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Standards Committee

Draft Report on Research Commissioner in Session 1 on behalf of the Standards Committee of the Scottish Parliament into aspects of the Cross-Party Group System

The Committee reports to the Parliament as follows—

Background

1. At its 16th Meeting 2002 (20 November) (Session 1), Members of the Standards Committee agreed to commission objective external research into the operation of the Cross-Party Group (CPG) system in the Scottish Parliament. The Conveners’ Group agreed to the Committee’s proposal in January 2003.

2. The research aims and objectives were set out in the full research specification sent out to potential external researchers, with the following aims being identified:

   • to provide an analysis of the purpose(s) and role(s) initially envisaged for CPGs in the Parliament;

   • to provide analysis of the purposes, roles and practices of CPGs in the first session of the Parliament and in the early months of the second session;

   • to identify where there are divergences between what was envisaged and practice, the reasons for any such divergences and the implications for both the Parliament and CPGs, particularly in terms of regulation.

Award of contract to research team

3. The specification for the project was drafted by a Research Specialist from the Scottish Parliament’s Information Centre (SPICe), in conjunction with the Senior Research Assessor from the Participation Services Team and the then Convener of the Committee. Institutions and individuals were identified by examining existing research in this area, identifying experts in the field and by searching the researcher database held by SPICe. Following a competitive tendering process, the contract was awarded to a team from the Centre for Public Policy and Management, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
Timetable

4. The contract was awarded to the team from the Robert Gordon University in March 2003. The timescale allowed for background work to start during the Dissolution period in April 2003.

5. On completing the background and comparative work, the research team contacted representative interviewees (including MSPs who were members of CPGs; MSP Conveners of CPGs; CPG secretariat members; and members of CPGs from outside the Parliament) in the period up to the middle of August 2003.

6. Having analysed the responses from this initial round of interviews, the researchers carried out a further round of interviews in September and October 2003 and submitted a draft report to the Parliament in December 2003.

Consideration by the Standards Committee (Session 2)

7. At its 1st Meeting 2004 (13 January), Members of the Standards Committee received a briefing from a member of the research team from The Robert Gordon University\(^1\). The briefing allowed the researcher to expand on and clarify some of the key points of the draft report and to make some revisions to the report based on Members’ questions.

8. The final report from The Robert Gordon University is attached as Annex A.

9. It is the intention of the Standards Committee to consider the report and review its policies in relation to the operation of Cross-Party Groups in the Scottish Parliament during Session 2 of the Parliament.

\(^1\) The Official Report of the meeting (13 January 2004) is attached as Annex B.
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Executive Summary

The Research
1. As part of their comprehensive review of Cross-Party Groups (CPGs) in the Scottish Parliament, the Standards Committee commissioned independent research to provide a critical review of the CPG system operating in the Scottish Parliament, focusing on its first session 1999-2003.

2. The aims and objectives of this critical review were to:
   - Provide an analysis of the initial purpose(s) and role(s) of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament
   - Provide an analysis of CPG purposes, roles and practice as these developed in the Parliament’s first Session
   - Identify any divergences from the initial purposes and roles of CPGs in their implementation, including analysis of reasons and implications of any divergences, particularly for the Parliament, CPGs and regulatory arrangements
   - Use the research findings to explain why the CPG system exists as it does, as of 30 September 2003, and discuss any implications for the Standards Committee review of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament

3. We used a number of methods and information sources in producing the critical review, involving analysis of key Parliamentary publications (plenary debates, Standards Committee meetings, research reports and policy, regulatory and legal documents). Standards Committee files on CPGs were used to develop classificatory typologies of the 49 CPGs registered late in Session 1, and 26 face-to-face interviews were carried out with a range of individuals and organised interests involved with CPGs. Interviews were also conducted with Parliament staff and with the Session 1 Convener of the Standards Committee.

4. The typologies enabled CPGs to be classified in groups according to four different criteria:
   - the subjects they covered
   - their types and levels of membership
   - their funding
   - their type of secretariat

5. We also undertook a systematic literature review of academic literature relating to CPGs and equivalent groups elsewhere, supplementing these data with information from key informants on purposes, roles and practices relevant to CPGs in other jurisdictions.

Rules Governing CPGS
6. The original rules for CPGs are set out in section 8 of the Code of Conduct for MSPs. There are 14 rules for CPGs, covering the nature and membership of groups; registration requirements; procedures for group meetings; use of Parliamentary resources; and arrangements for recognition after Scottish Parliamentary elections. Briefly, the rules are:
• The group must be Parliamentary in character, and its purpose of genuine public interest
• The group must be open to all MSPs and must include at least five MSPs, with one MSP from each of the parties or groups represented on the Parliamentary Bureau
• There may be group members from outwith the Parliament, but all meetings must be attended by at least two MSP members
• Group meetings must be held in public and must be publicly announced at least seven calendar days beforehand
• Groups must observe the limitations placed on use of Parliamentary facilities, with only MSP members allowed to make use of most of the available resources

7. Section 10 of the Code includes sanctions in relation to CPGs. This section excludes complaints about CPGs from the remit of the Standards Commissioner, and sets out that these will be dealt with by the Standards Committee, unless they are about the use of Parliamentary facilities and services. Cases concerning such complaints are to be made to the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (SPCB). The SPCB may refer any such complaint, together with recommendations for action, to the Standards Committee.

**Typologies**

8. As noted above, we developed four different typologies for CPGs. This involved categorising groups from four perspectives:

• by types and levels of membership
• by type of secretariat
• by type of subject matter covered
• by funding

9. Of the 49 CPGs in Session 1, the vast majority had between 16 and 50 members – 35 (71%) in total. Two groups had more than 75 members and six each had fewer than 16 and more than 50. Sixteen CPGs had no individual members, six had no organisational members and one had a membership comprising only MSPs.
10. Classifying CPGs by secretariat type showed that, although insufficient information was available for eight CPGs, of the 42 groups analysed:

- 21 had an external voluntary or charitable body providing secretariat
- nine groups had an internal (ie MSP or parliamentary staffed) secretariat
- five groups had an external private body providing the secretariat
- five had an external public body providing the secretariat
- two had a professional body providing the secretariat

11. The categories we used for subject matter identification were: health policy, commercial areas, reserved matters, social issues and transport and the environment. Groups were defined under the category ‘reserved matters’ where a significant part of their remit covered issues where legislation is reserved to Westminster but this does not preclude the Scottish Parliament from considering such matters. Health policy had the most groups (15), followed by reserved matters and social issues (each with 11 groups), commercial areas (8 groups) and transport and environmental policy (4 groups).
12. Classifying funding (apart from secretariat funding) available to CPGs, showed that 27 (55%) of the 49 groups received funding of some sort (with some groups receiving more than one type of funding). Session 1 finance was distributed as follows:

- 10 groups had funding from membership subscriptions
- seven had funding from external organisations for catering at meetings
- three had support from external organisations for catering purposes other than at meetings
- six had funding for events from external organisations and individuals
- one had financial support for a visit from an external organisation
- seven gained general funding from external organisations
- three had funding for other purposes from external organisations

13. Funding from subscription fees ranged from £5 to £20 per member a year, and for other uses such as catering and events ranged from £140 to £17,000.

**CPG Equivalents Elsewhere**

14. Cross-party groups, or their equivalents, are not that common in other parts of the world. Within the European Union Member States, most legislatures do not have CPG-type bodies. Among those that do, no parliament has formal rules governing such groups, which are instead operated on the basis of custom and practice, except for the Westminster Parliament. There are strong similarities between the rules governing all-party groups (APGs) at Westminster and those governing CPGs in the Scottish Parliament. Differences relate to the existence of formal rules relating to voting on APGs and the lack of CPG financial information that has to be notified in the Westminster rules for APGs. All-party groups are expected to meet twice a year; there are no such demands on CPGs. At Westminster, changes in the composition of an APG should be notified within 28 days.
Main Findings of Interviews

15. The interviews conducted with MSPs, members from external organisations, including group secretaries, and individual members of CPGs produced the following main findings.

16. The most frequently raised issue is the shortage of time available for MSPs to devote to CPG activity.

17. Knowledge of the CPG system is in general limited in most cases, with the exception of several interviewees who were very aware of the range of registered CPGs and their activities and had given some thought to possible changes to increase CPG efficiency.

18. Knowledge of CPG rules is fairly limited, although CPG Conveners and Secretariat members were well-informed.

19. Views about the purpose and function of CPGs ranged from a laissez-faire approach, which relied on MSPs to determine appropriateness, through a more pragmatic approach, which stressed the need for some agreed parameters, to a focused approach for CPGs that would concentrate on Parliamentary business, particularly the work of the Parliament’s subject committees.

20. There was general approval of the current CPG system in the Scottish Parliament, although this was in the light of general concern about the time available among group members for CPG activity, and some strong opinions were voiced about difficulties in the system.

21. Although CPGs were not mentioned in the Consultative Steering Group (CSG) report, interviewees generally felt that CPGs had a role to play in furthering the Parliament’s founding principles in practice, and CPG activity to date was widely held to operate in line with these principles.

Other Key Findings from the Research

22. CPGs do not fit neatly into the wider framework of the Scottish Parliament’s institutional make-up.

23. Most CPGs receive funding from organisations outwith the Parliament to provide secretariats, or more commonly, receive secretariat services in kind from such organisations.

24. There is a lack of information about CPG activity in Session 1, but available data indicate that most CPGs had regular meetings and there is evidence of other activities, particularly conferences, social occasions, visits and other ad hoc events.

25. Within the broad statements of purpose provided by the rules on CPGs, individual CPG registration documents and interview data evidenced wide variety of purpose.
26. The Scottish system is currently more regulated by Parliament than most of its counterparts elsewhere.

**Key Recommendations**

27. The critical review found that the role of the CPG system in the Parliamentary framework is neither clearly defined, nor generally understood. Assessment of the work of CPGs depends crucially on an agreed statement of purpose of the system. We recommend that the Standards Committee address this issue, perhaps by adapting the proposed statement of purpose from its 2002 consultation document, which was well-received by respondents. The proposed purpose was:

*to enable Members of the Scottish Parliament to establish a mechanism for briefing themselves on a subject of genuine public interest; and*
*to bring together Members of the Scottish Parliament from across the parties and external organisations/members of the public who share an interest in advancing a particular subject or cause.*

28. Our review also found uncertainty about the meaning of the term ‘parliamentary in character’. The Standards Committee might therefore consider offering an interpretation of the term. It might also consider providing broad objectives for CPGs, which could include facilitation of debate and exchange of information between MSPs and organisations and individuals outside Parliament on matters of relevance for Parliament.

29. While the review found that most interviewees supported a light regulatory regime, there was wide support for making completion of the annual return compulsory. There was also support for expecting CPGs to reflect on their achievements in the last 12 months in making their returns.

30. The review found that monitoring of CPG activity has become the responsibility of Standards Committee clerks, and although the clerking team has become increasingly pro-active in its CPG work, insufficient time is available to them to monitor the system. To aid the workings of CPGs and to help them achieve CPG objectives, we recommend that the Standards Committee considers whether a dedicated CPG team or the creation of a Cross-Party Group development worker is necessary to promote good practice among CPGs.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Aims
1. The research on Cross-Party Groups (CPGs) in the Scottish Parliament was commissioned by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body on behalf of the Standards Committee in March 2003. The research is part of the Scottish Parliament’s Standards Committee review of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament.

2. The overall research aim is to provide a critical review of the CPG system operating in the Scottish Parliament focusing on its first Session 1999-2003. This is to assist the Committee in determining whether the current rules outlined in section 8 of the Code of Conduct\(^1\) are sufficient for effective development and regulation of CPGs in the Parliament’s second Session.

3. The research carried out for the critical review builds on the questionnaire responses\(^2\) from CPGs surveyed by the Committee in 2002. It also builds on the responses\(^3\) to the consultation on cross-party groups\(^4\) undertaken by the Standards Committee between 3 July and 30 September 2002. This consultation came out of debates in the Standards Committee relating to the roles and purposes of CPGs.

4. The specific aims of the critical review presented in this report were to:
   - Provide an analysis of initial purpose(s) and role(s) of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament
   - Provide an analysis of CPG purposes, roles and practice in the Parliament’s first Session
   - Identify any divergences from the initial purposes and roles of CPGs in their implementation, including analysis of reasons and implications of any divergences, particularly for the Parliament, CPGs and regulatory arrangements
   - Use the research findings to explain why the CPG system exists as it does, as of 30 September 2003, and discuss any implications for the Standards Committee review of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament

Research Methods
5. The research methods used in preparing the critical review were:
   - Systematic review of academic and Parliamentary literature relating to CPGs and equivalents elsewhere

---
• Analysis of key Parliamentary publications, and of relevant policy, regulatory and legal documents
• Development of a classificatory typology of CPGs
• Undertaking qualitative interviews with a range of interests in CPG work
• Obtaining information on purposes, roles, and practices relevant to CPGs in other jurisdictions from key informants

6. The findings presented in this report draw upon existing information and analyses provided for the Standards Committee’s work on CPGs, in particular for the Committee review of the CPG system. These sources include:

• Standards Committee publications
• Parliament publications
• CPG Registration forms and Annual Returns submitted to the Standards Committee
• CPG files held by the Standards Committee
• the analysis of responses to the Committee consultation on CPGs
• the paper on issues arising from the consultation prepared by the Committee clerks

7. The research also draws upon information from interviewees who talked to the researchers about the CPG system and CPG activities in Session 1. The interviewees were mainly CPG members in Session 1 and were selected because they belonged to one of the following five categories:

• MSPs
• Conveners
• Secretariat members
• External members
• Relevant Parliament staff

8. Most interviewees had wider CPG membership than the particular group or role for which they had been selected. For example, some secretariat members were either individual or organisational members of other groups. During interviews, respondents were not restricted to discussing only one particular role.

Structure of the Report
9. The remainder of this report is presented in seven chapters:

• Chapter 2 sets out the background to the research, including the reasons for its undertaking, and how it fits with existing research on CPGs in the Scottish Parliament and on their equivalents elsewhere


• Chapter 3 outlines the typologies developed to categorise CPGs and highlights the main features of the typologies
• Chapters 4 and 5 consider the roles, purposes, activities and the monitoring of CPGs in Session 1
• Chapter 6 examines the practice of CPG-equivalents in other Parliaments
• Chapter 7 sets out interviewees' views on the operation of CPGs in Session 1
• In Chapter 8, the implications of the research are discussed, including the conclusions reached
• There are also six annexes containing research documentation
Chapter 2: Research Background

Current Framework
10. Neither the Scotland Act 1998 nor the Standing Orders of the Scottish Parliament explicitly mentions CPGs. The Consultative Steering Group (CSG) report which sets out the founding principles of the Parliament is also silent on CPGs.

11. Section 8 of the Code of Conduct for MSPs sets out the rules for the recognition and operation of CPGs and section 10 sets out how the rules on CPGs are to be enforced. While the Code stresses the need for CPGs to be Parliamentary in character and established in the public interest, it does not explicitly set out the purpose and objectives of the CPG system.

Code of Conduct for MSPs
12. Section 8 of the Code contains the regulations for the operation of CPGs. Only recognised CPGs can use the title of Cross-Party Group in the Scottish Parliament and have access to Parliamentary facilities. Proposed groups must apply to the Standards Committee for recognition, which is based on compliance with the rules set out in section 8. Compliance is checked by the Committee clerks against information provided in the registration form. A proposed MSP official of the group must sign a declaration on compliance on behalf of the group.

13. The MSP signing the declaration on compliance on behalf of a CPG will be held primarily responsible for the group, although each MSP group member is responsible for their own conduct in relation to CPG membership. Failure on the part of a CPG to comply with the rules may result in withdrawal of recognition of that group, and individual failure to comply may result in withdrawal of the contravening MSP’s rights and privileges.

Scottish Executive Ministerial Code
14. The guidance contained in the Scottish Executive Ministerial Code sets out that Ministers should not join CPGs and that new Ministers should resign from CPGs of which they are already members. The stated rationale for this is to avoid any conflict of interest.

The Role of the Standards Committee in Regulating CPGS
15. The remit of the Standards Committee in the first Session of the Parliament was to consider and report on:

   a. whether a member’s conduct is in accordance with these Rules (the Standing Orders) and any Code of Conduct for members, matters relating to member’s interests, and any other matters relating to the conduct of members in carrying out their Parliamentary duties; and

---

b. the adoption, amendment and application of any Code of Conduct for members. Where the Committee considers it appropriate, it may by any motion recommend that a member’s rights and privileges be withdrawn to such extent and for such period as are specified in the motion.

16. The Committee met on 15 and 29 September and on 10 and 24 November 1999 to discuss regulating CPGs. These meetings resulted in the Committee’s 2nd Report of 1999 on the Regulation of Cross-Party Groups9. The impetus for the report was that approaches had already been made by MSPs interested in setting up CPGs and the Committee expected that a variety of CPGs would be established in the Parliament. Because of the potential influence of such Groups, the Committee took the view that they should be regulated and that procedures on their establishment, registration and operation should be drawn up.

17. The Committee recognised that amendments to the regulations may be needed in the light of experience of CPG operation.

Draft Code of Conduct for MSPs

18. On 24 February 200010, the Committee convener, Mike Rumbles, presented the Parliament with the Committee’s draft code of conduct for MSPs and moved the motion11 to adopt the code:

That the Parliament agrees to adopt the Code of Conduct for Members annexed to the 1st Report, 2000, of the Standards Committee; that the provisions of the code shall have immediate effect and shall apply to all Members and that the code be printed and published for sale in hard copy and made available on the Parliament’s website.

19. Section 8 sets out the rules on CPGs. In his speech, Mike Rumbles stated:

A number of members have already been involved in setting up cross-party groups, and recognised groups are successfully up and running. Rules on cross-party groups are included in the code. The main reason for regulating them is that they may have — or may be seen to have — some influence on the Parliament. It is important that they operate in accordance with good practice and that their activities are transparent and open.

20. The code was agreed without amendment and came into immediate effect.

Guidance Provided by the Committee

21. In addition to the Code, the Standards Committee also provided guidance12 to CPGs. Most of the guidance consists of a summary of the rules for operation of

---

10 SPOR, Meeting of the Parliament, Vol 5 No 2, 24 February 2000, Cols 177-208
11 S1M-517, in the name of Mike Rumbles
CPGs, but it also introduced the principle that CPGs should provide annual returns detailing their activities for the year.

**CPG Annual Returns**

22. At its meeting on 3 May 2000\(^\text{13}\), the Committee discussed introducing a requirement for each CPG to provide details of its activities at its AGM, and to provide the Committee with an annual return, giving information on a number of points. The Committee decided that the annual return should not be required, but would be expected from CPGs as good practice. Annual return forms were developed, asking for the following information:

- Group name
- Date of approval
- Date of annual report
- Group meetings and activities (including dates, brief description and attendance figures by MSP and non-MSP members)
- Group members (by MSPs, non-MSP individuals and organisations)
- Group officers (convener, vice-convener, secretary, treasurer)
- Financial or other benefits exceeding £250 from a single source per year (including date received, brief description, source and monetary value)
- Group subscription
- Group staff holding Parliamentary passes (name, post, employer’s name and address, type of employer organisation)
- Group contact (signatory of declaration on compliance)

23. Annual returns do not have to be sent on the form provided, and although it is not mandatory for CPGs to provide annual returns, this is strongly encouraged by the Committee. The Committee clerks issued reminders (at regular intervals up until the end of December 2002) to those groups who had not provided them or who had not sent updated returns when they again became due.

**Guidance on Dissolution**

24. The Committee also provided guidance to CPGs on procedures on dissolution\(^\text{14}\) of the Parliament at the end of Session 1. All recognised CPGs had until 90 days after the election to re-register. Any CPGs not re-registered by then ceased to be recognised.

**Committee Survey of CPG Activity**

25. During several discussions of applications to recognise individual CPGs between 2000 and 2001\(^\text{15}\), Committee members raised several general concerns about the operation of CPGs in the Parliament.


\(^{13}\) Standards Committee (2000) Meeting, 3 May [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/official_report/stan-00/st00-0802.htm]

\(^{14}\) Standards Committee *Guidance to Cross-Party Groups on Dissolution and Re-registration*, February 2003 [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/official_report/cttee/stan99-00/str02-c.htm]

\(^{15}\) Standards Committee meetings on the 5 April 2000, [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/official_report/cttee/stan-00/stmop0405.htm] 3 May 2000,
26. These concerns included lack of information about how CPGs were operating in practice and the large number of CPGs being recognised, with the attendant difficulties of ensuring sufficient MSP time to support these groups' activities. At its meeting on 28 March 2001, the Committee decided to seek information about the activities of recognised CPGs. A survey questionnaire was sent on 30 April 2001 to all existing CPGs (38) seeking information about their activity rate, activities undertaken and attendance at meetings during the period 1 April 2000 to 31 March 2001. Responses were sent by 33 CPGs, although two of these were partial returns only.

27. A summary of the questionnaire responses16 was prepared for the Committee. The survey found that:

- considerable variation existed in activity rates for CPGs, although this may have been due to differences in the length of operation of CPGs recognised by 30 April 2001
- CPGs showed strong Parliamentary activity in their membership, with the average number of MSP members (18.6) comparing well to the average for individual membership (3.6) and organisational membership (17.6)
- the rule that two MSPs must be present at each CPG meeting was being breached in a small percentage of cases: 5% of CPG meetings were attended by only one MSP
- about half of the groups (17) had agreed a forward work programme
- several joint meetings had been held between CPGs, and between CPGs and similar groups in other Parliaments and Assemblies
- nearly all the groups (32) had undertaken events and/or produced publications

Committee Review of the CPG System
28. While the Committee found the survey helpful in informing their work on CPGs, concerns about how the CPG system was working in Session 1 continued to be expressed. The Committee had always envisaged that changes might need to be made to the regulatory framework for CPGs in the light of experience of CPG operation. At several Committee meetings since 2000, concerns had been expressed about the need to monitor CPG activity. At its meeting on 8 May 2002, the Committee discussed the need to review the operation of the CPG system, taking into account the experience of CPGs to date. It was agreed that a review was needed, and was particularly timely in that any recommendations for change could be made to inform procedures, rules and practice in Session 2.

29. At its meeting on 5 June 200217, the Committee agreed that a first step in the review should be a consultation document, tightly focused on the issues that had

---

17 Standards Committee (2002) Meeting, 5 June
emerged in Committee discussions, and representations from individual CPGs to the Committee on CPG function and operation. The Committee decided that a wholesale review of the system was preferable to making any changes to the rules in piecemeal fashion.

