



The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

## Official Report

# PUBLIC AUDIT COMMITTEE

Wednesday 12 January 2011

Session 3

---

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2011

Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to the Information Policy Team, Office of the Queen's Printer for Scotland, Admail ADM4058, Edinburgh, EH1 1NG, or by email to:  
[licensing@ogps.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@ogps.gov.uk).

OQPS administers the copyright on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body.

Printed and published in Scotland on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body by  
RR Donnelley.

---

**Wednesday 12 January 2011**

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Col.</b>
<b>DECISION ON TAKING BUSINESS IN PRIVATE</b> .....	2469
<b>SECTION 23 REPORT</b> .....	2470
"Improving energy efficiency: a follow-up report" .....	2470
<b>SECTION 22 REPORT</b> .....	2482
"The 2009/2010 audit of the Scottish Government consolidated accounts" .....	2482

---

**PUBLIC AUDIT COMMITTEE**

**1<sup>st</sup> Meeting 2011, Session 3**

**CONVENER**

\*Hugh Henry (Paisley South) (Lab)

**DEPUTY CONVENER**

\*Murdo Fraser (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

\*Willie Coffey (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP)

George Foulkes (Lothians) (Lab)

\*Jamie Hepburn (Central Scotland) (SNP)

\*Mr Frank McAveety (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)

\*Anne McLaughlin (Glasgow) (SNP)

\*Nicol Stephen (Aberdeen South) (LD)

**COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTES**

Derek Brownlee (South of Scotland) (Con)

Linda Fabiani (Central Scotland) (SNP)

\*James Kelly (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)

John Farquhar Munro (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)

\*attended

**THE FOLLOWING ALSO ATTENDED:**

Mr Robert Black (Auditor General for Scotland)

Barbara Hurst (Audit Scotland)

Mark Roberts (Audit Scotland)

**CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE**

Jane Williams

**LOCATION**

Committee Room 4



## Scottish Parliament

### Public Audit Committee

*Wednesday 12 January 2011*

[The Convener *opened the meeting at 10:00*]

### Decision on Taking Business in Private

**The Convener (Hugh Henry):** This is the first meeting in 2011 of the Public Audit Committee. I wish everyone a happy new year. I am sure that we are all looking forward to a frenetic few months. Who knows what will happen then?

I have apologies from George Foulkes; James Kelly will attend in his place. I remind members and others to ensure that all electronic devices are switched off.

Under the first agenda item, does the committee agree to take items 4 and 5 in private?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

## Section 23 Report

### “Improving energy efficiency: a follow-up report”

10:00

**The Convener:** I ask the Auditor General for Scotland to brief the committee on the section 23 report.

**Mr Robert Black (Auditor General for Scotland):** Good morning, convener. Barbara Hurst will introduce the report.

**Barbara Hurst (Audit Scotland):** This follow-up report was published in early December. Members may recall that the committee considered the original report on “Improving energy efficiency” in December 2008. At that meeting we made a commitment to follow up that work. This report re-evaluates the performance of councils, national health service boards and central Government bodies in reducing their energy use.

On energy use and spend, we reported in 2008 that public sector energy use fell between 2004-05 and 2006-07. Since then there has been little change in energy use, but spending has continued to rise, as you can see in exhibit 2 on page 7 of the report.

Over the three years to 2008-09, overall public sector energy use increased by 1 per cent. However, that disguises some variation: although energy use did not change in councils and central Government bodies, it increased by 3.5 per cent in the health service. Over the same period, spending on energy increased by 21 per cent in real terms to more than £300 million.

We looked at progress since 2008 against the recommendations for the Government and public bodies in our original report. Since then, action has been taken nationally and locally to improve energy efficiency. However, in the context of rising prices and ambitious climate change targets, we feel that that action needs to demonstrate a greater sense of urgency.

The Scottish Government has made progress against the recommendations in our 2008 report, but that has taken time and it is too early to assess the impact of the Government’s activity. The Government published its energy efficiency action plan in October last year, two years after a commitment was made to develop it.

