ACCOUNTS COMMISSION FOR SCOTLAND

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL: REPORTS BY THE CONTROLLER OF AUDIT ON THE AUDIT OF BEST VALUE AND COMMUNITY PLANNING AND ON THE PROPERTY SALES INVESTIGATION

PUBLIC HEARING

at

Town and County Hall, Town House, Castle Street, Aberdeen on

Tuesday 13th May and Wednesday 14th May 2008

BEFORE:

MR JOHN BAILLIE
(Chairman)
MS ANN FAULDS
MR KEITH GEDDES
MR IAIN ROBERTSON
MR DOUGLAS SINCLAIR

DAY ONE, Tuesday 13th May

From the shorthand notes of Ubiqus Cliffords Inn, Fetter Lane, London EC4A 1LD Telephone: 0207 269 0370

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Let me extend a warm welcome to this public hearing. My name is John Baillie and I am Chair of the Accounts Commission. In a moment I will take you through the procedures that we will be following over the course of this public hearing but first of all I will ask Catherine Coull, the Secretary of the Accounts Commission, to go through with you the usual health and safety announcements in any public hall.

MS COULL: Thank you, and good morning. Aberdeen City Council obviously has a no smoking policy and so you are requested to refrain from smoking at all times whilst in the building. In the event of a fire or another emergency requiring the evacuation of the building you will hear a continuous single tone and you should proceed immediately out of the building via the designated exit routes, either out through the door through which you came in, back down the staircase and down to the ground floor, or the alternative means of escape is through the door at this end of the hall into the Bon Accord Room, and from there you can access the escape stairwell via the fire door in the middle of the far wall. When you get out of the building you should proceed to the Arts Centre in Queen Street where we would wait until clearance is given to return to the building.

The closest toilets are located on your right hand side as you approach the main spiral staircase.

It would be appreciated if mobile phones could be switched off or put on to silent mode.

For anyone with hearing difficulties there is a hearing loop system in this room linked to the sound system, so if you wish to put your hearing aids to the 'T' position you should be able to hear via that system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Catherine.

This is a formal meeting of the Accounts Commission for Scotland under section 103 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973. This is a hearing in respect of a report by the Controller of Audit on the audit of Best Value and Community Planning in Aberdeen City Council. Copies of that report have been available on Audit Scotland's website and there are copies available here today for the public. This is also a hearing in respect of the report by the Controller of Audit into the property sales investigation of the Council. Copies of that report have also been made available on the website and again there are copies available here today.

When the Accounts Commission receives a report by the Controller of Audit it can do all or any of the following, or indeed none of them: direct the Controller of Audit to carry out further investigations; hold a hearing; state its findings. The purpose of this hearing is to allow the Commission to give consideration to the Controller of Audit's reports with a view to making findings. Those findings may include recommendations for action and may be directed to the Council or to Scottish Ministers. If recommendations are made to Ministers they may include a recommendation that a Ministerial Order be made requiring the Council to take any action specified in the order.

We are therefore here to listen to representations that will be made and to ask questions that will help us reach our findings. I would stress that the Commission does not have a role in setting Council policy and so, while we can make recommendations, we do not have powers to decide matters regarding the running of a council. We have received some representations regarding the effect of budget cuts. Decisions such as those relating to the amount of funding of services are primarily matters for councils to decide and, while we have read with interest all the submissions sent to us, we do not have powers to overturn the decisions of the Council.

We have also received a number of representations regarding the recent decisions on the future of a number of schools. Again we have read these with interest but we have no powers to change the decisions of the Council in this regard.

We are not here to act and operate as a court of law and I will attempt to keep proceedings as informal and relaxed as is appropriate, consistent always with the aim of allowing those who wish to express their views to do so and to allow the Commission to obtain a clear understanding of the issues.

Let me introduce you to the other members of the Commission who are here today; on my extreme left Iain Robertson, next to me Douglas Sinclair; on my extreme right is Keith Geddes, then Ann Faulds, and sitting next to me on my right is Catherine Coull, the Secretary of the Commission. As I say, Catherine Coull is the Secretary and we may refer to her for advice during the hearing. If you are giving evidence to the hearing could I ask you, please, if you would make yourself known to Catherine at an appropriate break in the proceedings if you have not already done so.

A note of the procedure that we will follow has been made available to witnesses and copies are again available in the hall. We intend to hear in the first instance from the Controller of Audit and where appropriate the audit team. We will then ask representatives of the Council to give evidence, and in addition to

that we have invited a number of other individuals and bodies to speak.

We received a number of applications but the following are those who will be asked to speak, and you can see from my shuffling of paper here that this has been changing right up to the last minute. Firstly we will ask Audit Scotland; we will then ask Aberdeen City Council; then Councillor Alan Milne, Leader of the Conservative Group, and Councillor Leonard Ironside thereafter, Leader of the Labour Group; then Karen Donnelly from Unison; then there will be a joint hearing of four representatives of unions, Janet Adams of GMB, Grant Bruce, EIS, Graham Trann, Unite (Amicus), and Tommy Campbell, Unite (T&G); then Rhonda Kelly, Chief Executive of the Aberdeen Council of Voluntary Organisations; Paul Hannan, Chief Executive of the Cyrenians; and, finally, Sultan Feroz, Aberdeen Trades Union Council.

We received a number of applications to be heard from other individuals. We have applied the following criteria to those applications: the relevance to the audit report; the relevance to the Commission's particular areas of interest in the report; the contribution to assisting the Commission in considering the report; and whether the individual is an individual or is a representative of a group. We have therefore had to decline to invite a number of people to give evidence.

Each witness or group of witnesses will be given the opportunity to make an opening statement and we have asked them to confine this to a maximum of 10 minutes, please. Members of the Commission in turn will then ask questions of the witnesses. At the conclusion of each witness's evidence I will give them the opportunity to say anything else that they wish us to take into account.

The Controller's reports cover a wide variety of issues, and again I must stress that the purpose of the hearing is to allow the Commission to make findings on those reports. As I have said, we appreciate the concerns regarding particular budget cuts and in relation to the decision to close a number of schools. However, I do reiterate that the hearing will be restricted to the matters covered in the Controller of Audit's reports.

The particular issues therefore that we wish to address are these: firstly, the pace of improvement in achieving the Council's vision for the area; secondly, the capacity of the Council to secure change; thirdly, why the staff commitment to the programme of change does not seem to have been achieved; fourthly, the Council's financial position; and, last, the issues arising from the report on the property sales and in particular the management and governance arrangements pertaining to these and future transactions.

Let me stress that the issues we are exploring in relation to the property sales do not relate to the actions taken by any individual member of staff and I cannot and will not allow any evidence that attempts to apportion responsibility to any member of staff. Our interest is in the management and governance arrangements of the Council.

This first session of the hearing will last until around 1 o'clock. We will reconvene after lunch and it is likely that the hearing will be adjourned and reconvene tomorrow at 10 am. That at least is our tentative plan. At the conclusion of all the proceedings I will adjourn the hearing so that the Commission can consider the Controller of Audit's reports in the light of what it has heard and make its findings thereafter as expeditiously as possible. If it is necessary for the hearing to be reconvened I shall do so, although I obviously hope that that will not be necessary.

Can I just say finally, ladies and gentlemen, I give you another reminder about mobile phones; can you please make sure they are off. I have just checked mine and it is off.

Let me then ask the first witness, Caroline Gardner, Controller of Audit, to make an opening statement.

Opening statement by Caroline Gardner, Controller of Audit

MS GARDNER: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning. I would like to start by introducing the members of my team. On my left I have Cathie Wyllie, who is a partner with Henderson Loggie, the external auditors of Aberdeen City Council. On my right is Antony Clark, who is Assistant Director in the Public Reporting Group who oversaw the finalisation of the audit of the Council; and on my far right is David Pia, who is the Director of Public Reporting for all our local government work. We hope that together we will be able to answer any questions you may have. Before that I would like to start by briefly summarising the key findings from the Best Value audit report on Aberdeen City Council. I will then go on to mention my recent report on property disposals and its links with the Best Value audit findings before finishing with a short explanation of the reasons for the extended period over which the audit took place and how I assured myself that the Best Value audit report gives an up to date picture of the Council as at March 2008.

Starting with the Best Value audit report, it is clear that Aberdeen City

Council has been involved in an ambitious programme of modernisation and change for over a decade. Progress is being made but we believe there is still a significant gap between its aspiration to be a leading council in northern Europe and the reality on the ground in some areas. As the report makes clear, overall service performance remains mixed. Several recent inspection reports have identified significant weaknesses in the Council's core services of education, social work and housing, and a further inspection report on social work services is expected soon which is also likely to be very critical.

Aspects of some services are very good, such as the usage of learning centres and learning access points, the speed of assessing people who are homeless, and the condition of roads in Aberdeen, but even within those service areas there are performance weaknesses. Mixed progress within and across the range of services is a common pattern in Aberdeen city.

While the Council's long-standing commitment to continuous improvement is leading to change in some areas service improvements cannot be consistently demonstrated and the Council acknowledges that it has found difficulty in putting its vision into practice and achieving the changes it desires. Elected members, the Chief Executive and his management team have all felt frustrated by the slow pace of change which they attribute to a culture of non-compliance with corporate systems and processes, and they believe this explains why corporate initiatives have not succeeded in the past.

We believe there is still a long way to go in achieving a culture where the Council can demonstrate that all its services are improving. The Council's leadership has struggled to take staff with it and there is poor morale. We found particular difficulties with staff understanding of the relationship between strategic leadership at the centre of the Council and the new area based service delivery arrangements. The Council does recognise that it needs to secure better understanding and commitment among staff to its programme of change and it is clear that effective staff involvement in the transformation programme will be central if that is going to happen.

At the same time the Council's financial position is precarious. It has had significant deficits over the last two years and a further deficit is forecast for the financial year that has just finished. The balance on the general fund is forecast to be £2.9 million at the end of March, which is significantly below the £9.3 million required under Council policy and likely to be below the level required to cover the financial pressures that the Council faces. Rebuilding that financial

position at the same time as improving services is bound to be a major challenge and we are concerned that the Council has failed to deliver its planned savings in the past.

The new management team is showing signs of progress and the Council has committed significant additional resources to supports its transformation strategies. But we believe it is not yet possible to say whether the Council's leadership has the capacity and capability to transform the organisational culture and deliver the service improvements which it recognises are needed.

Moving briefly on to the property disposal report, the Commission considered this report at its meeting on 30th April. I issued this second report because it reinforced concerns about scrutiny and about organisational culture which were highlighted in the Best Value report, and in particular the finding that while members are keen to scrutinise service performance the information they receive to do so is not always fit for purpose.

The property disposal report was based on preliminary enquiries by external auditors into the sale of Carden House following which senior officers of the Council asked internal audit to carry out a wider review of property transactions between 2001 and early 2006. The investigation identified some serious problems: evidence of procedural and administrative deficiencies and poor record keeping; cases where accurate and relevant information was not reported to elected members; a lack of evidence to support the valuation at which some properties were sold; and cases where the Council may have achieved a better price. Overall it appears that there is a potential loss of capital receipts which may be more than £5 million.

The Council has taken action in these areas but I decided that it was in the public interest to report these concerns so that the Commission could take them into account in considering the overall position at the Council.

I would like to finish by saying a few words about the time taken to finalise the Best Value audit report. The main audit field work on which the report is based took place between November 2006 and January 2007 but completion of the audit report was delayed by the elections last May and by the illness of two key members of the audit team. In the light of that delay we identified a senior member of staff, Antony Clark, to complete the audit report and a draft of the report was submitted to Council in November last year. Because of the time taken to reach that stage I asked the Council to submit additional evidence to bring it up to date and also to reflect changes and progress made since the field

work was carried out.

Over 40 additional pieces of evidence were submitted by the Council as part of that process and these were reviewed and taken into account in preparing the final audit report. On that basis I am confident that the report considered by the Commission presents an accurate position of the Council's situation in March. For example, the judgment about the financial position was based on the Council's February 2008 budget monitoring and the Council's approval in mid February of transformation strategies for environmental services, sports services and waste management is also reflected in the audit judgments.

I hope that I have given you a useful summary of the overall position for my reports. I will stop there but the team and I are obviously happy to do our best to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I shall lead off with some questions and then invite my colleagues to follow if they have any further questions. Let us first, if we may, go to the pace of change. You draw in your report attention to the clear and ambitious vision of the Council but of course you also say there are serious concerns about how well it is performing. What are the main reasons for your concerns?

MS GARDNER: I think they are threefold, Chair. The first is the problems which are evidenced from a range of sources about problems in the main services the Council is responsible for. We have had critical reports in relation to social work, education and housing, and we understand that a forthcoming report by the Social Work Inspection Agency is also likely to be critical of social work services. That is clearly an important marker of problems, even though, as I have said, there are other areas where services are performing well.

There also appears to be a particular challenge for the Council in getting staff commitment to the change that it is seeking to achieve. That is evidenced by information from the Council itself about staff morale and some of the problems there but also from a range of information which suggests to us that people do not understand well the operation of the neighbourhood based service delivery arrangements and how that relates to the corporate centre of the Council.