Consultation by the Committee
30. The consultation document on CPGs, issued by the Standards Committee on 3 July 2002, set out a proposed statement of the purpose and objectives of the CPG system, which was based on the Code of Conduct for MSPs’ rules for CPGs. The consultation document included 15 questions, and commentary on the Committee’s rationale for posing these questions was provided in the document. The questions are summarised in Annex 3.

31. Thirty consultation responses were received:

- three from individual MSPs
- 17 from CPGs, several joint responses with organisational members
- eight from external organisations
- two anonymous

32. Consultation respondents agreed almost unanimously with the purposes and objectives for CPG activity proposed in the consultative document:

14. A cross-party group should be formed for two general purposes. These are:
   to enable Members of the Scottish Parliament to establish a mechanism for briefing themselves on a subject of genuine public interest; and
   to bring together Members of the Scottish Parliament from across the parties and external organisations/members of the public who share an interest in advancing a particular subject or cause.

The Objectives of a Cross-Party Group
15. Any cross-party group in the Scottish Parliament should set itself the following broad aims or objectives:
   the group must be Parliamentary in character by reflecting genuine cross-party membership during the lifetime of the group;
   the group should be accessible to individuals who and organisations which can make effective contributions to achieving the purposes of the group;
   the group should be participative, aiming to reach the wider community and taking cognisance of outside views;
   the group must operate in a culture of transparency, enabling observers to follow activities of the group with ease and be informed about the group’s thinking;

---

[http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/official_report/cttee/stan-02/str02-06-01.htm]
the group should have a clear understanding of where it fits into the Parliamentary process and system.

33. Broadly, the other main responses to the consultation showed:

- Apparent consensus on keeping the current rules on use of parliamentary resources for CPGs
- Wide agreement on revising the current rules to exclude the use of the Parliament’s logo by CPGs
- General concern about the pressure on the CPG system of the large number of existing CPGs
- Wide agreement on the appropriateness of external secretariats alongside agenda setting by the MSP convener
- Apparent support for requiring detailed financial accounts from CPGs
- Large majority support for revising the current rules to require more detailed and regular records of CPG meetings

34. On considering the consultation responses, the Committee decided that academic research should be commissioned to provide analyses of all the information obtained about CPGs, including primary research into the operation of CPGs in Session 1. The research specified also included a literature review of academic and other literature on CPG equivalents in other Parliamentary jurisdictions.

35. In undertaking this review, we used information contained in the Standards Committee files on CPGs to develop a typology of CPGs in existence during Session 1. In the end, we were unable to provide one comprehensive typology, but classified CPGs in four different ways. The typologies were developed to provide a framework for examination of the CPG system in practice and to help explain its structure.
Chapter 3: CPG Typologies

36. In the absence of an existing typology of Scottish Parliament CPGs, and the unsuitability of the crude Westminster classification of all-party groups (by country groups and issue groups) we had to develop our own categories for a typology. Because it became clear that we would be unable to develop one classificatory approach able to capture the entire CPG system of 49 groups in Session 1 of the Scottish Parliament, we have categorised these CPGs in four different ways:

- by subject matter covered
- by type of secretariat
- by types and level of membership
- by funding

**CPGS by Subject Matter**

37. We have categorised all CPGs by subject matter using the following categories:

- Health policy
- Commercial areas
- Reserved matters (these included issues where only Westminster can pass legislation but which the Scottish Parliament is not precluded from considering)
- Social issues
- Transport and environment policy

38. The health category contains the highest number of groups (15); social issues and reserved matters both contain 11 groups; commercial areas cover eight CPGs; and the transport/environment category has four groups. While some groups were difficult to categorise in this way, we relied on the statements of purpose provided by CPGs to allocate them. For example, Cycling is in the transport and environment category (as opposed to being in the health category) because the group’s purpose includes promoting cycling as part of a sustainable transport policy. Similarly, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment is included in the commercial category as the group’s purpose emphasises the role of these areas in the Scottish economy. The most difficult groups to allocate in this typology were: (a) Sports; and (b) Business, Economy, Environment and Society.

39. Table 1 on page 19 sets out the categorisation by subject matter.

**CPGS by Type of Secretariat**

40. We used this categorisation because there was a clear range of secretariat interests on recognised CPGs. Secretariats performed a number of functions which varied from group to group. These included organising meetings, taking notes of meetings, arranging other activities, and taking the lead in completing the annual return for the group. Eight CPGs were excluded from this typology since the information was either not provided by the CPG or information given was too vague to classify. Most of the 41 groups for which information was available had external secretariats (only ten had internal secretariats, mostly provided by MSPs’ staff). The remaining CPGs had a mix of public, private, voluntary or charitable, and professional bodies as secretariats. Of the 41 CPGs analysed, 31 (76%) had
external secretariats, and of these 31 groups, 21 had secretariats provided by voluntary or charitable interests (68% of external groups).

41. Table 2 on page 20 sets out the categorisation by secretariat type.

Table 1: Typology of CPGs by subject matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health policy</th>
<th>Commercial areas</th>
<th>Reserved matters</th>
<th>Social issues</th>
<th>Transport and environment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture</td>
<td>Consumer Issues</td>
<td>Carers</td>
<td>Architecture and Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
<td>Borders Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society</td>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
<td>Crofting</td>
<td>Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Pain</td>
<td>Environment and Society</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Gaelic</td>
<td>Strategic Rail Services for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment</td>
<td>International Development</td>
<td>Men’s Violence against Women and Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Textiles, Clothing and Footwear</td>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament</td>
<td>Older People, Age and Ageing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misuse</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Refugees and Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Shipbuilding</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2: CPGs by secretariat type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td><strong>External – private bodies</strong></td>
<td><strong>External – voluntary / charity bodies</strong></td>
<td><strong>External – public bodies</strong></td>
<td><strong>External – professional bodies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Pain (Party researchers)</td>
<td>Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment Oil and Gas Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society Children and Young People Crofting</td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy (MSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development (MSP PA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney Disease (MSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Violence against Women and Children (Party researcher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding (MSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (Party researcher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Services (MSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPGS by Types and Levels of Membership

42. Of the 49 CPGs in Session 1, by far the most had between 16 and 50 members (35 or 71%). A small number of groups (2) had more than 75 members; and an equal number had fewer than 16 and more than 50, but less than 75 (6). The table below gives the overall breakdown.

Table 3: Breakdown of Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Number of CPGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Table 4 below provides a complete list of CPGs by total number of members and also gives a breakdown by type of membership for each CPG.

44. Of the 49 CPGs, most had a mix of MSP, organisational and individual members. Seventeen groups had no individual members and six had no organisational members. Two CPGs had MSP members only, although one of these, Visual Impairment, divided its members into full members and others, therefore only MSPs were reported as members of this group, although its secretariat was provided by the RNIB. Shipbuilding was therefore the only CPG with apparently MSP only membership.

45. Some CPGs had seemingly low numbers of organisational members, for example Asthma and Women both had only one organisational member each. Other groups, for example, Children and Young People and Autistic Spectrum Disorder, had evenly balanced MSP and organisational membership (23:23 and 19:19 respectively) while others had disproportionately more organisational than MSP members. These included, for example, Disability (16:9) and Men’s Violence against Women and Children (39:12).

46. The proportions of CPG membership between MSPs, external organisations and individuals varied quite widely across groups. The Cancer group had the highest number of MSP members (39) and this was coupled with 16 organisational members and one individual member. The Palestine group had by far the most individual members at 78, coupled with 10 organisational members and 20 MSP members. International Development stood out because of the high number of organisational members (67), coupled with nine individual members and 15 MSP members.

47. Most CPGs had low proportions of individual membership to MSP or organisational membership, although the Chronic Pain group had almost evenly balanced MSP and individual membership, with 11 MSPs to 10 individuals. The most evenly balanced group seemed to be ME, which has 26 MSPs, 17 organisations and 14 individuals as members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MSP Total</th>
<th>Organisations Total</th>
<th>Individuals Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 – 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles, Clothing and Footwear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 – 25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders Rail</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misuse</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Pain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26 – 50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade and Investment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Built Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Control</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People, Age and Ageing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Services for Scotland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative Care</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51 – 75</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Violence Against Women and Children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots Language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. We are aware that our classifications are based on CPG membership lists at one specific date (21 May 2003) and any analysis of size and membership cannot be pushed too far. Nevertheless, these typologies are useful in emphasising the numbers of those involved in CPGs in the Scottish Parliament, whether they are MSPs or representing organisational or individual interests. In particular, MSPs are the overall largest membership category of CPGs, making up just under half (49%) of total CPG membership. At our date of information collection, the total number of non-Ministerial MSPs in Parliament (107) were spread across 790 CPG positions, a mean of just under eight groups per MSP.

**CPGS by Funding and Use of Funds**

49. For this classification, we examined reported CPG funding, excluding secretariat funding because this has already been classified. Of the 49 CPGs in Session 1, a total of 27 received some form of funding other than secretariat funding. Table 5 overleaf summarises the information. Some of these groups received funding from more than one type of source. For example, International Development had funding from subscriptions, funded catering for meetings and general funding.

50. Apart from funding for secretariats, subscriptions were the most frequently reported source of CPG funding, with 10 groups using this method of funding. Subscription fees ranged from £5 per member per year to £20 per member per year. Catering for meetings was the next most frequently reported source of funding, with seven groups having funding for this purpose. Catering for other purposes was rare: only three groups reported this.

51. Six groups had attracted funding for events, which included an annual conference (Cancer) and an annual ceilidh (Gaelic). The Cancer group funding for its conferences was substantial (around £17,000 for two conferences) and was provided by sponsorship from pharmaceutical companies and delegate fees.

52. Only the Oil and Gas group had received funding for visits, and this covered MSP expenses for CPG relevant trips to Westminster and outwith the UK, for example, to Norway. A total of 10 CPGs reported receiving funds for general and other purposes. The Learning Disabilities group attracted press interest when a large brewing firm donated over £5,000 to the group for unspecified purposes.
Table 5: CPGs by source of funding (excluding secretariat funding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription</th>
<th>Catering (meetings)</th>
<th>Catering (other)</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Visit</th>
<th>General funding</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Built Environment</td>
<td>Consumer Issues</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>Gaelic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
<td>International Development</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>International Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>International Trade &amp; Investment</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Information, Knowledge &amp; Enlightenment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misuse</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People, Age &amp; Ageing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. The typologies show that funding for CPGs is generally limited, and the most important aspect of funding is for secretariat services, whether in cash or kind. They highlight the importance of external secretariats in the CPG system, given that at least 80% of the 49 Session 1 groups relied upon them. The typologies also highlight the partnership between MSPs and organisational interests in pursuing CPG work, showing the potential for certain external organisations to have a strong influence on CPG activity. These typologies provide evidence of the very wide range of policy areas CPGs have been established to cover, including policy reserved to the UK Parliament.

54. The four typologies produced gave us a basis for describing the CPG system in Session 1. They were, however, compiled using incomplete data from CPG files held by the Standards Committee and using data appearing on the Parliament’s CPG web pages on 21 May 2003 at the end of the Session. We were unable to find sufficient information in the files to analyse activity rates, for example, number of meetings held, nor to determine attendance at these and other CPG events. While the typologies are meaningful enough help us understand the composition of the CPG system, they cannot explain why the system has developed in this way to date, or how individual CPGs operate in practice. Most of our information about the day-to-day activity of CPGs was obtained from the face-to-face interviews we carried out with a range of interviewees (29) from across all 49 Session 1 CPGs and
representing different interests, from a small number of Parliament staff and from the Session 1 Convener of the Standards Committee.

55. In chapters 4 and 5, we combine information about the regulatory framework of CPGs with the views of CPG members to describe the rules, roles and purposes of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament and examine CPG activity to date.
Chapter 4: The CPG System in Session 1

Membership
56. Information on CPG membership is provided in tabular form in Annexes 4-6. The tables were compiled using the CPG membership lists posted on the Parliament’s web site as of 21 May 2003. In the interviews with members of CPGs, respondents were asked about how their membership of CPGs related to their interests, roles and broader activities, including parliamentary work. These areas were explored in order to gain an understanding of how interviewees perceived the role and importance of CPGs in their wider activities.

MSP Members
57. By the end of Session 1, nearly every MSP freely able to join CPGs had done so at some point over the four year period. Most ex-Ministers had become involved in CPGs on leaving ministerial office, and many CPG resignations were from MSPs taking up ministerial posts.

58. All CPGs had at least eight MSPs registered as members at the end of Session 1, and two CPGs had over 30 MSP members. The most common number of MSP members per CPG was between 11 and 20.

59. The cross-party nature of CPGs was strong, although eight CPGs did not satisfy the requirement of at least one MSP member from each political party or group on the Parliamentary Bureau at the end of Session 1.

60. Each of the MSPs interviewed (with the exception of one) was a member of a number of CPGs in the first Session of the Parliament. They had joined CPGs that reflected their interests before they became MSPs. Four said they had joined groups because of their constituency responsibilities. Two MSPs had joined a group because a member of their party was needed for the group to be established. MSPs reported having been active in some groups, attending meetings and taking part in other CPG activity regularly, and taking an interest in the issues the groups were raising, while limiting their activity in others.

61. A number of the MSPs who had been re-elected to Session 2 of the Parliament said they would be more selective about the CPGs they joined in this parliament. One interviewee was in a new situation, from being the only MSP in his parliamentary party to having a number of colleagues who could now share the load. He felt this enabled him to focus on a smaller number of CPGs.

62. Interviewees found it difficult to quantify their CPG work in relation to other Parliamentary work and tended instead to respond to questioning on this aspect in qualitative terms. MSPs said their CPG activity related to their wider work, though one MSP argued that their work on CPGs was distinguished from other parliamentary work, which was party political in nature. One MSP said information gained from CPG involvement had helped them to further the interests of their constituents, and another said their CPG work
complemented their parliamentary activity and enabled them to raise issues in Parliament in an informed way. Three MSPs reported that MSP access to external groups was a major benefit of CPG activity.

Non-MSP Members
63. CPGs had wide external membership, both of individual and organisational members. Six CPGs had no individual memberships registered at the end of Session 1 and 16 CPGs had no organisational members listed.

64. One CPG had a large number (67) of organisational memberships, and three had between 30 and 41. Fifteen CPGs had fewer than six individual members listed. One CPG had 78 individual memberships, and three had between 20 and 30. Thirty-eight CPGs had fewer than six individual members listed.

65. Organisational members represented the public, private and voluntary sectors as well as professional associations, trade unions and the church. Individual members were not often listed except by name, but some appeared to have a professional interest in the CPG they had joined. All of the non-MSPs secretaries of CPGs who were interviewed were secretaries of groups because of their position at work. Two CPG secretaries said their work in the CPG was one of the main ways in which they tried to get the Parliament to address issues of importance for their organisations’ interests.

Funding
66. Twelve CPGs had no registered financial or other benefits at the end of Session 1. Where such benefits were registered, most were either for the provision of free secretariat services or for funding to have these provided. Some CPGs, however, had attracted quite substantial funding for other purposes, such as sponsorship for holding a conference; travel costs for CPG MSP members; grant funding; production of reports; catering or hospitality costs; and for specified events. More details about funding are provided in Chapter 3.

67. On the question of CPGs and finance, some MSPs said that groups should not be concerned with fund raising or with collecting funds. One MSP felt that CPGs should not charge subscriptions but others believed this to be appropriate. One CPG secretary argued that there should be transparency about funding and all funds received should be declared. If that happened there should be no problems.

CPG Activities
68. Most CPGs had steady activity rates, mostly of group meetings, although several groups appeared to have very low activity rates. Frequency of meetings ranged from fewer than five (one group did not appear to have met for over a year) to up to nine in any one year.
69. Activities recorded by CPGs included:

- Meetings (including those based on presentations)
- Seminars
- Visits
- Joint meetings with Westminster equivalent all-party groups
- Conferences
- Consultations
- Exhibitions
- Publications
- Joint meetings with other CPGs
- Responses to Bill proposals
- Motions raised in Parliament
- Parliamentary debates secured

70. It was reported from interviewees that meetings were the main activity of most groups they had joined. In many cases the main purpose of meetings would be a presentation by a speaker, followed by discussion. This was seen as an essential part of the information-gathering purpose of CPGs. In some cases, CPGs had invited Executive ministers to address meetings. Some groups had also arranged visits to places within and outwith Scotland relevant to their CPG work. In addition, one group had arranged two annual conferences, and one MSP said that their CPG hoped to hold a conference in the future. It was reported that motions in the Parliament had been submitted on behalf of CPGs and that CPGs had been actively involved in the formulation of Parliamentary Questions.

Regulatory Framework for CPGs
71. CPGs were not mentioned in the CSG report and are not included in the Scottish Parliament Standing Orders. They developed on the initiative of individual MSPs and groups and organisations outside the Parliament. The Standards Committee has responsibility for approving and monitoring CPGs, with the purpose and role of CPGs being set out in the Parliamentary Code of Conduct for Members.

72. For Session 1, there were 14 rules for CPGs, covering the nature and membership of groups; registration requirements; procedures for group meetings; use of Parliamentary resources; and arrangements for recognition after Scottish Parliamentary elections. Briefly, the rules are:

- The group must be Parliamentary in character, and its purpose of genuine public interest
- The group must be open to all MSPs and must include at least five MSPs, with one MSP from each of the parties or groups represented on the Parliamentary Bureau

---

19 At the start of the Second Session, the Standards Committee provisionally amended this rule so that each CPG should have a minimum of one MSP from each of the Labour, SNP, Conservative and the Liberal Democrat parties and one from among the other parties or an
• There may be group members from outwith the Parliament, but all meetings must be attended by at least two MSP members
• Group meetings must be held in public and announced at least seven calendar days beforehand
• Groups must observe the limitations placed on use of Parliamentary facilities, with only MSP members allowed to make use of most of the available resources

73. Section 10 of the Code includes sanctions in relation to CPGs. This section excludes complaints about CPGs from the remit of the Standards Commissioner and sets out that these will be dealt with by the Standards Committee, unless they are about the use of Parliamentary facilities and services, in which case complaints are to be made to the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (SPCB). The SPCB may refer any such complaint, together with recommendations for action, to the Standards Committee.

Knowledge of the CPG System and its Rules
74. Knowledge of the rules was most advanced where CPG members had either Convener or Secretariat roles. There were differences between respondents in their understandings of the purposes for which CPGs existed. There was wide agreement that CPGs existed to inform MSPs and to increase their knowledge of the issues covered by the CPGs to which they belonged.

Current CPG Regulation
75. The main issue about the current rules on CPGs was the lack of time MSPs had for the CPG work they had undertaken. All interviewees spoke positively of the current wide cross-party nature of individual CPGs, but many felt that the Session 1 rule on CPG membership requiring at least five MSPs from different parties was too difficult to sustain.

76. Several interviewees had some ideas about how the rules might be amended. One MSP felt there should be a limit to the number of CPGs each MSP could join, while another MSP felt that the number of meetings held by individual CPGs in a year might be reduced, at least for new CPGs, alongside a relaxation of the rules governing the number of MSPs required to ensure parliamentary character in CPGs. Another MSP felt there were two potential ways of dealing with the problem of MSPs having insufficient time for CPG work: either the number of CPGs needed to be limited in some way or the hours of the Parliament had to be extended to give MSPs more opportunity to attend CPG meetings. Several interviewees, however, felt that the problem of overstretched MSPs should not be addressed by the system. They believed that MSPs as elected representatives had to make decisions for themselves about CPG establishment, membership and attendance.

independent. [Letter to all CPG secretaries from the Senior Assistant Clerk to the Standards Committee, 1 July 2003.]
77. It was also reported by most interviewees that they had experienced meetings with fewer than two MSP members present and that in most cases this was not seen as problematic by CPG members, except that it contravened current rules. Most interviewees felt that, in line with the need to be parliamentary in character, CPGs were being driven by MSP agendas, although there was some concern that a specific external organisation (acting as secretariat) was more influential in the agenda setting than other external organisational members.

Monitoring and Information Requirements

78. Views on monitoring and information requirements were less well-developed, with less evidence from interviewees of knowledge of what was expected. While it was generally agreed that monitoring was necessary in order to ensure the CPG system was working as planned and to provide information about individual group activity, interviewees with experience of providing information for their CPG admitted not always doing so in time, nor managing to quickly inform the clerks about changes in CPG membership. For some (MSPs and non-MSPs) current monitoring arrangements seemed appropriate and, as one CPG secretary put it, were ‘not over-zealous’. However, another secretary of a group regarded the rules as ‘chronically bureaucratic’, especially those relating to the use of parliament facilities, such as the intranet. Respondents differed in their attitudes to the annual reports groups were expected to complete. Some (MSPs and non-MSPs) felt that the requirements of the report were reasonable and the information collected was sufficient, although one CPG secretary thought that having to list all sources of finance, even if the amounts were very small, was expecting too much. For another interviewee, an MSP, the annual reports acted as a disincentive for MSPs to become conveners of CPGs.

79. It was generally felt that the current requirements for information on registration were logical, although it was strongly suggested by two of the MSP interviewees that funding for CPGs should be closely monitored, including information about the use of any funds available to individual CPGs. Most interviewees felt that externally-provided secretariats worked well, and were a practical solution to MSPs’ lack of both time and detailed knowledge of the stakeholders in many policy areas. Several interviewees expressed concern that without strong convenership, individual organisations acting as secretariats may influence a CPG agenda inappropriately. One MSP interviewee took the view that external funding was so potentially problematic that it had not been used in their CPG.

Establishment of CPGs in Session 1

80. Following the introduction of the Code of Conduct for Members, MSPs began to apply to the Standards Committee for recognition of CPGs. Under the rules set out in section 8 of the Code, applications should be made within 30 days of the first meeting of a proposed CPG. The Standards Committee clerks provided proposed conveners with registration forms (RG1) indicating the information needed for the Committee to consider applications:

- Group name
• Group purpose
• Group members (MSP, non-MSP individuals, organisations)
• Group officers (convener, vice-convener, secretary, treasurer)
• Financial or other benefits received (details required of benefits over £250 in value from any single source)
• Group subscription arrangements
• Group staff holding Parliamentary passes
• Group contact (MSP who signs declaration on compliance with the rules)

81. This chapter has focused on describing the operation of the CPG system in Session 1. Chapter 5 examines more closely the role, purpose and functions of the system within the parliamentary framework.
Chapter 5: CPG Roles, Purposes & Functions

82. Forty-nine CPGs were approved by the Standards Committee in Session 1 of the Scottish Parliament. These were approved on the basis of overall fit with the section 8 Code of Conduct rules. Verbatim accounts of individual CPG purpose statements are given at Annex 2.