The plan includes actions that are aimed at reducing energy use, although it does not include any mandatory actions for public bodies and some of the actions do not have timescales attached. It is important that public bodies now work with the Government to take those actions forward.

At a local level there is a lot of encouraging progress and bodies are adopting a more strategic approach to improving energy efficiency. Many public bodies—most, in fact—now have a strategy to improve energy efficiency and senior staff are increasingly leading on the implementation of those strategies. The majority of bodies have identified champions at senior management level to drive forward energy efficiency measures and more public bodies are setting their own targets for reducing energy use. Interestingly, bodies are now collecting more accurate data.

On the energy performance of public sector buildings, which is a new part of the report, you will see from exhibit 4 on page 16 of the report that more than 70 per cent of large public sector buildings have one of the lowest three energy performance certificate ratings. Only 4 per cent of buildings are rated in the top two levels. Those include the Parliament building, which has a B rating, and Inverdee House in Aberdeen—a shared premises for the Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee—which has an A rating.

It is important to note that those ratings are based on the fabric of a building rather than the amount of energy that is actually being used in it. If the committee is interested in that, the team will be able to explain the significance. The ratings help to highlight the scale of the challenge in improving the energy efficiency of the existing public sector estate. Given the reductions in budgets for capital projects, public bodies may find it increasingly difficult to allocate funding for investment in energy efficiency measures.

We also looked at the introduction of the CRC energy efficiency scheme, which used to be known as the carbon reduction commitment. It is a United Kingdom-wide scheme that is aimed at improving energy efficiency and reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The scheme applies to both public and private sector organisations, which in Scotland means that around 50 of the larger public bodies are required to participate. Those include 27 councils, 12 NHS boards, the Government and the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body.

Participants in the CRC scheme have to buy allowances for each tonne of carbon dioxide that they emit, based on the amount of energy that is used in their buildings. The original intention of the scheme was that the money raised through the sale of allowances would be redistributed among the participants, based on their performance in reducing their emissions, so there was a real financial incentive to do so.

Better performers would have received more money back than the poorer performers. However, changes to the scheme that were announced as

part of the UK Government's spending review in October mean that the money that is raised through the sale of allowances will now go directly to the Treasury rather than being redistributed among the participants.

Our survey of public bodies suggests that the cost of buying allowances will range from around £25,000 for one of the smaller central Government bodies in the participating organisations to more than £3 million for a large energy user such as Scottish Water. Again, the report makes a number of recommendations for the Government and public bodies, which are summarised on page 5.

I will stop there, convener; I am happy to take any questions.

**The Convener:** Thank you. I want to clarify something in your comments in relation to buildings and energy performance certificate ratings. You said that the rating was based on the fabric of the building rather than the amount of energy that was used. Would it not be absurd if a building had a high rating because it had a good fabric but used two to three times as much energy as comparable buildings? Surely the key criterion should be the amount of energy that is used.

**Barbara Hurst:** That is an interesting point. I will ask Mark Roberts to elaborate on it, because we had significant discussions about it in drafting the report.

**Mark Roberts (Audit Scotland):** As you say, convener, the Scottish energy performance certificate system requires only the performance of the fabric of the building to be rated, without any indication of its energy use being taken into account. That contrasts with the situation in England and Wales, where they have display energy certificates that take account of the energy used in the buildings.

**The Convener:** Who decided that in Scotland we would take the approach that we do, rather than the approach that is taken in England and Wales?

**Mark Roberts:** The legislation originated from Europe, but the Scottish Government decided how it was to be transposed.

**The Convener:** Forgive me—I feel as though as I am missing something here. It seems to be a no-brainer that we should be looking at the amount of energy that is consumed. You are saying that to do that would require a change in regulations.

**Mark Roberts:** That is right. The European Union is considering changes to the overarching legislation at present, and I understand that the Scottish Government will consult on potential changes in the course of 2011.