The third area is obviously the financial position. Over the last two or three years the position of the Council has worsened significantly and we are now in a position where significant financial savings are needed in order to bring the budget back into balance. Doing that while still achieving the improvements in services that the Council recognises it wants to make will be a real challenge, we

believe. 1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You mentioned the financial position and you 2 3 mentioned that it is precarious. What are the main factors contributing to that 4 position? MS GARDNER: I will ask Cathie Wyllie to answer that question on my behalf, if I 5 may. As the external auditor Cathie is very closely involved in the detail of the 6 financial position at the Council. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Just before you do that, can I check that our stenographer is picking up everything? Can I ask everyone to speak up just slightly? Thank you. 9 MS GARDNER: We will do our best, thank you, Chair. 10 MS WYLLIE; I think the main reason for the precarious 11 12 conclusion is that, as you can see for the last three years, including the year that has 13 just finished, there has been a budgeted expenditure that was in excess of the 14 income of the Council, but in addition to that there has also been overspending 15 against the budget so that in total over the last three years the amount that has come from reserves to support the revenue spending has been almost £70 million. 16 Given that situation obviously there is a need for that to be brought back into 17 18 balance. That kind of spending cannot go on for ever because the reserves are not there to allow that spending to continue. 19 20 THE CHAIRMAN: And the overspending against budget, is that something you could comment on further? 21 22 MS WYLLIE: Yes. I think there have been a number of reasons for the 23 overspending and there have been some savings that have gone to help to mitigate the overspending. The main reasons for overspending in the last two 24 25 years have been the compensatory payments for equal pay that were made in 2005/06 which totalled £171/2 million, and in 2006/07 overspends against social 26 27 work services of £6½ million and waste disposal of just over £2 million, these are 28 the main overspends that have occurred. THE CHAIRMAN: We will come back to these matters later in discussion with the 29 Council, but thank you for that. Still with the financial position, you draw 30 31 attention to the low level of reserves of the general fund. Do you think this is a 32 real problem? 33 MS WYLLIE: The difficulty with the low level of these funds is that there are then 34 no reserves to draw on when unexpected expenditure arises in the coming year. 35 THE CHAIRMAN: So that such a decline in reserves is quite a serious matter? 36 MS WYLLIE: Yes. I think if you look at the commitment that the Council has had

against the general reserve at the end of each year in the last two or three years they have been around £10 million or more, so to have only a reserve of £2 million to £3 million at this stage means that there is not enough for the commitments that are likely to be there at the end of the year.

- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Again we will again come back to that matter in discussion with the Council. Regarding the delay in completing the audit report, you touched on this in your opening statement. The period between starting the audit and completing the report seems really quite long. Is that unusual?
- MS GARDNER: Yes, this audit did take longer than certainly our plan for audits in general and our practice in most audits to date. As I said, that was due to two factors; firstly the elections in May here in Aberdeen and across Scotland but also because of ill health in two key members of the audit team. With your permission I will ask David Pia to talk a little more about the detail of that and how we managed it.
- MR PIA: As Caroline Gardner has said, the main reasons for the delay were the ill health of two of the managers of the team, and when it became apparent in the spring of last year that neither of them was going to be able to return to work in fact we brought in a more senior person, Antony Clark, to lead the audit team. We discussed the implications of all of this with the Council and we decided in the autumn of last year to invite the Council to submit further evidence so as to ensure that the audit report was up to date, and the Council did, as we said, submit over 40 pieces of additional evidence. We have had many discussions with the Council about the implications of the delay and we are confident that the report is up to date and indeed the report refers to events, reports and so on dated up until February of this year.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let us then move on to another point you mentioned in your introduction, which was the disposals of property. You issued that in very short order after the best value report. Can you explain why you decided to issue the report on property disposals at this particular time?
- MS GARDNER: Yes. While the Best Value audit report was being finalised the external auditors were looking at the process on our behalf and agreeing a report with the Council which summarised the position that had been the case between 2001 and early 2006 and getting up to speed on what action the Council had taken in response to that. I was obviously very conscious both on the one hand of the importance of the issues but on the other of the need to make sure the audit process did not prejudice any potential disciplinary or criminal proceedings that

might flow from that. So the decision I took when the Best Value audit report was being finalised was simply to refer to the issue as one which gave rise to concern and to take further advice on the best choice of timing for the audit report on property disposals.

Having looked closely at the issues that were involved, the action taken by the Council and the information we were able to gather about any follow-up to that action in terms of either disciplinary or criminal proceedings, I decided that the best course of action was to issue a public interest report which focused on the general questions for the Council around the governance of the property disposals and to make that available to the Commission in its consideration of the best value audit report. It was not an easy decision but I hope it was the right one on balance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ann, you have a question you want to put.

MS FAULDS: I would like to ask a question about the property report. In the Council's written submission to the hearing they say that far more stringent operational and quality assurance arrangements are now in place in relation to their property disposals and acquisitions. When you invited the Council to provide an update in preparing the Best Value report for reporting to the Commission in March this year did you have any evidence from the Council about these new arrangements on the property side?

MS GARDNER: Yes. At the same time that the Best Value report was being finalised I had written to the Chief Executive, once I had received the external auditors' report on property disposals, asking what action he had taken and received a very full response at that stage of new procedures and systems that had been put in place. What we have not been able to do so far is to go and look at the operation of those changes to see how effective they are being in practice. That is something that I expect will take place as part of this year's audit work.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion earlier about the financial circumstances referred to single status or equity, equal pay, I think, and waste management. Have you seen any plans or budgets since then that address these spending problems?

MS GARDNER: Again I will ask Cathie Wyllie to respond to that question.

MS WYLLIE: There are plans to address the cost of these and some of that is tied up with the transformation programmes that the Council is currently undertaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: And do they address the issue? Do they contain the spending?

MS WYLLIE: I think if you look at the budgets that have been set for the next three years they are quite tough budgets in terms of the cuts that are required in order

to balance the books again and these things are tied up with the balancing of the overall position.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me then go back on something else. If you were to read the Chief Executive's statement as part of the submission of evidence on behalf of him and the Council there is reference to significant progress having been made in the last 18 months. Could you comment on that?

MS GARDNER: I think there certainly is some evidence of progress being made. For example, it appears that the Corporate Management Team is working well together, flows of information are improving, and we have seen agreement of a number of transformation strategies that start to get under the surface of changes that are needed for services like social work. More specifically we have seen some real improvements in things like the level of housing voids and the number of delayed discharges in Aberdeen, so there are some indicators of real improvement happening. But I think it is also fair to say we have seen some evidence of slippage on the transformation strategies being put into practice. There is still a question for us about staff ownership of the level of change that is required and perhaps most importantly, and auditors always say this, in some ways it is too early to see the evidence of those changes in terms of improved services rather than commitments and aspirations for the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You mentioned some slippage. Can you be more precise?

MS GARDNER: I think that is a question really best placed to the Council but within the transformation strategies there are some commitments to action which appear to be slipping behind target and, as Cathie Wyllie has said, we also have questions about the precision with which the savings that the budget is predicated on have been set in practice at this stage.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me then turn to one or two remaining questions I have on finance. Do you have a view about how realistic the budget for 2008/09 is?

MS GARDNER: Again I will ask Cathie Wyllie to answer that.

MS WYLLIE: I think, as I said, the savings that require to be made are quite significant and there are a number of these that are dependent on the review of services which have not yet finished or in some way may not yet have started. So I think that there is quite a lot of work to do in order to actually achieve these savings. Some work has already been done and there is some evidence of savings beginning to come through, but there is still a lot to be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Accountants are always very nervous of the future and talking

about the future and forecasting, but is there any feeling you have? Are you 2 sceptical about the achievement of these budgets, or is that an unfair question of 3 you? MS WYLLIE: That might be an unfair question. I think there is a lot of work that 4 needs to be done to achieve these and past experience does not have a good track 5 record. 6 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. What happens if the budget for 2008/09 is not 7 achieved? We have a precarious position as described in your report; it becomes 8 9 I suppose even more precarious. When does "even more precarious" become disaster? 10 MS WYLLIE: At the point when all of the reserves have been used up and the figure 11 12 goes into negative reserve. 13 THE CHAIRMAN: So if the budgets for 2008/09 are not achieved, if they are not achieved by something like £2 million? What is the reserve position just now, 14 15 did you say? MS WYLLIE: The projected reserve position at the end of March is just under £3 16 17 million in the general reserve. There is also I think - you can check this with the 18 Council - projected to be just over £4 million in the HRA account, and there is also some money still in the capital fund but that can only be used for certain 19 20 types of expenditure. THE CHAIRMAN: So it is certainly even more precarious if it is not achieved, 21 22 obviously? MS WYLLIE: Yes. 23 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me then turn finally to the housing revenue 25 account. Over the period of, say, 10 years to the current position we see there are 26 some ups and downs in the account. In the years 2002/03, 2003/04 and 2006/07 27 there are substantial overspends against budget. Is that correct? 28 MS WYLLIE: Can you give me a minute to double check? 29 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course, take your time. It is important to get the 30 information accurate. 31 MS GARDNER: I am sorry for the delay. Cathie is just double-checking these 32 figures and will talk you through them. 33 MS WYLLIE: I think in these years there were budgeted over-spends but the actual 34 outturn was better than the budgeted position. 35 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, quite significantly, and then again, I think the record is that 36 more recently we have gone into this overspend in 2006/07, where we have £3/4

million surplus budgeted and a £1.7 million deficit. Is that correct for 2006/07?

MS WYLLIE: No, I think the budget was a deficit and the actual is a positive.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, but it is still a bigger deficit; thank you. Let me just check with my colleagues if they have any other questions.

MR SINCLAIR: Cam I just ask one question, if I may. You mentioned the difficulty in getting staff commitment to change, staff ownership of change, but of course that is not unique to any one council, it is a challenge for all councils to become more customer focused. What in your opinion are the reasons why it has been more difficult or less successful in Aberdeen than any other council?

MS GARDNER: The reason why that question has got such prominence in my report is because of the emphasis that was placed on it by the Council's leadership as being a reason for the difficulties that they had faced in bringing about the significant change in improvement that they were looking for. That was certainly supported by evidence from staff surveys, for example, and from the contact with staff that we had as part of the audit work. It is very difficult for us I think to speculate about what the reasons for it might be but one theme that did come through repeatedly in discussions with staff was their failure to understand the way in which the neighbourhood based service delivery which is now in place in the Council was connected to the strategic centre and the long term planning for change that is going on. It seems that there is an important issue there which has made the change more difficult in Aberdeen than we might have expected it to be. The underlying reasons, though, I think are better explored with the Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? (Negative)

Is there anything that you would wish to add before we finish this particular session?

MS GARDNER: Thank you, Chairman. I hope the report speaks for itself and if you have any questions about the finances with the last area of questions that we were focusing on we would be happy to provide more information in consultation with the Council to inform your consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Could I now ask the Aberdeen City Council witnesses to come forward and take a seat.

Lady and gentlemen, good morning and welcome to you. Thank you for coming along to help us with our hearing, and also thank you for your written submissions which we have read very carefully. I understand that you would wish to make an opening statement.

MS DEAN: Yes, please, and thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity.

Opening statement by Councillor Katharine Dean,

Leader of the Council

MS DEAN: I am grateful for the opportunity really to update you, I think, on what has happened since the audit visit which ended in January 2007, notwithstanding the fact that additional evidence has been put in there; but if you do not mind, and I appreciate that time is short, I would like to start a little earlier than that, going back to the previous administration, 2003 to 2007.

I think the first thing that I need to say is that virtually everything that has happened within this Council has been under the cloud or the shadow, however you want to put it, of single status. This has been a very big issue for us, not just because of the fact that we are trying to use this as a way of modernising terms and conditions and modernising the way we deliver services but also because we do this in the climate of being an area where there is a surfeit of employment. We have basically a less than 1 per cent unemployment rate here; there is great competition for staff which I know is not the same across the country, and while I do not use that as an excuse I set it in the background.

I would ask you also to try to estimate the challenge that I took on in 2003, firstly leading more than 50 per cent new members of Council and also leading a new administration with a relatively small majority. On paper that majority was three working together with the Conservative group; in reality we had one member who began and ended the Council's session on long term sick, which takes us down to two, and we did end with a resignation in the last six months of the Council, giving us a working majority of one.

While there was a recognition of the need to change both the culture and the ways of working within the Council, and I think significant progress has been made on that, as has been mentioned by the Controller of Audit, obviously given a very slim majority within the Council the taking of hard decisions was not always easy. One in particular that I would refer to was a service which was looked to be set up, and in fact it was the only vote that the administration lost in full Council, it was a service which the Cyrenians, who you are hearing from later, were setting up in Fonthill Terrace in Aberdeen, which was a tolerant wet house to deal with people with significant alcohol problems. As I say, the only vote that we lost within that administration was because two of our members wished to support the setting up of this at a cost of approximately £½ million at a time when we were dealing with significant overspends in the social work

budget. I say that just by way of background; life is never designed to be easy but that is the way of the world.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

Dealing with the four issues that are listed on the invitation to speak here, starting with the pace of improvement, which I think we would all agree has been slower than any of us would wish, and I would wish that for the sake of the staff, not just for the sake of first term service delivery; while change is a constant, they tell us now, I know that it is unsettling for staff members, particularly, as I say, with the shadow of single status, I think the two things kind of work together. The audit visit in the end of 2006/beginning of 2007 gives a snapshot when our new Corporate Management Team were not long in place and our heads of service had just been appointed. Since then I think we have seen significant differences. Our transformation strategies have been formulated and have started to roll out, and I think to me the important thing about that is that change within the Council in terms of the transformation strategies is no longer top-down but is in fact front line-back. We have long realised that the people who best know how to deliver our services are those on the ground and delivering them and I think it is important that we take their advice. To me the more successful of the transformation strategies so far, particularly in terms of housing repairs, has been because we listen to the people who actually do the repairs. I would hope that is one of the things that is now beginning to change the way we are looking at this.

But I would say that every change has involved a battle not only with the opposition in the councillors but also in some cases with the trade unions who seem to see no need for change but would rather that things remain as they are, and this despite the blueprint structure being agreed upon, indeed agreed on an all party basis in 2001. This was a group which worked hard and well together to look at what was good and what was bad in the Council and to come up with our ways forward.

I think the other thing that we have seen since the audit visit is a definite improvement in the performance management information that we are receiving. Even just looking at this year's budget, we had much more information. The Citistat process, which we were asked to trial on behalf of the Scottish Executive and we have continued to use very successfully, actually gives a degree of scrutiny and challenge which has been of great assistance to us.

In terms of the capacity to secure change, it has been described as turning an ocean liner and I do think that that is a fairly apt description. But as these

transformations roll out I think each one is providing an example to other services of how our front line staff are being listened to, and I am sincerely hopeful that that is actually beginning to permeate across the Council, that people are now starting to see change as not something that is being done to them but it is something that they should be involved in and that their ideas can actually come through this.

Having said that, I think we are happy to accept any advice or help with regard to this. We do not underestimate the challenge that is ahead of us. But I would also say that the structure which has come in since the elections in 2007 where as well as our committed conveners we have lead councillors for various strategic parts of the work, these are people who are there to help to drive and to challenge these agendas and to ensure that they are moving forward.

In terms of staff commitment to change I have talked already about the fact that the trade unions in rightly standing up for their members and we have had various disagreements, shall we say, over the way forward. One of the big ones has been on market testing which I know is something that has been mentioned in the audit report.