Purpose of the CPG System

83. Most interviewees reported that they did not understand the overall role of CPGs in the Parliament: views on what this should be varied. In particular, some respondents (MSPs and non-MSPs) had difficulty in explaining what was meant by the term ‘parliamentary in character’. A number of interviewees understood the term to refer to wide cross-party MSP membership of individual CPGs. Respondents, especially current and former MSPs, stressed that the groups must be genuinely cross-party. Some MSPs mentioned the provisional change in the rules20 which had been introduced by the Standards Committee, to account for the increased number of parties who had membership of the Parliamentary Bureau and thought they were sensible.

84. For some (MSPs and one non-MSP), ‘parliamentary in character’ meant MSPs taking the lead within CPGs and ensuring that the CPGs were focussed on the Parliament. One MSP said that CPGs should not be campaigning groups, trying to mobilise people outwith the Parliament. This interviewee was also concerned that the term ‘parliamentary in character’ might result in strict rules being applied to the operation of CPGs, with groups having to hold meetings in a certain way and being required to have a balance of members from different parties on the lines of the d’Hondt formula.21 For another MSP, the term meant that the CPGs were parliamentary bodies.

85. One CPG secretary argued that the secretariat of CPGs should come from within the parliament. Others, MSPs and non-MSPs, however, felt there were no problems in groups having an external secretariat, with one MSP feeling that external secretariats were a necessary part of the CPG system. One secretary reported that in the group of which they were secretary, the external secretariat took the lead in devising the programme of activities for the CPG but the MSPs could either accept the programme or amend it. Thus they argued that ultimate control rested with the MSPs.

Implications of the CSG Principles

86. Although CPGs are not mentioned in the Consultative Steering Group (CSG) report, there was agreement that CPGs should relate positively to the CSG principles on which the Parliament was founded. The most frequently mentioned implication of CSG principles for CPG activity was the public nature of the groups. There was a feeling that CPGs should promote openness and accessibility. However, one secretary said parliamentary in character meant that meetings of CPGs should not be public meetings and that CPGs should be formally constituted.

20 See note 19 above for an outline of the provisional change in the rules.
21 This determines how seats are distributed between parties on parliamentary committees.
87. Some respondents (MSPs and non-MSPs) viewed CPGs as an important way for groups and individuals outwith the Parliament to influence its work, although one MSP argued that this was not the only or necessarily the best way for organisations to work with MSPs. One MSP questioned the extent to which CPGs were involving ‘ordinary people’ in their work, especially those from disadvantaged areas. The feeling was that it was mainly already well-connected individuals and organisations who were being included.

**CPG Roles and Functions**

88. To some extent the intended roles and functions of CPGs is evident from the statement of purpose provided by each CPG in the registration forms they return to the Standards Committee. In this section we look at how CPGs have functioned by analysing information on CPG activities held in the Committee’s CPG files. The information presented has been collected from registration forms, annual returns, questionnaire returns and other documentation in the files. The researchers concentrated mainly on registration forms and annual returns. The available information is not always consistent across CPGs: some CPGs have not lodged annual returns or updated earlier ones; some provided information in the standard format requested in the form provided by the clerks to the Standards Committee but others did not; some provide partial information only; and the detail contained under the standard headings in annual reports submitted differed across CPGs.

89. Terminology used in the statements of purpose of each CPG registered in Session 1 of the Parliament has been analysed in the first instance to provide information about what the CPGs themselves have seen as appropriate purposes. An initial classification of five broad categories of purposes for CPGs has been deduced from these accounts. These are:

- Information provision and education for MSPs
- Research
- Profile raising of particular subjects
- Campaigning and representation
- Communication

90. These categories were developed on the basis of terms and phrases that recurred throughout the CPG purpose statements. The categorisation by terms and phrases is shown in Table 6 below.
Table 6: Examples of terms/phrases in CPG statements of purpose and category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Profile raising</th>
<th>Campaigning</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform MSPs</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Generate debate</td>
<td>Ensure SP/SE conformity with standards</td>
<td>Facilitate dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for MSPs to learn</td>
<td>Examine</td>
<td>Increase awareness</td>
<td>Apply current knowledge</td>
<td>Provide a forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help MSPs address needs</td>
<td>Assess prevalence of</td>
<td>Put on the agenda of SP committee</td>
<td>Give a voice</td>
<td>Exchange ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide MSPs with expertise</td>
<td>Determine the needs of</td>
<td>Raise awareness</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Liaise with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote understanding</td>
<td>Monitor policy implementation</td>
<td>Raise specific issues</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Work on all party basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote cause</td>
<td>Promote links</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. Interviewees most commonly mentioned the networking function, or contact with other interested parties on the particular topics or issues highlighted by CPGs, including MSP access to external groups, external groups’ access to MSPs and access between different external groups.

92. Interviewees were also likely to mention the purpose of CPGs as to inform, or educate, MSPs on particular issues, and several used the term campaigning to describe CPG function. Very few interviewees mentioned inter-CPG activity or joint CPG activity with other similar groups (for example, all-party groups at Westminster).

93. For one MSP interviewee and one external organisational interviewee, linking CPG activity with other Parliamentary activity was the apex of CPG function, although the MSP did not think that all CPGs should be forced in this direction. Several external organisational interviewees felt that there was a lack of clarity around how CPGs should fit into the Parliament’s Committee structure and suggested that explicit guidance on this should be provided.

94. Most interviewees felt that the current rules on CPGs were sufficiently flexible to allow individual CPGs to operate as MSP members decided; and that a tighter framework, or increased regulation of appropriate CPG activity, was not favoured by most interviewees. In particular, several interviewees felt that a target setting culture for CPGs would not be helpful, and one MSP who had strong views about effective CPG working did not feel that all CPGs should be pushed along these lines. One MSP interviewee took the opposite
view, arguing that broad membership of CPGs meant that MSPs were unwilling to devise appropriate regulation for fear that their own groups might fall foul of a tighter system, which the MSP felt was necessary. Another MSP argued that the rules should be applied and groups should not engage in activities that extend the scope of CPGs beyond that set out in the rules.

95. One MSP felt that the CPG system should have two main purposes:

- to act as focal points for other interested parties, ie as a meeting point for external groups, and to act as a network for information exchange between MSPs and others involved in a policy area or issue
- to relate to legislation as it is ‘rolled out’, by being able to comment on legislative proposals, and to encourage MSPs to propose legislation, thus ensuring CPGs have a direct role in the Parliament’s agenda

96. A number of interviewees felt that it was legitimate for CPGs to try to influence policy. Some (MSPs and non-MSPs) saw it as part of the role of a CPG to promote or encourage the development of parliamentary motions or parliamentary questions. However, one MSP argued that it was not the job of CPGs to promote motions or PQs, as this was something individual MSPs should do. A secretary of a group was unsure about whether CPGs should be trying to influence policy through the promotion of parliamentary motions, parliamentary questions and other parliamentary activity. That secretary said, however, that their group had tried to influence policy by bringing two organisations into contact with the Scottish Executive and felt there was nothing wrong with that, as the organisations concerned were not lobbying organisations. It was argued by some interviewees that CPGs would want to try to influence policy and one CPG secretary said they had expected that CPGs might look at policy papers and be given the chance to respond. Their CPG had made representations on the Mental Health Bill.
Chapter 6: CPG Equivalents Elsewhere

97. One of the specifications of the research was the completion of a review comparing the position in respect of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament with their equivalents in other parliaments and assemblies. The purpose of this review was to see if the Scottish Parliament could learn from experience in other parliaments regarding the role, workings and regulation of CPGs.

98. Of the parliaments and assemblies studied, the situation of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament is closest to that of all-party groups in Westminster. Most of the EU member-states parliaments which have equivalents of, or groups similar to, CPGs are not governed by formal rules and are subject to customary practice.

99. In respect of the rules relating to all-party groups at Westminster, it is striking how similar in many respects the rules are to those associated with CPGs in Scotland. Two differences are the existence of formal rules relating to voting on all-party groups and the lack of financial information that has to be notified in the Westminster rules. An all-party group rule stating that changes in the records of a group should be reported within 28 days may be something that may have relevance for CPGs in the Scottish Parliament. All-party groups are expected to meet twice a year; no such requirement exists in respect of CPGs in Scotland.

100. The general conclusion drawn from the comparison is that CPGs in Scotland are more highly regulated than in other European parliaments, that CPG equivalents do not exist in many European Union member parliaments and that, where groups with similarities to CPGs do exist, they are not governed by formal rules.

All-Party Groups at Westminster

101. Westminster all-party groups (APGs) are relatively informal. The groups are set up mainly by backbench MPs and Peers but may also contain government ministers and people from outside Westminster who are neither MPs nor Peers. APGs are classified in two ways: as either subject groups on particular topics, such as autism; or country groups, such as Cuba. Country groups normally join either the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association’s UK Branch and/or the Inter-Parliamentary Union’s British Group.

102. A register of APGs is administered at Westminster. This follows a House of Commons resolution in December 1995. All groups which contain MPs from more than one party and have one or more officers who are from the House of Commons must register. The Register gives details of:

- the groups that have been recognised by the House of Commons

---

• the officers of each group
• the assistance each group receives from non-parliament bodies
• the relevant gainful occupations of the staff of groups

103. As well as the Register of APGs, groups may apply for inclusion on an Approved List. The List was formed as a result of a House of Commons resolution passed in October 1984. The aim of the Approved List is to control the use of House of Commons facilities and the status of groups. Groups can decide if they want to join the Approved List, as this is not compulsory. However, most groups are on the Approved List, as well as on the Register. Only groups on the Approved List have access to All-Party Notices to advertise meetings. They also have priority over other groups not on the List in the booking of meeting rooms. In addition, it is only groups on the Approved List who can use the terms ‘All-Party’ and ‘Parliamentary’.

104. To be on the Approved List, APGs must give a written undertaking that they will:

• contain 10 members of the government party and 10 members of the opposition parties, with at least six from the main opposition party
• have a membership which is open to all MPs and aims and a constitution which is parliamentary in character
• meet at least twice a year
• elect officers, who must be MPs or Peers, annually at an AGM
• notify the election of officers in advance on the All-Party Notices
• have three members present at meetings one of whom must be an officer
• not charge annual subscriptions for MPs and Peers in excess of £5
• ensure that any MP or Peer can attend a meeting of the Group and vote, unless the Group charges a subscription, in which case only those who pay the subscription can vote
• notify the Registry of Interests of the result of its AGM by amending its Register entry and its Information Sheet or confirming the records have not changed
• agree to notify the Assistant Registrar of any changes in its records within 28 days of any change
• observe the rules on the use of House stationary and ensure such stationary is not used to communicate with people who are not MPs or Peers

105. The registration of groups on the Approved List ends two calendar months after the first meeting of a new Parliament after a General Election, unless a group has made a new application during that period or receives funding from the Government.

106. To be recognised on the Approved List, groups must also give the following information:

• details of the purpose of the group
• a list of its 20 qualifying members
• whether it is affiliated to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association or the Inter-Parliamentary Union
• details of its voting rights
• details of its Annual General Meeting every year

107. Entries on the Approved List simply show each group’s title and whether it is an ‘All-Party Parliamentary Group’, where only MPs and Peers have voting rights, or an ‘Associate Parliamentary Group’, where voting rights are not restricted to MPs and Peers.

108. The Register and Approved List are managed by the Assistant Registrar in the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards. The Register is up-dated monthly when the Commons is sitting and the Approved List weekly.

109. Many of the rules relating to APGs were established following the first report of the House of Commons Administration Committee (now the Public Administration Committee)\(^\text{23}\). An MP, in giving evidence to the Committee, expressed the concern that some meetings of APGs seemed to serve the purposes not of MPs or Peers but of external organisations. This concern was noted by the Committee, members of which considered limiting the number of ‘external’ members of APGs to one-third of the total group membership. This condition is imposed by the Inter-Parliamentary Union on its country group affiliates. However, it was concluded that the rule would not stop groups being dominated by external interests if the MP and Peer members of groups did not attend meetings and other group activities.

**Intergroups in The European Parliament**

110. The term that is used in the European Parliament for the equivalent of CPGs is intergroups. Initially such groups had no official status. They do not, whether officially registered or not, express the official view of the Parliament and cannot use the Parliament’s name or logo. However, as is shown below, they are now semi-official. To be established they need the agreement of three chairs of party groups\(^\text{24}\) and each chair can only support a limited number of groups\(^\text{25}\). As a result, in 2002, there were fewer intergroups in the European Parliament than CPGs in the Scottish Parliament. There were in 2002 19 Officially Registered Intergroups in the European Parliament and 18 Non-Registered Intergroups.\(^\text{26}\) (Some groups decide not to register with the Parliament. This may be because they are small, do not meet regularly, do not need facilities from party groups or do not gain support from three party

---


\(^\text{24}\) Party groups include the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats (EP-ED), Party of European Socialists, European Liberal, Democratic and Reformist Groups (ELDR).


\(^\text{26}\) ibid. pp. 161-162.
groups. Non-registered groups cannot use the interpretation facilities from party groups nor can they announce meetings on the Parliament’s screens.)

111. In some cases, intergroup membership is limited to MEPs, in others the membership of a group can include members of external groups, such as trade associations, as well as MEPs. Groups can get funding from party groups, and, in some cases, from the budget of the European Commission or from industry. Following an agreement between the chairs of the party political groups, ratified by the Conference of Presidents, in 1995, the following rules were applied to registered intergroups:

- they shall not meet during a scheduled voting session of the Parliament
- they must contain three members from different political groups
- the members of groups must be identified, along with the group’s logo and the sources of funding
- they must comply with the rules relating to the declaration of financial interests of MEPs and assistants and the rules on lobbying

112. Following an inquiry in 1998-1999, it was decided that chairs of Parliament intergroups would have to declare any financial support, in cash or kind, if it was offered to members of groups, as individuals. In addition, the Quaestors were given responsibility for drawing up rules for the declaration of external support received by intergroups and for keeping a register of such support. This was later extended, with new rules requiring:

- financial support to be declared annually
- the Quaestors’ register to be made public
- each group to clarify its objectives
- strict regulation of when intergroups can meet

113. The changes mean that intergroups are now semi-official.

Intergroups in EU Member States

114. In 1998, the Directorate-General for Research of the European Parliament conducted research into the regulation of lobbyists in member state parliaments and the rules relating to intergroups within such parliaments. In parliaments where intergroups existed, most of the groups were similar to CPGs in that they involved elected members from across political parties and had no formal input into parliamentary policy making. However, unlike CPGs, the groups considered did not generally include people from outwith the parliament in their membership. This research showed that there were no rules concerning the setting up or operation of

---

27 ibid. pp. 157-158
28 ibid. pp.155-156
29 Quaestors are directly elected by MEPs. Five Quaestors are responsible for administrative and financial matters concerning MEPs.
intergroups in the national parliaments of Belgium; Denmark; Germany; Spain; Ireland; Italy; Luxembourg; The Netherlands; Austria; Portugal; or Sweden.

115. Greece has ‘Parliamentary Groups of Friendship’ the aim of which is to promote good relations between members of the Greek Parliament and members of other national parliaments. They are set up and operate according to custom; there are no formal rules attached to them.

116. The French Senate has provisions for the establishment of study groups and working groups. Study groups contain members from a number of standing committees, while working groups consist of members from only one committee. Study groups require the support of the Senate Bureau and decisions about the establishment of Study Groups are made after consultation with the standing committee to which the group will be administratively linked. A Senate official acts as the secretary of each study group. Members of study groups have to pay a subscription with the sum being set by the college of Quaestors.

117. The French National Assembly also has provisions for the setting up of Study Groups. These are open to all Deputies. To be approved, a Deputy, or a number of Deputies, must request approval of the group. This is considered by a delegation of the National Bureau, after taking on board the views of the relevant standing committee or committees. Approval means an Assembly official may act as secretary of the group, if a volunteer from among their number can be found. Approval also gives access to meeting rooms and photo copying facilities.

118. In the Italian Parliament, intergroups are occasionally set up by Deputies or Senators, although they have no place in the official parliamentary structure. The parliament of Portugal has no rules concerning intergroups but, since 1990, ‘parliamentary friendship groups’ have existed. The purpose of such groups is to exchange information with parliaments in other countries. In Sweden, while intergroups may be established, they are not governed by rules of the parliament.

119. A number of intergroups exist in the Finnish Parliament. They are mainly voluntary but may sometimes receive secretariat services or funding from the administration. They are covered by customary practice and not by formal rules.

Interviewees’ Knowledge and Experience of Equivalents to CPGS

120. Interviewees had little knowledge of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament other than those they had joined, and very few had any experience of equivalents elsewhere. Some of the interviewees, MSPs and non-MSPs, had worked with APGs at Westminster. One CPG (Oil and Gas) had developed out of an APG at Westminster and the two groups held a joint meeting annually.

121. One MSP who had some experience of APGs at Westminster felt this had been some time ago and in any case that Scottish Parliament CPGs had
a different remit to Westminster APGs. Some MSPs felt that CPGs in Scotland were much better than APGs at Westminster because they were more active and dynamic. One interviewee, a secretary of a group from a voluntary organisation, had experience of an APG at Westminster and an intergroup in the European Parliament. They felt that APGs and the EU intergroup were more formal in their working than Scottish Parliament CPGs. A number of respondents, MSPs and non-MSPs, however, had no experience of APGs at Westminster. One MSP said that all he knew about APGs was that they were limited to MPs and Peers. This view was also expressed by a non-parliamentary secretary of a group. There was no detailed knowledge of practice elsewhere among the interviewees.
Chapter 7: Views on CPG Operation

122. Most interviewees had very limited knowledge of the CPG system as a whole and expressed surprise at the total number of registered CPGs, which was more than they would have guessed (though one non-MSP thought there were over 100 groups). Generally, interviewees noted that they focussed on the CPGs they were personally involved with and had little knowledge of how other CPGs operated. Nevertheless, it was frequently mentioned that the CPGs were driven by the MSP conveners, and generally held that this was as it should be.

Rationalising the Number of CPGs
123. One MSP interviewee felt they had a broad grasp of the CPG system and had spent some time attempting to categorise CPGs with similar subject matters, with the aim of improving the working of CPGs. Their suggestions involved establishing a type of umbrella or sub group for each category, which would meet to compare and discuss individual CPG agendas within the grouping. The purpose of the umbrella or sub-group would be to ensure knowledge of other CPG agendas and to facilitate joint working where appropriate. This MSP also felt there might be scope for CPGs within the group to meet collectively, albeit infrequently, to focus on an issue, bringing their own particular perspectives to bear on it. Similar ideas were expressed by a non-MSP secretary of a group.

124. A number of other respondents (MSPs and non-MSPs) argued that there was some overlap between some CPGs and it was suggested that groups covering similar topic areas might work more closely together. Some joint working between groups was reported. Nevertheless, it was argued by some MSPs that external organisations would not want groups dealing with a specific topic that concerned them to be merged into a more generic group. This view was confirmed by a number of interviewees from external organisations. There was a general feeling that CPGs should keep their specialist nature, with the exception of one MSP who felt strongly that CPGs should focus on national, rather than local, issues and on broad, rather than narrow, topics.

CPGs Encouraging External Involvement
125. There was a general view that CPGs seemed to be working well, although several MSPs argued that the expectations of external bodies about what CPGs could achieve were probably too high in the first Session. Most interviewees felt that the system helped promote engagement with groups outwith the Parliament on important issues. One MSP interviewee felt that even in groups where external organisations were divided on issues and where it was difficult to reach consensus on how to progress them, it was extremely helpful to have the different perspectives aired in CPG meetings. One CPG individual member felt it was important that the principle of lay person involvement in CPGs was strengthened because it was imperative to hear the views of those with an interest in the topic but who were not professionals. It was also reported by several external members that the views of professional members of CPGs were more influential in pushing
agendas in particular directions than those of individual members who were members of the public with a particular interest in the work of a CPG.

Uncertainty about the Position of CPGs
126. Several interviewees mentioned the potential for confusion about the status of CPGs in the Parliament, but felt that the confusion did not arise from CPGs, rather that the Scottish media were most likely to report the work of CPGs as being work of Parliamentary committees. Such confusion was put into the context of the confusion often evident in the press about the difference between Executive and Parliamentary functions.

127. Some MSPs argued that in some cases, members of individual CPGs had exceeded their positions and had talked to the media as if they were representing the Parliament. It was felt that the rules might stress that CPGs did not represent Parliament policy or views and that members from CPGs approached by the media should make it clear that this was the case. Moreover, it was stressed by some MSPs that if members of a CPG made statements on behalf of the group they should be clear that the group supported what they were saying.

Other Key Issues and Relevant Topics Raised by Interviewees
128. Interviewees were given a chance to raise issues they felt were most important, or to provide information on topics not discussed during the interview.

129. Very few interviewees raised new issues at this point, and most stressed issues they had already raised, most particularly the perception of MSP overload and its consequent negative impact on CPG work by MSPs. The pressing need for clarity about the role of CPGs within the parliamentary system was highlighted by one external organisational interviewee, and two MSP interviewees returned to the theme of how to reduce the number of memberships of CPGs by individual MSPs.

130. A number of respondents argued that the issue of inactive CPGs should be addressed. Some felt that if a group had engaged in no activities during a twelve month period, at the least, there should be some mechanism to make the members of the group address whether the group should continue. Others argued that in such circumstances, or where there was a very poor attendance at events, there should be some mechanism for closing down such CPGs. Nevertheless, it was argued that it would be wrong for the Standards Committee to refuse to register CPGs because too many groups existed and there was some opposition to the idea that a body other than the CPG itself (such as the Standards Committee) should be able to control CPGs more tightly. One MSP did not see the need for great change to the system of monitoring of CPGs or the rules surrounding their activities. Another, however, thought there was a need for the CPG system to regain legitimacy. One interviewee was unhappy about lobbying organisations being associated with CPGs and another questioned the involvement of big business in CPGs, as they were likely to be joining CPGs to further their own ends, rather than those of the broader community.
One MSP suggested that the objective of CPGs should be set out in the rules governing their operations. To further this proposal, it was also suggested that a CPG development worker should be appointed. The post might only be part-time but would help groups to reflect on their achievements and to work more effectively to develop discussion and the exchange of information between MSPs and organisations and individuals outwith the Parliament.

In addition to those interviews conducted with members of CPGs, Standards Committee clerks and the Session 1 Convener of the Standards Committee, an interview was carried out with a member of the Parliament's senior management staff. This took place after the interviews with CPG members. A crucial issue that was discussed concerned the resources allocated to CPGs by the Parliament. The respondent thought that in resource terms the CPG system was working well. There had been uncertainty when CPGs were first created about the resourcing implications but the system was now well-established, and resourcing the system was not a major problem.

