FINANCE COMMITTEE

AGENDA

16th Meeting, 2005 (Session 2)

Tuesday 14 June 2005

The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Committee Room 6 to consider the following agenda items:

1. **Item in private**: The Committee will decide whether to take item 6 in private, and whether to consider its approach to its Away Day in private at its next meeting.

2. **Efficient Government**: The Committee will take evidence on the Executive’s Efficient Government initiative from –
   
   Caroline Gardner, Deputy Auditor General, Audit Scotland; and
   Gary Devlin, Senior Manager, Audit Scotland.

3. **Efficient Government**: The Committee will consider its findings from its site visits on 7 June 2005 and note papers produced by the Adviser.

4. **Budget Process 2006 – 07**: The Committee will consider an approach paper from the Clerk.

5. **Cross-cutting Inquiry into Deprivation**: The Committee will consider a revised approach paper.

6. **Civil Service Effectiveness**: The Committee will consider its draft submission to the Public Administration Select Committee’s inquiry into Civil Service Effectiveness.

Susan Duffy
Clerk to the Committee
The papers for this meeting are:

**Agenda Item 2**

Written submission from Audit Scotland on Efficient Government

PRIVATE PAPER

**Agenda Item 3**

Paper by the Adviser

**Agenda Item 4**

Paper from the Clerk

**Agenda Item 5**

Submission from Scottish Executive on deprivation expenditure

Paper from the Clerk

**Agenda Item 6**

PRIVATE PAPER
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Efficient Government: Written Evidence Submissions

Background
1. Members will take evidence today from two witnesses on Efficient Government. The witnesses will be Caroline Gardner, Deputy Auditor General, and Gary Devlin, Senior Manager, both from Audit Scotland.

2. A written submission from Caroline Gardner is attached.

Recommendation
3. Members are invited to note the submission.

Susan Duffy
Clerk to the Committee
Submission from Audit Scotland

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Finance Committee setting out Audit Scotland’s role in relation to the Scottish Executive’s Efficient Government initiative in advance of the evidence session on 14 June.

Audit Scotland is a statutory, independent body that provides services to the Auditor General and the Accounts Commission. Together we help to ensure that organisations spending public money in Scotland use it properly, efficiently and effectively. We therefore welcome the Efficient Government initiative’s focus on continuous improvement and efficiency in the delivery of public services.

The Executive has asked us to audit performance in achieving the efficiency gains set out in the plan. Discussions are underway on the best way to achieve this; we are both clear that primary responsibility for monitoring lies with the Executive itself, and that audit can provide independent assurance on what has been achieved.

As a first step we agreed to review the Efficiency Technical Notes to assess whether they provide a sound basis for the Executive to monitor the achievement of savings, for example through the establishment of clear baselines, the application of project management disciplines, and clarity about the way in which savings will be calculated and measured. We identified some areas of concern, and have discussed these with Executive officials. We will also comment on the Technical Notes for time releasing savings before they are published by the Executive.

We are now in the process of agreeing what will be needed in order for Audit Scotland to be able to provide assurance on the achievement of savings. This is likely to take the form of efficiency statements by the officials responsible for delivery in each case, setting out what has been achieved and how this relates to the Efficient Government commitments. We are also considering how to take account of issues such as the methodological difficulties in measuring public sector output, limitations in the information held, and the interaction between different efficiency initiatives and other policy objectives.

Audit Scotland already has well established processes in place to enable us to comment on the achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness within the public sector in Scotland. Where possible, we will use these existing processes to provide assurance on the delivery of efficiency savings.

Some aspects of our audit approach are likely to be particularly relevant:

- we are rolling out a modernised approach to the audit of all public bodies, focusing on significant risks facing the individual body as a basis for planning audit work. The commitment to achieving efficiency gains will clearly be an important risk, and the approach adopted by
each body to achieving expected gains is therefore likely to be a feature of our audit work;

- our audit approach is also responding to the new duties of Best Value; audit reports increasingly provide information on how audited bodies are fulfilling their responsibilities for best value criteria such as sound management of resources, review and options appraisal;

- we are developing integrated overview reports, which are intended to comment on performance in the round across specific policy areas. This could include evidence of the extent to which expected efficiency gains in the policy area have been achieved.

In addition our study programme will continue to examine specific public services. We have recently published our programme for 2004-2006, and we will consider the efficient government agenda in agreeing the specification for each study.

I hope this gives the Committee a flavour of how our work may contribute to the efficient government agenda. I look forward to discussing it further at their meeting.

Caroline Gardner
Deputy Auditor General
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Supplementary Statistical Data On Efficient Government: Report by the Budget Adviser

1. At its meeting on 24 May 2005, the Committee requested further information from me in tabular form. It is set out on the tables 1 and 2 overleaf.

2. Table 1 compares the level of savings announced in the Efficient Government plan in September, with the levels reported in the Efficiency Technical Notes. To allow proper comparisons, I have excluded the saving of £95m attributed to Scottish Water, as this is not a DEL saving, and cannot therefore be released in cash for use in frontline services. Members will see that the total savings planned have grown from £650m to £730.98m mainly due to an increase in the health target from £166m to £248.8m. I understand a further saving was sought as health planned to meet its first target in year 1 of the SR cycle.

3. Table 2 sets out comparisons of savings in the Scottish DEL with equivalent targets for comparable programmes in Whitehall (i.e. by excluding the reserved functions). In these programmes, Whitehall departments were asked to save at least 1.25% of their budget per annum in cash.

4. Table 2 shows that the planned Scottish saving is £731m or 2.8% of the DEL. If the Executive had followed the UK targets, the saving would have been £970m or 3.75%.

5. Table 2 shows that significant savings targets have been concentrated in five portfolios – Administration, Crown Office, Finance, Health and Justice. By contrast, five portfolios have targets of less than 1% over three years – Communities, Enterprise, Environment, Tourism, and Transport.

