service could not also work to SOAs—

“A lot of it is cultural—where there is a will, there is a way—and the single outcome agreements should be the strategic priority as we move things forward. Likewise, in finances, the integrated resource framework is a template and a model that we should be using. I stress that, if we all have the same shared vision, we should be able to overcome the barriers and obstacles that we see.”

244. This view was echoed Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive of NHS Orkney.

245. The Committee recognises that there are challenges to achieving the targets set out in SOAs in terms of accountability and meeting different priorities. The Committee notes, however, the sentiments expressed by the two NHS boards from which the Committee took evidence, and considers that overcoming these challenges is possible. Outcomes should not be locally authority centric and should be relevant to all partners. The Committee believes that the imposition of a duty of community planning on all public sector partners could promote a greater commitment to SOAs and this will assist in overcoming these challenges.

Accountability for performance

246. A number of witnesses questioned how local authorities are held accountable for their performance in respect of the outcomes set out in the SOA and how success is measured in relation to them. Aberlour Childcare Trust questioned the effectiveness of measurement and suggested that there was lack of a defined process for responding if a local authority had been shown persistently to underperform in achieving the targets, indicators and outcomes it has set itself in pursuit of its commitment to the 15 national outcomes.

247. On this point, CCPS indicated that the response it received to this question was that “the electorate would hold partners to account”. However, in its view—

79 HEAT targets are a core set of Ministerial objectives, targets and measures for the NHS
"This continues to sound hollow, not only because many community planning partners are unaffected by the views of the electorate, but also because it seems unlikely that the majority of voters will be scouring public sector websites to find progress reports (and, we would add, large parts of the electorate may remain entirely unmoved by the consequences of failure for potentially small groups of vulnerable people, for example those with learning disabilities supported to live independently in the community: this indeed, was one of the main reasons for ring-fencing resources)."  

248. CCPS also commented on the annual reports on SOAs produced by some local authorities—

"They vary in format and accessibility. They are an exercise in self-assessment and can, in our view, be drafted with a positive ‘spin’ on an otherwise difficult result. They are usually statistics-driven and again can be difficult to interpret because of the way figures can be manipulated."  

249. Dundee City Council also advocated improved measurement of SOAs—

"The greatest room for improvement in the Single Outcome Agreement process is in ensuring the availability of outcomes based performance indicators."

250. The Statement of Ambition expressed how it saw reporting and accountability being improved—

"The development of transparent and accessible public reporting, together with an appropriate level of external scrutiny, is key to providing assurance about CPP effectiveness and SOA delivery, and to supporting CPPs in performance improvement. A cohesive approach to capacity building, driven and owned by CPPs themselves, is required, which is supported by co-ordinated activity by the Scottish Government, improvement bodies and others where appropriate. Scrutiny arrangements for CPPs and those for individual partners must complement, not cut across, each other; and take account of the differing governance structures and accountabilities of non-public sector partners."

251. Furthermore, the Statement of Ambition reflects the importance of political oversight in ensuring accountability—

"Political oversight is key to accountability. Local elected members will exercise oversight and formal accountability through their involvement in CPPs, and will exercise joint oversight and ensure accountability with the Scottish Government through the SOA. The Scottish Government must hold national agencies to account for their contribution to local community planning and SOAs, within the context of their National remit and
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responsibilities. Where changes, including through legislation, are required in order to ensure effective oversight and accountability arrangements are in place these will be made.\(^8^5\)

252. The Committee considers that for Single Outcome Agreements to be meaningful, there must be rigorous and robust procedures to measure the performance of the local authority and its partners, involving outside, independent scrutiny and regulatory bodies where appropriate, in addition to the political accountability that is established through scrutiny by the council’s elected members. There must also be clarity about who is accountable for performance in relation to the contents of the SOA. It is important that everyone understands where the buck stops.

253. The Committee welcomes the intent of the statement of ambition in this regard. In particular, the Committee welcomes the role envisaged for local elected members in providing oversight and scrutiny of CPPs and the outcomes they deliver.

**Principles for effective community planning partnerships and SOAs**

254. In agreeing to undertake the inquiry, the Committee recognised that much has already been done over the last decade in developing the community planning process and in refining and enhancing it during that period. The Committee also recognises that a number of workstreams are ongoing and that the picture is, therefore, a rapidly changing one. The Committee understood that this strand of the inquiry would be a snapshot that helped to mark the stage of development that Scotland is at in relation to community planning and single outcome agreements, with an acknowledgement both of the achievements but also of the challenges.