Asked about the resourcing implications if the Parliament were to provide the secretariats for CPGs, the above respondent stated that this would have important consequences for the use of resources and was not part of the Scottish Parliament's immediate priorities. However, the Parliament is currently reviewing its external communications policy and increasing involvement in the Parliament and its work remains an important issue. The possibility of a support worker for CPGs in the future was not ruled out, and might be part of a public participation strategy.

In line with comments from other interviewees, the respondent felt there was a need to clarify the purpose and objectives of the CPG system. Allocation of extra resources to CPGs would have to be on the basis that the system was performing a useful role. The respondent supported the suggestion that the Standards Committee should try to clarify the meaning of the term 'parliamentary in character' and define the role of CPGs more clearly.
Chapter 8: The Implications of the Research

135. The research presented in this report was undertaken to enhance knowledge of how the CPG system has been operating, with a focus on CPGs established in the first Session of the Scottish Parliament. The CPG system was initiated by Members of the Scottish Parliament; however, the Standards Committee is responsible for the regulation of CPGs. In Session 1, the Committee drafted the section 8 rules of the Code of Conduct for Members governing the registration and regulation of the groups. The Committee was also responsible for considering applications for CPG registration and for applying sanctions (section 10 of the Code) in the event of breach of regulation.

136. This concluding chapter considers the implications of the research. Firstly an overview of the CPG system, including positive views and issues of concern, is provided. Secondly, the key findings of the research are presented and discussed in some detail. Finally, several recommendations are set out to assist the Committee in its review of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament.

Overview of the CPG System

137. The CPG system has proved popular with MSPs and external interests: by the end of the first session, 49 CPGs had been approved for registration. The Standards Committee considered applications on a case by case basis as more groups became established between 1999 and 2003. Few applications were rejected, although a small number were referred back to the applicants after consideration seeking clarification of the application or amendments to it.

138. The rules for the CPG system provide for a high degree of flexibility in the system, allowing each CPG to pursue its own aims and objectives. This flexibility has resulted in a variety of purposes and a broad range of activities. The research recorded wide support for the CPG system that has developed from Session 1 practice, with general agreement that CPGs contribute to Parliament’s furthering of its founding principles.

139. Conveners and secretariats interviewed for the research generally had considerable knowledge of the rules governing CPGs; however, such knowledge was limited amongst other group members. On the whole, general approval was expressed for the practice of external organisations providing secretariat services or funding.

140. Despite the high levels of support for the CPG system as currently operating, a number of concerns emerged during the research. There was wide uncertainty about the role of the system in the broad parliamentary framework, with some anxiety that CPGs could potentially undermine the central role of the Parliament’s committee system.

141. There was also some concern that CPGs appear to be dominated by large external organisations which are professionally-staffed and well-
resourced. This position led to concern that CPGs are tending to exclude people from disadvantaged groups; people from outwith the central belt; and groups working at a local level.

Key Research Findings

142. The research findings reflect the scope and focus of the critical review of the CPG system in the Scottish Parliament. They also reflect the outcomes of the Standards Committee’s consultation, the interviews with members of CPGs and the various documents analysed as part of the research. The research suggests that the CPG system is generally seen as robust, serving a useful purpose and working in an efficient and effective way. Seven key findings of the critical review have been identified:

143. Finding 1: The most frequently raised issue was the lack of time MSPs are able to devote to CPG activity. Those interviewed perceived this as a major problem for the system, and it was widely recognised that MSPs had been over-stretched in their involvement in Session 1 CPG activity.

144. The research findings support this perception. Nearly all MSPs able to join CPGs in Session 1 had done so between 1999 and 2003 and the mean number of groups joined per MSP was eight. CPG members were clearly aware of the difficulties MSPs face in undertaking such levels of CPG work and MSPs themselves had developed various strategies for determining how to incorporate their CPG activity into very heavy workloads. While some interviewees offered possible solutions to the problem of MSP overload, the general view was that it was up to individual MSPs to set their own priorities, and that CPG overload should not be addressed by the rules governing the system.

145. Finding 2: The research found that although there are clear views about the purpose and function of individual CPGs, there is a general lack of clarity about the purpose and function of the system as a whole. This lack of clarity about any rationale underpinning the system also leads to difficulties in understanding how the CPG system fits into the wider parliamentary structure. Establishing a CPG system was not discussed by the Consultative Steering Group nor is such a system addressed in the Parliament’s standing orders.

146. What the CPG system is for and how it should relate to other elements of the parliamentary framework are amongst the most difficult issues raised by the research. No general agreement on these questions emerged amongst those interviewed and documentary sources supported the perceived lack of a stated rationale for the system. Section 8 of the Code of Conduct sets out the basis for establishing a CPG, requiring that each group provide a statement of purpose which satisfies the dual requirements for CPG registration — that they be both parliamentary in character and established in the public interest.

147. Neither of these terms is defined in the Code and the research found that interpretation of the term ‘parliamentary in character’ varied among those interviewed. Some interviewees interpreted the term broadly to mean that
CPGs should focus on influencing and assisting the parliamentary work of MSPs. Assisting MSPs includes ensuring information is shared between MSPs and non-parliamentary members of CPGs, and providing opportunities for MSPs and non-parliamentarians to debate issues of importance to them.

148. Others interpreted ‘parliamentary in character’ to mean that CPGs should give individuals and organisations outwith Parliament the opportunity to influence activity within it. For some interviewees, ‘parliamentary in character’ means that MSPs must be central to CPGs, and individual CPG agendas and activities should be directed by parliamentary rather than external members.

149. **Finding 3:** A range of purposes were set out in individual CPG registration documents and reported in interviews. Individual CPG purpose statements can be classified into five broad categories: information provision for MSPs; research; profile-raising; campaigning and representation; and communication. The general view was that communication of information between CPG members is one of the main purposes individual groups. CPGs were also widely seen as providing appropriate mechanisms for MSPs to discuss issues relating to parliamentary matters with external interests, and were viewed as of mutual benefit for parliamentarians and those with expertise or experience in the policy area concerned.

150. **Finding 4:** There is a lack of detailed information about CPG activity in Session 1, but available data indicate that most CPGs had regular meetings and there is evidence of other activities, particularly conferences, social occasions, visits and other ad hoc events. The main activities in which groups engaged were meetings. The meetings often had a guest speaker. Some groups engaged in visits or held conferences but these were rare. Most groups had little contact with similar groups at Westminster or in other parliaments. Guidance produced by the Standards Committee for good practice in CPGs encouraged annual reports from each group on its activities, membership and financial benefits.

151. **Finding 5:** Most CPGs received funding from organisations outwith the Parliament to provide secretariats, or more commonly, received secretariat services in kind from such organisations. This was not seen as a problem by most of those interviewed, but rather as evidence of commitment from external interests to the CPG system. Interviewees generally agreed that the system could not function without this level of input from individuals and organisations outwith the Parliament. Very few interviewees believed that reliance on external secretariat provision had compromised the position of MSPs or had allowed those interests providing secretariat support to exercise undue influence over the work of CPGs and consequently over the work of the Parliament.

152. **Finding 6:** There was widespread lack of knowledge amongst CPG members of the regulatory framework for CPGs as set out in the Code of Conduct for MSPs. Most CPG members had no detailed knowledge of the rules governing the system. The exceptions were those whose roles in CPGs demanded understanding of the rules for CPG conduct: conveners and
secretaries were generally very familiar with the s8 rules. The research found that in a small number of cases, rules were not always followed by CPGs. Although not often occurring, the most common breach was of the rule requiring at least two MSPs to attend each group meeting.

153. **Finding 7:** The rules governing CPGs are similar to those regulating All-Party Groups at Westminster. With this exception, the Scottish Parliament CPG system is currently more regulated by Parliament than most of its counterparts in other parliaments. In particular, the Scottish system contrasts with most parliaments across the European Union where groups of parliamentarians that cut across party allegiance are voluntary initiatives and are operated in accordance with custom and practice, rather than formal parliamentary rules.

**Recommendations**

154. One of the striking findings of the interviews was the enthusiasm of interviewees to take part in the research and the evidence shows that CPG members view the system as an important element of the parliamentary architecture.

155. Whether CPGs should be formally integrated into the structure of the Parliament, and if so how and to what extent, is more contentious. Integration of CPGs into the formal parliamentary framework requires increased direction and regulation of CPG activity to ensure fit with key aspects of the Scottish Parliament. Formal integration would mean that Parliament’s standing orders would have to be revised to include CPG rules, and additional rules about relationships between CPGs and core parliamentary institutions. For example, integration may involve requiring Parliamentary Committees to consult with relevant CPGs on proposed legislation or Committee inquiries. This would bring Committees and CPGs into a structural relationship and would be likely to result in more CPG focus on core parliamentary activity. Yet this method of integration into the parliamentary structure would result in less flexibility for CPGs to pursue their own purposes and agendas. This approach would require consideration of CPG composition, in particular the use of external interests as secretariats and membership criteria. Integration also requires increased monitoring of CPG operation, which may involve the need for detailed minutes of CPG meetings and more comprehensive reporting. Integrating CPGs into the formal structure would certainly entail allocation of more Parliament resources to CPGs.

156. Whether the CPG system is integrated into the parliamentary framework or not, there is clearly a need to determine the purpose of the system rather than simply requiring individual CPGs to ensure their purposes are compatible with the public interest and that the groups are parliamentary in character. A possible interpretation of the term ‘parliamentary in character’ could coalesce around the near consensual agreement that it means a) MSP direction of CPGs b) sharing information between MSPs and non-parliamentary members of CPGs and c) the opportunity for MSPs and non-parliamentarians to debate issues of importance to them. This core meaning could also be extended to
define more tightly what issues relate to the work of the Parliament. For example, the CPG system currently covers issues reserved to Westminster and devolved to Scotland. For the Parliament as a whole, it is appropriate to be able to examine issues affecting Scotland whether policy is reserved or not. In considering the role of Scottish CPGs, this approach may not be the most appropriate in determining the purpose of the system.

157. The Standards Committee might therefore consider offering an interpretation of the meaning of the term. ‘Parliamentary in character’ implicitly suggests that the role of MSPs within CPGs is the crucial element. This is borne out by the research findings on current understandings of the term, which stress that MSPs must be the central force within CPGs. These understandings reflect aspects of the section 8 Code of Conduct rules, in particular the requirement for a range of MSP members from across the parties to join CPGs before they can be registered, and the rule that at least two MSP members attend each CPG meeting. We recommend that the Standards Committee considers whether it is feasible to enforce these rules, and if so how they are to be policed.

158. Although some interviewees took the view that the CPG system needs increased regulation to ensure the effective and efficient working of groups, evidence from the research shows that most members of CPGs believe that the Standards Committee should provide only a light regulatory touch. In particular, there was strong support from the interviews and the responses to the Committee’s consultation on CPGs that annual reports should be compulsory. Reasons for requiring annual reports were mainly based on the need for CPGs to be accountable, and to satisfy the Parliament’s principles of openness and accessibility. Nevertheless, such a requirement also addresses the issues of monitoring CPG activity and the provision of information for this purpose. Currently the Committee clerks undertake monitoring of compliance with the rules and the research found that they had become more pro-active in their work for CPGs.

159. Whatever the decision of the Committee on setting an overall purpose for the system, or on any regulatory changes, collection of information also needs to be considered in the context of purpose of information collecting. Determination of how much information is required from CPGs should be made on the basis of what the information is for, and what will be done with it. Currently, more information on CPGs is available than is analysed, but current data are incomplete, and provision of information is not consistent across the CPG system. Improving consistency and completeness of information provided is necessary, but the extent of requirements for information should depend on its rationale. While the Committee clerks have increased the amount of time spent on monitoring compliance, and have become more pro-active in seeking information, they face the problem of resourcing such work.

160. In deliberating any proposals for change in the CPG system, resource issues need to be considered. Evidence from the research shows that CPGs play an important role within the Parliament, but that the system has developed on MSP initiative, informed by the external interests involved. This
approach in Session 1 has resulted in a wide variety of subject groups, of secretariat types, of CPG strategy and activity. It is clear that CPGs are very popular with both parliamentarians and external interests. As of February 2004 42 groups have been registered in Session 2, which suggests that the number of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament is increasing.

161. For these reasons, we recommend that the Committee considers the establishment of a dedicated CPG team or the creation of a CPG Development Worker. A dedicated post could help promote good practice across the CPG system and undertake information collection, compilation and analysis. The development worker could assist the Committee in providing an overall annual report of the work of CPGs to be considered by Parliament. As well as informing MSPs about how the CPG system is developing and about the work of CPGs, an annual report on overall CPG activity would inform the Committee’s decisions on whether the system is developing well, and where any further changes need to be considered.
Annex 1: Methods

A search was completed to identify literature on Cross-party Groups (CPGs). This revealed that there has been little mention of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament in academic literature. Peter Lynch makes a reference to CPGs in the Scottish Parliament in his book *Scottish Government and Politics*. Lynch outlines the rules relating to CPGs and includes a short piece on the composition and aims of the CPG on Borders Rail. The literature on comparable groups to CPGs in other parliaments, including all-party groups at Westminster is set out in Chapter Six of the report. This literature is generally non-academic.

All-party groups (APGs) at Westminster have received little academic attention. There are few academic references to such groups. We consulted a number of key textbooks on British government and found that Westminster APGs were mentioned in the index of only one of the texts, which had a short section outlining such groups.32

We searched the BIDS International Bibliography of the Social Sciences for the period 1990 - 2003, using the following search terms:

- All-Party Groups
- Cross-Party Groups
- Parliamentary Groups
- Non-legislative Parliamentary Groups
- Non-legislative Parliamentary Committees
- Intra-Parliamentary Groups
- Inter-Parliamentary Groups
- Party Parliamentary Co-operation
- Parliamentary Friendship Groups
- Representative Groups in Parliaments
- UK Parliament
- Scottish Parliament
- National Assembly of Wales
- Northern Ireland Assembly

We later went back and searched under the term ‘intergroup’.

---

Only one relevant reference was found, which related APGs at Westminster. The focus of material referred to was the extent to which pressure groups made contact with APGs and subject groups within individual political parties. It was argued that ‘outsider’ groups had greater contact with APGs than internal party groups, while ‘insider’ groups had greater contact with party groups than with APGs. It reflected a concern about the lobbying activities of non-parliamentary groups.

Publishers’ catalogues were also consulted and we have checked for appropriate articles in back issues of relevant journals published between 1990 and 2003, primarily the following:

- Political Studies
- Public Administration
- The British Journal of Political Science
- Government and Opposition
- The Political Quarterly

None of these contained references to books or contained articles covering relevant parliamentary groups.

Other Literature
In addition to searching BIDS, we undertook a general web search using Google, and using the same search terms as for the BIDS site. Under the term all-party groups, we found a number of references to UK Parliament all-party groups in general and to specific APGs at Westminster.

The search using Google produced few other sites apart from those relating to APGs at Westminster. It did reveal, however, the existence of all-party groups in Finland.

We also searched a number of parliament websites. Where the sites had a search facility, we used appropriate terms we had applied in the BIDS search.

The sites searched were as follows:

- Australia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Canada
- Denmark
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Jamaica

---

We found no reference to groups that seemed to fulfil a similar role to that of CPGs in the Scottish Parliament on any of the sites.

Academics in a number of other countries (including Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Germany) were contacted and confirmed that groups similar to CPGs do not exist in their parliaments.

Contact was made via SPICe with officers in a number of parliaments and assemblies, and they also informed us that groups similar to Scottish Parliament CPGs do not exist in the following parliaments:

- German Bundestag
- Northern Territory Parliament (Australia)
- Belgian Parliament
- Newfoundland and Labrador Parliament (Canada)
- Quebec Parliament (Canada)
- NRW Parliament (Germany)
- Czech Parliament
- Spanish Parliament

**Interview Topic Guide**

The topic guide for the interviews with MSPs, individuals and members of external organisations, who are members of CPGs was as follows:

1. The interviewees’ backgrounds re CPG membership in Session 1; their pre-Parliament related interests and relevant roles; their current position in relation to CPGs; and open discussion of their work on CPGs, including its place in other Parliamentary/other work.

2. The interviewees’ understanding of the purpose of the CPG system in the Parliament; their knowledge of the rules governing Session 1; their understanding of the term ‘parliamentary in character’; and the implications of the Consultative Steering Group principles for CPG activity.

3. Their views on the extent of CPG regulation and on the current CPG regulatory arrangements; the implications of monitoring and information requirements (including funding) from CPGs.

4. Interviewees’ knowledge and views on the current number of CPGs; views on the current limitations on CPG membership and proposals (if any) for
change; views on the appropriate types of activity for CPGs; and the respective roles of MSPs/other members.

5. Their knowledge of other CPGs and their equivalents elsewhere; views of current CPG operation in the Scottish system; and views of the system compared to practice elsewhere.

Key issues about the CPG system from interviewees’ perspectives; and any other topics interviewees see as relevant.

The intention was to interview 10 MSPs who were ‘ordinary’ members of CPGs; five MSPs who were convenors of CPGs; five secretaries of CPGs; and 10 external individual and organisational members of CPGs. In the end, interviews were conducted with:

- eight MSP members of CPGs and one ex-MSP
- four MSP convenors of CPGs
- five secretaries of CPGs
- eight individual and organisational members

In addition, the Session 1 Convenor of the Standards Committee, the Clerk and Senior Assistant Clerk and a member of the Parliament’s senior management staff were interviewed.
Annex 2: Purpose of CPGs

The following are verbatim accounts of the statement of purpose by each registered CPG in Session 1, taken from the registration form supplied for the Standards Committee.

**Agriculture and Horticulture**

- To better inform MSPs on all issues affecting agriculture and horticulture in Scotland
- To facilitate dialogue between industry, academics, representative organisations and policy makers

**Animal Welfare**

The aims of the proposed cross-party group in the Scottish Parliament on animal welfare are: to provide a forum where all shades of opinion can be expressed to MSPs; to raise awareness of the importance of animal welfare; and where consensus is reached, to make proposals to introduce or amend legislation concerning animals.

**Architecture and the Built Environment**

The establishment and maintenance of a forum of MSPs and others to discuss the economic, social, environmental and cultural contributions that architecture and the built environment can make to the highest standards of design, the promotion of architectural excellence, improve the quality of life of Scotland’s citizens within the responsibilities devolved to the Scottish Parliament.

*The objectives:

- Influencing the quality of the architecture and design in Scotland
- Developing the debate on architecture, and the built environment in which it is placed
- Sustaining a dialogue on Scottish architectural design in a European and World context

* added in later Registration form

**Asthma**

To provide a platform for parliamentarians to discuss all issues relating to asthma; to liaise with those affected by the condition, organisations representing their interests, and health workers dealing with asthma; and to provide good practice and raise specific issues of concern.
**Autistic Spectrum Disorder**

The Group will campaign to highlight the needs of those affected by autistic spectrum disorder.

**Borders Rail**

To promote rail links to the Scottish Borders and in particular the reinstatement of a railway line from Edinburgh to Carlisle. Further to investigate all possible means of achieving these objectives.

*B&I, Economy, Environment and Society (BEES)*

The Group will open-up ambitious debates, which will influence future tax and benefit policy. Main themes to be tackled by the Group are:

- Social and economic justice
- Corporate society and environmental responsibility

CPG BEES will play a role in improving poverty and corporate social and environmental responsibility. The Group is intended to enable and stimulate the welfare reform debate by providing a dynamic interface for the exchange of ideas, comments and discussion.

*renamed from Citizenship, Income, Economy and Society*

**Cancer**

- To act as a channel of communications between the Scottish Parliament and people and organisations working in cancer research, treatment, care and prevention
- To identify areas where inequalities exist in the provision of cancer care and campaign for their improvement
- To provide opportunities for MSPs to learn about the latest Scottish and international cancer research and to learn about cancer care needs and services, including the views of both parents and carers
- To examine areas of policy or service provision, including both the allocation and the effective use of resources, where there may be inequalities of practice or standards of care and to make representations for effective and timely actions

**Carers**

- To help MSPs to address the needs of Scotland’s adult and child carers
- To provide MSPs with a source of information and expertise on issues affecting carers
- To bring together those with an interest in carers, including MSPs who have, or have had, caring responsibilities
- To liaise with the corresponding group at Westminster
- To liaise with other relevant cross-party groups in the Scottish Parliament
Children and Young People

To ensure issues affecting children and young people are recognised and discussed throughout the workings of the Scottish Parliament, in order to ensure that the needs and rights of children and young people are met throughout Scotland.

Chronic Pain

- To inform politicians and other decision makers of the enormous amount of suffering and the cost to society in billions of pounds of resultant unemployment, family breakdown, depression and, in some cases, suicide
- To concentrate on chronic pain caused by both malignant and non-malignant conditions and suffered by large numbers in the general community, palliative care in hospices already being handled by another cross-party group
- To view the establishment of the Scottish Parliament as a chance to start afresh, overturn decades of neglect, often unintentional, of one of the biggest health issues in society
- To press for implementation of recommendations of reports made in 1994 and in the year 2000 on the subject of chronic pain which, so far, have not been acted upon
- To encourage the training of physiotherapists, occupational therapists, psychologists, GP’s, nurses and other professionals in pain management and look at new ways of relieving pain where cure is not possible

*Citizenship Income, Economy and Society (CIES)

The Group will open-up ambitious debates, which will influence future tax and benefit policy. Topics likely to be tackled by the Group include:

- Social and economic justice,
- Social security and tax reform, and
- The social dimensions of economic policy

CIES will play a vital role in building democracy, promoting pluralism, improving justice, addressing poverty and correcting and complementing the roles of the state and the economic marketplace. The Group is intended to act as a ‘springboard’, which will enable and stimulate the welfare reform debate by providing a dynamic interface for the exchange of ideas, comments and discussion. In this way we will be able to support individuals, in the communities we serve, to develop their talents and work skills, which enables people to help themselves.

*change of name to Business, Economy, Environment and Society, approved 6 November 2002 (see above)
**Consumer Issues**

- To act as a policy forum for discussion and updating on consumer issues in Scotland, with particular regard to disadvantaged consumers
- To provide MSPs with a source of information and expertise on consumer issues
- To liaise with the corresponding group at Westminster
- For the purposes of the group, consumers are defined as “purchasers or other users of goods or services, whether privately or publicly supplied”

**Crofting**

To provide a platform to parliamentarians to discuss all issues relating to the structure of Crofting and to provide further knowledge of the Crofting way of life.

**Cuba**

The purpose of the group is to promote links between Scotland and Cuba. To examine areas of common interest between Scottish and Cuban parliamentarians.

**Culture and the Media**

To provide a platform for parliamentarians to discuss all issues relating to the media; to liaise with appropriate individuals and organisations; and to raise specific issues of concern with the Scottish Executive.