We have looked to try to market test and more is under way at the moment because we know that that is the way to ensure that we are getting best value; but understandably that is seen as a threat by the trade unions representing their members. In many cases when we have tried to change things we have had disputes lodged which have obviously held up the process; again, as mentioned previously, a lack of support from the opposition; and I am sorry to go back to the single status again but I think we do have to recall that while we are trying to deal with single status and trying to ensure that we are in the best possible negotiations with the trade unions over this, it does mean that we are almost hampered in some other directions on that.

I would refer you to the unknowns of single status which I think in terms of individual staff members has been quite a strain on them, and I would not underestimate that, but I think we are at the stage where those unknowns are now known and the system whereby we can preserve salaries for three years and attempt to re-engineer the jobs is much better understood by individual members of staff when they have seen their own circumstances down on paper.

While there will be appeals against that, I am convinced of that, I think it is very much a better situation for us because people know where they are and know what they are up against as opposed to being up against an unknown. I do

believe there are strategies in place to deal with the morale issues in the Council, as has been mentioned in the Chief Executive's submission, and I think it is important that we all work together to work through those.

In terms, briefly, of the financial position, I spoke about the difficulty of making unpopular decisions with a small majority and I think that is why it has become so much more obvious that some of those unpopular decisions which we feel have to be made have been made since the new administration came into power. I would say that in the early days of this Council when coalition discussions were ongoing, finance formed a major part of that. There were discussions between all the major groups in terms of trying to find partnerships and, as I say, having spoken to the SNP group and looked at our manifestos and seen what was in common and then seen the differences and spoken through that, the next question was then what is not in the manifestos, and that was very seriously taken right at the very beginning of that.

I think it is fair to say, and I will not speak for Councillor Stewart but certainly on behalf of my own group one of the reasons that we are not in coalition with the Labour group was that their manifesto commitments would have involved probably an extra £10 million of expenditure in the last year in terms of things which had previously been savings which they wanted to see undone. That was not acceptable to my group and I will leave Councillor Stewart to speak about that. But the hard decisions have been made in this year's budget. I think they are inevitable because of the costs of the single status, equal pay and modernisation, the rising costs of social work and children's services, which are big issues for us.

You said in your introductory remarks about the school estates strategy, and while I do not wish to go into detail on that on your instruction I think it is important to realise that that is one of the decisions that we have had to make to ensure that we are trying to direct our expenditure towards the education of children rather than towards buildings, and I think that is an important part of it there. We have a drive to bring home those who were educated outside the authority, because again that is a major expenditure. The transformation strategy in social work has been agreed along with changes to the eligibility criteria which again have been very important to us because that is a big shift that we felt we had to make, and that brings us much more in line with our comparator councils.

Also, regarding the Budget Monitoring Board I am interested to hear the Controller of Audit say that this will be a challenging budget to achieve; I think we are all aware of that. The Budget Monitoring Board will be looking not only at this year's budget on a virtually monthly basis to try to ensure that all the savings are on track but will also be planning towards next year's budget so that we can ensure that our hopefully new found robust budgeting is able to continue into the future.

In terms of the property transactions I will not say much on that because I think others will be better placed to do that. I would be happy to answer questions such as they are but I would say that in terms of transactions involving NHS Grampian I had to declare an interest in that because I represent the Council on the Board of NHS Grampian.

Beyond that, just in conclusion, again I would like to thank you for the opportunity to say what has happened in the last 18 months here. I believe that we have come a long way. I believe we have the plans in place to look to the future. The changes that we introduced in 2005 came with a recommendation of review in 2008 and I would expect that to be undergone, probably started at the end of the summer, which will then look at the entire structure, along with any recommendations we have from yourselves. I hope you will agree that we have certainly moved since the date of the actual audit but would assure you again that we are happy to accept advice and any assistance that may be on offer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Councillor Dean. Councillor Stewart, did you want to say anything specifically? You were almost invited to do so by Councillor Dean a moment ago.

MR STEWART: I was almost invited to do so but I have not prepared anything. What I would add to what Councillor Dean has said, what I would say is that the audit itself took place November 2006 to January 2007. I have to say that in some regards there were few surprises in the audit. We recognised that there are budgetary difficulties and that is why we have gone through the process that we have in what has been a very difficult budget in some folks' eyes and also have pressed ahead with the transformations that are required.

We have, as Councillor Dean has said, a duty to ensure best value for the citizens of this city. I think we are moving forward. Regarding some comments that were made previously in terms of this year's budget, the 2008/09 budget, we realise that it is a very difficult budget to deliver but we have, as I say, moved on with the transformation. Not only just that, we have moved on in terms of how we deal with these matters with the Budget Monitoring Board.

We have already looked at options in case we do not deliver the savings that

we have in place, plan B, if you like, Chair, in terms of some of holding some of the corporate investment fund which we have put in place for the transformation and also looking at leaving some capital spend until the end of the financial year to see how that is going. So that has been looked at. Also, as Councillor Dean pointed out, that board is already looking at the pressures that there will be in the 2009/10 budget, so we are very aware of the difficulties that may arise and we are planning to deal with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I believe the Chief Executive, Mr Paterson, would like to make an opening statement.

Opening statement by Mr Douglas Paterson, Chief Executive

MR PATERSON: Thank you.

I will reflect on the key issues that the Commission has raised and that Audit Scotland has raised in their report as briefly as I can without repeating things that Councillors Dean and Stewart have raised. If I start with the rate of progress in achieving the vision, the statement actually is the vision for the area and what we have to be clear about is that there are actually two visions; there is a vision for the area, the city and surrounding area, which is set out in the Community Plan, and there is a vision for the Council, and clearly the vision for the Council complements what we would seek to achieve with partners for the area.

The report itself indicates that in terms of the achievement of the vision for the area we actually have been highly successful. We have clearly set out targets in the Community Plan, we have been working with partners to deliver those. It was an early Community Plan, done in 2000, and the bulk of those targets have now been met. That goes from fairly basic things like the cleanliness of the city, the refuse collection service which we worked on and improves quite radically in conjunction with staff, through to big things like infrastructure and particularly the provision of a bypass road for Aberdeen. So that area has been delivered to the credit of councillors, Council staff and the staff of our partner organisations.

The area that has been slower and more frustrating is the delivery of the vision for the Council and the time scales are quite important because the work on delivery of significant improvement really only began in the 2000/2001 period, so one has to be careful in quoting figures like, "We've been working on this for more than a decade," and so on. The first changes came in 2001/2002 and that had come from a fairly traditional structure which had been put in place when the

Council began in 1996, with a commitment from the then administration to streamline service delivery, and the first steps in that really only came in once we got through the process of the fairly significant changes of developments that were made in terms of drawing together the old regional and district services against a background of fairly tight budgets which all the authorities faced at the time of reorganisation. So the first part of that change journey took place from 2001/02/03 through to 2004/05.

The change journey is also a single continuous journey in two phases. The first one was that phase in was 2001/02 to 2004/05, the second one came from 2005/06 to the present time, but it is actually a consistent continuous journey and all the documentation would support that, so there was no further radical change to the direction of travel in 2005/06. What happened in 2005/06 was a rationalisation of central services which had been set out as being stage 2 in the papers in 2001/02 but, more importantly, what was done in 2005/06 was opening up the first and second tier posts within the City Council, the directors and head of services, through competition, which brought in a new management team which was a combination of the people from the previous management structure who were committed to the process and new people who were brought in to augment the management team.

The period between 2002 and 2004 when we began to review things as we intended to do was a difficult period and you may want to come back to that in the questioning because therein lies a lot of the issues of staff morale, confusion and so on, and there are a lot of explanations within there that you will want to hear about, so if you want to come back to that with a question that would be helpful.

Since 2005/06, and the new management team was in place in total in late 2006, there has been significant development within the Council and the councillors has covered that, as has the submission which we made, and again you may well want to go through that. There is tangible evidence of improvement which is measurable in terms of the Audit Scotland reviews.

The other factor is that the vision to become a leading local authority in Northern Europe, and again I can explain that if that is necessary, was set in 2006 so we have been working on that for a two year period, and we are beginning to have measurable evidence that the best of our services actually are getting into those realms. I mentioned briefly the difficulties that there were between 2002 and 2004 and I think therein lie a significant number of the answers to the issues

1 2

of staff confusion, staff morale and so on. We have mentioned the issue of equal pay and modernisation.

I think we also have to accept that one of the other elements that staff have found difficult and often quite challenging to deal with is a shift into what you might call a performance managing regime where issues about regular tracking of performance, clear planning and so on are actually new to them, they are new processes. You may have people who have worked in local government for 20 or 30 years and for the first time they are getting this detailed management of their team's performance and their individual performance, and that is one of the areas we have been working with. It is one of the areas that I feel strongly that a lot of the staff have found quite challenging.

We have also had problems in the city, as Councillor Dean alluded to, of recruitment in a very tight labour market, and that has also led to issues of workload for staff. If you move on to the capacity for change I think again we need to go through that in detail, and I am assuming that will come out in the questioning; I have got quite a lot of detail for that.

In relation to the budgets I will not add to what has been said now, I assume that will be picked up in the questioning. The linkage I would want to make is that the culture that existed in terms of performance and performance management and the perception of the need for improvement was not one which self generated proposals for improvement to service delivery, including efficiencies, and one of the major changes that took place in 2005/06 and the introduction of new managers to the Council was to specifically recruit people who had a clear understanding of the need to drive up performance, the skills to do it and the will to do it. Part of the problem up to the 2006/07 period was actually getting the organisation to generate a sustained flow of proposals for improving services.

If you backtrack through our best value reviews from that period quite a number of them were successful but the majority of them basically came back after a review and said either, "The service is fine," or, at worst, "We actually need more resources". Therefore this issue of creating a culture of continuous improvement lies at the heart of not only the performance side but the ability to deliver the levels of budgetary efficiency that are necessary.

Briefly touching on service improvement, I think one has to be careful in sweeping generalisations because what we are talking about are services which are by no means failing and over which quite a lot of our clients, citizens or customers are actually very happy, and I will talk through why I am saying that. A related factor to that also that we need to be clear about is that presumably the purpose of this hearing is to get at the problematic areas and one needs to be careful with not generalising to the point where we sound like we are damning all services and all staff and so on. The vast majority of our staff are committed and are working very hard. What a lot are focusing on is the requirement to deliver the commitment in ways that may be quite new to them relative to the way they have operated for the whole of their previous working life. Therefore I would not want to lose sight of that. What we are talking about is change, it is not necessarily a lack of commitment to the Council or to the community or to their profession.

In relation to education the bulk of our schools, the vast majority of them, normally get very good reports from HMIe, so we are not talking about a failure in our education service. The point that HMIe raise about school management and Council management is what they call a lack of self awareness and that is this issue about a real desire to drive performance higher, even if it is relatively good at the moment. Therefore the focus there has been on raising the whole aspiration of the nature of the service, but that is an area where we have actually had a reaction over the last few weeks when we have been out talking to parent groups about the need to raise performance within the education system. Traditionally it has been one of the best funded education systems in Scotland in terms of funding for people and so on, and yet the performance does not rise to that level of aspiration or that level of resources, nor does it rise to the level that we believe that AS is telling us we benchmarked it should.

Interestingly the reaction of parents has been really supportive of schools. They are challenging us as to why we are challenging the schools to raise performance. So there is a whole lot of complex issues going on and that is probably the most classic one where HMIe are challenging the Council, and I believe rightly, to get better performance from the schools but actually the parent groups are very defensive of where the schools are and the current levels of performance.

Social work is the area of excellence. It is also the area where staff are working extremely hard in very challenging circumstances, not least related to the fact that Aberdeen has a major substance misuse problem which generates a lot of the work for our social work services. They have had difficulties in recruitment. We need more resources in the front line in social work, and

especially in social work we need to implant the whole issues of more rigorous performance management, record keeping, management performance benchmarking and so on. Again it is a fairly heavily funded service. In spite of the hard work that is going on, the structures and the culture are not such that the staff are able to deliver, the quality of service that the resources should actually deliver.

Housing is very, very mixed and I think the Audit Scotland people indicated we have had some major improvements in housing. In terms of council housing sales we were regularly in the worst three local authorities in Scotland in terms of performance. During that 2003/04 period we turned that round and we are now permanently in the top three councils. We have dealt with voids where we were having a degree of difficulty in turning over houses and that led to huge losses in rentals; we have turned that situation around. That is a classic example of the involvement of front line staff in an improvement process.

The latest one we have been working on, and the bulk of the improvement is now in place and is beginning to deliver, is in the delivery of council house repairs and that was one of the major areas of interest to our tenants. However, the allocation system needs to be improved; we need general customer care improved. One of the big areas for us, especially with the demographic trends in Aberdeen, is housing for varying needs, with a growing elderly, frail population, and the provision of more affordable housing.

The property disposals issue we will go into in detail. The current focus really is to looking at the future; new management team, new council administration. A lot of difficult decisions and changes will soon be behind us, and I think we are going through a particularly difficult period because of the budgetary decisions that had to be made. You will be aware that I have indicated today the desire to take early retirement. That will open up the way for a new Chief Executive to be appointed. I would wish to work my notice period to get us through the fairly difficult point the Council is at with the budget at the moment. That would leave a new Chief Executive, a new management team and a relatively new administration in place to take the Council forward and to build on the work that has already been done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We, as you would anticipate, have a number of questions. Some of them have been anticipated in the opening statements and that will save us some time. I have one or two questions of Mr Paterson and then after that my colleagues will likewise follow me.

Let me start with a general question about the status of the Controller of Audit's report in your mind. You say in your written submission that you recognise much of the findings in the Controller of Audit's Best Value report because it was originally in your self evaluation of your Best Value process. Can I just confirm by way of a start, therefore, that you agree with the Controller of Audit's report and her conclusions? Is that fair?

MR STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say again in your written submission, and we touched on this with the Controller of Audit in discussing the new management team, that you have "made significant progress in difficult circumstances over the 18 or so months since then"; that is a quote from your submission. You say "significant progress". How much progress has been made? You have touched on the transformation strategies and the progress that has been made there. What has not progressed, do you think, in the last 18 months?