**The Convener:** It seems farcical, but never mind.

**Murdo Fraser (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con):** I will follow up on that point, because it is interesting. The issues are familiar to me because, when we moved house this time last year, we had to get a certificate for our house and, because it was a stone-built Victorian house, no matter how much money we spent insulating it or putting in expensive new windows, it made very little difference to the energy rating and it still came out poorly.

I am trying to understand how, from the certificates or perhaps from other information, you can track how efficiently public buildings are operating in terms of their energy use. From the information, can you differentiate the energy performance that equates to the construction type from the energy performance that equates to the energy that is used in the buildings?

**Mark Roberts:** On the basis of the certificate, we cannot tell how efficiently a building is being used. Clearly, public bodies have other ways of looking at the energy performance of their buildings, such as meter readings and monitoring systems, but the certificates do not give that information.

**Murdo Fraser:** As part of the study, did you look at that other information as to how buildings are used?

**Mark Roberts:** We collated information on energy use across the 96 public bodies and councils that we covered in the three years to 2008-09. As the study was a follow-up one, we did not get into any more detail than the aggregate figures for individual public bodies and councils.

**Murdo Fraser:** So you did not look at individual buildings. I am asking because I know that George Foulkes, who is not here, takes a keen interest in the energy efficiency of the Scottish Parliament building. However, you did not consider how energy efficient this building is, other than considering what is in the energy performance certificate.

**Mark Roberts:** We have data—the Scottish Parliament publishes an environmental report each year on its performance—but we did not look at individual buildings.

**Willie Coffey (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP):** I want to follow up on the same point. Like my colleagues, I was a bit surprised to see what the EPC rating actually means. There is more than just the level of energy use—there has to be some kind of efficiency factor. If a building is using energy, it is not necessarily being used efficiently. For example, in the school estate, there are old boiler systems heating up rooms that no one is

ever in and lights are on in rooms that no one is ever in. So the level of energy use is not necessarily a reflection of the efficiency of that use. Is there any movement towards trying to gauge that?

**Mark Roberts:** In the context of energy performance certificates, I am not sure that there is. However, councils, health boards and central Government bodies are trying significantly to improve their understanding of their energy costs and how well they use energy. A lot of the progress that we have seen since we last reported on the issue is indicative of that. However, in terms of the certificates, the answer is no.

**Willie Coffey:** Exhibit 2 shows that the amount of energy that is used was pretty much static in the period that you monitored, but that does not tell us whether that energy was required in a number of areas, particularly in the public sector, where there are some older buildings that we are all familiar with. At some stage, we need to look more closely at how energy is used. We have more efficient systems, such as those with sensors that mean that lights are automatically switched off if there is no movement in a room—that would never apply in here, of course. In some of the older school estate, a lot of energy is wasted. It would be to everyone's advantage if some effort could be channelled towards that.

**Jamie Hepburn (Central Scotland) (SNP):** My question is for Mark Roberts. He mentioned that the energy performance certification comes from EU legislation. What is that particular legislation and when was it brought into being?

**Mark Roberts:** It was introduced in 2002. It is the directive on the energy performance of buildings, which is directive 2002/91/EC.

**Jamie Hepburn:** When was it transposed by the Scottish Government?

**Mark Roberts:** In 2008.

**Jamie Hepburn:** You say that the EU is reconsidering the measure. Do you know where that reconsideration process is at present?

**Mark Roberts:** I think that it is in the latter stages. My understanding is that there will be a consultation on how that would be transposed later in 2011, but I can confirm that and get back to the committee if that would be helpful.

**Jamie Hepburn:** Turning to the CRC energy efficiency scheme, I might not have picked up Barbara Hurst correctly, so she should correct me if I am wrong, but I think that she said that it used to be the case that moneys that were raised by allowances were recycled into the scheme and went back to the participants, but that that is no longer the case and they now go to Her Majesty's Treasury. What is the reason for the change?

10:15

**Barbara Hurst:** You would have to ask the UK Government about that. When it was first conceived, it was very much a carrot-and-stick approach with a big financial incentive for bodies to reduce their energy use. That would be less so now because some of that money would go back into the UK Treasury, although there would still be an incentive for a body to reduce its energy use.

