

## CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

**Question 1 – Are there other areas you think the Partnership Agreement should address?**

No comment

**Question 2 – Do you think these thematic objectives will best address Scotland's short-term and long-term challenges?**

No comment

**Question 3 – Do you think there are any other thematic objectives which should be addressed?**

No comment

**Question 4 – Do you think the Scottish Themed Funds will address Scotland's key challenges?**

The Scottish Themed Funds appear to contain several areas of overlap and duplication.

Specifically, the 'Social Inclusion and Local Development Theme' needs to be widened out beyond employability to incorporate measures which will reduce all forms of deprivation and inequality. The Edinburgh Partnership Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) identifies actions to tackle key economic, health, educational and social priorities in the city.

**Question 5 – How do you think the governance and delivery arrangements will impact on your sector?**

There is no obvious benefit to combining numerous Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) together. There are no efficiency gains to be had from artificially combining CPPs, and such an arrangement is likely to lead to confusion as to where ultimate responsibility lies.

It is far from clear how these would work operationally and there would seem to be a degree of legal complexity (see note below regarding the non incorporation of CPPs) at the centre of it all. CPPs are delivering successfully at the moment via P5 with full Third Sector and other partner involvement. It would be simpler to extend the scope of their remit in terms of the activity that is funded, rather than create new structures which do not fit with the CPP construct.

Voluntary collaborations (as currently exists with the Edinburgh and Midlothian CPPs) are of course fine as these are properly tuned to local circumstances.

**Question 6 – How do you think the governance and delivery arrangements will impact on your organisation?**

The Edinburgh CPP welcomes the opportunity for full involvement in the delivery of the 2014-2020 Programmes. This will build on the considerable experience already gained from running complex, multi partner programmes (Competitive Communities and Strategic Skills Pipeline) that fit the local agenda. The intended role of CPPs does, however, need further clarification and the clear difference between local authorities as distinct entities and CPPs (which include local authorities together with other partners including the Third Sector) needs to be made clear in the proposals. The terms are not interchangeable. The capacity of CPPs to ‘own’ operations is, however, limited by non incorporation which has necessitated the local authorities to act as lead partners. This issue needs to be addressed.

**Question 7 – Are there any unidentified governance or delivery arrangements that could aid simplification of the future programmes and ensure that the Structural Funds complement each other?**

Community Planning Partnerships will need to be assisted with capacity to manage if this is the way the funds are to be delivered. This may require a financial contribution from the Scottish Government in the form of technical assistance money and/or appropriate seconded/delegated staff.

The simplification agenda is to be welcomed and should help to ensure positive performance. However it is imperative that a simplified claims and compliance process is not replaced with a more complicated delivery structure. Governance and delivery arrangements need to be established up front with roles and responsibilities fully clarified.

**Question 8 – What other delivery options do you think would be feasible for delivering youth employment initiatives?**

**Question 9 – What other measures could be taken to reduce the audit and control pressures?**

**Question 10 – Do you have any further comments on the proposals?**

Further consultation and discussion on the proposals with all Community Planning Partnerships directly would be helpful and welcome.

It seems premature and somewhat inappropriate to have two named CPPs (Dundee and North Ayrshire) on the shadow Strategic Delivery Partnership for Competitiveness, Innovation and Jobs when there is no CPP involvement in the other two shadow SDPs.

The SDP for the Social Inclusion and Local Development Theme is of particular relevance to CPP priorities.