MR PATERSON: Would you permit me to go further on what has progressed? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is perfectly fair, Mr Paterson, but could we include in your answer the extent to which services or other issues like management have not progressed.

MR PATERSON: If I try to work through the areas where progress has been made, and that probably points us to the areas where progress requires to be made or further progress requires to be made, to move from where we are now to a point where you could say the bulk of the organisation is a continuously improving one requires the further development of a number of processes and developments which are currently in train.

In relation to the leadership of the Council we have a new first and second tier. The third and fourth tier on the Council were not put through a recruitment process but there was a process agreed with the staff and the trades unions where a new "contract" related to performance and performance management was formally adopted by each of the members of staff in the third tier and a number of fourth tier staff members as well. I am attempting to respond to your point about what is not done and what needs to be done.

What I am looking at is the permeation of that performance management in a continuously improving culture through the whole of our leadership, from the top level leadership right through to the front line supervisors, and the work that we are doing on that. Therefore where we are at the moment would be, and I think this has been acknowledged by all the external inspections that we have had, is a

senior leadership which is pretty tight, knows what it has got to do and is working very hard to do it, but part of their challenge is permeation of that through the organisation.

What that then leads me to is that a number of the basic building blocks in terms of an efficiently run organisation, whether it is private sector or voluntary sector or public sector, are also being put in place in a consistent manner, whereas in the past it would have been patchy across the Council.

So in order for people to know exactly what they are supposed to be doing, and this is the point of confusion in any system, whether it is our structure or any other structure, people having absolute clarity on what is expected of them and therefore being able to be helped to account and be supported in delivering that.

We have rolled out key planning across the Council for the first time because that was patchy previously. Linked to that we have rolled out appraisal consistently across the Council. All of this has been done over the last 12 to 18 months and it has required a huge effort by people. The next stage will be to ensure that that becomes embedded as an annual cycle and more importantly in the annual appraisal. We now have regular supervision happening so that staff are getting feedback from their managers on a regular basis, and again the question is about getting that rolled out starting from the top and working through so that you have processes and you have also got key planning, you have an agenda of what each key member of staff is required to deliver.

That is going to take some time to complete the complete roll-out. The challenge then will be ensuring that it is embedded as part of the working practice. Part of what we faced in the past where a lot of this was new was staff not finding time to do it and therefore performance management became something that you did if you had time; it was often seen as a diversion from your real job, that your real job was your area of professional expertise.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you for a second. You say that it will take some time to roll out. How long?

MR PATERSON: The team planning, the first complete round is now in place. The first complete round of appraisal was done in the last financial year, so those are about getting this embedded and continued so they do not begin to lapse. The supervisory side, I would need to check the time scale but we are well through getting that down to the management hierarchy.

If I then reflect on those issues as being delivered in a top-down way, one of the key things for us is to get greater engagement with front line staff in the processes and in terms of the confusion that is alleged about roles and responsibilities and linkages between the operational and the strategic. We have a number of means of doing that, some of which are in place already, and we intend to use the team planning process to engage front line staff now that we have got the embryos of the team plans done, to debate with staff what those team plans say, engage them in the further development and refining of the team plans, and again the challenge then will be to see that those are sustained on an ongoing basis.

Another key element in why staff I think justifiably have claimed that they did not understand what was happening, and I think what they are saying is they do not understand what their role is in what is happening, is that the team planning process is partly intended to allow that contextualisation for teams of staff as to what their role is in delivering the targets of the Council so that the high level corporate targets that are in the Council's plans, the Community Plan and so on, have been broken down to a level where the teams can say, "This is part of this that I'm being charged to deliver," and you are getting that linkage from the front line staff up and down to the high level corporate and regional priorities in the community planning process.

We then also have a number of measures, including the things that have been mentioned like Citistat processes, the development of transformation strategies and so on, where every effort is being made to engage front line staff in these processes at the earliest opportunity. That is a long way of saying here are the things we are doing to try to cover greater staff engagement, therefore greater staff security, and hopefully greater staff morale and confidence in what is happening.

In terms of your question of what still needs to be done, that is a large part of it. It is about getting that engagement of our front line staff in the earnest hope that a lot of these unresolved questions are dealt with, they will have more confidence and their morale will be higher.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Supposing you were to wave a wand and it is all finished, done and dusted and it is now to your satisfaction, where are we in terms of months and years? What do you envisage as the time scale to have these practices and attitudes, if you like, all subscribing to the plan and the vision which you have described there?

MR PATERSON: I think the experience of life, whether it is private life or working life, would lead you to give a number of answers to your question. The targets to

which we are working are still around the 2010 period, so we are talking about another 30 months in terms of moving things forward. You then would have to say that there are for instance budgetary pressures which cannot be left for 30 months. If the transformation strategies are partly intended to bring expenditure into line with GAE, and they are specifically intended to do that, to close either overspending or inefficiency and bring high quality service delivery in a modern fashion in line with budget, then they have got to be pushed through more quickly, we are aware of that, and we are aware that there has been a compromise to date where we will be challenged about it in terms of front line staff and about pushing transformation strategies too quickly and not taking time enough to think about the content or to consult people. So that is a shorter time scale in terms of delivery of budget efficiencies through that method.

The other part of it in terms of the experience of the organisation and working life and so on must lead you to believe that there will be elements of cultural change where you cannot actually define how long it may take because of the reality of organisational dynamics and individual human dynamics where you cannot legislate for how long it may take people to get to that change of attitude, you know, if your question is literally indicating how long will it be before all of it is there.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I clarify? I guess I am asking in terms of cultural change, where is the tipping point of critical mass so that then becomes in effect the culture you are seeking?

MR PATERSON: My feeling, and this can only be an evaluated judgment, is that I begin to feel that we are heading towards the tipping point now in terms of the things that have been happening over the 18 months and the things I and my colleagues would raise as the kind of the green shoots we are seeing of the kind of things that we want to happen, the initiatives being taken by staff and so on, instead of people having to be driven and encouraged in a top-down way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I will now ask Ann Faulds to take up the questioning.

MS FAULDS: Good morning, Mr Paterson. In your written submission you said that to achieve the change that you wanted to pursue you had to overcome a variety of intractable problems. Given that change and reorganisation has almost become the norm over the past 20 years in local government why did you face intractable problems? What was it about Aberdeen City Council that caused this problem?

MR PATERSON: I think we started from a point of a very traditional, traditionally

operating and traditionally thinking council, and I think there would be general agreement with that perception. I think the balance against that was a scale of change, and one is a direct consequence of the other, the scale of change that was deemed to be necessary to get the kind of shift that we needed, and that the whole thinking and being of the organisation needed to change. This thinking was teased out over a period of time by a working group of staff and elected members and it was quite explicit, the thinking at the time. Therefore the challenge was to get very, very radical change because there was an explicit view that if we tried to get change through an incremental process it just would not happen. That is set out in the papers that were done as a result of the analysis that was done over 1999, 2000 and into 2001.

So therefore we had to go for radical change and another explicit part of the thinking was that part of the conservatism of the organisation which had to be overcome was absolutely entwined with the fact that we had a very traditional, professionally defined structure of large numbers of departments. The departments were defined professionally in terms of social work, housing, education. You had power bases in those of directorates matched with committees and convenerships which were defined in the same way and these did not match the aspiration for joined up, high quality service delivery that were beginning to emerge at that point in point in time. The Council was quite brave in looking forward trying to anticipate where service delivery in the public sector would go.

Therefore from the outset we were attempting major change in a very traditional organisation. I think I have also reflected in the notes, and these are broader reflections, they are not just my own reflections on the situation, if we were guilty of anything it was that we did not anticipate the resilience of that culture in terms of our attempts to change it.

MS FAULDS: I would just like to understand, you see. In 1996 it was a new organisation, we had local government reorganisation and it was like a merging of the regional council and the district council. Are you saying that this culture was a legacy from the regional and district merging; is that what you are saying?

MR PATERSON: Yes.

MS FAULDS: Why is that different to any other merging of regional councils and district councils throughout Scotland?

MR PATERSON: Can I add to that? For me, looking back, although I may not have been that acutely aware of it at the time, there was an explicit decision made, and

I think it may have actually been a formal Council decision, that there would be no attempt to change anything, in 1996. I think that decision was made at the behest of the trades unions at that time on the basis of an argument that the organisation and the staff within it were suffering a sufficient change just through the merger of the two organisations that we should not start to go about changing service deliveries. Therefore not only was that opportunity lost at the time but there was a further entrenchment of, "And therefore we can continue in this way". MS FAULDS: OK. Can I just ask one other question, then, Mr Paterson. You also said in your written submission that weak leadership and the lack of effective line management contributed to low staff morale. I am bound to put this question to you, I think especially given your decision today to seek early retirement, if only to give you a fair opportunity to respond to this question: is the office of the

Chief Executives part of the weak leadership?

MR PATERSON: These are questions that you ask yourself in terms of self awareness and self analysis as you do your job, in terms of strength and weaknesses of leadership, how you should go about it. I would actually find it surprising if you were to find anybody or any significant number of people in the Council or in significant parts of the city or the surrounding area who would put myself as opposed to the office of the Chief Executive in the category of being a weak leader, and I will talk you through that.

I would have thought it would be more likely that there would be allegations about being too single minded, not deviating, driving too hard and so on, and those were actually the allegations or assertions I thought I might have to answer as the first line today.

In terms of strength of leadership, what are the aspects of that? You have got a clear vision for the organisation whose future is entrusted to you. I think there was clear evidence in ample measure, and I think people would agree with that if it was put to them, that I have a clear vision for the city. I have worked with colleagues in the other local authorities to develop vision for the region. I have been a key player in that. Therefore if it is about having a clear vision for the city, for the Council and for the area I think there is ample evidence of it.

The next line about leadership would be, "Well, OK, you have got a vision but do you actually have the leadership skills to be able to deliver it?" because the envisioning can be the nice bit of the job, the delivery is the harder bit. Whilst I cannot go into individual cases of where I have intervened to deal with poor performance in terms of the delivery of that vision, certainly not in an open forum

like this, I think there is ample record of the fact that I have dealt with poor performance in terms of senior managers or sections of the Council in terms of driving forward. So if the will to deliver the vision is the second part of strong leadership I think there is ample evidence that I have done that as well.

In terms of leadership by example I have never been frightened to roll up my sleeves and get stuck in with staff at any level in any of these improvement processes, again there would be evidence of that, and again you would probably get negative reactions to that in terms of micro-management and interference and, "He doesn't trust us," and so on.

In terms of being supportive, where I am challenging people, and that normally would be senior managers who I am working alongside, my starting point if people are facing difficulties in delivering is always to say, "Is there something I can do to help you here? Have you got a problem?"

And I think the final part in terms of strong leadership has been my determination right through, and herein for me lie a lot of the issues that have become known as non-compliance and so on, about firstly the systems that we have and the need for really powerful, robust business systems in the organisation, and I have taken a leading role in that as well. It was interesting when the report about the property sales hit the media, I got an email from a relatively junior member of staff who was not involved in that side of the business saying, "This is really unfair, Mr Paterson. If anybody in this organisation has tried to drive proper business processes and has got personally involved in driving them, it's you". So there is that side.

Then I think the final side in terms of communication and being a visible leader, I must do as much as any other Chief Executive in any public sector organisation in Scotland in terms of getting out of the office and making myself available to staff both in formal and informal ways. So I think what I am saying is are there any other aspects of strong leadership that you would be looking for that I have not reflected?

- MS FAULDS: No, that is very helpful, thank you, Mr Paterson.
- 31 THE CHAIRMAN: Keith.

- 32 MR GEDDES: No questions.
- 33 | THE CHAIRMAN: Iain.
- MR ROBERTSON: You mentioned, Mr Paterson, in your submission that the City
 Chamberlain is preparing a medium term financial strategy to restore reserves in
 the general fund. Can you share what that medium term financial strategy is with

us?

1

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

2 MR PATERSON: Do you mind if I refer that question to the Resources Director? 3 MR ROBERTSON: No.

MR EDWARDS: Thank you, and good morning. The medium term financial strategy is around the basis of restoring the balances on the general fund but tied in with that there are a number of issues also. It is looking at future capital spend which has impact on capital financing charges also, which then impacts on the revenue budget. It is looking at Treasury management strategies also which impacts into some revenue balances, capital financing charges etc. It is looking at the timing of spend coming through both revenue and capital budgets. So it is a pulling together of a number of elements there to go into one financial strategy. Basically that financial strategy will be driven by the final audited outturn results for 2007/08 and we see what the uncommitted balances actually are at that point in time, what our preferred recommended level of balance is over the next two or three years, and that financial strategy taking account of all the various strands I have mentioned making recommendations to the Council for restoring from the general fund budget over the next two or three years transfers from that budget specifically into the general fund reserve. So it is a pulling together of various strands where all the strands are in place, then making recommendations to get that general fund balance back up over the next two or three years. That is all tied in with the far wider budget strategy which I could go into just now or perhaps answer later, but very briefly that wider budget strategy is moving towards sustainable base budgets and getting budgets more closely aligned to the grant aided expenditures assessment that are the Scottish Government assumptions of where we should be spending money over a two to three year period as well, so it is all tied in as part of that wider strategy.

MR ROBERTSON: That is a very informed accounting type answer but for the man in the street he wants to know where the actual money is going to come from. Can you give us it in a slightly more practical way?

MR EDWARDS: It is difficult for me to say exactly where the money is going to come from because that depends what decisions you take to spend on various services, what decisions you take to generate income from various sources, and all that is taken as part of a Council budget meeting. So I could not say specifically we are going to get funding from this source or that source; that is all taken as part of the general decisions within the Council at budget time.

What the Council has made a commitment to do is move over a period of time

to a line budget more closely to grant aided expenditure assessments. In some areas that will mean reducing some budgeted spend and that reduction in spend is coming through the transformation strategies which we are driving to improve service delivery. We recognise we cannot go on just simply cutting services at the margin, there has got to be a far more fundamental review of service delivery and that is what the transformation strategies are driving towards, a far more fundamental review of the way services are delivered, the way budgets are constructed, so it is all tied in with that aspect.

MR ROBERTSON: OK, thank you for that. Let me move on, Mr Paterson, to another aspect of your report. You used what struck me as the very unusual phrase in your submissions, you said education was generally OK. I am sorry, but the way I read the report from the Controller of Audit it did not say education was generally OK, it said it was, if anything, poor in many areas and patchy. Would you like to comment?