**Jamie Hepburn:** I hear Murdo Fraser saying, "Now it's just the stick." I do not know whether there are any carrots going around, convener. Perhaps we should look into that.

**The Convener:** On the issue of EU legislation, do we know why the Government decided not to adopt a similar approach to that which was adopted in England and Wales?

**Mark Roberts:** That question might be better answered by the Scottish Government.

**The Convener:** It seems ridiculous that we are not looking at energy use. We can follow that up.

**Anne McLaughlin (Glasgow) (SNP):** I want to look at energy use. Paragraph 12, on page 7 of the report, states:

"Ten public bodies were responsible for consuming half of all energy used by councils, NHS boards and central government bodies in 2008/09."

That is astonishing. Those bodies included six councils, one of which was Glasgow City Council, which, we are told, was responsible for

"8 per cent of total energy used by the public sector".

I have an on-going thing with Glasgow City Council about street lighting. I have had many complaints—indeed, I have complained many times myself—about street lights being on for long periods during the day. The explanations that I have received have just not been feasible. I have been told that the council has been testing the lights for a couple of hours, but they have still been on three weeks later. I am aware of many instances of that. In addition, a member of my family has contacted Inverclyde Council—which is not included in that group of six councils—several times over the past few years on the same issue. The explanation that she has been given is that it does not matter because a fixed cost has been agreed with the energy supplier. I think that that is utterly ridiculous. If the council reduced its usage, surely the cost would be reduced. Also, it does not take into account the environmental impact and the importance of the message that it sends to members of the public. We are trying to get everyone to be more energy efficient. If our councils have street lights on during the day on bright, sunny days—not that we get many of those—that sends out the wrong message.

We often see reports in which the figure for Glasgow is very different from the figures for the rest of the country, but there is often a reasonable explanation for that. I note that Glasgow City Council was not alone in accounting for 8 per cent of the energy use—so did NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. Is there any explanation why not just Glasgow City Council but all those other public bodies are using up so much more energy than the rest of our public bodies? Do you have any idea why that is?

**Mark Roberts:** The simple answer is that they are the largest ones in terms of the number of buildings and premises that they need. The highest energy user was NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. The second-highest energy user was Scottish Water, which has a large energy demand because of the water and waste treatment work that it carries out. Glasgow City Council, Fife Council, City of Edinburgh Council and South Lanarkshire Council are all large councils with a large number of premises. The NHS bodies were NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, NHS Lothian and NHS Tayside, which are the three largest. So, the answer to your question is mainly that it is a matter of size and the number of facilities. The specific requirements of Scottish Water make it a high energy user.

**Anne McLaughlin:** Obviously, there will be some correlation between size and energy usage, but are you finding any pattern other than that?

**Mark Roberts:** No.

**Anne McLaughlin:** Okay. That is good to know.

**The Convener:** I accept what you say about the larger bodies having more facilities and, therefore, a higher energy demand. However, Aberdeen City Council accounted for 3 per cent of the energy usage. I do not know what the population of Aberdeen City Council area is, relative to the population of the City of Edinburgh Council area, which accounted for 4 per cent. Is there any reason why Aberdeen City Council is up there?

**Mark Roberts:** The level of detail in the data that we gathered was comparatively coarse, as it was the basis of a follow-up report.

**James Kelly (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab):** The issue of energy efficiency has gained greater prominence in recent years. As the years have passed—even within this session of Parliament—it has been increasingly talked about. You note that from 2004-05 to 2006-07, energy usage was declining but that from 2006-07 to 2008-09 it stayed pretty much the same. Is there any reason why it stayed the same? The question that I am driving at is: given all the talk about the importance of energy efficiency in the Parliament, in councils and in public and private bodies, why has that not translated into lower energy use?



**Mark Roberts:** A number of pressures on public bodies are causing continual increases in demand. When we spoke to energy managers, they talked about the pressures of new technology, with greater demand for electricity, expansions in the scale of the estate and longer working hours. Buildings were open for longer than a standard 8.30 to 5.30 day, which was having an effect. Despite the progress that has been made in reducing energy use, it may be being offset by increased demand, which makes the overall task even harder.