Professor Arthur Midwinter
Budget Adviser
Table 1: Efficiency Savings in BABS and ETN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficient Government Report (BABS)</th>
<th>Efficiency Technical Notes (ETNs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>£8m</td>
<td>£8.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>£9m</td>
<td>£9.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Office</td>
<td>£3m</td>
<td>£2.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and young people</td>
<td>£12m</td>
<td>£10.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Lifelong</td>
<td>£5m</td>
<td>£5.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>£5m</td>
<td>£5.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Public Services</td>
<td>£246m</td>
<td>£245.53m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£166m</td>
<td>£248.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>£30m</td>
<td>£31.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism etc.</td>
<td>£2m</td>
<td>£1.75m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>£14m</td>
<td>£12.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non NHS Procurement</td>
<td>£150m</td>
<td>£150.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£650m</td>
<td>£730.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>DEL budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>263.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>970.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Office</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>101.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>570.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2893.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>940.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>245.5</td>
<td>7011.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>248.8</td>
<td>10271.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1012.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>292.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1379.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non NHS</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£731m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£25706.61m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Budget Process 2006-07: Approach Paper

Background

1. The Executive’s response to the Committee’s report on Stage 2 of the Budget Process 2005-06 agreed a revised approach to budget scrutiny, with consideration of the AER taking place in Spending Review years only.

2. There was therefore no ‘Stage 1’ scrutiny this year. The Executive is due to publish its detailed spending proposals for 2006-07 by 20 September 2005. This paper sets out proposals for the Committee’s approach to the Budget Process 2006-07.

Timescale

3. It is likely that the Scottish Executive will meet the 20 September deadline for publication of its detailed spending proposals and this paper assumes that this will be the case.

4. As in previous years, the Committee’s Adviser will produce guidance for subject committees (to include guidance on scrutiny of Efficient Government) and a paper on the Draft Budget itself. The debate on the Committee’s report normally takes place towards the end of December and so the draft timetable below provides for the final report to be published in the week commencing 13 December 2005.

Evidence: External meeting

5. As last year, it is proposed that the Committee hold an external meeting to enable local groups and organisations to contribute to the budget scrutiny process. For resourcing and travel reasons, it is proposed to hold this meeting on a Monday rather than a Tuesday (and not to hold a formal meeting in the Parliament that week). The draft timetable below proposes Monday 7 November but this will depend on venue availability etc. The previous Finance Committee met in Orkney, Skye, Kirkcudbright and Perth; this Committee has met to date in Motherwell and Cupar. Members are invited to propose either a specific location or a general geographic area for the external meeting.

6. In previous years the Committee has set up workshop sessions with various local organisations. The workshops aim to provide insight into how national priorities and spending plans affect the local area and the level of engagement that local organisations have with the budget process. Members are assigned to workshops which meet informally with the support of a clerk. One member from each group then reports back to the formal Committee meeting which follows the workshops.
7. In addition to this process it is proposed that there may be scope to add additional value to an external meeting by, for example, seeking to involve local secondary school children via the Parliament’s Education Outreach Service so they can learn more about how the Parliament works.

8. The formal meeting would also take evidence from the Finance Minister. A separate formal meeting following the external meeting would take evidence from the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body and consider the Scottish Commission for Public Audit’s report on Audit Scotland’s budget.

Subject Committee Reports
9. Last year subject committees were asked to provide their individual reports to the Finance Committee in time for inclusion in the Committee’s draft report. In addition to scrutiny of the draft budget itself, subject committees will this year be asked to carry out scrutiny of the Efficient Government proposals.

10. Under this approach, the Budget Adviser provides a summary of subject committee reports which forms part of the Finance Committee’s draft report. The Committee thus considers subject committee reports alongside its own draft report. The approach was successful last year, providing subject committees with more time to undertake scrutiny of the draft budget. It is therefore proposed that this approach be adopted again this year and the draft timetable below reflects this proposal.

Draft timetable
11. The following timetable illustrates how the proposals in this paper would work in practice. Should the publication of any of the budget documents be delayed, the timetable would be revised accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 27 September</td>
<td>Agree guidance for subject committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper from Budget Adviser on the Draft Budget 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7 November</td>
<td>External meeting including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- informal workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- education/information session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- formal Committee meeting with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidence from the Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 15 November</td>
<td>Evidence on SPCB and Audit Scotland budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16 November</td>
<td>Deadline for subject committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 30 November</td>
<td>Consider draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 December</td>
<td>Consider draft report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

12. The Committee is invited to:

1) agree the broad approach to scrutinising the Draft Budget 2006-07 as set out in this paper;

2) agree to hold an external meeting, to agree either a specific location or a geographic area and to agree the outline format as set out in paragraphs 6-8 above;

3) request the clerks to seek the appropriate authorisations for such a meeting;

4) delegate the authority given to them under Rule 12.4.3 of Standing Orders to the Convener to authorise witness expenses if appropriate; and

5) agree to deal with subject committee reports as set out in paragraphs 9-10 above.

Judith Evans
Senior Assistant Clerk
Finance Committee
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Cross-cutting Expenditure Review of Deprivation: Response from the Scottish Executive

Dear Judith

Cross Cutting Review of Deprivation Expenditure

Further to your letter of 3 May 2005 to Richard Dennis and our subsequent telephone discussion I attach the Executive’s response to the information requested by the Committee. I apologise for the slight delay in replying.