MR PATERSON: I did attempt to cover that in the opening comments that I made. The reality is, and it is my understanding that it is the HMIe's assessment as well, is the one I tried to explain, that generally the performance in schools, it would cover the normal distribution from very good to excellent down to poor, but our schools are doing reasonably well. The issue that we are being challenged on and which we would agree on is this issue about they could be doing better or much better, but our school system and our schools are in no way failing or poor or in difficulty. It is more about lifting from what I tried to describe as generally OK, people are happy, parents are generally happy, and I gave the indication, I was at a parents meeting a couple of weeks ago about the budget and budget cuts and the parents were quite angry about any suggestion that the school service ought to be doing better. I am just trying to temper what the actual situation in the city is as regards the school system.

In terms of the assessments the individual schools get from HMIe they are not generally bad. It is this issue about the ability to actually do better, given the nature of the pupils within the schools, their latent ability, and the resourcing levels that we have traditionally had in the city.

MR ROBERTSON: Can I just ask, as an addition to what Ann said, you talked about strong leadership; there are people who would say that tunnel vision is a weakness and that strength in that regard would be a disadvantage.

MR PATERSON: I think I tried to reflect, that is a reality of life and I tried to reflect that in terms of the other aspects of strong leadership, that what one person sees

as strong leadership somebody else can see as a potential weakness. The tunnel vision one I did not raise but that clearly is a potential perception. I think the reality is that if you go back to the period I was reflecting on in the opening presentation, the 2002 to 2004 period, I think part of the problem then was that rather than having tunnel vision on the basis of risk management arguments about the risks to social work and the risks in education if we went too quickly to a disaggregated structure, in hindsight it might be argued that we listened too much to those arguments in terms of the negative consequences those caused in terms of confusion for staff.

I think had we moved more quickly to disaggregate those services fully and more importantly to get them fully embedded within the new three management areas in the city a lot of the confusion that has been around, and I am accepting that it is genuine, certainly over that period of time, would have been avoided. But we got strong representations in relation to high risk areas in relation to social work and quality assurance issues in relation to education that we should hang on to what actually was an amalgam of the traditional departmental structure, supposed to be a phased process but actually it almost became embedded, and that caused a confusion.

So that deals partly with the confusion issue but I am also responding to your point about the allegation that strong leadership can also be seen as tunnel vision. I think there are major areas like that and that would be a significant one where I and we in the management team actually listen to staff, we listen to professional pleadings, but again in terms of perception my view or my understanding would be that that would be the perception among staff, that the Council and ultimately myself have driven this and have not taken account of their worries, their pleas, and so on, and the reality is actually quite different.

THE CHAIRMAN: Keith, do you have a question?

MR GEDDES: Yes. I just wanted to separate out leadership in schools compared to leadership of the education service itself. If you look at paragraph 170 on page 50 and exhibit 22 on the following page, page 51, you will see that Aberdeen in terms of the leadership and quality of the education service itself did not achieve anything in the excellent category or the very good category, four or five in good, four in adequate and one in weak, and the weak one was the most important one because the weak one was leadership and direction.

I can broaden this out as well because I think it is a political question, too. Clearly education accounts for 28 per cent of your budget, it is regarded by most people as the most important service that local government delivers; what instructions, Councillor Dean, when you saw that report did you give to the Chief Executive to take steps to improve the leadership of the education service? Do you think it might be better to have specifically identified the Director of Education with sole responsibility for education service?

MS DEAN: I think in terms of the instructions that were given there was a degree of continuation on the path that we were actually going down at the time. I believe that there is a leadership capacity there within our education service which albeit needs some work, and again at the time of the HMIe inspection, which was at the same time as the audit of Best Value, again the people who were fulfilling those roles were relatively new to those roles and thus needed some time to actually make their mark within there. I believe again that is one of the things that has improved within that time.

In terms of having a specific Director of Education, it would go against everything that this Council has been attempting to do in terms of joining up children's services in the way that we are joining up adult services and various other parts across there. In the interim structure which Mr Paterson spoke about we did have a Director of Learning and Leisure. There were differing opinions on that but I felt and I think many of my colleagues would feel that while learning and leisure had traditionally in previous structures been put together it was much more important to get all our services to children together rather than lumping schools with playing fields and art galleries and sports and the kind of things that had gone on previously. So to me it is much more important that the leadership comes across the field of children's services rather than just in the education sphere.

MR GEDDES: We could obviously argue the point about integration in specific services and specifically identify posts for quite a while, but do you think that because of the level at which the most senior person in education is appointed he or she does not carry sufficient weight in relation to the importance of education and is just seen as another service?

MS DEAN: No, I think when you consider that the person with ultimate responsibility for policy and strategy in education is the Director for Strategic Leadership with head of service below that, then I do not see that as an issue at all.

35 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Douglas.

MR SINCLAIR: I have a couple of questions for the Leader.

In your opening remarks you outlined a number of areas which suggested that perhaps those were some of the difficulties the Council faced. Let me just run through those. You mentioned the challenge of single status, but you would accept that is a challenge that all councils face and there is nothing unique to Aberdeen in meeting the challenge of single status.

Secondly, you mentioned the fact that in 2003 50 per cent of the Council were new members and you had a small majority but again that is not unique, other councils have coped with that challenge.

Thirdly, you mentioned trade union resistance, and again I think if you look across the piece that is not unusual, that is the role of trade unions, to represent their members' interests and resistance to change is often how that change is handled.

Then you mentioned the budgetary difficulties, and there are two points on that. That is not new, that has been building up over a number of years. Secondly, I am sure you would accept that grant distribution ultimately is a zero sum game; if somebody wins, somebody loses, and the challenge for all councils is to manage within their budgets.

So I would be interested to know, having listened to what I have just said, what do you think has been the totally different thing about Aberdeen that has made the agenda of improvement harder for you than any other council?

MS DEAN: I think of the opening remarks that I made the

one which you have not taken forward is the fact of the labour market here. In many places it is an extremely desirable thing to work for the Council and here ---

MR SINCLAIR: Just to interrupt, presumably Aberdeenshire can make the same point as well, or Edinburgh, and they have managed to run their councils apparently more effectively than Aberdeen.

MS DEAN: Right, OK. I will certainly take that on board.

It would be a matter for conjecture and I am sure that when your auditors come to consider those other councils they will consider them in the same light. But I think we have had a combination of issues here and the points that Mr Paterson raised about the very traditional structure which was deliberately accepted in 1996 when the two councils joined, I think also there are a number of issues in there. I think the fact that there was a change of administration in 2003 and with that a change of ambition, shall we say, not a change of vision but a different way to try to achieve the vision for the city, has meant that we have been trying to tackle things in a more compact space.

While, as I said, the working group which produced the blueprint for all this met from 2001 onwards, it kind of got to the stage that the plan was there and not much was actually progressing towards it. So I think we have tried to push it, it is starting to push the boulder up the hill, and the first parts about actually getting that boulder moving are always going to be the most difficult part to my mind.

MR SINCLAIR: The point that Keith Geddes and Iain Robertson have touched on, this issue of the tension between professional leadership and customer based arrangements which indeed was explicitly recognised in the Council paper in 2005, but the Council of which you were the Leader took the view that it was not appropriate to deal with those tensions by replicating posts and structures which would make it difficult to develop a joined up approach, and as I understand it the most senior officers for education and social work are third tier within the strategic leadership directorate you have referred to.

Let me just touch on social work because in your submission to the Commission you I think very properly said the forthcoming SWIA report was likely to be highly critical and that overall you were not delivering improved customer outcomes for your users. We have seen the draft scoring points, and I appreciate the report has still to be formally signed off, and of the 10 areas for evaluation five were described as weak, three were described as adequate and two as unsatisfactory.

Interestingly, one of the two that were unsatisfactory, and the same thing with education, is that issue of leadership and direction, and I just wonder with hindsight whether you would agree that insufficient recognition was given to the status of the two largest services both in terms of the overall structure of the Council and the importance of professional leadership. I understand the point about there being the down side of professional leadership, but there is also strength to professional leadership as well and one is left with the potential conclusion that perhaps the change that you brought about and the creation of multidisciplinary teams negated the value of professionalism.

I would be interested in your reflection in hindsight, given that you have had two major reports saying the same thing of weak direction and weak leadership. Does that not give you pause for thought?

MS DEAN: It would certainly give me pause for thought, and I think that is why when we introduced the structure in 2005 we did put in a fairly swift review. It was argued at the time that perhaps that review period was too early to let everything bed in. We will need to look carefully at these reports. I am certainly

1 not dismissing them. My understanding, though, however is that it can be seen 2 that these are reports which are done by professionals in these particular 3 organisations who particularly highly value the kind of structures that you are talking about. As I say, I am not trying to say that they are favouring traditional 4 structures over less traditional structures. I think I would require to see the 5 SWIA report before we come to any decision but I do expect that to be part of the 6 review that will be undertaken later this year. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Keith. Before you go on, Keith, I should 9 explain that having covered the generalities of opening statements and so on and so forth we are now into looking at the Controller of Audit's report in terms of the 10 headings that her report covers. So that is us past the preliminaries; there is quite 11 12 a long way to go. 13 MR GEDDES: I will leave aside the issue of single status or majorities in the culture of change which, as Douglas said, is something that all councils throughout 14 15 Scotland have got to deal with, and I will leave aside your excursions into Donald Rumsfeld territory about knowns/unknowns; it is beyond me so I will skip over 16 that. What I would like to try to explore is the nature of the relationship between 17 18 the political leadership and the professional staff. What formal arrangements are in place for discussions between senior elected members and the Chief Executive 19 20 and his colleagues? Do you have formal meetings and are they minuted? 21 MS DEAN: We have formal meetings once a week as the leaders of the

MS DEAN: We have formal meetings once a week as the leaders of the administrations which are basically the main conveners, bringing in whatever lead councillors are appropriate to the events that are going on, along with the Corporate Management Team. I would say they are noted rather than minuted and mostly just with action points that need to go further, but those meetings happen weekly.

MR GEDDES: So you are able to follow up on action points that are agreed at the meetings?

MS DEAN: Yes.

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

MR GEDDES: In terms of the issue of political scrutiny, at page 28 there is quite a series, and this is a question I will put to other party leaders as well.

Paragraph 84: "Members are keen to challenge service performance," but, "Members who responded to [the Audit Scotland] survey indicated that they needed better information to explain [or examine] underperformance."

Paragraph 85: "The level and quality of information provided to members varied across services."

Paragraph 86: "There is a lack of detailed option appraisal within Best Value reviews and some reports have significant gaps in information."

Then paragraph 86 also refers to the property disposals report where there are examples of misleading information being presented by Council officers to elected members.

Obviously if you are going to run a true democracy it is important for politicians to have information in front of them that is accurate and not misleading. What steps have you and your colleagues taken to change this apparent culture whereby members are kept in the dark about important issues?

MS DEAN: I think the change in the structure has gone some way towards that. I think I am more confident now, or I did not realise I should not have been confident previously, I have to admit, until the issues came forward, but I am certainly more confident now on the procedures which are in place to ensure that matters such as these property disposals could not recur, and in particular the use of external consultants in terms of valuation is in my understanding one of the bigger changes that have come in there.

To a degree we will always be dependent on our officers because councillors can not be professionals in every single part of the wide range of things in which we have to work. I think a lot of that will just come down to the sheer ability to scrutinise what is going on. I think in terms of the performance management and the parts you have raised there, there have been significant changes in the kind of information that we are getting and I think in the way that we are dealing with that, and that has probably been a training issue as much as anything else for councillors.

MR PATERSON: Do you want to add anything?

MR STEWART: I will easily pick up on that; thank you.

I have always been keen to scrutinise everything that comes before me and the more information the better as far as I am concerned. I have to say in terms of the new set-up in terms of area committees we can scrutinise to a much greater degree, boring right down to individual school level, which I think is very important for elected members. I think in terms of the Continuous Improvement Committee we have seen a change from the previous standards in Scrutiny Committee, which I was also on, which gives members again the opportunity to bore down much further than probably ever before.

As I say, I always think that the more information I get the better. I think you have got to temper that as well, though, in what is actually given out to members.

If we take the property side, which I think you are probably driving at, I have to say that I took severe umbrage at what went on there because basically members, all members were lied to, and I am not using the word "misled" or anything like that, we were lied to on a number of issues. As far as I am concerned that is not good enough.

MR GEDDES: I do not want to get into the detail of the property transactions because my colleague on my left has got a series of questions which are far too complicated for me to understand, but as a simple former politician, when I was looking to leave a legacy in terms of new schools or improved roads or better social work facilities I was always crawling over the senior officials to say, "How much did we get for that property? What are you doing to maximise capital receipts?: Are there proper strategies in place to ensure that we do boost our capital receipts?"

What really struck me about the property report was, it took a member of the public or business person to raise the issue and there appears to be a failure right across the political groups in the Council to ask obvious questions about high profile property sales and just check out whether or not the maximum was achieved for them. Why did it take four years for this to come to light?

MR STEWART: Can I answer that? I think it would be unfair to say that members did not ask questions. I quite clearly remember at a full Council meeting, and I have actually talked to the external auditor about this previously, the former Conservative councillor, Jack Dempsey, who now sadly is deceased, asking numerous questions about Carden House at a meeting. Unfortunately in my opinion he did not get the answers that he should have got from the officer who was answering those questions.

MS DEAN: I think if I can just add something on there, what we are looking at here, and I am not trying to belittle the issue at all, what we are looking at here is the table in the report which looks at proceeds received against maximum potential value. Maximum potential value is one thing and I would not dispute the figures that go along with that, but what I think that does not take into consideration is the use that some of these properties were to be put to.

At Carden House, as I say, I was not involved in the decision because of my interest as a member of the Board of NHS Grampian; similarly the site at Earnsheugh Road, because firstly it is a health centre, secondly it is in my own ward and something that was very close to my heart and I did not feel I could be objective on it; but Carden House was sold, on my understanding, with a clause

in the deeds that it would be used as a medical centre. That presumably gives it a different value from if it had been on the open market and available to be flats or offices or whatever.