**James Kelly:** I note what you say, but my experience before entering Parliament is that all the reasons that you gave, such as longer working hours, existed in the period 2004-05 to 2006-07. You noted that 70 per cent of large public buildings are rated in the poorest three levels. Do we have a comparison from before 2006-07? Is the trend improving?

**Mark Roberts:** Energy performance certificates only came into force in January 2009. As the certificate is one of the significant changes that has arisen since we last reported, we wanted to ask bodies about the state of their estate, as defined by their energy performance certificate. We cannot make a comparison.

**James Kelly:** As we have already noted, they are perhaps not fit for purpose in that way.

**Barbara Hurst:** The interesting thing about the energy performance certificates, even with the caveats that the committee has raised, is that it is not just the older buildings that are sitting in the lower categories. We were keen to ensure that there was a recommendation on building energy efficiency into new-build properties because we were quite surprised at the ratings for some of the newer public sector buildings.

**Murdo Fraser:** Can you give us an example?

**Barbara Hurst:** Yes. We thought that more attention would be paid to sustainability. It may be unfair to pick out examples, but they are quite interesting. The City of Edinburgh headquarters at Waverley Court, which is a relatively new building, has a C rating; Victoria Quay has a D rating; and Edinburgh royal infirmary has an E rating. Those are not old buildings. Although you would expect that to be the picture with our fantastic Victorian municipal buildings, they are not the only ones involved.

**Mr Frank McAveety (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab):** You have covered many of the points in your responses. There are two big difficulties here. One is that the incentive that was there before is no longer there because of the spending review. That is a genuinely retrograde step, and the committee should explore it with the UK Government. The second issue that we have

identified is that of the assessment of buildings and their energy use. We should explore that with both Governments.

In paragraph 72 of the follow-up report, you refer to those who have responsibility for energy use and the resulting emissions from a building. Hybrid models have emerged in recent years—a combination of public-private partnerships and various other models. How can we as politicians have an influence over better ensuring that those who are responsible for emissions or usage are held to account? How should we pursue the matter with Government?

**Mark Roberts:** That issue was raised by energy managers when we spoke to them. Every individual contract for a hospital or school is different. Trying to determine who ultimately had responsibility for buying allowances under the CRC scheme came down to debates and arguments about who was responsible for paying the bill, which varied according to the contract. In some cases it was the council or the health board; in other cases it was the contractor.

**Mr McAveety:** I do not think that there was ever a golden age. I have taught in older secondary schools in which you could feel the chill in the air for the whole day—in fact, you got warmer when you stepped outside some of the classrooms. That is not always the case with PPP, but there have been some difficulties around specifications—a number of us have had concerns raised with us about the conditions inside the schools because of overheating. How do we sort that out? One of the key criteria for PPP was meant to be the ability to set specifications. That might have happened in some contracts that were signed, perhaps not in the early stages but certainly in the later stages. The Scottish Government has now adapted a PPP model for future procurement, so it will set specifications. How do we get to the level at which the public sector, the private sector or a hybrid model takes responsibility? Perhaps you are not the right people to answer that, but it would be helpful if you could speculate a wee bit, because that could help us a bit more.

**Mr Black:** I am always willing to speculate, provided that we understand—

**Mr McAveety:** Leave the facts to the others, Robert, and you can speculate.

**Mr Black:** Absolutely. You have got it in one, Mr McAveety.

Over the years, we have gathered audit evidence that the quality of the specification of PPP, not-for-profit contracts has improved. A learning process has gone on. Edinburgh royal infirmary was an early one. My speculation would be that, as we have moved through the years on this journey of using PPP and various other forms

of commissioning, it might well be the case that we have been able to nail down more tightly some of the criteria around energy use. One imagines that the commonsense approach to this would involve looking at the specification of the contract and the energy-use standards for a modern building and insisting that those were built into the contract, so that you would get the benefit. Of course, as we move through the years, new technologies will become available and people will want to move on, but they will be locked into that contract. I guess that such issues will be quite complicated; for a non-speculative answer I strongly recommend that you go to the Scottish Government.