The response covers four broad headings relevant to the Committee’s Review:

- Paper 1: Update on Closing the Opportunity Gap and Community Regeneration;
- Paper 2: Measuring area deprivation;
- Paper 3: Clarification of points in Professor Midwinter’s paper; and
- Paper 4: Detail on funding streams targeting areas of multiple deprivation

I trust this answers the questions set out in your letter. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Richard Rollison
Branch Head – Regeneration Unit
Paper 1: Closing the Opportunity Gap and Community Regeneration

The Partnership Agreement, the most recent Spending Review document (*Building a Better Scotland: Spending Proposals 2005-2008 – Enterprise, Opportunity, Fairness*, published on 29th September 2004) and the most recent Budget document (*Draft Budget 2005-2006*, published on 15th October 2004) reconfirm the Executive’s commitment both to Closing the Opportunity Gap and to regenerating our most deprived communities. Both also include more detailed information on how our investment will target individuals, families and areas suffering from poverty and disadvantage.

In addition, the Executive has recently refocused its social justice strategy and approach to area regeneration through the Closing the Opportunity Gap (CtOG) approach. The Minister for Communities announced six high level CtOG objectives on 12th July 2004 and 10 more detailed targets on 9th December 2004. Henceforth, the Executive’s progress in tackling poverty and deprivation – closing the opportunity gap – will be measured against these 10 targets. The targets cover a wide range of Executive portfolios, departments and agencies and focus on the most important challenges in terms of tackling poverty and disadvantage in Scotland today. Targets include tackling concentrations of worklessness in 7 local authority areas, improving the health of our most disadvantaged communities, tackling educational underachievement, improving access to services in our most disadvantaged rural communities and tackling financial exclusion and multiple debt.

In terms of areas of multiple deprivation, there is a specific CtOG target as follows:

*To promote community regeneration of the most deprived neighbourhoods, through improvements by 2008 in employability, education, health, access to local services, and quality of the local environment.*

This target is, in essence, the Executive’s strategic target which monitors progress for the most deprived 15% communities as a whole and how the Executive will measure its overall performance in terms of tackling multiple deprivation.

In terms of the target, the most deprived neighbourhoods are defined as those areas (or data zones) ranked as the most deprived 15% of data zones through the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004. Meanwhile, improvements in employability, education and health are defined in terms of progress in the most deprived neighbourhoods against the wider CtOG targets as follows:

*Employment*: Reductions in the number of people from the most deprived neighbourhoods claiming benefits

*Health*: Improvements in under 75 Coronary Heart Disease and under 75 Cancer mortality in the most deprived neighbourhoods

*Education*: Improvements in the average tariff score at the end of S4 for children from the most deprived neighbourhoods
Access to local services: This will be defined locally through the Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs) being developed and delivered by Community Planning Partnerships to reflect the needs and priorities of the most deprived neighbourhoods.

Improving the quality of the local environment: Although there are a number of factors that contribute to the quality of the local environment, such as access to good quality green space, biodiversity and air pollution, the initial focus will be on issues such as graffiti, vandalism and litter which are often key priorities for people living in the most deprived neighbourhoods. Monitoring data on these issues is available through the Scottish Household Survey.

Further information on all the CtOG targets, including baseline data, definitions of how the targets will be measured, the action that will be taken to achieve them, and the resources that are being invested can be found at: www.scotland.gov.uk/closingtheopportunitygap/.

Regeneration Outcome Agreements and the Community Regeneration Fund

The driving force for the achievement of our CtOG target for the most deprived neighbourhoods is the development and delivery of 3 year (2005-08) Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs) by Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) and the associated targeted investment of £318m (2005-08) through the Community Regeneration Fund (CRF).

ROAs and the associated integration of Social Inclusion Partnerships and CPPs have their roots in the Executive’s Community Regeneration Statement (2002) and independent studies of former area based programmes. As Professor Midwinter points out (para. 34), this emphasised that local regeneration should take place within the wider strategic context of community planning so that core public services have as much effect as possible on deprived areas and are working effectively in those areas. ROAs also recognise that a strategic approach allows for better linking of opportunity and need. Opportunity has also been taken to merge funding streams with similar objectives together whilst continuing to invest in targeted local projects and initiatives – the Community Regeneration Fund.

Communities Scotland is currently working with all 32 CPPs to develop ROAs in line with the requirements set out in ROA Guidance (June 2004). Each ROA will set out how the CPP will use the CRF and their own and other funding resources to achieve better and additional outcomes for people living in the most deprived neighbourhoods. This reflects the Executive’s emphasis on bending core budgets and services in favour of deprived neighbourhoods. It also reflects the Executive’s focus on outcomes - ROAs will enable progress to be monitored not only in terms of outputs but also in terms of outcomes (e.g reductions in unemployment, improvements in educational attainment, reductions in crime) against a baseline position.
Paper 2: Measuring Area Deprivation

In terms of measuring area deprivation the Committee may wish to be aware that the Executive contracted the Scottish Centre for Research on Social Justice (SCRSJ), Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen to develop its strategy for measuring deprivation\(^1\). The SCRSJ carried out extensive research and consulted widely with stakeholders throughout Scotland in developing the strategy. The strategy sets out how the Scottish Executive intends to measure area and individual multiple deprivation.

SCRSJ provided a clear definition and conceptual basis for measuring deprivation, clarifying how the terms relate to others used to refer to social need such as poverty, social exclusion or social injustice. They also set out the long-term strategy for measuring area deprivation building on the widely accepted methodology developed by Oxford University\(^2\). In addition, SCRSJ explored approaches to measuring deprivation for individuals. In particular, to recommend whether individual measures should be developed as replacements to area-based measures or as additional to them.

The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (SIMD) is designed to identify small areas with high concentrations of multiple deprivation across the whole of Scotland. Work is ongoing to develop measures of individual multiple deprivation which can be used to identify the overall levels of deprivation across Scotland.


The SIMD has been recognised by stakeholders as a significant improvement on previous area deprivation measures. The introduction of the new data zone geography (with an average population of around 750 people) allows the SIMD to pick out small pockets of deprivation previously missed by indices based on larger ward and postcode sectors. Previous measures based on census data and geographies were able to pick out small pockets of deprivation, but were limited to the topics covered in the census and could not be updated between censuses. The emphasis on using administrative data allows for the SIMD to be updated with new data on an ongoing basis.