255. In taking this “snapshot” view, the Committee was also aware that it was in a position to help influence the future policy direction in relation to the matters under consideration in each of the three strands. In the course of strand 1, having considered the effectiveness of CPPs and SOAs, the Committee, having considered the varied evidence heard during strand one, the Committee notes the features that its evidence has shown are common to effective CPPs and SOAs.

256. The Committee therefore commends the following points as key ingredients of an effective CPP:

- A clear and shared vision for the CPP;
- Strong, inspirational and coordinated leadership at all levels in the council and partner bodies, but particularly at the top of each body;
- A clear understanding and appreciation of the value of partnership work and a commitment to working across organisational boundaries and breaking down silos at all levels within those bodies making up the CPP;

\(^8^5\) Review of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements - Statement of Ambition
A shared sense of responsibility among the partners for the actions of the CPP;

A clear process for the evaluation of the actions of the CPP;

The commitment of resources by all partners;

Incorporation of partnership work within the performance appraisal systems of partner organisations;

A commitment to data sharing amongst partners and to the development of technological solutions to overcome data sharing challenges;

Development of roles within CPPs for the third sector as appropriate to local circumstances;

Effective, meaningful engagement with communities to understand their needs and to develop and deliver services that respond to them;

A commitment to the preventative spending model and early intervention;

Embedding of the outcomes based approach into policy and service delivery development;

Outcomes that are smart, consistent and that are not local authority centric, but that are shaped by all partners including the local communities;

Spending decisions by the CPP that reflect its agreed outcomes.
ANNEXE A: NOTES OF FACT-FINDING VISITS TO KELSO AND LIVINGSTON

VISIT TO KELSO

Introduction
1. In order to inform its consideration of strand 1 of its inquiry into public services reform, the Committee agreed to undertake two fact-finding visits.

2. The first of these visits was to Kelso and more specifically, to the Cheviot Project which is based in Kelso.

3. The Cheviot project is an example of a place based project where Scottish Borders Council, NHS Borders and the voluntary sector work together to support older people to enable them to stay in their homes rather than being in care homes or in hospital on a long-term basis.

4. The Committee’s visit consisted of meeting with all of the partners involved in delivering this service as well with those in receipt of the services.

Cheviot Project
5. The project sought to respond to the challenge of a growing older population in the area and diminishing resources available to support it.

6. The objective of the Cheviot Project was:

   “to consider the most effective model of service delivery that includes looking at the current service provision, joint finances & joint management in one locality and to then deliver a detailed plan of action.”

7. NHS Borders and Scottish Borders Council’s social work department drew on the experience of Total Place to develop a model for meeting this challenge.

8. Firstly, they established a baseline figure for investment in services for older people and looked at what they could deliver given the resources available.

9. In order to inform their decisions, they engaged with the local community so as to provide a service that met with the communities’ needs and expectations.

10. In seeking to deliver a more effective service, responsive to the communities’ needs, NHS Borders and the Council focussed on a move to more community based care. In doing so, they focussed on preventative care, so as to avoid the need for older people to receive hospital care.

Committee Visit
11. To understand better how NHS Borders and the Council have delivered on this agenda, the Committee visited both Kelso Hospital and Grove House, an intermediate care unit.
12. At the hospital the Committee saw the adaptations made to the hospital in order to co-locate NHS and social work staff. The Committee was informed that this had been achieved through the use of change funds.

13. It was explained to the Committee that co-location of staff was being introduced in order to engender greater integration between social work and NHS staff. It was further explained that co-location delivered benefits in terms of the avoidance of duplication in terms of the services delivered, and improved sharing of data.

14. Alzheimer Scotland is also located in the hospital. The Committee also met with Alzheimer Scotland staff and were informed about the benefits of co-location for them in terms of providing services in coordination with Social Work and NHS staff.

15. As previously noted, the Committee also visited Grove House. Grove House is an intermediate care unit, there to provide older people with the skills to live independently.

16. It is a joint project between NHS Borders and Social Work. Those who come to Grove House from hospital care are supported to develop the skills to enable them to return to their own accommodation. The aim is to limit their stay in the intermediate care and during that stay to focus on rehabilitating them for a return to the community.

17. Members were advised that before returning home, it was ensured that all practical alterations were made to that person’s accommodation to ensure it was habitable.

18. The Committee also learned of the involvement of the third sector in engaging with the older people once they have returned to the community. Members were advised that third sector representatives visited older people in their homes to ensure they were coping back in their own environment.