**Murdo Fraser:** I want to ask about the national contracts for procuring energy, which are referred to in paragraphs 16 and 17 on page 8 of the follow-up report, and how their costs work out. I notice a reference at the start of paragraph 17 to the fact that

“The electricity supplied ... is generated from renewable sources (mostly wind power).”

That is interesting, given that if you look at the output figures for wind energy for the past couple of months, when we have had very low temperatures and very high demand for energy, you will see that the output from wind has been extremely low—it has been between 1 and 2 per cent of the total generated.

First, how can the contract specify that the power will come from wind energy when there ain't any wind? Secondly, what impact does that have on the overall cost? Is it more expensive to specify that the power will come from a particular source? Would it be cheaper just to buy in the general marketplace?

10:30

**Mark Roberts:** I am afraid that I do not immediately know the answer to that—I will get back to you about it in writing, if that is all right.

**Murdo Fraser:** Thank you.

**Mr Black:** Again, I suspect that it is a question that the Scottish Government could answer more effectively than we could.

**The Convener:** I wish to ask something on the record that I have mentioned elsewhere, regarding renewable energy and wind power in particular. Wind power has been underpinned by significant public investment, and is highly controversial. Following up Murdo Fraser's point, I note that there have been critical periods during this very severe winter when the wind turbines have not been generating the energy that has been required, which has meant that we have had to rely on alternatives. Has there been any audit of

the value of the investment that has been put in? Has there been any audit of whether the money has been used efficiently, whether we are getting the anticipated return from the investment and whether continued investment at the same level will be sensible in the future?

**Mr Black:** Is Mark Roberts aware of the Government undertaking any work in that area?

**Mark Roberts:** No, not in terms of audit work. That is not something that Audit Scotland has looked into.

**Mr Black:** The question is clearly important, and we should reflect on it when we are thinking about future work programmes. This is perhaps the sort of area where a conversation with the National Audit Office might be useful.

**Barbara Hurst:** Yes. We are refreshing our programme, so we will put that into the mix.

**The Convener:** That would be helpful. It would also be worth our inquiring of the Government what work it is doing to justify the levels of expenditure that are being allocated. There is a huge commitment in this area. If it can be justified, we should support it, but we need to work on the basis of knowledge and facts.

**Jamie Hepburn:** On the costs of energy, exhibit 2 on page 7 of the follow-up report seems to show that, between 2007-08 and 2008-09, although the energy use of “Central Government”, which I presume refers to the Scottish Government, has remained fairly constant—it has gone up slightly—it managed a 10 per cent reduction in cost, even against the backdrop of increasing costs to both the NHS and local authorities. At first, I thought that that was perhaps due to the role of procurement Scotland, but I note that the figures predate that development. How did the Government manage to achieve a 10 per cent reduction in cost?

**Mark Roberts:** “Central Government” refers to both the Scottish Government and bodies such as executive agencies and non-departmental public bodies—it is broader than just the Scottish Government itself. The Scottish Government publishes an annual environmental report on the core Scottish Government, which did not show a marked decrease in energy consumption up to 2008-09. Energy consumption must have been reduced across the broader spread of NDPBs and executive agencies.

**Jamie Hepburn:** But that is not reflected in the report. Consumption actually goes up slightly, yet the costs came down between 2007-08 and 2008-09.

**Mark Roberts:** Potentially, there are factors concerning the contracts that were negotiated by

individual bodies before the procurement Scotland national contract came into play.