The characteristics of the people and households living in each area (e.g. lone parents, disabled or elderly) are not factors used within the SIMD. Instead, it uses people’s and household’s circumstances (e.g. dependent on benefits, educational attainment and premature mortality). The overall SIMD 2004 is created from 31 different indicators which cover specific aspects (called domains) of deprivation: Current Income, Employment, Health, Education, Housing and Access. The final


output is a relative ranking of the data zones from 1 (most deprived) to 6,505 (least deprived) on the overall measure and on each of the individual domains.

The areas which are amongst the most deprived on the overall measure will also tend to be ranked the highest on the domains of deprivation. For example, a third of those data zones in the most deprived 15% by the SIMD 2004 are in the most deprived 15% on at least 5 of the 6 individual domains. This rises to almost two thirds when 4 of the 6 individual domains is considered.

Not all people and households living in deprived areas are themselves deprived, and deprived people and households do live outwith deprived areas. For example, just under 40 per cent of those people considered to be income deprived are living in the most deprived 15% of areas and this figure rises to almost 60 per cent in the large urban areas and decreases in rural and remote areas.

The long term strategy for developing the SIMD sets out a programme for developing existing indicators and domains, and for developing new domains, in particular on crime which is a recognised gap in the existing index.

It is noted that the Committee has contracted Professor Bramley to examine SIMD04 and whether it could be used in a way to assess overall progress in particular areas. In this respect, the Committee may wish to be aware that the methodology used within the SIMD 2004 is based on the well-respected methodology developed by Oxford University\(^3\) which is also being used in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Furthermore, in line with the recommendations within the long term strategy, the Robertson Centre for Biostatistics at the University of Glasgow has been contracted to investigate the statistical techniques used within SIMD. The research covers how the SIMD methodology incorporates indicators based on small numbers, the methods used to assign weights to indicators within the health, education and geographical access domains, how weights should be assigned to any new domain added to the SIMD in future, and the uncertainty around the overall SIMD ranks. The Robertson Centre have brought in expertise from across the UK and the research is expected to be completed and published by September 2005.

In terms of measuring progress, it should be noted that the SIMD 2004 is a relative measure and, as such, cannot be used directly to make assessments about the differences in the scale of deprivation between areas and over time. However, the introduction of the new small area statistical data zone geography (which for the first time has introduced a consistent geography across government), the background indicators used to produce the index and the wide range of other socio-economic indicators available through Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics\(^4\) do allow analysis of the differences in the scale of deprivation between areas and over time. For example, the income and employment domains in the SIMD can be used to provide proxies of the absolute numbers of deprived people in any areas of Scotland.

---


\(^4\) Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics – the Scottish Executive programme to develop small area socio-economic statistics to support the development of national and local policy (www.sns.gov.uk)
Similarly, other indicators used within the SIMD can be used to measure changes in education and health outcomes. Indeed, the Executive will be using data available through Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics to assess progress towards the Closing the Opportunity Gap target for deprived communities.
Paper 3: Cross-cutting Inquiry into Deprivation Spend: Review by Advisor – Points of Clarification

The papers on ‘Closing the Opportunity Gap and Community Regeneration’ and ‘Measuring Area Deprivation’ which form part of this response aim to update the Committee on the Executive’s current approach to these issues. They also provide a useful context to Part One of Professor Midwinter’s review. There are also a number of other points arising from the Review which it may be helpful to clarify at this stage.

Para. 24
The Committee may wish to note that the figures provided are for absolute not relative poverty. Furthermore, the baseline and current figures have shifted slightly from the paper’s source to reflect improvements in the statistical series. The latest Households Below Average Income (HBAI) figures for 2003-04 (as at 30 March 2005) are included in the table which follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children living in workless households</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children living in low income households</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of unemployed working-age people</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of working age people in low-income households</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of low-income pensioners</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Para. 25
The figures given in the table show that absolute poverty is falling. It is also worth noting that the latest HBAI figures show that, whilst there is still some way to go, even relative poverty is now falling significantly across all age groups.

Para. 29
The Committee may wish to note that the Executive tackles poverty (as well as equality) through a focus on people and groups.

Para. 37
For clarity, it should be noted that Sure Start is not an educational programme in the sense that it provides education or training to individuals. It is, however, a programme delivered by the Executive’s Education Department. Although it is not geographically targeted at areas of multiple deprivation it does aim to break the cycle of deprivation - whatever its cause - by working with the most vulnerable families with children aged from 0-3.

Para. 39
The paper on the approach to measuring area deprivation which forms part of this response provides further information on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. For clarity, it should be noted that SIMD identifies the most deprived areas in Scotland based on 31 different indicators which are contained within six domains of deprivation. These domains are Current Income, Employment, Health, Education, Housing and Access.
Para. 40
In terms of funding for tackling Anti-Social Behaviour it should be noted that £33.6m was made available for tackling antisocial behaviour over 2004-6. From this, £26.2m was allocated to local authorities and their community planning partners for community wardens and for services to support people affected by antisocial behaviour. Funding was allocated on the basis of SIMD and crime rates, as well as other factors. The remaining £7.4m was held centrally to support demonstration models and provide support to antisocial behaviour practitioners.

The Committee may also wish to note that £67.5m was made available for tackling antisocial behaviour over 2006-8. From this, £64m was allocated to local authorities and their community planning partners to tackle antisocial behaviour, according to local needs and priorities. Again, funding was allocated on the basis of SIMD and crime rates, as well as other factors. The overriding consideration was to ensure that local authorities who have invested in important services to help tackle antisocial behaviour had sufficient funds to continue these services in 2006-8. The remaining £3.5m was retained centrally to support the delivery of the Executive’s antisocial behaviour strategy.