19. The skills provided to the older people and the focus on early intervention before the older people are forced into a position where they require primary care or are in need of residential care, provided the Committee with a good example of the preventative spending model.
Introduction

20. As part of the process of informing the Committee’s consideration of its inquiry, the Committee visited Livingston to understand more about the operation of the community planning process in West Lothian.

21. As well as learning about community planning partnerships in West Lothian more generally, the visit provided an opportunity for the Committee to see the impact of the co-location of services on service delivery.

Visit

22. The Committee’s visit to West Lothian consisted of a meeting with community planning partners where the Committee received a briefing on community planning in West Lothian and a tour of Livingston’s civic centre where services are co-located.


24. Steering the work of the CPP is the CPP Board which includes senior representatives of all partners agencies and meets four times a year.

25. The Partnership produced a Community Plan ‘Shaping our Future’ in 2000 which set out the strategic direction for West Lothian over the next ten years and detailed the key targets and priorities for the Partnerships work. Over 2006/07, the Partnership re-thoughts its priorities and developed a new plan, “Towards 2020”, which was published in December 2009.

26. The Committee was advised that at the core of the Partnerships work is the “Life Stages” Programme. The overall aim of the Programme is to enable the CPP to plan and deliver more effective interventions to tackle social inequalities and build successful communities across West Lothian using a Life Stage approach targeting deprived geographical areas. The Programme recognises that those who are most at risk (often lead complex lives, and hence focuses on redesigning services around the needs of the target group using a partnership approach. The Committee was advised that the programme initially focused on the early years, but now encompasses all life stages.

27. The Committee was provided with some practical examples of the partnership working West Lothian. One example related to a police drugs
operation. It was explained to the Committee how the police had carried out a drugs operation including a series of raids in an area of West Lothian. In undertaking this operation, they had worked closely with education services to carry out simultaneous drug education campaigns in the local schools and with health and housing services to support the operation. The Committee was advised that by working together with other partners, the operation proved to be a success and engendered support for the operation in the local community.

28. Following the briefing, the Committee was given a tour of the civic centre. The Committee was advised that although there had been a long history of partnership work in West Lothian, the move to the Civic Centre had entrenched this culture.

29. The Committee saw how the centre was set-up to deliver services as opposed to around organizational boundaries. Co-location in the Civic Centre offers the partners the opportunity to work more closely on these key public services.

30. Amongst other examples, the Committee saw how services were delivered for individuals who have suffered domestic abuse. In this context, the Committee saw how effective co-location can be in fostering partnership work and engendering improved outcomes. Police, social work, third sector and court staff were all physically next to one another, enabling them to communicate routinely and work closely together to provide an effective service to those who had suffered domestic violence.
ANNEXE B: EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE

6th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 7 March 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes: The Committee took evidence from—

Dr Stephen Sinclair, Lecturer in Sociology and Social Policy, Glasgow Caledonian University;

Professor Richard Kerley, Queen Margaret University;

Joe Simpson, Principal Strategic Adviser, Local Government Association.

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received.

7th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 14 March 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes: The Committee took evidence from—

Bob Jack, Chief Executive, Stirling Council;

Gavin Whitefield, Chief Executive, North Lanarkshire Council;

Hugh Robertson, Assistant Chief Executive, Angus Council;

Stuart Crickmar, Strategy and Performance Manager, Clackmannanshire Council;

Dr David Farquharson, Medical Director, NHS Lothian.

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received.
8th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 28 March 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes: The Committee took evidence from—

Graeme Downie, Communications Manager, Scotland and Northern Ireland, NESTA;

Cathie Cowan, Chief Executive, NHS Orkney;

Martin Bruce, Managing Director, and Derrick Thomson, Director Urban Projects, Scotia Homes;

Dave McDougall, Chief Executive, West Lothian Chamber of Commerce.

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received and agreed additional witnesses for future evidence sessions.

9th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 18 April 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes: The Committee took evidence from—

Ken Dunbar, Chief Executive, Aberlour Childcare Trust;

Duncan Thorp, Parliamentary, Policy and Communications Officer, Social Enterprise Scotland;

Hugh Cairns, Chairperson of the Scottish Mental Health Co-Operative and, Lanarkshire Association for Mental Health;

Hugh O'Donnell, Parliamentary Officer, BEMIS;

Dr Marsha Scott, Convener, Engender;

Andrew Laing, Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland;

Neil McFarlane, Chief Fire Officer, Fife Fire and Rescue Service;

Rosaleen Brown, External Relations Manager, Jobcentre Plus;
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Danny Logue, Director of Operations, and Katie Hutton, Head of National Training Programme Policy and Integration, Skills Development Scotland.