Powis Terrace again similarly is a medical centre and I would not be aware what the chances in planning terms would be of actually getting a housing development on there but I would have thought, given its location, it would have been quite slim. So while I do not wish to undermine that at all, and I would agree certainly with Councillor Stewart that there were times when it appears that members did not get the information that they required, I think it is fair to say that certainly there was challenge and the example he cites about Councillor Dempsey is a fair one, and I know that Councillor Fletcher, who was Councillor Stewart's predecessor as Resources Management Convener, questioned very, very closely on some occasions, and obviously what we are looking at here are half a dozen of I think 26 property transactions that were looked at.

MR GEDDES: Can I say, only seven out of the 26 property were carried out correctly, I think the report says. I do not want to get into the detail because others will ask that question later on, but effectively what you were saying was there was intermittent concern expressed about property sales that was not followed through in a strategic manner?

MS DEAN: It is difficult for me to answer but I think there were questions asked just in the kind of things that you have said yourself: "Are we getting the best return on this? Is this the best return for the Council?" If those questions were answered then we would as elected members, or certainly with my limited expertise I would have no reason to question the answers, if I am not confusing you again. I am sorry.

MR GEDDES: OK. Let us go back to scrutiny because we will get too far into property and that comes later on. Just going to paragraph 42, which is on page 16, the admirable principle of strengthening democratic accountability, in the survey that was done by Audit Scotland: "Seventeen of the council's 43 elected members ... responded to [the] survey. While 40 per cent of these felt that the neighbourhood delivery arrangements were an effective way to deliver services, 47 per cent were unclear about how and who to contact within the three areas. Staff interviewed during the audit echoed these concerns." It goes back to my earlier question about scrutiny, holding people to account; it is difficult to do that if you do not know who to talk to.

MS DEAN: I think first of all we have to remember that the heads of service were

fairly newly into post at that time, that that was a time of major change and the heads of service had been appointed over the back end of 2006, just coming up to the time the survey was done. Let us also put into proportion that 47 per cent of the 40 per cent is eight people, eight people out of 43 who were unsure who to contact, which would assume then that the rest of them either knew who to contact of the ones that answered or the ones that chose not to answer must have been relatively satisfied with the process.

MR GEDDES: Eight out of 17, not eight out of 43, but we cannot assume that the 26 others who did not answer shared the view that everything was satisfactory. It is an unknown, is it not?

MS DEAN: Maybe you cannot assume but I think in most cases where consultation occurs you kind of assume that the people who have an axe to grind will be the ones that will respond. That is certainly what we have found as a council.

MR STEWART: A key change since the time of the Best Value audit, and we have got to remember it is November 2006/ January 2007, is the fact that the area committees are now in place. The opportunity for members to scrutinise the staff is much greater now and they have the opportunity on a six weekly basis to put folk under the spotlight, if you like, and scrutinise. They also know these people. Things have changed since the time of the audit report in that regard.

MR GEDDES: Thank you very much. I have a couple more before we move on. Paragraph 87, page 28, again on scrutiny. Paragraph 87 effectively says: "There is also some evidence of officers not being held to account effectively," and it is claimed that: "There was no evidence of effective challenge of the projected overspend of £4 million in health and social care for 2006/07 ..." When the leadership was told of that projected overspend what did you ask the senior officers to do to ensure the overspend was curtailed as far as possible and how did you monitor the steps that were put in place to stop that over-expenditure getting worse?

MS DEAN: Our Community Services Committee at the time, certainly this was reported there and action plans were brought back to that committee. I was not a member of that committee so I was not actually involved in the detail of that but from a resources management point of view as well I think certainly actions were required of senior officers. I think in my mind we have to look at two things in terms of an increasing demand, in year as well as year on year, for social work services which is never going to be easy to manage. So while I am not excusing this by any manner of means I can understand where it is coming from and for

that reason it is extremely difficult in a short space of time to try to turn that. I do 2 not know, it is possibly unfair to ask Councillor Stewart to comment since he was 3 a member of the opposition at the time but he certainly would have been a 4 member of the committee that first scrutinised this and looked at the action plans. MR STEWART: I have to say that the action plans were looked at and further reports 5 were supposed to come back to committee; in some cases they did and in others 6 they did not. I think Mr Edwards has done a lot of work in that regard and I do not know if he wants to add more on that. Certainly the committee had an 8 9 overview but did not take a firm decision at that time and call for further reports on various savings that it may have been possible to meet. 10 MR EDWARDS: Can I just add to the comments that Councillor Stewart has made. 12 In terms of what we are talking about here, going back to 2006, there were action 13 plans taken back to the Community Services Committee, and tracking that back some of the budget actions were implemented. What you were dealing with at 14 15 that time also, though, was the rising needs led demand for services as well 16 as well for sometimes very expensive care packages. So the view was taken that 17

1

11

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

because some of the savings were coming through but the demand was increasing a firmer fundamental approach had to be taken. Two things were established: a commissioning board which looked at projected trends for needs led care coming through, and also what is called the Citistat process which I think is referred to in the submission, which again is getting into the detail of how spend and how case management is carried out. That further scrutiny was put in place to better understand why the pressures were there on social work in particular.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that another way of saying that effectively you revised the budget midstream because of these pressures?

MR EDWARDS: That always is the case, that you look throughout the financial year and if it is clear that budget savings are not going to be achieved for some reason then we report back, when I say "we", the City Chamberlain will report back timeously to elected members to advise our projected overspends and the committee would then take a decision perhaps to come forward with revised action plans. That always is the case in terms of budgets being regularly reviewed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but my query was that if you did presumably somebody had identified the source for the additional budget?

MR EDWARDS: Identifying the source would be perhaps identifying other sources of savings within the existing budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

MR GEDDES: Just on that, John, exhibit 19 on page 48: 2002, 2006, 2007 SPIs. Is the problem not the fact that of the 19 areas where there was unreliable data 12 were in adult social work and four were in education and children's services; is the problem not that if you do not know what you are doing it is very difficult to know where to curtail expenditure or adjust policy?

MS DEAN: I am not sure enough about the matters which would be the subject of unreliable data to be able to comment on that. I do not know if anybody else can.

MR PATERSON: I am wondering if Martin can help us on that one.

MR MURCHIE: Good morning, Chairman; Martin Murchie, Head of Performance Management and Quality Assurance.

The issue of the 19 unreliable SPIs in 2006/07 is of course a matter of extreme concern and you are right to highlight that. The 19 that you have referred to, 12 being in adult and four being in children, are primarily made up of one issue. There are eight elements of the adult SPIs which relate to respite services, four of the children's relates to respite services, so in effect 12 out of that 19 is entirely about respite. Another four of the adult relate to home care.

My understanding, and I do have a fair bit of understanding because I have taken positive action this year to take all necessary steps that we can to change that and turn that round for this year, is that it is a combination of factors which have led to that. The information that we use to monitor the social work services is entered into a computer system called CareFirst which is a package that a range of local authorities use across Scotland, so that is not an issue. The issues is one of how it actually gets there, the reliability of the information as it goes in from staff and thereafter the monitoring and checking of that to make sure that it is robust.

I do not know how far back you want to go in terms of how we have got to that situation by my task at the moment is looking forward to make sure that as part of the transformation programmes and teams that is fundamentally a root and branch performance, that we do not have an issue going forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: How soon do you think these indicators will be confidently produced?

MR MURCHIE: I have been asked that question quite a lot over the last month and a half or so and if you want me to go in detail through each of the SPIs ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No, a general indication would help just now, I think.

MR MURCHIE: For the home care one I am confident that as it is audited this year it

will be robust. For the adult and children's respite I am hopeful that they will be robust in this year but I do think that that will be as a result of a lot of retrospective action and effort put in by staff rather than the systemic issues which we are now putting in place to solve them on a sustainable basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Keith, have you anything?

MR GEDDES: I have two final questions, John, because time moves on. There is quite a significant improvement agenda at the back of the report, on page 62, Councillor Dean. How do you intend to take this forward? What processes would you put in place to ensure that officials where appropriate report back on every one of these 20 or so items on the improvement agenda and how would it be monitored?

MS DEAN: I think that is where our Continuous Improvement Service and Committee would come into play. This is very much one of the reasons why this was set up. It is not only to monitor the continuous improvement across the Council but to provide a continuous improvement ethos for members as well so that we are aware of this. It would certainly come back through there, and it will be minuted.

I could probably see that once we get the report and recommendations back from this hearing we should actually almost set aside half a day or a day to go through this as elected members of all parties with the senior officials and to work out our preferred action plans on this, but as I say the reporting will be through the Continuous Improvement Committee and from then on to Council.

MR GEDDES: At what level? Are you on the Continuous Improvement Committee

MS DEAN: I am not particularly on it, no, but it is chaired by a convener who is a senior member of the administration, and again it is a full committee of the Council so not one that is a sub-committee or being pushed aside or anything of that nature. I would expect the Continuous Improvement Committee to do the first of the work on this and to present this action plan to the whole Council because I think it needs to be agreed and owned by the whole Council.

MR GEDDES: I wonder just in terms of the seriousness of the situation, to give it emphasis in terms of turning things around, whether or not something like a leadership and with the leaders of all political parties set-up at least for the first 12 months to drive this forward would give it the sort of urgency that perhaps it deserves?

35 MS DEAN: I would certainly have no objections to that.

I think that is probably a reasonable way forward. As I say, I would expect the

Continuous Improvement Committee will wish to look at this first but if that were to be one of your recommendations or indeed one of their recommendations then I think that is a fair way forward.

MR GEDDES: OK. The last point in relation to that as well: again we are relying on the surveys so we are not sure if people are happy or not but in terms of part of continuous improvement it says here, according to the Audit Scotland survey, less than half the councillors who replied, i.e. less than half of 17, had taken up any training in the last year. What are you doing to suggest to councillors? I know it is difficult; many councillors think once they are elected that they know everything, it is certainly a view I held for a while, I changed that, though. What are you doing? What have you done recently to urge councillors to take part in training of some sort?

MS DEAN: As you will be aware, the last Scottish Executive put a responsibility on all of us to ensure that we accept training as part of the payment package that was offered to us. I am being told that the Continuous Improvement Committee in fact instructed further training for their members as recently as last week. The situation that we are all in, and I think given the fact that the snapshot was 2006-07 in the run-up to an election and in particular this election when many members were seeing this as an opportunity to step down, it would not surprise me that not many had availed themselves of training in that time.

What has happened since then was an intense period of training at the beginning of the Council session which was first of all induction training and then to the particular spheres of interest of many of the councillors.

Many of those training sessions are on their way through their second cycle now which would largely repeat the training that was done the first time with some additions, but I think again because there were many new members this time and many members who were taking on new and different responsibilities the training which was done in the early days can only have had I would not say a limited effect, that would be disrespectful to my fellow elected members, but when we are all learning so much in the very early days it is difficult to assimilate that information, particularly when you have nothing to link it to; if you are brand new on to a council or brand new to administration it is difficult to assimilate it.

That is why the training cycle has begun again, really, and to my mind to sit through the same training a year on when you have that year's experience is going to give you an awful lot better opportunity to absorb it and a wider opportunity to know what questions you want to be asking. So training is very much a commitment of the Council and is available to all members and, as I say, we will continue to be so, and my understanding is in particular continuous improvement training which will be, I am sure, largely directed at members of the Continuous Improvement Committee, but nobody has ever shut the door on a training session to any councillor who is interested.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We now move on to looking at managerial leadership and structures, Douglas Sinclair.

MR SINCLAIR: Could I before I get into that just pick up a point that you and your colleagues mentioned about scrutiny. I am not sure if you have seen the submission that we received from the Labour Group but one of the points they make, and I will just give you a quote, is: "The opportunities for councillors particularly but not wholly on the opposition benches to obtain relevant information, scrutinise performance and make a meaningful contribution to development is being curtailed. Group members are increasingly having to use notices of motion and questions to officials and senior politicians to pursue issues."

MR STEWART: Maybe I could answer that. First of all, I am quite new to administration and I have to say that as a member of Aberdeen City Council I have been treated exactly the same in opposition as I have been in administration, and I have never had a problem in getting information from any officer of this Council. I think that is a very serious allegation.

In terms of scrutiny itself, I would point out that the Continuous Improvement Committee met last week and only half the Labour members attended that committee meeting, so they have the opportunity to scrutinise, it is whether or not they choose to come and scrutinise, I would say. But I would go back to the very serious allegation of how members are treated because I have never ever been denied any information from any officer of this Council, in opposition or in administration.

MR SINCLAIR: Thank you for that. Councillor Dean, you mentioned that there is an intention to revisit or review the structure in 2008 and it is not really a matter for the Accounts Commission to tell a council what kind of structure they should have, but I was interested in looking back at the papers. There is always a tension between the pull to centralise and the pull to decentralise and equally there is always a tension between the service perspective and the council perspective, and you have gone for a very radical solution, the neighbourhood

multidisciplinary teams, and you have described that as radical. I suppose the issue for us is, it may be radical but is it effective.

I was struck in the early working papers, I did not get any sense of option appraisal. Other councils have recognised the challenge of that tension by opting for different arrangements, for example the use of co-ordinators to work across the council whilst leaving the professions, if you want, in their boxes where they are trying to make the join-up across the way and to counter the tendency for departments to work up and down. Is it your intention looking forward to 2008, I would be interested to know how wide ranging that review is going to be.

MS DEAN: In terms of the radical structure and is it effective, I actually think it is. I think it gives more accountability at neighbourhood level. It means that if as we know the needs of each neighbourhood are different and the priorities of each neighbourhood are different, it is much more easy to react to that within the broad umbrella of the policy and the strategy set by the Council.

To be honest, I have not yet started to get my head around how far this review will go but I think it needs to be far reaching and I think it needs to look at every aspect of this. We have obviously had concerns expressed about the structure that we are using and I think it is only fair and courteous to the people who have expressed those concerns that we will have to look at it. It is early days yet but, as I say, I think we will need to look at it and obviously while I appreciate that it is not for the Accounts Commission to tell anyone what kind of structure to have I think we will need to be cognisant of what comes back from yourselves in terms of the report back from this hearing.

MR PATERSON: Could I perhaps add, I am fairly certain that there would be documentation from that period around 2000 and 2001 which would actually confirm that we did do the kind of option appraisal that you were raising and that that issue about having line management control or co-ordination control at a local level was actually gone through and teased out and an active decision was made for the option of the line management as opposed to the co-ordinating role.