In terms of the Vacant and Derelict Land Fund, the Committee may wish to note that the key objectives of the Fund are to stimulate economic growth and job creation and to promote environmental justice and improved quality of life. Based on information from the Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Survey, the Executive allocated £20m (2004-06) to the three local authorities with the highest levels of long term vacant and derelict land - Glasgow (£4m/£6m); Dundee (£2m/£2m) and North Lanarkshire (£2m/£4m). SR2004 includes a further £24.3m for the Fund for the period 2006-08. Ministers have yet to decide on how this money will be allocated.

The Urban Regeneration Company (URC) programme was established in response to the Cities Review and aims to test the role of innovative delivery vehicles like URCs in improving the delivery of regeneration. The 3 URC Pathfinders (Craigmillar, Clydebank Rebuilt and Raploch) are all in or close to areas of multiple deprivation but were selected as a result of a formal consultation on URCs (August 2003) where local partnerships were invited to bid to become Pathfinder URCs. Bids were assessed against a set of criteria which included:

- clear and credible vision
- an outline business case with potential funding sources
- appropriate management and delivery structures
- evidence of support from key partners and the community

The bids from Craigmillar, Clydebank and Raploch were selected as Pathfinders as their proposals were sufficiently well developed and had the closest match with the selection criteria, although all of them had further work to do. Executive funding for the three URCs is £20m over the period 2004-06.
Para. 41
In terms of Communities Scotland’s housing investment programme it should be noted that the resource allocation process from the national programme to each individual Communities Scotland Area Office has been based on around 50% of the allocation in areas of urban deprivation, and a further element of 20% on rural/remote areas, with the remainder allocated on the basis of indicators of particular needs, homelessness and disrepair. Once allocated to the Area Office level, programmes have then been developed in close consultation with partners and reflect a broad range of existing partnership arrangements. They are based on local housing market and needs analysis and, in line with Ministerial priorities, they identify the demands, needs and opportunities for housing investment. They are also heavily informed by the Local Housing Strategies prepared by each local authority.

In 2005-06, with an investment programme of £404m at least £332m will be spent on new and improved housing primarily in disadvantaged communities to replace or improve poor quality housing and to help people on low incomes rent social housing or buy a home in areas where demand exceeds supply.

Para. 44
It should be noted that the Health Improvement Fund (HIF) was introduced in 2000 to support health improvement work and encourage local communities to address the root causes of ill health. However, with effect from 2004/05 the HIF was subsumed within each Board’s overall financial allocations. As such, it no longer exists as a separate funding stream.

Para. 51
The Committee may wish to note that the Health Department does intend to shift to the SIMD in due course.

Para. 60
Regional Selective Assistance (RSA) is the Executive’s main form of financial assistance to industry, encouraging investment and employment in the Assisted Areas of Scotland (areas designated for regional aid under European Community Law). The Assisted Areas map, agreed with the Commission, sets out those areas eligible for regional aid, targeting areas of greatest need to ensure that regional aid helps address the lack of employment opportunities in these areas. The methodology for identifying and selecting the Assisted Areas had to meet European Commission requirements, and used economic indicators which measured, for example unemployment, employment and dependency on manufacturing.

RSA is a demand led scheme and is available to businesses of all sizes, across a wide range of sectors. In order to qualify for RSA, a business’ project must meet all the RSA scheme criteria, including taking place within an Assisted Area, creating or safeguarding jobs within the business and involve an element of capital investment. RSA is a discretionary grant where the level of grant offered depends on an assessment of how much is needed to make sure the project goes ahead. Once accepted, projects are closely monitored and payment of grant, usually made in instalments over several years, is only released as job and capital expenditure targets are met.
The origins of the figure of £161m quoted in Professor Midwinter’s paper for European Structural Funds are unclear. European Structural Funds are expected to deliver over £1.1 billion of funding across Scotland in the current Programming period (2000-06). The two main funds, European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) both have particular funding ‘priority streams’ with an area focus.

Committed spend for these priority streams up until 31 May 2005 is as follows:

- Priority 3 in the Highlands & Islands Special Transitional Programme *Active Labour Market Policies to fight Unemployment* - committed spend of approx. £23.5m.
- Priority 3 in the Objective 2 West of Scotland Programme *To increase the economic and social cohesion of the region* - committed spend of approx. £9m.
- Priority 1 in the Objective 3 European Social Fund Programme *Increase the economic and social cohesion of the Region* - committed spend of approx. £26.5m.
- Priority 2 in the Objective 3 European Social Fund Programme *Addressing Social Inclusion* - committed spend of approx. £80m.
- Priority 5 in the Objective 3 European Social Fund Programme *Addressing Gender Imbalance* - committed spend of approx. £7m.
- The URBAN II Community Initiative also addresses this in a very specific smaller Programme split across the River Clyde between Port Glasgow and South Clydebank.

**Paragraph 69**
In terms of the indicators for monitoring health progress in the most deprived communities, the Committee may wish to note the specific age groups associated with these indicators as follows:

- coronary heart disease mortality (under 75s)
- cancer mortality (under 75s)
- adult smoking (16 – 64)
- smoking during pregnancy
- teenage pregnancies (13 – 15 year olds)
- suicides (10 - 24 year olds)
Paper 4: Funding Streams targeting areas of multiple deprivation

The Committee has asked:

(i) Which programmes/funding streams the Executive would regard as specifically targeting areas of multiple deprivation;

(ii) How the Executive i) allocates such funding to delivery bodies and ii) measures its use by them; and

(iii) How the Executive measures performance in terms of tackling multiple deprivation and Closing the Opportunity Gap.

In considering the response to (i) and (ii) above, we have focused on those funding streams which target multiple deprivation at the neighbourhood level and which meet one or more of the following criteria:

(a) Explicitly targeted at areas of multiple deprivation – i.e their primary purpose is to tackle one or more causes or symptoms of area based multiple deprivation;

(b) Allocated wholly or partly to delivery bodies using a measure of area based deprivation (eg SIMD04, Carstairs etc) in the distribution formula

(c) Eligibility for funding determined by whether service/project is within a defined deprived area (eg eligibility for Post Office Fund); and

(d) Policy/funding guidance or grant conditions place significant emphasis on need to target most deprived areas.