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received and agreed additional witnesses for a future evidence session.

10th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 25 April 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes: The Committee took evidence from—

Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning, Scottish Government;

Councillor Pat Watters, President, COSLA;

David Martin, Chief Executive of Renfrewshire Council, Chair of SOLACE Scotland, and Chair of the National Community Planning Group;

Professor Fiona Mackenzie, Chief Executive of NHS Forth Valley, and NHS Chief Executives Forum Member of the National Community Planning Group;

Lewis Ramsay, Assistant Chief Officer, Strathclyde Fire & Rescue Service, and Chief Fire Officers Association of Scotland Member of the National Community Planning Group;

Assistant Chief Constable Bill Skelly, Lothian and Borders Police, Member of the National Community Planning Group;

Bob Christie, Outcomes Programme Manager, The Improvement Service, and Member of the National Community Planning Group;

Mark McAteer, Director of Governance and Performance Management, The Improvement Service.

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered both the evidence received and the issues to be highlighted in its forthcoming report on the inquiry.
14th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 30 May 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered a draft report. Various changes were agreed to, and the Committee agreed to consider a revised draft, in private, at a future meeting.

16th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 13 June 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered a draft report. Various changes were agreed to, and the Committee agreed to consider a revised draft, in private, at a future meeting.

17th Meeting, 2012 (Session 4)

Wednesday 20 June 2012

Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes (in private): The Committee considered and agreed a revised draft report.
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6th Meeting 2012 (Session 4), 7 March 2012

Written Evidence

Dr Stephen Sinclair  
Professor Richard Kerley  
Local Government Association

Oral Evidence

Dr Stephen Sinclair  
Professor Richard Kerley  
Local Government Association

7th Meeting 2012 (Session 4), 14 March 2012

Written Evidence

Stirling Council  
Angus Council  
Clackmannanshire Council

Oral Evidence

Stirling Council  
Angus Council  
Clackmannanshire Council  
North Lanarkshire Council  
NHS Lothian

8th Meeting 2012 (Session 4), 28 March 2012

Written Evidence

NESTA  
NHS Orkney  
West Lothian Chamber of Commerce  
Scotia Homes

Oral Evidence

NESTA  
NHS Orkney  
West Lothian Chamber of Commerce  
Scotia Homes
9th Meeting 2012 (Session 4), 18 April 2012

Written Evidence

Aberlour Childcare Trust
Social Enterprise Scotland
Lanarkshire Association for Mental Health
BEMIS
Engender
Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland
Fife Fire and Rescue Service
Jobcentre Plus
Skills Development Scotland

Oral Evidence

Aberlour Childcare Trust
Social Enterprise Scotland
Lanarkshire Association for Mental Health
BEMIS
Engender
Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland
Fife Fire and Rescue Service
Jobcentre Plus
Skills Development Scotland

10th Meeting 2012 (Session 4), 25 April 2012

Written Evidence

Scottish Government
COSLA
National Community Planning Group

Oral Evidence

Scottish Government
COSLA
National Community Planning Group
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Aberdeen City Council
Accounts Committee for Scotland and the Auditor for Scotland
Association of Direction of Social Work - ADSW
Angus Council
Argyll and Bute Council
Association of Public Service Excellence
CEMVO – Council for Ethnic Minority Voluntary Organisations
Centre for Scottish Public Policy
Children in Scotland
Coalition of Care and Support Providers in Scotland – CCPS
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (Western Isles Council)
Dundee City Council
East Ayrshire Community Planning Partnership
East Lothian Council
Edinburgh Council
Falkirk Council
Fire Brigades Union
Forum of Private Business
Glasgow City Council
Grampian Police
Highland Council
Long Term Conditions Alliance Scotland (LTCAS)
Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Service
MacKinnon, Niall
NHS Ayrshire & Arran
NHS Dumfries and Galloway
NHS Health Scotland
NHS Lothian
North Ayrshire Council
North Lanarkshire Council
Northern Constabulary
Outer Hebrides Community Planning Partnership
Royal Town Planning Institute Scotland
Scottish Association of Social Work (SASW)
Scottish Borders
Scottish Natural Heritage
SCVO – Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Social Enterprise Scotland
SOLACE Scotland
South Lanarkshire Council
UNISON
Vanguard Consulting
Volunteer Development Scotland
West Dunbartonshire Council
West Lothian Council
Public Audit Committee of the Scottish Parliament
NHS Borders
COSLA
Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) Scotland
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