There was a huge amount of work done over an extended period of time, primarily within the Council but it also involved the police service and the then Chief Superintendent, now the Chief Constable in Dumfries & Galloway was a full member of our restructuring team. A lot of work was done and the background documentation I suspect would not have been submitted as any part

of this process, what we would have submitted would have been the ultimate

papers that went to Council committees, but that degree of detail was gone into and active decisions were made, always weighing up options.

MR SINCLAIR: Thank you for that. Can I just pursue that point a bit further, particularly Councillor Dean's point about the needs of neighbourhoods varying and the need to be sensitive to that. In the 2005 Council paper there is a clear intention to reduce city-wide and lead roles to the minimum necessary. The point was reinforced in the same papers with proposals for the further modernisation of service delivery which argued for as full a disaggregation to the three areas as possible. With that approach and structure how do you ensure consistency in city-wide standards, that people in Aberdeen get the same level of service, and city-wide reporting; secondly, the development of city-wide policy where appropriate, because there will be occasions when you want to get a policy across the whole city; and, thirdly, preventing the duplication of specialist resources? There is always a danger in disaggregation that you end up with three teams doing what one specialist team at the centre could do. I would be interested in both your comments in relation to those questions.

MR PATERSON: Again I would suspect all the points that you are raising were covered in the background papers and probably the papers that went to the Council in 2001. Those are the fundamental papers. The 2005 thing was a review of progress and then further refinements to move forward. You may have to help me with all the points that you raise; I am not sure I can remember all of them.

MR SINCLAIR: I will just repeat them. Given the structure that you have got which aims at maximum disaggregation to the three areas how do you ensure consistency in city-wide standards, because the people of Aberdeen might say, "Why should I have one standard in the east of Aberdeen as opposed to the west of Aberdeen?" How do you ensure that? How do you ensure consistency of city-wide policy, for example social work is a good example, in terms of how you treat the elderly, where appropriate? Thirdly, how do you prevent the duplication of specialist resources? With the three area model there is always a danger you create three teams where in some cases where it is a particularly specialist service, for example education and psychology comes to mind, it may or may not be the right one, it might well be better in terms of best value to provide that on a central basis to the three teams.

MR PATERSON: Can I start by describing the job description of the heads of service within strategic leadership and therefore the Director of Strategic Leadership.

They have got primarily three related roles and I think therein lies the answer to your question. The first role is to develop the strategies and the associated policies for the Council and therefore the assumption is that the bulk if not all of our strategies and policies will be city-wide, and there is no presumption at all that policies will be developed at a local level. That is one of the fundamentals of the structure, that there would be that separation between the policy development and the operational side.

Clearly, then, the challenge that that raises, and this was well teased out in the documentation, is how you then ensure that there is a proper interface between the operational side and the strategic, because you are going to have those interfaces whatever kind of structure you have. So the first part of their remit is to produce policies and strategies. The second part is to see that those are delivered in a consistent manner across the city.

Therefore when I was talking, for instance, earlier about team plans, strategic leadership have provided the three areas under their parts of the Council with detailed guidance about the various policies, SPI targets and so on, and set out what each of the teams' particular areas of responsibility will deliver. They have a second responsibility which is to ensure that the policies and strategies they have developed are delivered in a consistent manner across the city.

In relation to duplication of resources I think there are at least a couple of answers there. One is, there has always been a common sense approach that if it was going to be hugely more expensive to duplicate or triplicate across three areas any particular resource we would not do that, if there was an overwhelming argument in terms of efficiency. What we have therefore done there, and we are well through the process, we have almost completed it, is that where that is the case, where there is no disaggregation or reaggregation at a local level by structural means that central service will have a service level agreement with the areas as to what service, what level and quality of service they can expect and which they can therefore assume when they are doing their planning.

Has that covered the three points you raised? These things were thought out in great detail.

- MR SINCLAIR: I do not know, Councillor Dean, whether you want to add anything to that?
- MS DEAN: I think the only point that I would have picked up on is the one that you made on monitoring and inter-area monitoring, which again comes under the remit of the Continuous Improvement Committee. Each of the area committees

looks at its own statistics and has the ability to thus compare them with other areas but all of these performance indicators do go to the Continuous Improvement Committee and they are charged with keeping the overview on that and reporting where necessary, which could be policy and strategy if it is a policy issue, resources management if it is a resources issue, or to any of the specific neighbourhoods, the area committees, or to the area management teams if they have concerns there.

MR SINCLAIR: Could I just pick up a point that Mr Paterson mentioned about the link between the policy and the operational. Policy influences the operational, equally the operational needs to influence policy. It needs to be a virtuous circle.

You mentioned earlier, I think, both you and Councillor Dean, about staff not always understanding their roles and the question I would like to put to you, and it is based on a comment by the Controller of Audit in her report in relation to social work, was the lack of clarity about the respective roles and responsibilities of the three operational areas and strategic centre. It seemed to me that went to the heart of a fairly important issue and the extent is, is there an explicit scheme of delegation in place, not just for social work but for all your services, which defines clearly which decisions are delegated, and presumably all day to day service decisions are delegated, and which are reserved to the centre?

One would assume if that was in place then that would bring a degree of certainty to staff in terms of the decisions they could make and the decisions that had to be referred up, which were policy decisions and which in your structure are retained by the centre.

MR PATERSON: If you mean a detailed scheme of delegation, no, that does not exist. What has been made absolutely clear is that separation between day to day operational matters which are for the area teams to deliver within the policy confines of defined policies of the Council and the policy side, and it is absolutely clear that there is no latitude at a local level at this point in time to deviate from the policies of the Council.

Part of the developmental process in terms of disaggregation and the localisation and personalisation in service delivery is that certainly a number of elected members who have spoken to me would like to see more flexibility at a local level with more delegation of budgets and more freedom to use those more creatively, you might argue, but at the moment because of the fears that you are raising of losing control of standards, losing control of policy and so on, there is a very, very tight definition, and if there is any sign of anybody stepping outwith

that they have got to be pulled back in.

That aspect of it has not actually created a major problem to date. The major problem that I think you are probing in relation to lack of clarity was partly related to what I explained in terms of the 2003 to 2005 time period where we had retained what in essence were the remnants of city-wide control in education, including intervention in operational matters, and social work, for planned and intended risk management reasons; that caused difficulty and confusion for staff, although it was actually well intended and it was put in place in a response to staff's individual and professional concerns about the risks that could be implied.

The other issue was the one that you raised in your previous question about the continuation of city-wide roles. What happened during that time period was that we had all sorts of arguments about why individual services, and they tended to be largely smaller sized services but not very small services, would fall into the category where you would say there is a cost argument for keeping it city-wide, why these should be kept city-wide; the lead role issue became, for instance, sports management will be held in north because you had somebody there who traditionally had experience in that area, where it should have just been disaggregated.

That is why in those papers that part of the 2005 thing came largely from elected members who saw the lead roles as an unnecessary, confusing and restraining factor unless they were justified by that ultimate efficiency argument, and that caused confusion for staff and for elected members.

MR SINCLAIR: Just observing in relation to delegation the sense of fear that people would go native, which is in a sense what you are alluding to, but if you had clear policies people can exercise that delegation within the framework of a clear policy and that seems to me the bit that perhaps is missing.

MR PATERSON: I think you have got to distinguish, and forgive me if I am misunderstanding you, between having clear policies and having a kind of scheme of delegation which you described earlier. There is no doubt that we have clear policies but ---

MR SINCLAIR: But that scheme of delegation can affect that?

MR PATERSON: The scheme of delegation is as I described it.

For the moment those policies will be delivered equally or equitably in each part of the Council, each part of the city, in the same manner. Again it is a risk minimisation thing in relation to the question you are raising.

The point I was going on to is that you could imagine, if the structure in the

organisation had matured to that point, that there could be greater delegation of flexibility to a local level to allow more creative responses to the needs of a community or individual family or whatever, but for the reasons that you are rightly raising about the risks of fragmentation of the structure and loss of control, our view at the moment is that we are not at the stage where that degree of delegation could take place, and that is about risk minimisation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Iain Robertson will now move on to accountability and scrutiny. MR ROBERTSON: We have touched a bit on scrutiny already, so I will try not to duplicate that. As I understand it, you agree with the Controller of Audit and with us that without absolutely accurate and appropriate and plentiful information the councillors are prevented from exercising both their scrutiny and their leadership roles and in addressing this you have set up the Continuous Improvement Committee. Can I ask what impact that committee is having, perhaps if I can ask the Leader first; is that committee really working and is it your leading scrutiny committee?

MS DEAN: It is our leading scrutiny committee and the chair of that was appointed because it was a great interest of his and something which he had felt was needing to be improved.

I think we also have to look at the fact that we have a continuous improvement service as well now, so it is not just a committee but it is a whole service designed not only to help us with effective scrutiny but to turn that scrutiny into the plans and procedures that need to go on to actually make the improvements that we are looking for.

I am aware of various items which that committee has taken because it has the powers to effectively scrutinise or look at any decision, any aspect of the Council, I am aware that they have been proactive on several occasions. If you asked me for examples I would be struggling, and I do not know whether the convener is here on the public benches but I am sure we can manage to find examples if you are looking at it. I think that is the important part, that they have already been seen to be proactive, they are not only dealing with audit reports, internal and external, they are dealing with all the performance management figures and the comparison of those across the three areas but, as I say, are also proactively seeking to challenge areas within the Council. And again any other committee which is unhappy with anything can either undertake its own investigation or preferably refer matters to the Continuous Improvement Committee for investigation.

MR ROBERTSON: And the Continuous Improvement Committee is chaired by a member of the administration?

3 MS DEAN: It is, yes.

4 MR ROBERTSON: Would it not be more valuable if it was chaired by somebody from the opposition?

MS DEAN: It is something that certainly was considered but in terms of the relationship between the committee and the service I think it is important that it is chaired by a member of the administration. I was once told by my predecessors in administration when we asked them the same question of the then Standards and Scrutiny Committee that the person they had put in charge was virtually a member of the opposition anyway, or some joking phrase of that nature. I would refrain from saying such a thing but I think we would be hard pushed to find anyone on the Council with a more robust idea of challenge than the convener of that committee. Is that fair?

MR STEWART: I would say so. Do you want me to add to that?

16 MR ROBERTSON: If you can.

MR STEWART: I will, if you do not mind. I was initially on the Audit Sub-Committee of this Council when I first joined in 1999, which was very weak indeed. We moved on to the Standards and Scrutiny Committee which upped the game and now we have the Continuous Improvement Committee, where there is much more room for scrutiny, and when it comes to such things I would have to say that I am a complete and utter anorak.

In terms of scrutiny we do not only just have the Continuous Improvement Committee, we also have the area committees where now much more information is available to me and to other elected members which I like to see so that you can actually deal with the problems that do exist out there. It should also be said that there is also a fair degree of monitoring at the Policy and Strategy Committee on its statutory performance indicators and at the Resources Management Committee, which I chair as well. I have to say that the level of knowledge and information that we can get at now is much greater than it has ever been since I have been on this Council.

You were asking about major differences that committees can make and what the Continuous Improvement Committee has done. The prime example is that you had Mr Murchie here earlier on talking about the failure in terms of 19 of the performance indicators. The Continuous Improvement Committee last week again went over this ground to ensure that there was movement forward on this

issue because we are unhappy. That is not the first time that has happened, that has happened before. We are able, much more able, I would say now, to move forward on these things and scrutinise what is happening in these particular areas.

MR ROBERTSON: Thank you. The audit report criticised the lack of scrutiny of Best Value. Will that be the committee that scrutinises Best Value?

MR STEWART: It will be and it has been, and I would go back to the point that the report itself is from that period, 2006/07, and not as things stand today.

MR ROBERTSON: And that committee will also scrutinise the way the Council is being run?

MR STEWART: It does.

MR ROBERTSON: There is another form of scrutiny, and that is with a small 's' perhaps, scrutiny by the public. The report was actually quite complimentary on your annual report, it won various awards for Plain English and things like that, but the report also acknowledged that it perhaps was not published widely enough and that neighbourhood service reporting was somewhat inadequate. It also pointed up weaknesses in service base reporting, I think they said that four out of 130 PPR reports were not available. How can your customers, the people, judge whether you are doing a good job if you do not put the information out to them, if you do not have it sent out? Perhaps the Leader would like to answer that.

MS DEAN: I think that is a fair point and my understanding is certainly that many more of these reports are now available. We need to get the information out to the public. We are fortunate I think to have a local press who take a great deal of interest in the workings of the Council and the public similarly take a great deal of interest in the workings of the Council, so notwithstanding the kind of statutory or formal means of getting the Council's performance out I think that scrutiny with a small 's' certainly happens in no short measure.

MR ROBERTSON: Thank you.

MR SINCLAIR: Can I just ask Councillor Dean about the issue of benchmarking about competitiveness which you mentioned earlier on. You said that you were keen on market testing and you were looking at this. I accept from the period from 1995 through to 2003 your group was not the administration of the Council, but notwithstanding that since 2003 and indeed, if you want, before that there were about 14 years where services in Aberdeen were not exposed to competitive tender; so how do you give the guarantee to the people of Aberdeen that the services that you currently provide represent value for money?

MS DEAN: I think that is an issue that we have been wrestling with. Obviously there have been best value reviews within that time but I think that is why there has been much more of a move to go towards market testing and I would draw the distinction there between market testing and immediately privatising services, which of course is what we are accused of any time we suggest market testing.

I think it was a concern that we were not able to provide the kind of assurances that you are talking about which has led to consideration of market testing which, as I say, has not been a popular decision. There is another one just either been approved or about to be approved, about to be considered over the next little while in terms of grounds maintenance services which we need to look at. But we have best value reviews which have gone on for the length of time that Best Value has been ---

MR SINCLAIR: But good Best Value reviews involve option appraisal and market testing, rather than just looking, "Where can we make efficiencies?"; they are part of the debate about Best Value reviews but an open, honest and transparent Best Value review would be to say, "Well, let's test the market and see whether our ratepayers, our council tax payers, are getting value for money".