Table 1 (attached) provides detail on those Executive funding streams which meet one or more of these criteria and describes how these funding streams are monitored. However, at a strategic level, as indicated in Paper 1, the Executive measures its performance in terms of tackling multiple deprivation through Closing the Opportunity Gap Target J:

*To promote community regeneration of the most deprived neighbourhoods, through improvements by 2008 in employability, education, health, access to local services, and quality of the local environment.*

The Committee may also wish to note that eligibility for residential Stamp Duty Exemption, which is a reserved matter for the Inland Revenue, is determined by whether or not a property is located in the 15% most deprived areas based on the 1998 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. Also, a number of external agencies, such as the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council and the Big Lottery Fund, have programmes which fit one or more of the above criteria.

It must be emphasised that Table 1 does not provide a complete picture of Executive funding streams which make a direct or indirect contribution to addressing the causes and symptoms of area based multiple deprivation. In particular, there are a range of funding streams aimed at tackling specific aspects of individual or family...
deprivation which, because a disproportionate number of individuals/families facing these problems live in deprived areas, are likely to bring disproportionate benefits to deprived areas. For example:

- One third of the employment deprived people living in Scotland live in the most deprived 15% of areas and will benefit from employment and training programmes such as Training for Work. Also, programmes such as Regional Selective Assistance, whilst not explicitly targeted at the most deprived areas will create and safeguard jobs for people from these areas.

- Nearly half (46%) of people living in the most deprived 5% of data zones and 29% of those living in the most deprived 15% are defined as income deprived. Again, funding such as the recently announced £10m (2006-08) financial inclusion fund is likely to bring disproportionate benefits to deprived areas.

- Although Sure Start is not specifically targeted at areas of multiple deprivation it is targeted at vulnerable families with children from 0-3 - whether they are vulnerable by virtue of poverty, mental health, substance misuse problems etc. The Sure Start programme, with a budget of £169.7m (2005-08), is therefore likely to have a disproportionate impact in deprived areas.

- The National Priorities Action Fund (NPAF) is a specific grant which provides additional financial support to local authorities to raise standards in schools and promote social inclusion. Funding for NPAF is £586m over the next 3 years (2005-08). It is allocated to local authorities across six themes - Schools in the Community, Social Justice, Discipline and Ethos, School Infrastructure, National Qualifications and Nutrition. Each theme supports a range of policy objectives/strands. Depending upon the specific activities supported by councils from these resources, a number of the strands will have an impact in deprived areas.

Flexibility in the way NPAF is used is being opened up in 2006/07 and Ministers will be challenging authorities to use the funding more flexibly to target particular action areas and priorities. This will undoubtedly include a focus on attainment at the bottom end ensuring that all, and in this respect children in deprived communities, are benefiting from education.

Similarly, the significant core budgets of local government and the health service also provide services to and have an impact on multiply deprived areas. The development of Regeneration Outcome Agreements by Community Planning Partnerships aims to demonstrate how local government, the health service and other public agencies use their own resources and the Community Regeneration Fund to achieve better and additional outcomes for people living in the most deprived neighbourhoods.