**Jamie Hepburn:** So it could be as simple as that: the Government could just have got a better deal—perhaps using uSwitch.com or something. [*Laughter.*]

**The Convener:** When did the procurement Scotland initiative kick in?

**Mark Roberts:** In autumn 2009.

**The Convener:** It is too early for that be reflected in the figures to which Jamie Hepburn referred.

**Mark Roberts:** Yes.

**The Convener:** In the case of councils, it seems as if a decrease in energy use has resulted in a significant increase in cost. I accept that there could be general market increases. There is a similar situation for the NHS. For what you describe as “Central Government”, however, the opposite is the case. It is worth asking why there was relative inefficiency in those two areas.

**Willie Coffey:** There are some strong, positive messages in the follow-up report. In my view, paragraph 20, which is the last paragraph of part 1, is encouraging. It says:

“Despite an overall increase in energy use, CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions have reduced”.

On the target for local authorities, it adds:

“Councils achieved a three per cent reduction”.

That is to be applauded. We know that a lot of the council estate is older, so that is encouraging.

This is probably unrelated to Audit Scotland’s remit, but where would we get a similar analysis of private sector energy efficiency performance? Could we try to gather such information? I know that Audit Scotland does not do that, but somebody will have to at some stage if we are to consider how the private sector is embracing the energy efficiency agenda.

**The Convener:** Presumably it is the Government, if anybody.

**Willie Coffey:** Who does it?

**Barbara Hurst:** We do not know, to be honest. We do not know whether such information is collated anywhere.

**Willie Coffey:** It is worth flagging up, I think.

**The Convener:** I draw this agenda item to a close, and I thank the witnesses very much for their contribution.

## Section 22 Report

### “The 2009/2010 audit of the Scottish Government consolidated accounts”

10:36

**The Convener:** The next item is a section 22 report, “The 2009/2010 audit of the Scottish Government consolidated accounts”. The committee has the relevant papers in front of it. We have received a response from the permanent secretary to our letter. As members do not wish to raise anything in relation to that response, we will simply note it.

10:37

*Meeting continued in private until 10:49.*



Members who would like a printed copy of the *Official Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice to SPICe.

Members who wish to suggest corrections for the revised e-format edition should mark them clearly in the report or send it to the Official Report, Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh EH99 1SP.

#### PRICES AND SUBSCRIPTION RATES

##### OFFICIAL REPORT daily editions

*Single copies: £5.00*

*Meetings of the Parliament annual subscriptions: £350.00*

##### WRITTEN ANSWERS TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS weekly compilation

*Single copies: £3.75*

*Annual subscriptions: £150.00*

Available in e-format only. Printed Scottish Parliament documentation is published in Edinburgh by RR Donnelley and is available from:

#### Scottish Parliament

All documents are available on the Scottish Parliament website at:

[www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk)

For more information on the Parliament, or if you have an inquiry about information in languages other than English or in alternative formats (for example, Braille, large print or audio), please contact:

#### Public Information Service

The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh EH99 1SP

**Telephone: 0131 348 5000**

**Fòn: 0131 348 5395** (Gàidhlig)

**Textphone users** may contact us on **0800 092 7100**.

We also welcome calls using the Text Relay service.

**Fax: 0131 348 5601**

**E-mail: [sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk](mailto:sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk)**

We welcome written correspondence in any language.

#### Blackwell's Scottish Parliament Documentation

**Helpline** may be able to assist with additional information on publications of or about the Scottish Parliament, their availability and cost:

#### Telephone orders and inquiries

**0131 622 8283** or

**0131 622 8258**

#### Fax orders

**0131 557 8149**

**E-mail orders, subscriptions and standing orders**  
**[business.edinburgh@blackwell.co.uk](mailto:business.edinburgh@blackwell.co.uk)**

#### Blackwell's Bookshop

**53 South Bridge**  
**Edinburgh EH1 1YS**  
**0131 622 8222**

#### Blackwell's Bookshops:

243-244 High Holborn  
London WC1 7DZ  
Tel 020 7831 9501

All trade orders for Scottish Parliament documents should be placed through Blackwell's Edinburgh.

#### Accredited Agents

(see Yellow Pages)

and through other good booksellers

e-format first available  
ISBN 978-1-4061-7162-4

Revised e-format available  
ISBN 978-0-85758-428-1