*Until 13 February 2002, this CPG was named Media and the statement of purpose included liaison with ‘consumers, workers and owners of media’ instead of ‘appropriate individuals and organisations’.*

**Cycling**

To generate debate on cycling issues and to promote cycling as part of an integrated and sustainable transport policy, as a recreational activity and as a major contributor to the health of the Scottish people.

**Deafness**

To work on an all-party basis within the Scottish Parliament for the interests of the deaf, deafened, hard of hearing and deaf/blind people, children and young people, their families and professionals working with them.

**Disability**

- Advance disability issues, raise awareness of these issues to MSPs and the public in general
- Give disability organisations access to the Parliament to inform
• Work on a non-partisan basis to achieve equality for disabled people and to highlight their concerns

**Drug Misuse**

The aim of the group is to examine the current policy – and practice – in responding to drug misuse in Scotland and to advise on, and promote the development of realistic, evidence-based responses, which could assist in the reduction of the damaging consequences of drug misuse in Scotland.

**Epilepsy**

The main purpose of the group is to address the needs of people with epilepsy by bringing together those with an interest in the welfare of persons with this condition. The group will promote discussion of epilepsy issues, raise awareness and increase understanding of epilepsy across a range of services and within the Parliament.

**Gaelic**

To promote the cause of Gaelic and to inform members of the Scottish Parliament about Gaelic and its culture.

**Human rights**

The establishment and maintenance of a parliamentary forum of MSPs and others to discuss issues of human rights, to promote human rights issues within the Scottish Parliament, and to ensure that the Scottish Parliament and Executive conform to the highest standards in human rights matters.

**Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment**

To champion the use of new and emerging information and communication technologies (ICT) in Scotland in general and in the Parliament and the governance of Scotland in particular. To act as a forum for discussion by MSPs and other interested parties of:

- The emergence of a knowledge-based economy in Scotland and its implications
- Developments in ICT and electronics and their potential in Scotland
- The social impact of the use of technology for access to information

To liaise with industry bodies in the fields of ICT and electronics to promote an understanding among MSPs of the issues affecting those industries in Scotland.

To liaise with information professionals to promote an understanding among MSPs of the potential uses of ICT for economic development, social inclusion and individual empowerment.
**International Development**

Aims:
- To ensure liaison between MSPs and organisations working in Scotland on international aid and development issues
- To raise awareness in Scotland of these issues and to provide a Scottish forum for discussion
- To promote stronger links between Scotland and international aid and development agencies

Objectives:
- To promote development education in Scotland
- To provide a forum for engagement with southern countries and those in economic transition on debt relief and the causes and consequences of poverty
- To support Scottish organisations working in international aid and development programmes
- To facilitate regular visits to Scotland by representatives of the international humanitarian agencies
- To engage with minority residents in Scotland and to encourage their involvement in the work of the group

**International Trade and Investment**

To provide a platform for MSPs and others to discuss issues relating to Scotland’s international trading activities and the flow of investment into, and outward investment from, Scotland. The Group will seek to promote practice and innovation in these areas, working to raise specific issues of interest or development with Parliamentary colleagues, the Scottish Executive and industry sector representatives. A primary role will be to encourage greater awareness and promote understanding amongst MSPs of the importance and impact of international trade and investment to Scotland’s economy.

**Kidney Disease**

To consider the current service provision, assess the prevalence, determine the need, disseminate good practice, apply current knowledge from research to prevention of kidney disease.

**Learning Disabilities**

The Cross-Party Group on Learning Disabilities will give a voice to people with learning disabilities in Scotland, their families and carers and the agencies in the voluntary and independent sectors who support them, in influencing the policy of the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Executive as it affects them in all areas of their lives.
Mental Health

- To act as a forum for assessing the implications for people with mental health problems and their carers of any relevant proposed legislation or other action which may impact upon them
- To raise awareness and understanding of mental illness and mental health and wellbeing
- To promote the rights of people with mental health and their carers and ensure that the views of these groups inform the political process
- To campaign to reduce the stigma and discrimination experienced by people with mental health problems at work and to improve public understanding of mental health issues

M.E.

- To help MSPs to address and represent the need of ME sufferers in Scotland to the Scottish Parliament and Executive
- To provide MSPs with sources of information and expertise on issues affecting ME sufferers, their families and carers
- To bring together those with an interest in the issues affecting ME sufferers
- To liaise with other relevant cross-party groups in the Scottish Parliament
- To liaise with the corresponding group in Westminster

Men’s Violence Against Women and Children

The purpose of the group is to establish a forum for debate on the issue of men’s violence against women and children. It is intended that the remit be broad enough to include the issues of rape, domestic violence, physical and emotional and sexual abuse. The work of the group will focus on the 3P’s: prevention, protection and provision.

Nuclear Disarmament

- To act as a policy forum for discussion and updating on policy impacts on Scottish nuclear issues
- To share information and expertise on Scottish nuclear issues between MSPs
- To maximise information and expertise from external sources, including Scottish CND and other statutory, public and voluntary organisations which support the aims of the group
- To act as a forum for networking and support led by MSPs sympathetic to the aims of the group

Oil and Gas

To provide a platform for parliamentarians to discuss all issues relating to the whole structure of the oil and gas industry; to raise specific issues of concern with the Scottish Executive and the industry itself; to promote innovation in
offshore engineering and to encourage greater recognition of the importance of the oil and gas industry to the UK.

**Older People, Age and Ageing**

- To help the Scottish Parliament to address the challenges of an ageing population
- To provide MSPs with a source of information and expertise on issues of age
- To bring together those with an interest in the well-being of older people
- To encourage co-operation in promoting the interests of older people and their involvement with the Scottish Parliament
- To assist the Scottish Parliament in meeting older people's needs as well as benefiting from their experience

**Palestine**

To establish a link between Palestinians living, working or studying in Scotland, and civic Scotland - and to provide a forum for discussions on issues facing the Palestinian people in general and the Palestinian national authority in particular.

**Palliative Care**

- To act as a channel of communication between the Scottish Parliament and people and organisations working in palliative care
- To provide opportunities for MSPs to learn about palliative care needs and services, and the issues involved in palliative care provision
- To increase awareness and raise the profile of palliative care
- To put palliative care on the agenda of the Health and Community Care Committee

**Refugees and Asylum Seekers**

To provide a forum for the discussion of issues relating to refugees and asylum seekers both in Scotland and abroad; and to promote the welfare of refugees and asylum seekers.

**Renewable Energy**

To bring together members of the Scottish Parliament and others with an interest in renewable energy in Scotland. The group will meet to ensure an exchange of information between members of Parliament, industry, NGOs and other interested parties. This may take place through presentations, debates, newsletters and production of reports. Topics that the group is likely to consider include:

- Climate Change Programme - UK and Scotland
- Utility Bill and secondary legislation - Renewables (Scotland) Obligation
• Renewable energy within the planning system
• The Climate Change Levy
• Support for the new renewables technologies
• Role of renewable energy in rural development in Scotland

**Scottish Contemporary Music Industry**

• To help MSP’s to address the needs of Scotland’s contemporary music industry
• To provide MSP’s with a source of information and expertise on issues affecting the Scotland’s contemporary music industry
• To create a forum that enables interested parties to forward ideas to improve the national infrastructure of Scotland’s contemporary music industry
• To liaise with external agencies of the Scottish Executive in order to promote Scotland’s contemporary music industry’s interests at home and abroad
• To ensure the agencies of the Scottish Executive are aware of the value of the industry in both economic and cultural terms

**Scottish Traditional Arts**

To provide a platform for parliamentarians to discuss all issues relating to traditional arts; liaising with relevant organisations, artists, performers, promoters, and enthusiasts; and to raise specific issues of concern with the Scottish Executive.

**Scots Language**

To promote the cause of Scots, inform members of the culture and heritage of the language, and highlight the need for action to support Scots

**Shipbuilding**

To support the Scottish shipbuilding industry.

**Sports**

• To encourage the development of sport and sporting opportunities for the people of Scotland
• To ensure that sport has a high profile in the Scottish Parliament
• To influence the Scottish Executive sports policy
• To liaise with SportScotland, the governing bodies and other sports organisations in Scotland so that such organisations will be able to keep MSPs informed on matters affecting Scottish sport
Strategic Rail Services for Scotland

To raise awareness of MSPs and other members of the group on the barriers to development of strategic rail services as they affect Scotland and to work to shape improvements and new directions for Scotland’s rail services.

Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse

To establish a forum for debate, with an agreed specific programme of targets and action, on the issue of childhood sexual abuse, domestic violence and homelessness. The group will ascertain the level of current service provision nationally, identify gaps in services and address funding issues. The group will consider the requirement for care pathways for survivors, as well as the need for joined-up policies. The legal considerations surrounding childhood sexual abuse and those agencies over which the Executive has authority will be examined. We will seek to create greater public awareness and understanding of the issues, and combat the many myths that surround sexual abuse and its impact on our society as a whole.

Textiles, Clothing and Footwear

To raise awareness amongst MSPs of the importance of the textiles, clothing and footwear sectors in Scotland.

Tobacco Control

To take forward an effective tobacco control agenda and monitor the implementation of the UK white paper on tobacco, Smoking Kills, in Scotland.

Tourism

To inform MSP’s and other parties on the importance of tourism to the Scottish economy and on the whole range of issues affecting the tourist industry in Scotland. Also to facilitate dialogue between the tourist industry, tourism organisations and policy makers.

Visual Impairment

To provide a forum for advising MSPs on issues across the range of devolved matters, which affect the lives of the 180,000 people in Scotland who have serious and un-correctable sight loss. The Group will discuss and formulate submissions on bills and Scottish Executive consultations to ensure that the interests of blind and partially sighted people are taken into account. The participants will also bring forward issues of significant interest to blind and partially sighted people in order to instigate discussion among MSPs. It is envisaged that some MSPs will then use their good parliamentary offices to ensure that the interests of blind and partially sighted people, many of whom are among the most socially excluded in Scotland, are taken into account in the legislative process and when scrutinising the work of the Executive.
**Women**

- To act as a forum for discussion and updating on policy impacts on women
- To share information and expertise on women and gender impact between MSPs
- To maximise information and expertise from external sources, including EOC Scotland, and other statutory public and voluntary equality organisations which support the aims of the group
- To act as a forum for networking and support led by women MSPs
Annex 3: Consultation on CPGs

The Standards Committee issued a consultation document on 3 July 2002, with a closing date for responses of 30 September 2002. The consultation document included 15 questions, and commentary on the Committee’s rationale for posing these questions was provided in the document. The questions were about:

- The purposes and objectives of CPGs, including a proposed statement of the purposes and objectives of CPGs, based on the requirement in the existing Code of Conduct for MSPs
- The ease with which the rules on CPGs can be understood
- The membership of CPGs, including the current minimum number of MSPs (5)
- The time allowed (if any) to replace MSP members who resign from a CPG
- The adequacy of the two MSPs per CPG meeting rule
- The accessibility of MSPs to the wider public via CPGs
- The composition of CPG secretariats, internal or external
- The appropriate nature of financial support, in addition to secretariat provision
- The need for detailed CPG accounts, including financial support capping and extra-ordinary funding
- The usefulness of a distinction being made between active and non-active MSP CPG members
- The use by CPGs of the Parliament logo
- The incorporation of current guidance into section 8 of the Code of Conduct for MSPs
- The need for detailed and regular records on CPGs
- The use of sanctions for MSP CPG members or for CPGs
- Any other issues that the respondent wants to raise about CPGs

Consultation responses
Thirty consultation responses were received:

- three from individual MSPs
- 17 from CPGs, several joint responses with organisational members
- eight from external organisations
- two anonymous

Broadly, the responses showed

- Almost unanimous agreement on the establishment of the proposed statement of purpose and objectives for the CPG system
- Apparent consensus on keeping the current rules on use of parliamentary resources for CPGs
- Wide agreement on revising the current rules to exclude the use of the Parliament’s logo by CPGs
• General concern about the pressure on the CPG system of the large number of existing CPGs
• Wide agreement on the appropriateness of external secretariats alongside agenda setting by the MSP convener
• Apparent support for requiring detailed accounts from CPGs
• Large majority support for revising the current rules to provide more detailed and regular records of CPG meetings

Other responses
• Approval for the incorporation of current Standard Committee guidance on CPGs into the Code of Conduct for MSPs; and support for more guidance notes on best practice, agreed accounting practices, format of meetings, and for MSPs members and office bearers of CPGs
• Support for monitoring of MSP activity and attendance in CPGs
• Views/suggestions relating to possible rules on financial support for CPGs, including a requirement to declare all amounts received, a list of permitted use of financial support, the setting of a maximum allowed amount, the requirement for the Standards Committee to approve proposed financial support for a CPG
• Support for more detail in CPG annual returns
• Support for introducing rules on CPG spokespersons, CPG documents and other outputs, CPG activity
Annex 4: Membership of CPGs by MSP and Party

The following information details party and CPG membership of MSPs at the end of Session 1. The information was taken from the Parliament’s web site and was accessed on 21 May 2003.

Bill Aitken  
CON  
Animal Welfare  
Cancer  
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment  
International Trade and Investment  
Scottish Traditional Arts  
Shipbuilding  
Tobacco Control (T)

David Davidson  
CON  
Agriculture and Horticulture  
Asthma (VC)  
Cancer  
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment  
Oil and Gas (VC1)  
Scottish Contemporary Music Industry  
Tourism

James Douglas-Hamilton  
CON  
Animal Welfare  
Architecture and the Built Environment  
Asthma  
Cancer  
Children and Young People  
Consumer Issues  
Deafness  
Epilepsy  
International Development  
Palliative Care  
Renewable Energy  
Scottish Contemporary Music Industry  
Scots Language  
Sports  
Tobacco Control

Alex Fergusson  
CON  
Agriculture and Horticulture (JC)  
Animal Welfare (VC)  
Borders Rail  
Cancer  
Carers (VC)  
Drug Misuse  
M.E. (VC)  
Palliative Care  
Scottish Traditional Arts  
Scots Language  
Tobacco Control

Murdo Fraser  
CON  
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment  
International Trade and Investment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annabel Goldie</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>International Trade and Investment (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Harding</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Cancer, M.E., Palliative Care (VC), Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse, Visual Impairment (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Johnston</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Johnstone</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Cancer, Crofting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie McGrigor</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Animal Welfare, Business, Economy, Environment and Society, Children and Young People (C), Disability, Gaelic (VC), M.E., Men’s Violence Against Women and Children, Older People, Age and Ageing, Tobacco Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay McIntosh</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Asthma, Cancer, Children and Young People, Chronic Pain, Culture and Media, Drug Misuse (T), Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, International Development, Kidney Disease, Men’s Violence Against Women and Children, Mental Health, Palliative Care, Refugees and Asylum Seekers, Scottish Contemporary Music Industry, Scottish Traditional Arts, Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse, Textiles, Clothing and Footwear, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McLetchie</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Cancer, Human Rights, Older People, Age and Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Monteith</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Architecture and the Built Environment, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Cancer, Cuba, Cycling, Scottish Contemporary Music Industry, Sports (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mundell</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Asthma, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Borders Rail, Children and Young People, Culture and Media, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment (C), International Trade and Investment, Mental Health, Strategic Rail Services, Textiles, Clothing and Footwear (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Scanlon</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Asthma, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Cancer (C), Carers, Chronic Pain, Crofting, Cuba (VC), Cycling, Drug Misuse, Epilepsy (S), Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, Learning Disabilities, M.E., Mental Health (VC), Palliative Care, Scots Language, Textiles, Clothing and Footwear, Tobacco Control, Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scott</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Animal Welfare, Cancer, Epilepsy, M.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Tosh</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Borders Rail (VC), Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Wallace</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Kidney Disease, Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Young  CON  Animal Welfare
Cancer
International Trade and Investment
Older People, Age and Ageing

Robin Harper  GREEN  Agriculture and Horticulture
Animal Welfare (VC)
Architecture and the Built Environment
Borders Rail (VC)
Business, Economy, Environment and Society (C)
Children and Young People (C)
Chronic Pain
Consumer Issues (C)
Crofting
Culture and Media
Cycling
Disability
Epilepsy
Human Rights
International Development (Ctte)
Learning Disabilities (VC)
M.E.
Mental Health (VC)
Nuclear Disarmament
Older People, Age and Ageing (T)
Palestine
Renewable Energy (VC)
Scottish Traditional Arts (VC)
Scots Language
Sports
Strategic Rail Services
Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse
Tobacco Control

Dennis Canavan  INDP  Animal Welfare
Cuba (T)
Drug Misuse
Epilepsy
International Development (VC)
Learning Disabilities
Nuclear Disarmament
Palestine
Palliative Care
Refugees and Asylum Seekers (VC)
Sports (C)

Dorothy-Grace Elder  INDP  Animal Welfare
Borders Rail
Cancer
Chronic Pain (C)
Culture and Media
Epilepsy
Human Rights
International Trade and Investment
Kidney Disease
M.E.
Men’s Violence Against Women and Children
Nuclear Disarmament (C)
Palestine
Palliative Care
Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse
Women

Wendy Alexander  LAB  Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment

Jackie Baillie  LAB  Learning Disabilities (C)
Palestine

Scott Barrie  LAB  Asthma
Children and Young People (C)
Cuba
Drug Misuse
Sports
Strategic Rail Services
Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse
Textiles, Clothing and Footwear

Sarah Boyack  LAB  —

Rhona Brankin  LAB  Architecture and the Built Environment (C)

Bill Butler  LAB  Cancer
Cuba
Kidney Disease
Palestine
Shipbuilding
Visual Impairment

Malcolm Chisholm  LAB  —

Cathie Craigie  LAB  Animal Welfare
Autistic Spectrum Disorder
Carers
Deafness (C)
Drug Misuse
Epilepsy
Learning Disabilities
Mental Health
Older People, Age and Ageing
Palliative Care
Visual Impairment

Margaret Curran  LAB  —

Susan Deacon  LAB  Children and Young People
Consumer Issues
Culture and Media
Strategic Rail Services
Women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald Dewar</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Eadie</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Borders Rail, Cancer, Cycling, Disability, Human Rights, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, International Development, M.E. (VC), Oil and Gas, Palliative Care, Strategic Rail Services (C), Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse, Tobacco Control, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ferguson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Human Rights, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, International Trade and Investment, Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Galbraith</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gillon</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Asthma, Borders Rail, Business, Economy, Environment and Society, Sports, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Godman</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Children and Young People, Epilepsy, Palliative Care, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda Grant</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Carers, Crofting (JC), Gaelic, Oil and Gas, Tourism, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Gray</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Henry</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Home Robertson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Roles and Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Jackson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Epilepsy (JC), Shipbuilding (C), Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Jackson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Animal Welfare (C), Cancer, Carers, Children and Young People, Drug Misuse (VC), Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, International Development, Older People, Age and Ageing, Palestine, Renewable Energy (C), Shipbuilding, Sports, Tobacco Control, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Jamieson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Jamieson</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Asthma, Business, Economy, Environment and Society, Cancer, Carers, Children and Young People, Drug Misuse, Epilepsy, Kidney Disease (C), Palliative Care, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Kerr</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>M.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Lamont</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Cancer, Children and Young People, Culture and Media, Drug Misuse, Epilepsy, Human Rights, International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Livingstone</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Cancer, Carers, Children and Young People, Cycling, Epilepsy, M.E., Strategic Rail Services, Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse (C) Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McAllion</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Architecture and the Built Environment, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Carers, Chronic Pain, Cuba (C), Epilepsy, International Trade and Investment, M.E. (C), Men’s Violence Against Women and Children, Nuclear Disarmament (VC), Palestine, Refugees and Asylum Seekers, Renewable Energy (C), Sports (VC), Strategic Rail Services, Visual Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank McAveety</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tom McCabe</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Consumer Issues, International Trade and Investment, Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jack McConnell</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Macdonald</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Macintosh</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Asthma, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Cancer (C), Crofting, Culture and Media, Cycling, Deafness, Gaelic, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Mackay</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>International Development, Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Maclean</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carers, Deafness, Drug Misuse, Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health, Visual Impairment (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry McLeish</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McMahon</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Cancer, Carers, Disability (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kidney Disease, Palliative Care (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shipbuilding, Sports, Tobacco Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Macmillan</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture, Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carers, Crofting, Gaelic (C), Oil and Gas (VC2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine, Palliative Care, Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts, Strategic Rail Services, Tourism (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McNeil</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Deafness, Shipbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline McNeill</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Cuba, Epilepsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, M.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine (C), Scottish Contemporary Music Industry (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des McNulty</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Paul Martin           | LAB   | Children and Young People  
                        |                      | Chronic Pain          |
| Alasdair Morrison     | LAB   | Oil and Gas                                                          |
| Bristow Muldoon       | LAB   | Cycling (C)  
                        |                      | Epilepsy               
                        |                      | M.E.                   
                        |                      | Strategic Rail Services 
                        |                      | Tobacco Control         
                        |                      | Visual Impairment       |
| Mary Mulligan         | LAB   | —                                                                     |
| Elaine Murray         | LAB   | M.E.                    
                        |                      | Older People, Age and Ageing |
| Irene Oldfather       | LAB   | Animal Welfare            
                        |                      | Cancer                 
                        |                      | Consumer Issues        
                        |                      | Tobacco Control (VC)   |
| Peter Peacock         | LAB   | —                                                                     |
| Cathy Peattie         | LAB   | Asthma (C)               
                        |                      | Business, Economy, Environment and Society (VC) 
                        |                      | Carers                 
                        |                      | Children and Young People 
                        |                      | Crofting                
                        |                      | Culture and Media (C)   
                        |                      | Drug Misuse             
                        |                      | Human Rights            
                        |                      | Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment 
                        |                      | Men’s Violence Against Women and Children (VC) 
                        |                      | Oil and Gas             
                        |                      | Palestine               
                        |                      | Renewable Energy        
                        |                      | Scottish Contemporary Music Industry 
                        |                      | Scottish Traditional Arts (C) 
                        |                      | Scots Language (VC)     
                        |                      | Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse 
                        |                      | Women (C)               |
| Richard Simpson       | LAB   | —                                                                     |
| Elaine Smith          | LAB   | Autistic Spectrum Disorder (VC)   
                        |                      | Carers                 
                        |                      | Children and Young People 
                        |                      | M.E.                   
                        |                      | Men’s Violence Against Women and Children 
                        |                      | Mental Health           |
Palestine
Scottish Contemporary Music Industry
Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse
Women

Elaine Thomson  LAB  Culture and Media
Cycling
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment (VC)
Learning Disabilities
Oil and Gas (C)
Older People, Age and Ageing
Strategic Rail Services
Women

Mike Watson  LAB  —

Ian Welsh  LAB  —

Karen Whitefield  LAB  Animal Welfare
Carers (C)
Deafness
Drug Misuse
Palliative Care
Strategic Rail Services
Visual Impairment