Whilst appreciating the Committee’s wish to identify those funding streams specifically targeted at areas of multiple deprivation it should be recognised that there is a complex interaction between these funding streams, those targeted at individuals and families and specific aspects of deprivation, and the core budgets of local government, the health service and other public agencies. If the purpose
of the Committee’s Inquiry is to investigate the Executive’s commitment to tackling multiple deprivation, looking solely at the method of allocation and targeting of individual funding streams can only provide part of the picture.
# TABLE 1: DEPRIVATION FUNDING STREAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Depriv. Criteria (a) – (d)</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Method of Allocation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Regeneration Fund (CRF) (Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>To help, along with the resources of community planning partners, regenerate the most deprived neighbourhoods through the development and delivery of Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs).</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>£318m (2005-08)</td>
<td>Allocated to Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs). 2/3rds to CPPs based on their share of data zones in the most deprived 15% by SIMD04 and 1/3rd to those CPPs with an above average (i.e. &gt;15%) concentration of deprivation. All CPPs receive a minimum of £100k pa. Arrangements are also in place to smooth the transition from predecessor programmes (SIP/BNSF).</td>
<td>Communities Scotland is currently developing a Performance Monitoring Framework for ROAs and the CRF. This will include quarterly spend returns, Annual Reports and in-year performance monitoring linked to a programme of continuous improvement. CPPs will be required to report progress against the outcomes targets set in their ROA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Voices (Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>To support CPPs, in the context of their ROA, to deliver community engagement in the most deprived neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>£9.8m (2005-08)</td>
<td>In 2005-06 CPPs will receive the same allocation as the Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) in their area received through the Community Empowerment Fund in 2004/05 or, for those without SIPs, £30k. From 2006/07 allocations will be based on the proportion of people in each CPP area living in the most deprived 15% data zones by SIMD04 along with a flat rate of £30k for all CPPs and transitional funding arrangements.</td>
<td>Community Voices will be monitored as part of the overall Performance Monitoring Framework for ROAs and the CRF (see above).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 1: DEPRIVATION FUNDING STREAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Depriv. Criteria</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Method of Allocation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Investment Programme (Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>To create decent and affordable housing for everyone in Scotland by providing new and improved housing, primarily in disadvantaged communities, and by helping people on low incomes rent social housing or buy a home in areas where demand exceeds supply or where market prices are beyond the reach of their incomes.</td>
<td>(a) – (d)</td>
<td>£1,268m (2005-08)</td>
<td>Allocation links the national measurement of deprivation and housing demand and supply to locally devised programmes and decision making. They are based on local housing market needs analysis which identifies the demands, needs and opportunities for housing investment and are heavily informed by the Local Housing Strategy prepared by each local authority. (see Paper 3 – comments on para. 41 of Prof. Midwinter’s Review).</td>
<td>Progress is monitored on a monthly and quarterly basis and the data for each year published in an Annual Statistical report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund to develop Post Offices in Deprived Urban Area (Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>To contribute to the regeneration of deprived urban areas by sustaining and improving Post Office branches, on the margins of viability, that provide socially important services and facilities and that act as an ‘anchor’ for other retail activity.</td>
<td>(a), (c) and (d)</td>
<td>£2m (2003-06)</td>
<td>Fund is allocated to individual sub postmasters who apply for funding. Applications are assessed on various eligibility criteria such as location, profitability and benefits to wider regeneration activity. Geographic eligibility is one of the key criteria and is based on location within the 20% most deprived urban areas by the 1998, 2003 or 2004 Scottish Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</td>
<td>Progress on individual projects is monitored through invoicing and final inspection of funded works by PO Ltd. The programmes will be evaluated in 2005.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 1: DEPRIVATION FUNDING STREAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Depriv. Criteria (a) – (d)</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Method of Allocation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Estate Regeneration Fund (Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>To assist Councils in delivering affordable housing and related environmental projects.</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>£50m (2005-08)</td>
<td>Funding is only available (from July 2005) to those Councils who can demonstrate that they will be able to achieve the Scottish Housing Quality Standard while retaining their housing stock. Allocations will be based on bids against published criteria, including demonstration of links to the Regeneration Outcome Agreement. New Build projects necessary to achieve regeneration will be prioritised over any other projects.</td>
<td>Delivery will be monitored against the projects and activities set out in successful funding bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Studies for Unmet need (Health Dept)</td>
<td>To improve access to healthcare among the most deprived communities.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>£15m (2004-06)</td>
<td>Funding allocated to the three NHS boards with a significant proportion of their population living in the most deprived areas based on the Carstairs index of deprivation.</td>
<td>Monitoring will be undertaken by an expert group established to develop measures of inequality in health and will focus on a small number of key indicators related to improving the uptake of services by those in deprived areas relative to those in more affluent areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 1: DEPRIVATION FUNDING STREAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Depriv. Criteria (a) – (d)</th>
<th>Budget (2005-08)</th>
<th>Method of Allocation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working for Families Fund (Development Dept)</td>
<td>To help parents in deprived areas and groups into work by ensuring that availability of childcare is not a barrier to entering education, training or employment.</td>
<td>(a) and (d)</td>
<td>£35m</td>
<td>Funds are allocated to local authorities with the highest level of parents in need of support towards employment and are distributed, on a banded basis, to authorities where there are more than 3,000 children of claimants of income based Job Seekers Allowance and Income Support and children in these circumstances form more than 20% of the under 16 population. The two highest ranking rural authorities also receive funding.</td>
<td>Authorities provide six monthly and end year reports on the overall position, project by project activity, and delivery and financial reports. An overarching monitoring and evaluation framework is also in place to report centrally on activity data for projects and hard and soft outcomes for clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting People (Development Dept)</td>
<td>To provide good quality services, focused on the needs of users, to enable vulnerable people to live independently in the community, in all types of accommodation and tenure.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>£1,208m</td>
<td>Funding is allocated to local authorities with 30% of funding dependent on the number of people aged over 65, 30% on the number of homelessness applications, 20% on the number of people on Disability Living Allowance and 20% on the number of people living in the most deprived 15% of neighbourhoods as defined by SIMD04. Funding to smooth the transition to this formula from the previous Transitional Housing Benefit funding arrangements is also in place.</td>
<td>Local authorities provide quarterly and annual expenditure returns (annual audited by Audit Scotland). Local authorities are currently undertaking Supporting People Service Reviews in line with SE Guidance and will report on these to the Executive every six months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Deprivation Funding Streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Method of Allocation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tackling Antisocial Behaviour</td>
<td>For 2004-06 to provide funding for community wardens and other services to support people affected by antisocial behaviour (asb). For 2006-08 to support priorities identified by local authorities and their community planning partners, in consultation with local people, as part of their asb strategies.</td>
<td>£90.2m (2005-08)</td>
<td>Funding is allocated to local authorities on a banded basis. Deprivation and crime rates were used, among other factors, to allocate funding. 2004-06 funding used the SIMD 1998 (no. of postcodes in most deprived 20%). 2006-08 funding used SIMD04 (number of data zones in most deprived 20%). For 2004-06 local authorities and CPPs were asked to submit proposals in line with guidance issued by the Executive. Funding from 2006 is tied to the satisfactory development and delivery of asb outcome agreements.</td>
<td>Councils are required to submit monitoring forms covering the impact of community wardens at 6, 12 and 24 months and must also complete spend returns. The Executive is also undertaking visits to all 32 local authorities to assist in monitoring the use of the funding. From 2005 onwards funding is being monitored through the use of asb outcome agreements with CPPs required to report annually on whether outcomes are being met and funding has been spent. The Executive has put in place an asb accountability framework to assess the impact of the funding and wider asb strategy at a national, local authority and neighbourhood level. The Executive is also conducting a national evaluation of community wardens schemes across Scotland (which mainly operate in the more deprived neighbourhoods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Stream</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Depriv. Criteria (a) – (d)</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Method of Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Childrens Services Fund (Education Dept)</td>
<td>To support local authorities, health boards and voluntary organisations in working in partnership to deliver better outcomes for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children through more effective and integrated service delivery. The Fund is intended to improve services and support for the most vulnerable, whether addressed in terms of support for more disadvantaged communities, groups or individuals.</td>
<td>(b) and (d)</td>
<td>£196.5m (2005-08)</td>
<td>Each local authority area receives an indicative allocation based on population aged 0-18 (30%), deprivation (population aged 0-15 weighted by a combined standardised index comprising seasonally adjusted dependants of income support and job seekers allowance claimants and the number of children in lone parent families) (60%) and rurality (10%). Joint proposals are then submitted to the Executive for uptake of the allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deprivation Criteria

(a) Explicitly targeted at areas of multiple deprivation – i.e their primary purpose is to tackle one or more causes or symptoms of area based multiple deprivation

(b) Allocated wholly or partly to delivery bodies using a measure of area based deprivation (eg SIMD04, Carstairs etc) in the distribution formula

(c) Eligibility for funding determined by whether service/project is within a defined deprived area (eg eligibility for Post Office Fund)

(d) Policy/funding guidance or grant conditions place significant emphasis on need to target most deprived areas
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Cross-cutting Expenditure Review of Deprivation: Approach Paper

Summary

1. This paper sets out progress to date on the Cross-cutting Expenditure Review of Deprivation and proposes an approach to evidence taking.