Allan Wilson  LAB  —

Robert Brown  LIB  Architecture and the Built Environment
Business, Economy, Environment and Society
Chronic Pain
Deafness (VC)
Disability (VC)
Epilepsy
Human Rights (C)
Older People, Age and Ageing
Shipbuilding (VC)
Strategic Rail Services (VC)
Tobacco Control (PO)

Ross Finnie  LIB  —

Donald Gorrie  LIB  Autistic Spectrum Disorder
Carers
Children and Young People (C)
Cuba
Disability
Drug Misuse
Epilepsy
Human Rights
International Development (Ctte)
Nuclear Disarmament
Older People, Age and Ageing (VC)
Refugees and Asylum Seekers
Sports (VC)
Ian Jenkins  
LIB  
Architecture and the Built Environment  
Asthma  
Borders Rail (VC)  
Consumer Issues  
Culture and Media (VC)  
Human Rights  
International Development  
M.E.  
Mental Health  
Older People, Age and Ageing  
Palliative Care  
Scots Language  
Sports  
Textiles, Clothing and Footwear (C)  
Tobacco Control  
Tourism  
Visual Impairment (VC)

George Lyon  
LIB  
Agriculture and Horticulture (JC)  
Business, Economy, Environment and Society  
Crofting  
Kidney Disease  
Renewable Energy  
Tourism (VC)

John Farquhar Munro  
LIB  
Animal Welfare  
Autistic Spectrum Disorder  
Crofting (JC)  
Epilepsy  
Gaelic (VC)  
Kidney Disease  
M.E. (VC)  
Nuclear Disarmament  
Strategic Rail Services

Nora Radcliffe  
LIB  
Agriculture and Horticulture  
Architecture and the Built Environment  
Carers (VC)  
Chronic Pain  
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment (VC)  
Oil and Gas  
Older People, Age and Ageing  
Palestine  
Palliative Care  
Renewable Energy  
Scottish Traditional Arts  
Scots Language  
Strategic Rail Services  
Women (C)

Keith Raffan  
LIB  
Asthma  
Cancer  
Culture and Media  
Drug Misuse (VC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Constituencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euan Robson</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rumbles</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavish Scott</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Trade and Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable Energy (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Rail Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Smith</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Smith</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Older People, Age and Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Rail Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tobacco Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Steel</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicol Stephen</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Stone</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>Asthma (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic Pain (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crofting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wallace</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Adam</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Borders Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug Misuse (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Trade and Investment (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tobacco Control (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Campbell</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nuclear Disarmament  
Scots Language  
Tobacco Control

**Bruce Crawford**  
SNP  
M.E.

**Roseanna Cunningham**  
SNP  
Cuba  
Epilepsy  
Scottish Traditional Arts (VC)

**Fergus Ewing**  
SNP  
Asthma  
Autistic Spectrum Disorder  
Crofting  
Epilepsy  
International Trade and Investment  
Oil and Gas  
Older People, Age and Ageing  
Scottish Traditional Arts  
Scots Language  
Sports (VC)

**Margaret Ewing**  
SNP  
Animal Welfare  
Autistic Spectrum Disorder  
Disability  
Epilepsy (JC)  
International Trade and Investment  
M.E.  
Men’s Violence Against Women and Children  
Mental Health  
Oil and Gas  
Older People, Age and Ageing  
Palliative Care  
Scots Language  
Strategic Rail Services  
Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse  
Tourism (VC)

**Winnie Ewing**  
SNP  
Animal Welfare (VC)  
Asthma  
Cancer  
Crofting (JC)  
Learning Disabilities  
M.E.  
Nuclear Disarmament  
Scots Language

**Linda Fabiani**  
SNP  
Human Rights (VC)  
International Development (Ctte)  
M.E.  
Nuclear Disarmament  
Palestine  
Refugees and Asylum Seekers (VC)  
Scottish Traditional Arts  
Women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Gibson</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Cancer, Children and Young People, Consumer Issues (VC), Epilepsy, Kidney Disease, Learning Disabilities, Mental Health, Scottish Contemporary Music Industry, Shipbuilding, Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse (VC), Tobacco Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Grahame</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Borders Rail (C), Cancer, Carers, Chronic Pain, Drug Misuse, Epilepsy, M.E., Nuclear Disarmament, Older People, Age and Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Hamilton</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Hyslop</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society, Cancer, Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Ingram</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Borders Rail, Carers, Drug Misuse, Human Rights, Men’s Violence Against Women and Children, Mental Health (C), Scottish Contemporary Music Industry, Strategic Rail Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lochhead</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Consumer Issues, Crofting, Culture and Media, International Development, Oil and Gas (VC3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny MacAskill</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Borders Rail, Renewable Energy (C), Tobacco Control, Visual Impairment (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo MacDonald</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irene McGugan  SNP
Children and Young People (C)
Cycling (VC)
Mental Health
Nuclear Disarmament
Oil and Gas
Scottish Traditional Arts
Scots Language (C)

Fiona McLeod  SNP
Architecture and the Built Environment
Children and Young People
Drug Misuse
Human Rights
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment (T)
Mental Health
Palliative Care
Tobacco Control
Women

Tricia Marwick  SNP
Animal Welfare
Cancer
Carers (VC)
Cuba
Men’s Violence Against Women and Children
Nuclear Disarmament
Palliative Care
Scots Language

Michael Matheson  SNP
Cuba (VC)
Disability (C)
Sports

Alasdair Morgan  SNP
Agriculture and Horticulture (JC)
Borders Rail
Crofting
Cycling
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment
International Trade and Investment
Strategic Rail Services

Alex Neil  SNP
Animal Welfare
Business, Economy, Environment and Society
Cancer
Children and Young People
Cuba
Culture and Media
Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment
International Trade and Investment
Mental Health
Nuclear Disarmament
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Interests and Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gil Paterson</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Men’s Violence Against Women and Children (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Quinan</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Reid</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Development (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles, Clothing and Footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona Robison</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refugees and Asylum Seekers (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Russell</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Borders Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and Media (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaelic (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tobacco Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Salmond</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Stevenson</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Sturgeon</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shipbuilding (VC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Swinney</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Ullrich</td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew Welsh</strong></td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Asthma, Oil and Gas, Older People, Age and Ageing, Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sandra White</strong></td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Cancer, Deafness, International Development, M.E., Men’s Violence Against Women and Children, Nuclear Disarmament, Older People, Age and Ageing (C), Refugees and Asylum Seekers, Strategic Rail Services, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew Wilson</strong></td>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>International Trade and Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tommy Sheridan</strong></td>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>Animal Welfare, Cuba (VC), Nuclear Disarmament (VC), Palestine, Refugees and Asylum Seekers, Sports (VC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C  Convener
Ctte  Committee Member
JC  Joint Convener
PO  Press Officer
T  Treasurer
VC  Vice Convener

Source: [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html)
Date accessed 21/5/03
Annex 5: CPG Membership (Individuals/Organisations)

The information below details the organisational membership of CPGs at the end of Session 1 of the Parliament. The information was accessed from the Parliament’s web site on 31 May 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agriculture and Horticulture</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Auctioneers and Appraisers in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFU Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Agricultural Organisations Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Association of Meat Wholesalers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Crofters’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Landowners’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UKASTRA (Scottish Council)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Animal Welfare</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocates for Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Defenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Association for Shooting and Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Small Animal Veterinary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Veterinary Association Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canine Concern Scotland Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassion in World Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grampian Pig Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International League for the Protection of Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Anti-Vivisection Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pig Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Zoological Society of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Countryside Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Crofters’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Gamekeepers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Homing Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Kennel Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Landowners’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society for Companion Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WildAid Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Society for the Protection of Animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Architecture and Built Environment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson Christie Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Chief Architects of Scottish Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Regional and Island Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect (Prison Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built Environment Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell and Morris Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council for Scottish Archaeology  
Dignan Read Dewar Architects  
Elder and Cannon Architects  
Hackland and Dore Architects  
Holmes Partnership  
Murray and Dunlop Architects  
National Trust for Scotland  
Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland  
Royal Town Planning Institute in Scotland  
Scottish Civic Trust  
Smith Scott Mullen Associates  
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland  
Wren Rutherford ASL

Asthma

Individuals
Tom Beattie - Royal Hospital for Sick Children  
Geraldine Brown  
Christine Cameron  
Ann Conlan  
Phil Cotton - Dept of General Practice, University of Glasgow  
Alison Culpan  
Michael Fagan  
Mrs Gannon  
Tom Garrett  
Fiona Garrett  
Ian Henderson  
David Hogg  
Mary Hosie - Southern Medical Group  
Gaylor Hoskins - Tayside Asthma Research Unit  
Janet Ingleby  
Alex MacMahon  
Phil Madge - Senior Research Fellow in Delivery of Care, Dept of Children’s Health  
Mary Malarkey  
Jim McCormack - Scottish Council Foundation  
Christine McIntosh  
Ron Nevill - Westgate Health Centre  
Wendy Nganasurian  
Richard Norris  
Marjory O’Donnell - National Asthma Campaign Scotland  
Willie Rennie - National Asthma Campaign Scotland

Organisations
Astra Zeneca

Autistic Spectrum Disorder

Individuals
Ken Aitken - Child Neuro Psychologist  
Moira Dickinson  
Heather Haines  
John Haines  
Christine Johnston  
Angela Laverty  
Steven Law - Lecturer  
Jim Mackie - Party Researcher  
Sue McLernon
Norman Will - Party Researcher

Organisations
Allergy Induced Autism (AiA)
Fife Council Psychological Service
Grampian Autistic Society
Intowork
Lothian Autistic Society
Lothian Primary Health Care NHS Trust
Lovaas Technique Advisor in Scotland
Moredun Institute
National Autistic Society
Options Technique Advisor
Perth Action on Autism
PHI
Renfrewshire Autism Group
Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists
Scottish Society for Autism
Strathclyde Autistic Society
Struan House School
UNISON
West Dumbartonshire Council

Business, Economy, Environment and Society

Individuals
Steve Burgess - Party Researcher
Hugh Kerr - Party Researcher
Claire Robertson
Dave Smith - Party Researcher

Organisations
AGENDA
Anchor Housing Association
Bank of Scotland
CSV Scotland
City of Edinburgh Council
Japan: representation from the Embassy of Japan
The Poverty Alliance
Prosperity
SCVO
Scarman CanDoers
The Scarman Trust
Scottish Low Pay Unit
Senscot
Volunteer Development Scotland

Borders Rail

Individuals
Mark Hirst - Party Researcher

Organisations
Borders Transport Futures Ltd
Campaign for Borders Rail
Scottish Borders Council

Cancer

Individuals
Organisations
ASH Scotland
Astra-Zeneca
Aventis Pharmaceuticals and Joint Oncology
Breast Cancer Care.
Cancer Bacup
Cancer Research UK
Citigate Public Affairs
MacMillan Cancer Relief Scotland
Marie Curie Cancer Care
News Direct
Ninewells Hospital
Pharmacia
Roy Castle Lung Cancer Foundation
Scottish Breast Cancer Campaign
Scottish Partnership for Palliative and Cancer Care
Tak Tent Cancer Support

Carers Organisations
Carers Scotland

Children and Young People Organisations
Adoption UK in Scotland
British Agencies for Adoption and Fostering (BAAF)
Childline Scotland
Children in Scotland
Children's Panel Chairmen's Group
Community Learning Scotland
Contact a Family Scotland
ENABLE
Family Mediation Service
International Christian College
Mental Health Foundation
NCH Scotland
National Deaf Children's Society Scotland
Play Scotland
Quarriers
Save the Children
Scottish Children's Reporter Administration
Scottish Council for Single Homeless
Scottish Youth Parliament
Sense Scotland
Youthlink Scotland

Chronic Pain Individuals
Gordon Anderson - Party Researcher
Evelyn McKechnie - Party Researcher
Bill Macrae - Consultant anaesthetist and pain specialist, Pain Centre, Ninewells Hospital, Dundee
John Asbury - Reader in anaesthesia and now Consultant Anaesthetist: Western Infirmary, Glasgow
Denis Martin - Assistant Director, Scottish Network for Chronic Pain, Queen Margaret University College
Ruhy Parris - Consultant in Anaesthesia and Pain Management, Glasgow Royal Infirmary
Janette Barrie - Pain Control Sister, Lanarkshire Acute Hospital Trust, Hairmyres Hospital
David Falconer - National Organiser, Pain Association Scotland
Heather Wallace - Chair of Pain Concern Scotland
Fiona Garrett - Branch Support Officer, Backcare Scotland

**Consumer Issues**

**Organisations**
Automobile Association (Scotland)
Citizen’s Advice Scotland
City of Edinburgh Council
Consumers’ Association
EnergyWatch Scottish Committee
LACOTS
Money Advice Scotland
Postwatch Scotland
SCOTSS
Scottish Association of Law Centres
Scottish Consumer Council
Scottish Consumer Forum
Scottish Retail Consortium
Trading Standards Institute

**Crofting**

**Organisations**
Scottish Crofting Foundation

**Cuba**

**Individuals**
Liz Elkind

**Culture and the Media**

**Individuals**
Jessica Carsen - Party Researcher
Luke Cavanagh - Party Researcher
Stuart Donaldson - Party Researcher
Hugh Kerr - Party Researcher
Dave Smith - Party Researcher

**Organisations**
BBC
BECTU
Church of Scotland
Equity
Federation of Scottish Theatre
NUJ
News Direct
PACT Scotland
Royal Lyceum Theatre
Scotsman
Scottish Media Group
Scottish Theatre Boards Committee
UNISON

**Cycling**

**Individuals**
Deafness

**Organisations**
- British Deaf Association
- Deafblind UK
- RNID
- Scottish Association of Sign Language
- National Deaf Children’s Society
- Scottish Council on Deafness
- Scottish Lipreaders Tutors Group
- Scottish Course to Train Lipreaders
- Scottish Sensory Centre
- Sense Scotland

Disability

**Organisations**
- Capability Scotland
- Disability West Lothian
- ECAS Access and Full Life
- Enable
- Epilepsy Action Scotland
- Leonard Cheshire Scotland
- Andrew MacLachlan
- Elma Mitchell
- PHAB Scotland
- Quality Action Group
- RNIB Scotland
- RNID Scotland
- Scottish Association for Mental Health (SAMH)
- SCOD
- Scottish Disability Equality Forum (SDEF)
- Sense Scotland
- Theatre Workshop
- Visualise

Drug Misuse

**Organisations**
- Scottish Drugs Forum

Epilepsy

**Individuals**
- Pauline Archibald - PA to Margaret Ewing MSP
- Mary Austin - PA to Gordon Jackson MSP

**Organisations**
- Church of Scotland (Westhaven)
- Enlighten
- Epilepsy Scotland
- Joint Epilepsy Council
- Quarriers
- University of Glasgow (Epilepsy Unit)
- Epilepsy West Lothian

Gaelic

**Organisations**
- Commun Na Gaidhlig
- Labour Resource Centre
- Ministerial Advisory Group on Gaelic
- Scottish Parliament
Telford College

**Human Rights**

**Individuals**
Fiona Killen

**Organisations**
Amnesty International
Anderson Strathearn
Church of Scotland
Civil Rights Movements
Disability Rights Commission
Equal Opportunities Commission
Faculty of Advocates
Freedom of Information Campaign
National Schizophrenia Foundation
Reporter to the Children’s Panel
Scottish Human Rights Centre
Scottish Refugee Council
Law Society of Scotland

**Information, Knowledge and Enlightenment**

**Organisations**
SELECT

**International Development**

**Individuals**
Martin Black
Missionary Comboni
Bill Donaldson
Sarah Donaldson
Joyce McMillan
John Riches
Neil Robertson
Isobel Shanks
Murray Tyrrell

**Organisations**
Amnesty International
BESO Scotland
Banana Link
Books Abroad
British Red Cross
CBS Network
Central Scotland Fire Brigade
Centre for African Studies
CERES
Christian Aid Scotland
Christian Engineers in Development
Church of Scotland, Board of World Mission
Civic Forum
Clacks Council
Common Weal
Concern
Conflict Studies Research Centre
DFID
East Timor Support Group
Edinburgh & Lothians Racial Equality Council
Edinburgh City Council Community Ed
Edinburgh University Settlement
Equilibrium Associates Ltd
Ettrick
FHI Europe
Forum for Private Business in Scotland
Friends of Namibia Scotland
Gardenfield
Global Concern
Global Concerns Trust
IDEAS
Inter-ed Ltd
International Institute for the Environment and Development
International Rescue Corps
International Unit Manager Community Ed
Jubilee Scotland
Just World Partners
Aid International
New College
One World Shop
Oxfam in Scotland
Palcrafts
Population Concern
Pro-Poor Development
Save the Children
SCIAF
Science & Technology - Environment, Public Policy
Scotdec
Scottish Centre for Non-violence
Scottish Churches World Exchange
SCVO Parliamentary Information and Advisory Service
SEEC
Scotland Zimbabwe Group
Scottish International Relief
Scottish Palestinian Forum
Social Anthropology Dept
St Colms International House
Tearfund
The Leprosy Mission Scotland
UNA
University of Edinburgh, Medical School
VETAID
VSO Scotland
War on Want
Wasco Consultancy, West-Africa-Scotland
Wester Hailes Representative Council Ltd
World Development Movement

International Trade and Investment

Individuals
Tricia Scott - Party Researcher

Organisations
BAA Scottish Airports
Continental Airlines
McGrigor Donald Public Policy
Kidney Disease

**Individuals**
- Jen Lumsdaine - Transplant Co-Ordinator
- John Marley - Transplant Patient
- Anna Murphy - Paediatric Renal Consultant, Yorkhill
- Elaine Nicol - Renal Nurse, Aberdeen
- Andy Rees - University of Aberdeen

**Organisations**
- National Kidney Research Fund (NKRF)
- National Kidney Research Fund in Scotland
- Scottish Federation Kidney Patient Association
- Scottish Renal Association/Scottish Renal Registry

Learning Disabilities

**Individuals**
- Una Purdie - Parliamentary Researcher
- Shona Earle
- Sally Ann Elfverson
- Iden Lewis
- Joan Griffiths

**Organisations**
- Learning Disability Alliance Scotland (LDAS)
- Enable Scotland
- Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB)
- National Autistic Society
- Profound And Multiple Impairment Service (PAMIS)
- Minority Ethnic Learning Disability Initiative (MELDI)
- People First Scotland
- Cornerstone

M.E.

**Individuals**
- Ian Cameron
- Paul Cooper
- Merryn Fergusson
- Iain Lee
- Morven McDade
- Marilyn McNeill
- John McNeill
- Lynn Michell
- Elizabeth Moncrieff
- Connie Nelson
- Deborah Shearer
- Helen Smith
- Nye Stenning
- Allan Stroud

**Organisations**
25% M.E. Group
Action for M.E.
Association for Youth with ME
Cathcart ME Support Group
Edinburgh Western General Self-Help Group
Equilibrium Associates
Dumfries and Galloway ME Support Group
Kinross Friendly Support for M.E.
M.E. Association
M.E. East Kilbride
Glasgow West M.E. Support Group
N.E. Fife M.E. Support Group
MERGE
MESH Dunfermline
MESH Edinburgh
MESH West Lothian
M.E.S.S. Borders Group

Men’s Violence Against Women and Children

Individuals
Linda Watson Brown
Juliet Casey
Sarah Nelson - Research Fellow in Sociology at Edinburgh University
Heather Williams - Party Researcher

Organisations
Aberdeen Rape Crisis Centre
Barnardos
Breakthrough for Women
Campaign Against Domestic Violence
Central Scotland Rape Crisis and Sexual Abuse Centre
Campaign to End Rape
CHANGE
Childline
City of Edinburgh Council
Dalkieth Social Work Centre
Domestic Violence Probation Project
Dundee Young Women’s Centre
Edinburgh Rape Crisis Centre
Fife Women’s Network
Fife Domestic Abuse Forum
Glasgow Health Board
Glasgow Multi-Agency Partnership on violence Against Women
Glasgow Rape Crisis Centre
Highland Domestic Abuse Forum
Lothian Health Promotion / CEC Promoting Women’s Safety Group
Men’s Health Development Group
Mid-Lothian Women’s Aid
NHS Fife
Open Secret
Pilton Community Health Project
Routes Out
SACRO
Scottish Children’s Reporter Administration
Scottish Police Service
Scottish Women Against Pornography
Scottish Women’s Aid
Shakti Women’s Aid
Soroptimist International
South West Rape Crisis and Sexual Abuse Centre
The Eva Project
UNICEF
Victim Support Scotland
Womanzone
Women’s Support Project
Women’s Rape and Sexual Abuse Centre
Zero Tolerance

Mental Health

Individuals
Robin Anderson - Party Researcher
Amanda Gordon - Party Researcher
John Hargreaves - Party Researcher
Steve Platt - Edinburgh University

Organisations
Mental Welfare Commission
Scottish Association for Mental Health
Penumbra
Scottish Development Centre for Mental Health Service
Mental Health Foundation
A Carers Connection
Depression Alliance Scotland
National Schizophrenia Fellowship Scotland
ABPI - Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry
The Royal College of Psychiatrists

Nuclear Disarmament

Individuals
Mark Hirst - Party Researcher
John Mellon - Party Researcher
Dave Smith – Party Researcher

Organisations
Scottish CND
Trident Ploughshares 2000

Oil and Gas

Individuals
Jim Rae

Organisations
Aberdeen City Council
Agip
Amerada Hess
BG
BP
Chevron Texaco
Conoco
Energy Watch
ExxonMobil Oil
GPC
Scottish Enterprise
Shell
UK Offshore Operators Association (UKOOA)

Older People, Age and Ageing

- **Individuals**
  - John Crichton
  - Phyllis Herriot
  - S Kohli
  - Jack Webster

- **Organisations**
  - ARP050
  - Age Concern Scotland
  - Alzheimer Scotland Action on Dementia
  - Age Concern Black and Minority Ethnic Elders Group (BMEEG) Scotland
  - Help the Aged
  - Scottish Pensioners’ Forum
  - Scottish Pensions Association
  - South Lanarkshire Council
  - University of Strathclyde