Background

2. The Committee agreed on 25 January 2005 to undertake a cross-cutting review of Executive expenditure on deprivation. On 19 April 2005 the Committee considered a paper from the Adviser setting out the history and development of deprivation spend. The Committee agreed to request additional information from the Executive and to commission a short piece of research on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.

Progress

3. The Executive’s response to the four questions set out in Professor Midwinter’s paper has not been received but will be circulated before the meeting as Paper FI/S2/05/16/4. Professor Glen Bramley, Professor of Urban Studies at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh has been commissioned to assess the statistical validity of Scotland’s Multiple Index of Deprivation and its appropriateness as a mechanism for targeting resources on deprivation. This research will be available by the beginning of the summer recess.

Shape of inquiry

4. During the discussion on 19 April 2005, the Committee agreed that a two-stage approach to the inquiry would be beneficial. Such an approach is set out below.

Stage 1: Is it right in principle for different departments to have different criteria for allocating resources on the basis of deprivation?

Approach:
- seek additional information from Executive on how deprivation influences the allocation of resources (to follow as paper FI/S2/05/16/4)
- hold a round-table discussion early in September 2005 with experts and Executive officials, to discuss allocation of resources, funding and outcome measures
Stage 2: What the investment should be, how we should track it and how we can achieve outcomes that make a real difference.

Approach:
- commission further work from SPICe on the history and development of deprivation funding, along with a review of current work (eg Europe-wide, Welsh, English etc)
- seek written evidence from local authorities. It is proposed that the Clerks together with the Adviser and SPICe develop a questionnaire to be sent to all local authorities.
- seek written evidence from targeted groups, individuals and organisations, particularly in the health sector, the economic development sector and the voluntary sectors
- issue open call for evidence focusing particularly on what works and what doesn’t, ie barriers to change and opportunities for development
- set up informal case study visits to deprived areas to speak to those who seek funding (public and private sector); those who deliver services on the ground (if these are different from the first group); and those who benefit or should benefit from the funding
- take formal evidence from local authorities and other key delivery agents ie Communities Scotland, HIE, health boards etc. It is proposed that a mixture of those who currently use the SIMD and those who do not should be invited to give evidence.
- take formal evidence from Ministers. It is proposed that the Ministers for Communities, Health and Finance should be invited, separately but on the same day, to give evidence.

Issues

5. During discussion on 19 April 2005, members raised a number of issues to be considered in the course of the inquiry. These are set out below and it is proposed that they be included in the general calls for evidence as well as more targeted calls to, for example, local authorities.

- what is the rationale for seeking to benefit the 15% most deprived areas as opposed to, for example, the most deprived 5%?

- what are the mechanisms for dealing with anomalies arising from very small data areas?

- what are the costs, risks, opportunities and benefits associated with different types of allocation mechanisms, including for example core vs initiative funding; short vs long-term funding etc?

- how does local authority Grant Aided Expenditure operate in the context of deprivation?

- what is the fit between different types of eligibility, and how far is there a strategic and cross- and/or inter-government approach to eligibility, funding and benefits?
6. An outline timetable for the inquiry is set out below. It should be noted that an additional evidence slot has been timetabled in case members wish to follow up any particularly interesting written evidence. It is proposed that the Committee aim to publish the report towards the end of January 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By end June</td>
<td>Issue open call for evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop questionnaire and issue to local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 September</td>
<td>Presentation of research followed by round-table discussion on resource allocation criteria, funding and outcome measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 20 September</td>
<td>Case study visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 4 October</td>
<td>Report back from case study visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written evidence summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence panel 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence panel 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25 October</td>
<td>Potential additional evidence session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 1 November</td>
<td>Evidence from Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>Consider draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End January 2006</td>
<td>Publish report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

7. The Committee is invited to agree:

1) the general approach to the Review as set out in this paper;

2) to issue an open call for evidence on the Review, focusing on “what works and what doesn’t”, and to publicise this call for evidence through the Parliament’s website and appropriate national, local and specialist media;

3) to request the Clerks, with support from SPICE and from Professors Midwinter and Bramley, to develop an evidence questionnaire for local authorities;

4) to hold a round-table meeting in early September 2005, to coincide with the presentation of the research commissioned on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, and to provide the Clerks with the names of any persons whom they consider should be invited as experts to that meeting;

5) to seek the appropriate authorisations for two case study visits, one rural and one urban; to agree that members should wherever possible seek to attend a case study visit which is dissimilar to their own constituency; and that locations for case study visits should be determined with reference to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation;

6) to delegate the authority given to them under Rule 12.4.3 of Standing Orders to the Convener to authorise witness expenses as appropriate;

7) to request the Clerks to identify appropriate witnesses for formal evidence sessions to take place in September/October 2005 and to provide the Clerks with the names of any organisations which they consider should be invited to such evidence sessions; and

8) to invite the Minister for Communities, the Minister for Finance and Public Sector Reform and the Minister for Health and Community Care to give evidence in October/November 2005.

Judith Evans
Senior Assistant Clerk