Palestine

- **Individuals**
  - Ishaq Abu Arafeh
  - Nancy Adams
  - Anne Alden
  - Freda Alexander
  - A E A Almaini
  - Dr Alubaid
  - Carole Alubaid
  - Tim Bell
  - Sheena Boyle
  - Pat Bryden
  - Janet Cameron
  - Susan Cameron
  - Ross Campbell
  - Sheila Connolly
  - Sana Dabbagh
  - Jacqueline F Dalrymple
  - Gillian de Santos
  - R Hugh Drummond
  - Ever Dundas
  - Maggie Erickson
  - David Fagan - Party Researcher
  - Margaret A Farrell
  - Brian Filling
  - Michael Freudenberg
  - J Galbraith
  - Hala George
  - Kathleen Gibb
  - Pam Green Lister
  - Ahmed Hamad
  - Victoria Hamilton
  - Samir Hashwa
  - Nada Hudson
Hugh Humphries
Abdul Ibrahem
Hugh Kerr - Party Researcher
Fathi Kmicha
Annette Lamont
Tom Leonard
John R Macdonald
Ranald MacDonald
Jock McDougall
Simon Macfarlane
Rica Macinnes
Sofia MacLeod
Runa Mackay
Mike McNicol
Gerard Madill
Zakia Maqbool
Nazim Merchant
Sheila Merchant
Colin Morton
Carol Morton
Maher Mufid Mughrabi
Margaret Mungavin
Anna Munro
Mick Napier
Hassan Norawa
Roy Paterson
Claudine Rebersat
Eddie Reilly
Carol Robertson
Guido Romano
Andree Ryan
Afif Safieh
Anna Sardesi
Anita Shanley
Nada Shawa
Wael Shawish
Bill Speirs
Christine St Clair
Ann Stewart-Kmicha
Yasir Suleiman
Ali Syed
Neil Walker
Norman Watkins
Duncan Webberley
Naoufel Werghi
Reverend Iain Whyte

Organisations
Deir Yassin Remembered
Palcrafts
Palestine Solidarity Campaign (Edinburgh)
Public and Commercial Services Union
Scottish Friends of Palestine
Scottish Medical Aid for Palestinians
Scottish Palestinian Forum
Palliative Care

Organisations
Borders General Hospital NHS Trust
Borders Primary Care NHS Trust
Cancer BACUP
Highland Hospice
NHS Lanarkshire
Macmillan Cancer Relief
Marie Curie Cancer Care
North Glasgow University Hospitals NHS Trust
Scottish Partnership for Palliative Care
South Glasgow University Hospitals NHS Trust
St Andrew’s Hospice
St Columba’s Hospice
Tayside Primary NHS Trust

Refugees and Asylum Seekers

Individuals
Cate Nicholl, Shona Robison’s Parliamentary Assistant
Kay Goodall

Organisations
Amnesty International
Civil Rights Movement
Dunfermline Council
Immigration Advisory Service
Jesuit Community
North Edinburgh Welcomes Refugees
Pilton Community Health Project
Refugee Council
Save the Children
Scotland Zimbabwe Group
Scottish Churches Action for Racial Justice
Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office
STUC
UMOJA / Glasgow Asylum Rights Campaign
The Well
YMCA Glasgow Work with Refugees

Renewable Energy

Individuals
Steve Burgess - Party Researcher
Paul Godzik - Party Researcher
Keith Gray - Party Researcher
Hugh Raven - Party Researcher
Dave Smith - Party Researcher

Organisations
AES Ltd
Aerpac UK
Anderson Strathearn WS
Ardkinglas Estate
Border Biofuels
British Wind Energy Association
Caledonian Energy Management
Enviros Aspinwall
Forestry Commission
Forward Scotland
Highland Light and Power
Industrial & Power Association
Napier University
Ocean Power Delivery Ltd
Powergen Renewables
RSPB
Renewable Development Company
Renewable Energy Systems
SERPD
Scottish Agricultural College
Scottish and Southern Energy
Scottish Executive
Scottish Green Party
Scottish Natural Heritage
Scottish Power Technology
Scottish Renewables Forum
Wavegen
Windways UK
World Wide Fund For Nature
Wright, Johnson & Mackenzie

Scottish Contemporary Music Industry

Individuals
Liz Cameron - Party Researcher
Gerry McInally - Party Researcher

Organisations
Dig Media
DF Concerts
Glasgow City Council
James Watt College
Musicians Union
Scottish Arts Council
Soma Records

Scottish Traditional Arts

Individuals
Matthew Anderson
Douglas Beck
Catriona Black
Paddy Bort
Barnaby Brown
Dougal Carnegie
Aileen Carr
Catriona Chisholm
Jack Evans
Bob Ferguson
Rob Gibson
Campbell Gunn
Karen Hannah
Stewart Hutchinson
Shonagh Irvine
Shonagh Irvine
Ronnie Lang

100
Rob Maxtone Graham
Elizabeth McDowell
Roger Moran
John Murphy
Neil Nicholson
Karine Polwart
Phil Taylor
Chris Wright

Organisations
Adult Learning Project
Celtic Connections
City of Edinburgh Council
Dumfries and Galloway
Edinburgh Folk Club
FEIS DHUN EIDEANN
Feis Rois; Feisean nan Gaidheal
Feisean Nan Gaidheal
Fife Council
Greentrax
Martin Coull Management / Stoneyport Agency
MCPS
National Association of Accordion and Fiddle Clubs
(N.A.A.F.C.)
Proiseact nan Ealan
Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama
Royal Scottish Country Dance Society
Saltire Society
Scotland and Northern Ireland Organiser Musicians’ Union
Scots Music Group
Scottish Arts Council
Scottish Culture and Traditions Association
Scottish Folk Arts Group
Scottish Storytelling Forum
Secretary Scottish Culture and Traditions Association
Storytelling Unplugged
Taigh Dhonnchaidh - Arts & Music Centre, Isle of
Tales and Tours (Tain)
Tartan Tapes
Temple Records
The Box and Fiddle magazine
Traditional Music & Song Association of Scotland
Traditional Music Association of Scotland
Traditional Music Co-ordinator
University of Strathclyde; Celtic Matters media company
Voluntary Arts Scotland

Researchers
Liz Cameron
Morag Dunbar
Dave Smith

Scots Language
Alasdair Allan
Eilidh Bateman

Individuals
Valentina Bold
Aimee Chalmers
Ronnie Cramond
Colin Donatti
Fiona Douglas
Andy Eagle
Matthew Fitt
Sandy Fleming
Dauvit Horsbroch
Billy Kay
Stuart McHardy
Margaret Munro
Liz Niven
Alex O’Henley
Janet Paisley
David Purves
Ann Rayner
James Robertson
Moria Stratton
John Tait
Robert Taylor
Raymond Vettese
Sheena Wellington
David Wilson
L Colin Wilson
Billy Wolfe
Louise Yeoman

**Organisations**
Association for Scottish Literary Studies
Chapman
Dundee City Council Literature Department
Luaty Press
Newbattle Abbey College
Scottish National Dictionary Association
Saltire Society
Scots Language Resource Centre
Scots Language Society
Scots Tung
Scotsman
Scotstoun Productions
Scottish Arts Council
Scottish Centre for Information on Language Training Scottish Language Dictionaries
Texas Tech University
University of Glasgow

**Shipbuilding**

**Sports**

**Individuals**
Maureen Conner - MSP’s Researcher

**Organisations**
Scottish Sports Association
Sportscotland
Strategic Rail Services

- Individuals
  - Jane Soren - GPC, 14 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh
  - John Yellowlees - ScotRail Railways
  - Graham Meiklejohn - Railtrack Scotland
  - Charlene Sloan - Virgin Trains
  - Allan McLean, Virgin Trains
  - Angus Peetz - Freelance TV Producer
  - Jim Eadie - Strategy in Scotland
  - Tom Kennedy - Transport Salaried Staff Association
  - Jim Gray - RMT
  - David Roberts - EWS
  - Kay Wallace - Freightliner
  - Malcolm Robertson - Scottish Airports
  - Bob Ballantyne - Stagecoach Integration of Rail Links
  - Ken Sutherland - Rail Development Society Scotland
  - Sheila Henderson - Scottish Accessible Transport Alliance
  - Ross Martin - Virgin Trains Consultant

Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse

- Individuals
  - Fran Walsh

- Organisations
  - Kingdom Abuse Survivors Project
  - The Moira Anderson Foundation
  - Stratheden Hospital

Textiles, Clothing and Footwear

- Organisations
  - Cardonald College
  - Edinburgh College of Art
  - Heriot Watt University
  - LATCF (Leading Action for Textiles, Clothing and Footwear)
  - Scottish Group
  - National Wool Textile Export Corporation
  - STUC

Tobacco Control

- Organisations
  - ASH Scotland
  - Cancer BACUP
  - Centre for Tobacco Control Research
  - Cancer Research UK
  - Macmillan Cancer Relief
  - Marie Curie Cancer Care
  - Roy Castle Lung Cancer Foundation

Tourism

- Individuals
  - Rob-Maxtone Graham
  - Terry Shevlin
  - Ian Watson

- Organisations
  - British Tourist Authority
  - Forum for Private Business in Scotland
  - GPC Scotland
  - National Trust for Scotland
  - Scottish Tourist Forum
  - visitscotland
Visual Impairment

At the inaugural meeting of the Group it was decided that only MSP will be full Group Members. Others will regularly attend as interested participants. Those who attended the inaugural meeting included: RNIB Scotland; The Scottish National Federation for the Welfare of the Blind (umbrella organisation representing most organisations of and for blind and partially sighted people in Scotland); the National League of the Blind and Disabled (trade union based in blind workshops); local societies for the blind in Glasgow, Edinburgh and the Lothians, Fife and Perth; Glasgow Social Work Services.

Women

Organisations

Equal Opportunities Commissions

Source: [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html)
Date accessed: 21/5/03
Annex 6: CPG Multiple Membership (Individuals/Organisations)

The information below details the individuals (other than MSPs) and organisations who were members of two or more CPGs at the end of Session 1 of the Parliament. The information was collected from the Parliament’s website on 23 May 2003.

**Individuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Smith</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and the Media, Nuclear Disarmament,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable Energy, Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn McKechnie</td>
<td>Cancer, Chronic Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Garrett</td>
<td>Asthma, Chronic Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Kerr</td>
<td>Business, Culture, Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Cameron</td>
<td>Music Industry, Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hirst</td>
<td>Borders Rail, Nuclear Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Maxatone Graham</td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts, Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Burgess</td>
<td>Business, Economy, Environment and Society,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>Human Rights, International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Strathearn</td>
<td>Human Rights, Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astra Zeneca</td>
<td>Asthma, Cancer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cancer BACUP  Tobacco Control
Palliative Care

Church of Scotland  Culture and Media
Human Rights

City of Edinburgh Council  Business, Economy, Environment and Society
Consumer Issues
Men’s Violence Against Women and Children
Scottish Traditional Arts

ENABLE  Children and Young People
Disability
Learning Disabilities

Equal Opportunities Commission  Human Rights
Women

Forum for Private Business in Scotland  International Development
Tourism

GPC  Oil and Gas
Tourism

Macmillan Cancer Relief  Cancer
Palliative Care
Tobacco Control

Marie Curie Cancer Care  Cancer
Palliative Care
Tobacco Control

Mental Health Foundation  Children and Young People
Mental Health

National Autistic Society  Autistic Spectrum
Learning Disabilities

National Trust for Scotland  Architecture and Built Environment
Tourism

Palcrafts  International Development
Palestine

Quarriers  Children and Young People
Epilepsy

RNIB  Disability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugees and Asylum Seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsman</td>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Agricultural College</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Arts Council</td>
<td>Scottish Contemporary Music Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Traditional Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scots Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Children’s Reporters</td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Men’s Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Crofters’ Union</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Landowners’ Federation</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Palestinian Forum</td>
<td>International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense Scotland</td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deafness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUC</td>
<td>International Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles, Clothing and Footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S1/msps/cpg/cpg-ag.html)
Date accessed: 21/5/03
Scottish Parliament
Standards Committee

Tuesday 13 January 2004

(Morning)

[THE CONVENER opened the meeting at 10:32]

Cross-party Groups

The Convener: We move to item 3. Sue Morris and Linda Strangward are unwell, so we will have the pleasure of hearing from Peter McLaverty of the Robert Gordon University, who will give us a bit more background on the draft report on cross-party groups that has been prepared for us. I invite Peter McLaverty to make an opening statement.

Dr Peter McLaverty (Robert Gordon University): I apologise for Sue Morris and Linda Strangward being ill, but these things happen. I will recap briefly the scope of the research that we undertook, say a little bit about some of the key issues that emerged from that research, and examine some possible solutions to some of the concerns that were raised in the various consultations and interviews that we conducted.

The research included an analysis of parliamentary documents and a range of documents relating to cross-party groups. We collected information from the files that the
Standards Committee keeps on cross-party groups, and searched the academic literature for information on cross-party groups and similar organisations in other Parliaments and Assemblies. We also interviewed a number of people, such as MSPs, other members of cross-party groups and members of parliamentary staff. That was the scope of our research.

I will say a little about what we found out about cross-party groups at the end of session 1. The groups were initiated by MSPs; they were not part of the original structure of the Parliament, but came out of MSPs’ concerns. By the end of session 1, 49 cross-party groups were registered. During session 1, few applications were rejected by the Standards Committee. We decided that we would try to put the different cross-party groups into typologies and group them around similar criteria. We came up with four typologies, which were subject matter, membership, secretariat provision, and funding sources and uses of funding.

I will now say a little about the purposes and activities of cross-party groups in the first session. There were a variety of purposes, as set out in the application documents to set up cross-party groups; those purposes included providing information, communicating information, raising the profile of a particular topic, campaigning for a particular topic, and research. The main way in which cross-party groups engaged was by holding meetings, but they also held other events, such as conferences and social events. A small number of cross-party groups engaged in visits that were relevant to the topic of the group. Cross-party groups also had an input into parliamentary business in various ways.

Positive views of cross-party groups came out in the research. There was general support for the cross-party group system, and a general belief that it served a useful purpose and was working fairly well. It was generally agreed that cross-party groups contributed to the furthering of the Parliament’s founding principles by engaging outside groups and individuals, which showed that the Parliament was open and encouraged access by people from outside.

Conveners and secretaries generally had considerable knowledge of the rules governing the operation of cross-party groups and what the groups should and should not be doing, although among non-conveners and non-secretaries knowledge of the rules was fairly limited. The secretariats of most cross-party groups came from external organisations of one kind or another, but there was general agreement that that did not create problems, did not bias the system, and did not give the organisations that provided the secretariats unfair influence over what the groups did or what happened within the Parliament more broadly.

Some of the concerns that were raised about cross-party groups related to what the role of such groups ought to be. There was no consensus on what cross-party groups should be doing and how they should relate to the broader parliamentary structure. There was much uncertainty about where the groups should fit in with the wider parliamentary structure and how they should feed into it.

Concerns were expressed to the effect that it was possible for cross-party groups to undermine the committee system, especially as the mass media did not seem to have a clear grasp of the difference between cross-party groups and parliamentary committees. There was a feeling that it would be possible for conveners or other members of cross-party groups to speak as if they were speaking on behalf of the Parliament, and perhaps to usurp the role of committees.

There was a feeling that the groups appear to be dominated by professionally staffed, larger, national-type organisations, and that they tend to exclude people from disadvantaged groups, people from outside the central belt, and groups that work at local level. Those may be some of the drawbacks of the cross-party group system and the way in which the groups operate.

Some key issues have arisen from the research. The main issue that arose with everybody whom we interviewed was that MSPs did not have enough time to spend on cross-party group work. They were overstretched and, as a result, the system was perhaps not working as well as it might do, because the MSPs could not give the time that was required.

Some people thought that there was lack of clarity about the purpose of the cross-party group system. There was lack of clarity about what the term “parliamentary in character” meant and about how that term was supposed to affect how cross-party groups operated, the things that they did, and how they went about their work. Many people felt that they were not clear about the term “parliamentary in character”.

On the extent of CPG regulation, monitoring and reporting, we found that regulation for cross-party groups is similar to that for all-party groups at Westminster. Cross-party groups seem to be more heavily regulated than such groups in most other European Union Parliaments and Assemblies.

We found that the information in the cross-party group files is neither comprehensive nor complete. That is not a criticism of the clerks; the problem is...
that the reporting mechanisms just do not give complete information. Moreover, given that the committee clerks monitor that information, there might be a question about whether they have the time and resources to do that work satisfactorily. People wondered about the purpose of the regulation and, in particular, about the information that is being gathered; they asked what should be done with the information and how it should be used. At the moment, the information that is collected seems to be kept in the files and little more is made of it, especially in the annual reports.

As for possible solutions, there was a general view that it was up to MSPs to address any problems with time constraints. That could not be done by changing the operation of the cross-party group system. However, some suggestions were made about what might be done within the system. For example, some suggested that cutting the number of CPGs might help to solve the problem, although there was not much support for that approach. It was also suggested that the Parliament’s working time could be extended to make more time for CPG activity. Furthermore, people suggested that groups that had a fairly similar remit or that covered similar topics could be linked together in an umbrella system to allow them to meet together occasionally instead of having to meet individually all the time. Other possible solutions would be to reduce the groups’ activities to ensure that they did not meet as often or to reduce the number of MSPs from different parties that are required for a cross-party group to be registered.

It would be a good idea for the Standards Committee to define the purpose of cross-party groups. We suggest that any such definition should be based on what was outlined in the committee’s 2002 consultation document, which said that the purpose of groups is “to enable Members of the Scottish Parliament to establish a mechanism for briefing themselves on a subject of genuine public interest; and ... to bring together Members of the Scottish Parliament from across the parties and outside organisations/members of the public who share an interest in advancing a particular subject or cause.”

Adopting such an objective for cross-party groups would make things clearer for many people who work in them.

Other possible solutions would include defining the term “parliamentary in character”. That definition should be based on the perception that the CPGs are a parliamentary forum. Furthermore, a minimum number of MSP members should be required to set up a CPG and groups should interact with external actors. However, that interaction should focus on the Parliament’s business, as it would be parliamentary in character. It is important to stress that such interaction should take place, because it would help the groups to play a part in furthering the Parliament’s founding principles.

As far as regulating, monitoring and reporting are concerned, we suggest that the committee should consider making the publication of the annual report compulsory to ensure that information about groups’ activities can be collected. Moreover, in order to fulfil the requirement for groups to be parliamentary in character, the requirement for two MSPs to attend cross-party group meetings should be enforced. It is also important for the CPGs to record changes of membership in the files and perhaps there should be a time limit in that respect.

Finally, our research suggests that there might be a case for appointing a CPG development worker, if only on a part-time basis, who might promote good practice within and across cross-party groups; maintain cross-party group files; monitor cross-party group activities; ensure that the rules are being implemented; analyse the information that comes from the CPGs; and help the groups to play a part in the Parliament’s efforts to involve the public. In that respect, a CPG development worker could liaise with the participation and outreach services.

The Convener: Thank you very much. The object of the external research was to examine the operation of the CPGs—I think that members will agree that your research has been fairly extensive—with a view to the committee reviewing the rules and code and developing a model of best practice.

It is probably fair to say that the primary finding of the research was that MSPs did not have enough time to give to CPG work. I am glad to see that Dr McLaverty is nodding in support of that comment. Is it also fair to say that there is little support for the suggestion that the committee should rewrite the cross-party group rules wholesale or add major new rules?

Dr McLaverty: I do not think that there was much support for that approach. Instead, there was a feeling that clarification was required on certain matters such as the purpose of the CPGs and how they were to operate within the terms of the phrase “parliamentary in character”. However, there was not much support for increasing the level of monitoring or for introducing new rules.

The Convener: In essence, you are giving the system a fairly clean bill of health, but you feel that it would help to clarify one or two areas.

Dr McLaverty: That is right. One or two aspects would work better if people had a clearer understanding of what was expected.

Alex Fergusson: I will probably have a few more questions to ask later. However, one
question came to mind during your presentation, when you mentioned that a possible solution would be for cross-party groups to focus on parliamentary business. Will you expand on that point? Do you mean that cross-party groups should, in essence, be involved with devolved issues? Would such a step reduce substantially the number of such groups?

Dr McLaverty: I do not think that that was the implication. Even though the Parliament cannot pass legislation on reserved matters, it can still discuss them. As a result, I see nothing wrong with having cross-party groups on such matters. It is up to MSPs to decide whether it is a good idea.

What we mean by that point is that, if the term “parliamentary in character” is to mean anything, cross-party groups should not be concerned about trying to mobilise support outside the Parliament. Indeed, they should not focus on doing things outside the Parliament that do not relate closely to the Parliament’s business; their emphasis should be on what is happening within the Parliament.

Alex Fergusson: You mentioned that campaigning was one of the purposes of the CPGs. Is it possible for the groups to have a campaigning role and still to focus only on parliamentary activities as you have just defined them?

Dr McLaverty: It depends on what the CPGs are trying to do with their campaigning. For example, a group might seek to find support for, raise the profile of, or clarify information with regard to, a particular issue. Such campaigning might well be focused on the Parliament and relate back to the Parliament’s business by allowing others to gain a greater understanding of issues. The points that you mention are not totally distinct. That said, campaigning that was not based around parliamentary activity probably would not be suitable.

The Convener: Can you give us an example of campaigning that would be inappropriate?

Dr McLaverty: Off the top of my head, it is difficult to think of an issue that does not bear on the Parliament.

Campaigning would not be acceptable if it was not linked to anything that the Parliament was doing and was centred on gathering and mobilising support and doing things outside the Parliament with no real emphasis on what was happening within it. It is hard to think of an area in which that would happen, but we feel that any campaigning that takes place should be related to what is happening within the Parliament rather than focused on mobilising people outside the Parliament to do things that are not directly related to the Parliament’s work.

The Convener: Even though that area might be reserved instead of devolved.

Dr McLaverty: That is right.

Alasdair Morgan (South of Scotland) (SNP): Dr McLaverty, I invite you to think about the way in which you are using the present tense to talk about this matter. For example, you have referred a couple of times to linking campaigning to what is happening in the Parliament and to what the Parliament is doing. Do you not mean that campaigns should be linked to what the Parliament could be doing or has the power to do?

Dr McLaverty: Yes, absolutely.

Alasdair Morgan: After all, a cross-party group is very often created because people feel that the Parliament and the Executive should be paying attention to an issue but are not.

Dr McLaverty: I agree with that.

Mr Kenneth Macintosh (Eastwood) (Lab): I have a couple of questions about issues that might have arisen in the course of your research. Cross-party groups stand in a funny area; they do not have full parliamentary approval but are not, as it were, ex-parliamentary. Although we have resolved some of those issues, others—such as the use of the parliamentary logo—remain.

Cross-party groups have a certain standing. However, the media sometimes does not discriminate between the groups and full parliamentary committees. I am trying to work out how much of a problem that is. What about the rules that we have now drawn up about, for example, the use of the parliamentary logo or of certain resources? The parliamentary logo is a good example of the kind of authority that cross-party groups might try to assume. Did you find that to be a sizeable or on-going problem for MSPs, members of the public or the media?

Dr McLaverty: Although some interviewees raised the issue in the way that I described in my presentation, it was not generally seen as major and was not raised by the majority of the people whom we interviewed. Some people were concerned that cross-party groups might be usurping the position of parliamentary committees by taking a stance and perhaps giving themselves an imprimatur that they do not have. They felt that, as a result, there needed to be a clearer dividing line between the CPGs and the committees. However, as I said, most of the people whom we interviewed did not raise the issue.

Mr Macintosh: That has been a problem in the past and, because of the continuing lack of clarity about the exact nature and position of cross-party groups, it remains a potential problem. However, you think that the issue of the use of the logo has been resolved.
Dr McLaverty: The logo was not mentioned.

Mr Macintosh: Another on-going concern that members have expressed is that some of the cross-party groups are overly party political. Obviously, everything associated with the Parliament is by its very nature political. However, some groups have perhaps overstepped the mark—I was about to say boundary, but I am not sure that such a thing exists or where it is drawn in this respect. Was such a concern repeatedly expressed?

Dr McLaverty: That point was raised by one or two people, but it was not a general consideration.
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Mr Macintosh: Most of the CPGs were seen to operate in a genuinely consensual and cross-party manner.

Dr McLaverty: A number of people said from experience that that was one of the CPGs’ strengths, although there was a feeling that the situation varied from group to group. Some people raised the issue of the groups’ being overly party political, but that was not seen as being a general problem.

Mr Macintosh: I have other questions, but I will let in other members first.

The Convener: I will abuse my position as convener by asking some more questions.

Is there a distinction between the confusion between cross-party groups and parliamentary committees and the confusion about the various interpretations of the Scottish Executive and whether its role is administrative or political and whether it is the Government? Should we draw a distinction between the confusion that may exist—in the minds of the media and the people—and clear-cut attempts to usurp the role of parliamentary committees?

Dr McLaverty: I think there is general confusion about those divisions. I do not think that the confusion about the distinction between cross-party groups and parliamentary committees is very different from the confusion about the difference between the Executive and the Parliament.

However, some concerns were expressed that outsiders’ confusion about the difference between CPGs and parliamentary committees could be used by CPG conveners to lend what they say greater authority than it should have. There was a sense that that had happened on one or two occasions, and that there is a danger that it might happen in the future.

The Convener: Is there specific evidence that that has happened or are you talking simply about a worry that it might happen? If there is such evidence, perhaps you could include it in your final report.

Dr McLaverty: The concern was expressed in relation to a matter about refugees.

Mr Macintosh: It is probably slightly unfair to ask Dr McLaverty to include that, given that we asked him to do a survey for us.

The Convener: Fine. Do you feel that reference to that specific matter ought to appear in the final report or did you deliberately not include it in your draft final report?

Dr McLaverty: It would be difficult to include such a reference in the final report because we did not talk to some of the people who were involved in the accusations that were made. I would not feel comfortable about putting that in the report without my having interviewed those people to hear their side of the case.

The Convener: At this stage, we are considering the draft final report. We will move on, because Donald Gorrie has been patiently waiting.

Donald Gorrie (Central Scotland) (LD): Has Mr Macintosh finished?

The Convener: We will come back to him.

Donald Gorrie: I read the written report with great interest. I must have missed something, because I did not notice any material about CPGs’ tending to exclude certain people—disadvantaged groups, groups that work at local level and people from outwith the central belt—which was one of the points in the summary that you gave today. I wonder whether MSPs or people from outside the Parliament said that. Was that a serious issue? If it is genuinely the case that CPGs tend to exclude certain people, that is obviously a matter of concern.

Dr McLaverty: Some MSPs raised the issue when they were asked how far CPGs helped to promote the Parliament’s founding principles. Although they said that CPGs helped to do that, one or two members said that they thought that membership was fairly restricted and that people from disadvantaged groups and disadvantaged areas, and people from outside the central belt were not heavily involved in the groups. We mentioned that in the report, but perhaps we did not do so as clearly as we should have done.

Donald Gorrie: I had not picked that up. I might be verging on developing an argument rather than asking questions, but did anyone relate that to most groups’ lack of financial support? Was the point made that the fact that CPGs have no money means that the only people who come are those who can afford to come?

Dr McLaverty: No, that issue was not raised.

Mr Macintosh: The relevant part of the report is on page 35.
Karen Whitefield (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab): I want to discuss your proposed solutions on regulation, monitoring and reporting. You made a number of recommendations. Will you provide us with a little more information on why you felt that those recommendations were necessary, given that the people who were interviewed generally felt that CPGs were working quite well?

What would be the benefit of requiring an annual report, to whom would it be submitted and what would happen to it? Did you recommend that two MSPs should be present at every meeting because there was a sense that, although a number of MSPs were present at most CPG meetings, there were occasions on which only one MSP was present and the discussions were led by groups that were affiliated to the CPGs rather than by MSPs? If we were not to take up your suggestion that we employ a development officer, who do you think should be responsible for collating all the information and what would be the purpose and benefit of that?

Dr McLaverty: I will deal first with the issue of stipulating that two MSPs should be present at every meeting. At most CPG meetings, there were more than two MSPs present—we are not saying that there was a general tendency for only one MSP to turn up. We think that the suggestion is important in order to make sense of the idea that the groups should be parliamentary in character. Given that CPGs help to involve outside groups and members of the public in the Parliament’s work, it is important that MSPs be engaged as fully as possible in CPGs’ work, to avoid the situation that you described in which the outside groups talk to themselves at CPG meetings. That is not the purpose of CPGs.

Someone whom we interviewed said that it would be good for CPGs to have to produce annual reports because that would encourage them to reflect on what they had been doing, to think about whether they had achieved what they wanted to achieve and to consider where there might be problems and how they could improve matters in the future. If submission of annual reports were made compulsory, that would serve the purposes of clarifying what different CPGs were doing and of identifying where there were differences of emphases and different views about what CPGs should be doing. It would also help the members of CPGs to assess whether the groups were achieving what they wanted them to achieve. The proposal would be useful in that respect.

On the appointment of a development worker, we have not really thought about how he or she might be placed within the Parliament’s structure, which I appreciate is an important issue. Some of the people whom we interviewed felt that it would be good if cross-party groups could be helped to adopt best practice and that there should be some thought about how they could best relate to outside groups, organisations and members of the public. A development worker could play a role in that. There are questions about where such a worker would fit in the parliamentary structure, which we need to think through.

Karen Whitefield: If we went ahead with your recommendations, but did not have a development worker, who should be responsible for collating information?

Dr McLaverty: The collection and handling of information would be one of the development worker’s roles.

The Convener: How can we get the balance right between the desire of most interviewees for a very light regulatory touch, and the additional regulatory recommendations that you make? For example, how could we enforce a rule about two MSPs’ having to attend a CPG’s meeting without our having to obtain a list of everyone who attends every meeting? How could we enforce the proposal on notification of changes in membership? Should there be some kind of sanction?

Dr McLaverty: I think that there is a case for saying that, if two MSPs are not present at a number of a group’s meetings, the group’s continued registration should be questioned, because it would not be performing the role that a CPG should perform.

The Convener: How will we know whether two or more MSPs have been present? Will we insist that every CPG produce minutes with a sederunt within a particular time frame? Should there be a monitoring mechanism, which could be in the hands of the clerks or a development worker, and should a report come back to the Standards Committee? Is that the kind of enforcement approach that you are suggesting?

Dr McLaverty: That would be the logic of what I am saying.

The Convener: How is that compatible with a light regulatory touch?

Dr McLaverty: Our proposals are light in that what CPGs should do would not be heavily prescribed, but I accept that there would not be a light regulatory touch on MSPs’ attendance at CPG meetings or on related issues.

Bill Butler: I am still a bit concerned about how that would be policed, which is what we have been asked to do.

The time constraints on MSPs in relation to CPGs have already been mentioned and we know that some CPGs get secretarial assistance in kind and so on. You talked about compulsory annual reports; how detailed should those reports be?
Dr McLaverty: They should give information about groups’ activities, including information about who attended various meetings and events. Reports could say what the groups thought that they had achieved and how far they had moved towards their objectives, for example.

Bill Butler: Should such annual reports be submitted to the Standards Committee and, if so, what should we do with them? Should we merely note them or should they be published widely for public consumption? What would be their purpose?

Dr McLaverty: I take your point. One of the reports’ purposes should be to encourage reflection by the CPGs on what they have been doing and on whether they have been doing the right things, which is quite important. There is a case for saying that the reports should be published. Given that the Parliament believes in transparency and openness, one could say that CPGs’ annual reports should be publicly available.

Donald Gorrie: Did anyone to whom you spoke suggest the adoption of best practice rather than an approach that is based on regulation? Groups could be encouraged to reflect on what they had done and they could put that in an annual report. If the reports were put on a website, for example, that would help to promote the groups’ causes because there would be more publicity.

Also, it would not be possible to cancel a CPG meeting if only one MSP were to turn up for it, because people might have come from places such as Dumfries or Thurso. However, I presume that it would be possible to carry on with the meeting without its counting as an official meeting of the group; it would simply be a discussion. Has anyone suggested encouragement of the adoption of good practice rather than regulation?

Dr McLaverty: I suppose that that is one of the roles that the development worker could carry out. It was suggested that one of his or her jobs would be to promote good practice, to see what seemed to be working well in some groups and to consider how it could be adapted to the needs of other groups.

I want clarification on a few points. Donald Gorrie mentioned accessibility of the groups. There is a concern that the groups have limited accessibility to members of the public because they are Edinburgh based and Edinburgh-centric and are dominated by voluntary organisations and lobby groups. I am not sure whether that came out in your research; perhaps you could comment. I do not suppose that you were able to examine in any detail the membership of groups to see where individual members came from geographically and socially. It is my impression—from anecdotal evidence—that membership of the groups tends to comprise articulate middle-class people who have access to Edinburgh, and lobbying or business organisations. Is that backed up by evidence that you took?

Dr McLaverty: That is the impression that we got from the interviews and it is certainly true in relation to most of the organisational members of cross-party groups. It is more difficult to trace individual members of the groups because we do not have much information about them and we do not have their addresses. Therefore, I cannot comment on individual members.

Mr Macintosh: Are there barriers to people finding out about the groups? Parliament broadcasts its work widely and is reported widely in the media and, obviously, there are constituency MSPs and others throughout the country. Are there obstacles to people’s knowing about cross-party groups? I know that there is a website, but other than through that, I do not know how people would find out about cross-party groups. It might not have come out in your evidence, but was that mentioned as a problem? I would have thought that if we were to ask somebody in a small town in the Borders, they would not know much about cross-party groups and they would not know how to find out about them.

Dr McLaverty: I suspect that that is probably true. There is an issue about whether people know that CPGs exist. I suspect that, if we asked a dozen people on the street here, only two or three would know that there is such a thing as cross-party groups. I do not think that they are widely known about.

Mr Macintosh: Is the website used a lot? Perhaps you did not examine that as part of the survey.

Dr McLaverty: We did not examine how much the website is used. The information on the website about the groups is fairly comprehensive; there is a page for each group and each group can be accessed through MSPs.

Mr Macintosh: Concern was expressed at one stage about the disparity in the levels of funding
for the groups. You seem in the survey to have given them a fairly clean bill of health in the sense that concern about the way in which the groups are funded did not emerge. Is that fair?

Dr McLaverty: Yes, that is true generally. There did not seem to be much concern about funding among the people whom we interviewed.

Mr Macintosh: On a more practical issue about how the groups operate, the groups have no access to Parliament’s resources—individual MSPs do, but the groups do not. That seems to be okay as a way of working and it does not seem to have been a barrier to the groups’ efficiency. Has that been a barrier?

Dr McLaverty: The research does not show that people think that lack of access to parliamentary resources has been a barrier to the groups’ working effectively. There was no evidence to support that.

Mr Macintosh: You spoke about the positive suggestion that was put to you that a development worker would be a good idea. There is wide variety in the efficiency of the groups. I have observed from anecdotal evidence that some groups are rigorous and thorough—their minutes are up-to-date and produced quickly—but that other groups are less efficient.

Dr McLaverty: That is certainly true. The information in the annual returns varies considerably from group to group. Some groups are not very good at getting in their annual returns.

Mr Macintosh: Did that depend on who supplied the secretariat to the group? You have broken down the groups by whether their secretariat was provided by an MSP or MSP researcher, by an outside organisation or by a voluntary group or whatever. Did you draw any conclusions about the sort of support that is available for CPGs and how that related to their efficiency?

Dr McLaverty: We did not consider that in any great detail in relation to the groups’ annual returns. We did not study the relationship between whether a group had an external secretariat or internal secretariat and the details in their annual returns.

Mr Macintosh: It was a bit unfair to ask you that, because I do not necessarily think that you should be asked to make judgments on how efficient certain cross-party groups are. Is there a way of assessing the benefits of a certain type of set-up?

Dr McLaverty: There might be. We can certainly go back and see whether there is such a relationship.

Mr Macintosh: There is a wide variety of groups: some are quite small and focused, while others have large memberships including MSPs and other people. At one point in our discussions, it was proposed that we should have two types of cross-party group. Does the difference between the largest and smallest groups, or between the most efficient that meet most regularly and those that are less active, justify the idea that we could have two separate classifications of group, or would that be an unhelpful road to go down?

Dr McLaverty: I am not entirely sure how having two different classifications of group would help, or what purpose it would serve. Is the suggestion that they would be regulated differently and that there would be different expectations of them?

Mr Macintosh: I think so. The thought was expressed that some CPGs were run more like parliamentary committees than others about which there was more concern. I am not promoting the suggestion that there be different classifications of group; I am just saying that the point was made. Although there is a wide variety of groups, it does not seem to me that the variety is so great that the current rules—or a tightening of the rules—would not be able to encapsulate them all.

Dr McLaverty: That is my general position. I would not have thought that there was a strong case for having two separate categories of group. I do not know where the line would be drawn or what the criteria for each category would be that would make such a distinction worthwhile.

Mr Macintosh: A second suggestion—I think it was mine—was that because of the problem in the first session, which is still a problem, of MSPs’ being unable to attend cross-party groups, there could be two classifications of MSP membership. Many members will want to be active in several cross-party groups, while others will want to be a member of a group purely to get information, to be provided with the minutes and to see what is going on. My feeling was that when members add their name to a cross-party group, they raise expectations among its membership in relation to their attendance. I was trying to work out whether having two classes of membership would provide a way to handle that. I am not convinced that it would. Did that come out in your research?

Dr McLaverty: Nobody said that there should be two classes of MSP membership.

Mr Macintosh: To be fair, you said clearly at the beginning that attendance at the groups would be up to the MSP.

Dr McLaverty: That was the general finding of the research.

The Convener: There are, of course, members who kindly lend their names in order to allow groups to exist under the current regulations, for
which groups are grateful. Some such members are in this room—I am not looking at anyone in particular, Mr Gorrie. The question of efficiency is not necessarily the right question; it is more a matter of whether groups are delivering what the membership wants. A highly organised group might deliver precisely what its membership wants as, equally, might one that is organised more informally. Did you get that mix of views, or were most of the concerns expressed about the groups that were organised more informally? Was it felt that there should be a little more formality and regulation?

Dr McLaverty: The general feeling was that all groups should be treated the same and with a light touch. We interviewed a number of people who thought that the current regulations are too onerous and that there should be less regulation than there is at the moment. Others felt that the rules were not being implemented as clearly as they ought to be. There was no feeling that groups should be treated in different ways, regardless of whether they are defined as formal, informal, efficient or inefficient. I got no feeling from the interviews that were conducted that people felt that there should be different classes of CPG operating in different ways.

Alex Fergusson: On page 7 of the draft report, you list other key findings from the research. I am afraid that I left my copy of the report behind; I thank the official report staff for lending me theirs. I picked up on the last bullet point in that section, which states:

"The Scottish system is currently more regulated by Parliament than most of its counterparts elsewhere."

The first bullet point in that section states:

"Cross-party groups do not fit neatly into the wider framework of the Scottish Parliament’s institutional make-up."

Some of your recommendations are designed to get the groups to fit more neatly into the institutional make-up, yet you say that elsewhere there is even less regulation than there is in the Scottish Parliament’s set up. Does that mean that elsewhere cross-party groups, or their equivalents, fit even less neatly into the institutional framework of their Parliaments? If so, are they less effective or more effective? Have you done enough research to be able to comment on that?

Dr McLaverty: I have not done enough research to be able to comment on how effective similar groups in other Parliaments are. There does not seem to be anything in other Parliaments that is directly comparable with the Scottish Parliament’s cross-party groups. There are, elsewhere, groups in which parliamentarians from different parties come together, but it is not clear that they are set up on the same basis as are the Scottish Parliament’s cross-party groups and it is not clear that they have the similar relationships with outside groups and members of the public. I am not clear about that and research on it is limited; there is not a lot of information about. I am not sure that there are many real equivalents to the cross-party groups outside Westminster and the UK.
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The overwhelming way in which intergroups, as they tend to be called—where people from different parties work together—are regulated is by custom and practice: there are no formal rules. I suppose that the Scottish Parliament is in a different position. Its groups cannot be regulated by custom and practice because there is no custom and practice. It is difficult to know whether what CPGs can do is more restricted than what intergroups can do in other Parliaments. There was not enough scope for me to do that sort of comparison and getting the necessary information would have meant going out to people in other Parliaments and interviewing them.

Alex Fergusson: I accept that we cannot be ruled by custom, because there is none, which is refreshing. In the setting up of a new parliament it is to be encouraged that regulatory criteria for such groups be kept at an absolute minimum in order to allow such groups to flourish as best they can. Is that, in effect, what you agree with at the end of it all?

Dr McLaverty: I agree, but people need to be clear about what cross-party groups are for. Among those whom we interviewed there was some uncertainty about the purpose of cross-party groups and about how they relate to wider parliamentary activities. That needs to be clarified. There was a lot of uncertainty about what "parliamentary in character" means, and about whether cross-party groups are doing what they ought to be doing. There is a need to clarify that. Although I do not think that the Standards Committee or anybody else should dictate the substance of what cross-party groups do, the rules should be made to work; I presume that the rules exist to ensure that cross-party groups work in the best possible way. There is a need for monitoring.

The Convener: Mr Macintosh will have the privilege of asking the last question.

Mr Macintosh: I agree that cross-party groups can benefit or damage the Parliament, which is why we need to be careful about how they operate. They could be a huge asset or they could damage our reputation. While not forgetting the remarks that were made earlier about accessibility—in particular accessibility for individuals and people from disadvantaged
communities, which is a problem—do you agree that the cross-party groups have been welcomed as another method of accessing the Parliament?

I notice at the end of your report your comment on the general enthusiasm of everybody to whom you talked about cross-party groups. Do you agree that the cross-party groups have been a way in which the Parliament has communicated with civic Scotland and others, shared ideas, and been true to the founding principles of the Scottish Parliament?

Dr McLaverty: I agree very much with that. That was the attitude that came out of the interviews with MSPs, with people from other organisations and with individuals. There was a general feeling that cross-party groups were a good innovation. There might be one or two uncertainties about what the groups should be doing and about how they relate to the wider parliamentary structure, but the general feeling was positive: the groups are a good development and the Parliament would be much weaker without them.

The Convener: On behalf of the committee, I thank you for giving us so much of your time today, and I thank you for your draft report. We wish your colleagues a speedy recovery and we look forward to receiving the final report. As you have seen, there is a wide variety of views on the committee about how we will proceed. You have left us with the dilemma that we knew from the beginning would arise, which is how we will balance the light touch while holding cross-party groups properly to account.

Meeting closed at 11:33.
EIGHTH MEETING OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE
CHANGES TO SECTION 10 OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT

1. The Committee is invited to consider the attached draft report setting out amendments to section 10 of the Code of Conduct which the Committee agreed at its meeting on 25 May 2004.

2. The Committee is also invited to agree the following motion:

   Brian Adam MSP (on behalf of the Standards Committee): That the Parliament agrees to the changes to section 10 of the Code of Conduct for Members of the Scottish Parliament as set out in the Standards Committee’s 3rd Report 2004.
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Draft Report on Changes to Section 10 of the Code of Conduct for Members of the Scottish Parliament

The Committee reports to the Parliament as follows—

Background

1. The Code of Conduct for Members of the Scottish Parliament was agreed by the Parliament on 24 February 2000. The Standards Committee like its predecessor in the first Parliamentary session regards the Code as a ‘living document’ and keeps its provisions under review to ensure that they remain relevant, unambiguous and proportionate.

2. The Committee wishes to propose a series of amendments to section 10 of the Code of Conduct as set out in Annex A to this report. The proposed changes take account of recent Directions from the Standards Committee to the Standards Commissioner, which require that complainers be given an opportunity to make representations on the Commissioner’s draft factual findings prior to his or her report being finalised. The changes also clarify administrative procedures for handling correspondence during the complaints process, in light of the following points agreed by the Standards Committee at its meetings on 9 and 23 March 2004:

   • Any inquiry or complaint concerning the complaints procedure should be addressed to the Commissioner if the complaint is at Stage 1 or 2 and to the Standards Committee Clerks during Stage 3 or 4. Any complaint that the Commissioner considers relevant concerning the handling of the investigation at Stages 1 and 2 together with his response should be annexed to his Stage 2 report.

   • Any additional material relating to the complaint should be directed to the Commissioner during Stage 1 and 2 of his investigation.

   • Any additional material relating to a complaint at Stage 3 should be addressed to the Committee Clerks who will make this material available to the Committee when it carries out its initial consideration of the Commissioner’s report.
• When the Standards Commissioner’s report is submitted to the Parliament, the Committee Clerks will write to the parties to the complaint to advise them that the complaint is now at Stage 3.

• Should the Committee decide to conduct its own investigation at Stage 3, the Committee will provide guidance to the parties to the complaint on the format and timing of any written or oral submissions to be invited by the Committee.

• Any contact aimed at influencing members of the Standards Committee either individually or collectively or ‘lobbying’ by any party to a complaint which is under investigation by the Commissioner or consideration by the Committee will be viewed as unacceptable and reported accordingly.

• Should a member attempt to influence the Committee in this way, their behaviour would be viewed as discourteous and disrespectful towards the members of the Committee. Such behaviour could, of itself, be the subject of a complaint against that member.

• Material sent directly to members of the Standards Committee will be disregarded by the Committee.

• Persistent lobbying by the complainer may be considered an abuse of process and could lead to dismissal of the complaint.

Conclusion

3. The Standards Committee believes that the complaints procedure as set out in the Scottish Parliamentary Standards Commissioner Act 2002 and section 10 of the Code of Conduct provides a robust framework for handling complaints of misconduct against MSPs. The Committee believes that these changes will serve to enhance both the independence of the Commissioner and the integrity of the complaints process and asks the Parliament to endorse them.