18 MS DEAN: Yes, and can I say that ---

19 MR SINCLAIR: What are your plans in relation to all your services?

20 MR STEWART: Can I maybe come in?

21 MS DEAN: Please.

MR STEWART: At this moment in time there is market testing going on in some of the building cleaning services. Councillor Dean has mentioned grounds maintenance and that is something that we are keen to progress very quickly. That has been under discussion for a while. Again I would refer back to the Continuous Improvement Committee, we keep going back to that today; it was recommended that there be a report as soon as to the Resources Management Committee to allow the market testing of that service.

I would recognise that there has not been probably as much market testing as maybe should be the case. I think Councillor Dean is right to point out that in some regards you do face that accusation of moving to privatisation if you market test and that is something that we have got to overcome and get on with the job of actually going out there and doing the market testing that is required.

I have to say that in some regards the moves towards market testing is because of changes in the market itself. In terms of the building cleaning stuff which we are doing at this moment in time we cannot get the staff, so I think we have got

absolutely no option but in some regards to go and do this anyway, for all kinds 1 2 of reasons. 3 MR SINCLAIR: Thank you. 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Could you just sum up succinctly for me why there has been such a long time before market testing ground maintenance and environmental? 5 That is of the Leader; I beg your pardon. 6 MS DEAN: I think every time that it has been suggested there has been opposition 7 from not only the opposition groups within the Council but from within the trade 8 9 union movement as well, again understandably. It has seemed like an extremely 10 big issue. We have attempted to do it, it has been debated at many, many meetings, and in some cases concerns over trade union relationships and 11 12 relationships with staff may have set this back a bit, but I think we are now at the 13 stage of realising that this requires to be done and that we need in all good faith to take the trade unions along with us because they need to realise that this is a 14 15 necessary part of our scrutiny on the Council. 16 THE CHAIRMAN: As you know, we are seeing the unions during this hearing, so 17 obviously it is a point we will put to them. In the meantime, are discussions 18 started with the unions on this matter? MS DEAN: On the particular one? 19 20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. 21 MR EDWARDS: I think we have but I would prefer to refer to the local ---22 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, we will leave that just now. Let us then move on to 23 finance in the time just before lunch and then we will draw a halt for lunchtime. I 24 have already referred earlier to the auditor's report that talked about the financial 25 position being precarious; that is paragraph 112 of the best value report; 26 significant deficits in the last two years with a further deficit predicted for 27 2007/08. I guess part of the deficit is the failure to make the savings that were 28 committed to in 2006/07 and 2007/08. Is that fair? 29 (Inaudible comment) MS DEAN: Yes. 30 31 THE CHAIRMAN: One of the problems with such hearings is that eventually some 32 of the questions discussed earlier start to cascade down the way, we overlap a 33 little, but nonetheless we need to pursue this particular line. Yes, please, Mr 34 Edwards. 35 MR EDWARDS: Thank you, Chairman. You are right, savings have not been made 36 in 2006/07 and 2007/08. I think reference was made in the Audit Scotland

introduction to one of the reasons for the overspend being the payment of compensatory payments under the single status agreement.

Can I make the point there that the Council anticipated those payments being made and put a funding strategy in place to deal with that. That funding strategy essentially was the disposal of some assets where it was deemed to be Best Value to dispose of and create a capital fund, and the idea was to release the capital fund into the general fund to meet the cost of those compensatory payments. That was agreed in advance before the compensatory payments were made. The problem with the capital fund, and I do not want to be too technical, is you can only release so much of the capital fund into the revenue account, into the general fund, each year, it is limited how much you can release each year.

So the funding was there, the funding strategy was there to deal with the compensatory payments, it was a timing issue. I do not want to give the impression there was an overspend because of compensatory payments. Plainly we had to think how to fund it; the funding strategy was in place ahead of that.

Two other issues in terms of the overspends in 2006/07 and 2007/08; obviously any council budget is very huge, it is very complex, but the main areas of overspend as we talked about were on the health and care side, the social work/health and care side. More accurately, rather than saying overspend we would argue it is over-budget commitments because of increased needs from client groups.

I think we came to the position that we could not fund these increased needs led demand services by continually funding it from reserves and balances or making just general cuts in service delivery, something far more radical had to be done, and that is where we came into the process of transforming the way that those services are delivered, adult services and children's services, looking at various forms of care, various packages of care, and coming up with alternatives that still provide the quality of service but not such an expensive option. So we have dealt with that in the bigger picture in dealing with the transformation strategies which did kick in during 2007/08 and are going to kick in in far greater numbers and greater detail in 2008/09.

I think one of the comments obviously that has been made as well is, "You are putting a lot of store on these transformation strategies, generating savings/cost reductions in 2008/09". That is absolutely correct, we are putting a lot of store on that because we believe that is the only way we can go in order to stay within our budgets. We do take the point that grant distribution is a zero sum game and we

fully recognise that. We would make the point that we have been at the bottom three per head of population ever since 1996 and living within tight budgets is something we have had to do since 1996. But we have come to the point where we cannot just make cuts in services without some fundamental approach as to how we deliver services. That is why the transformation strategies are coming in and are playing a big part in our budget strategy in 2008/09.

If you permit me, I can go on to say that in 2008/09 we will be monitoring the budgets very, very closely through the Budget Monitoring Board with the monthly reporting to that board, in particular monthly reporting on progress of transformation strategies using what we call the traffic light system - Are we on target? Are the strategies delivering? Are the action plans in place? - recognising that it is a big sum there and having, I think as Councillor Stewart referred to, a plan B, as he called it, a risk management approach to our budget.

If those transformation strategies do not come in in their entirety in this financial year as a dual implementation or whatever, we have another plan to fall back on and that plan does consist of a number of elements to it. It is holding back spend on some of the areas of the budget. It is not committing all the revenue investment we have for driving transformation, so it is a balancing act between committing that sum and holding it back. It is looking at other things like potentially not committing all the capital projects to hold back on capital financing. That will be assessed on a monthly basis at the Budget Monitoring Board. It is a risk assessment on a monthly basis.

So we see the Budget Monitoring Board being a very powerful board of the Council, all party representation on that board, that will monitor the budgets, all aspects of the budgets, particularly the transformation programmes, on that monthly basis and will take decisions on a monthly basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR STEWART: All party and independent members of the Council were on that board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can I just go back to something you said about identifying needs within the social care budget, the social care spend. To what extent was that late recognition of a need that could have been in the budget?

MR EDWARDS: I think some colleagues from that service may be able to answer more adequately than I can but it is difficult always to predict need. It can be very unpredictable, when a child requires some particular level of care, individual care packages can cost £200,000 or £300,000 each, that is not atypical, and you

cannot predict exactly when that might come through. So to that degree there is an unpredictability with the health and care budgets, it is not as static as perhaps other budgets are, and that is something I know other councils always have issues with as well, it is that dynamic approach towards the social work budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Let me then pursue that a little in terms of your plan of monthly monitoring. Given that it is so unpredictable does that mean that the monthly monitoring will be there if you like simply to note the change? How does the monitoring work if the need is going to be unpredictable? What does the monitoring contribute?

MR EDWARDS: The monthly monitoring will be the historical side of it, as I think you alluded to, but also looking ahead in trends analysis in terms of potential commitments coming through. As I said, that cannot be 100 per cent accurate but you can start looking at some trends coming through in terms of elderly people in care, trends coming through in terms of vulnerable adults who require care packages, predicting ahead to the year end and making some assumptions based on past experience of what the likely increase may be.

That cannot be an exact science but we are getting better, I would say, in that trends analysis at predicting what demand for services might be, it cannot be 100 per cent, as I said. So it will not be as to the historical side of it, it will be predicting trends going forward as well and taking decisions based on those forward trends and forward predictions.

MR STEWART: I think there are also a number of things which we need to look at because the way that we currently commission services has to change as well. We are putting in place in control where people will be in charge of their own budget. Those will be fixed budgets and we will have a clear indication of what that spend is likely to be. So there is a radical shift in the way that we are dealing with some aspects of social care as well and some of that shift will mean that we will have a more concrete idea of what we are actually going to be spending.

THE CHAIRMAN: And are you content that the information the budget holders will receive will enable them to manage the budgets?

MR STEWART: I would hope that that would be the case but we have put in place the Budget Monitoring Board for that reason. We also have a group who are looking at the commissioning of social work at this moment in time which will involve folk from the voluntary sector as well for their professional input to make sure that we are getting best value in terms of the commissioning that we are doing as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me then move on to 2008/09 where there is an assumption, a plan to achieve savings of £27 million.

MR STEWART: Could I just say, it is savings of round about the £24 million mark because we have the £3 million investment fund to drive forward the transformation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The £24 million: how much detail has been looked at there in terms of estimating that saving? Is that a fully costed £24 million?

MR STEWART: We as the administration looked very carefully at the information that came in front of us and have put together a budget which officers have given us, the list of possible savings which we hope will be delivered. But, as has been said, we have got a plan B in place just to make sure that we do not reach a situation or try not to reach a situation of overspend again.

As was highlighted earlier, we are well aware that the balances at the end of March are likely to be in the region of £2.9 million. That leaves us very little leeway, it has to be said. We are trying to ensure everything possible to deliver this budget as a balanced budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is what led the auditor to describe the position as precarious. Mr Edwards, please.

MR EDWARDS: It is just to mention that each saving/cost reduction in 2008/09 has got a detail behind it, there is no kind of blanket general savings there in management costs or general savings in overheads. Everything has been detailed to that extent, so it can be monitored quite closely. There is nothing of a general nature in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: OK, thank you.

MR STEWART: Can I add to that as well because in terms of the amount of information that councillors had in the budget documents which went to all groups, we had much greater levels of detail of impact as well on those savings. We had for the first time in many areas the amount of service users of a service and various other things which we had not had before because of the Citistat process and other methods that had been put in place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me then refer to the Controller of Audit's report at paragraph 48 because this says that, and this is a question for the Leader: "... the process of linking corporate and service-based plans and the more recently introduced neighbourhood community action plans was still under way. As a consequence the council still had work to do to link resource planning and budgeting to corporate and service planning." I am slightly confused by that in

the sense of how one plans resources without links to the corporate plan.

MS DEAN: I think that was part of the issue, that many of the budgets were still held fairly centrally and had not been disaggregated and reaggregated to the neighbourhoods, and that has been part again of the challenge of this budget round. My understanding is that that is much more clearly defined now than it was 18 months ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it is tightening gradually, slowly but surely; thank you. Let me pursue the generality of that. Paragraph 65 refers to the internal audit report on the development of service plans. It identified a number of weaknesses that still existed in 2006/07. One was that there had been no review to ensure that such service plans could be delivered within existing budget allocations. Can you just confirm to me that the service plans are now checked against budgets for affordability?

MS DEAN: Can I have that confirmed by others?

MR EDWARDS: Yes, through the service plans, through the transformation programmes everything links in there in terms of service planning, being informed by the transformation strategies which inform the budgets, so there is that linkage now being developed and being strengthened.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: So, to be short, that is a yes?

MR EDWARDS: It is a yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. A final question from me just now, and then I suggest we break for lunch, and it is this. The Controller of Audit's report at paragraph 14 talks about how the population of Aberdeen City Council is expected to decline by 23 per cent by 2024, and of course within the population there are various categories of change, old people, younger people etc. Have you identified, have you discussed the consequences for the Council's planning in the short term and in particular the long term financial planning?

MS DEAN: Yes, it has certainly been discussed and I think that is why we are doing all that we can. We are in a strange situation in terms of our planning framework at the moment. Our Local Plan dates from 1991; the reasons why the Local Plan dates from 1991 I do not think are necessary to rehearse here. The next Local Plan is with the Scottish government at the moment and we would hope to have approved probably by the end of the summer. From that point of view it means that the housing land allocations and even industrial land allocations are way out of date. What we have done certainly within the Local Plan is to open up much more of that and the new City Region Structure Plan - I think it is City Region

Plan, rather, "structure plan" in my traditional mind - will actually give much more opportunity to try to reverse that balance. The difficulty that has been caused, the shortage of housing land then pushes up the price of that land which means that developers looking at that land are trying to get the maximum number of units on that, which is understandable from their point of view. We now have a surfeit of flats, which are still being sold, so it is not a surfeit that is a problem, but when people are looking for family housing they are moving into Aberdeenshire, the relative drop in our population is virtually equalled by a relative increase in Aberdeenshire's population. So, as I have said before, when people get to the stage of wanting a front and back door and a garden they are heading to Aberdeenshire to do it. While, yes, we have factored this into our plans for the foreseeable future we

are also doing what we can to try to reverse that trend. In particular the upcoming structure plan is looking at 35,000 new homes within the city boundary, so I think it is as important that while we need to plan for the eventualities of a population decline then we also need to try to plan to avoid that population decline, and that is the way we are trying to work it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just before we break for lunch let me check with my colleagues whether anyone wants to ask any burning question that cannot be deferred until afterwards. There is none. Are there any other points you wish to make just before we break for lunch, or would you be quite content to carry them forward?

MS DEAN: I think we have had a fair chance to have our say and I am grateful for the questions we have had.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not finished yet. There are a lot more questions. This is half time.

27 MS DEAN: I will leave it at that, then.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall reconvene at 2 pm.

28 29 30

1

2

3

4

5

6

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

(The lunch adjournment)

31 32

33

34

35

36

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen; welcome back to the afternoon session of our public hearing. The story so far is that I am just about finished my questions on finance, I have just a few more to put to the Leader and others who wish to respond on looking forward.

Can I then turn to the future and looking at the base budgets for the three years

2008/09 to 2010/11. The net expenditure for 2008/09 is £444 million and that represents an increase of 19 per cent on the base budget for 2007/08. If I then 2 3 were to give you the same percentages as increases on 2007/08 for the succeeding two years, these are 24 per cent and 29 per cent increases. These are base budget 4 figures. They are clearly significant increases in expenditure. Could you give us 5 some outline of the reasons for these increases? 6 MS DEAN: I think I am going to have to ask Mr Edwards to respond on that one. 7 8 MR EDWARDS: Just to clarify, Chairman, you started off with a figure for 2008/09 9 of what? THE CHAIRMAN: £444 million. 10 MR EDWARDS: And you were relating that to the percentage increases based on 11 12 previous years? 13 THE CHAIRMAN: No, that £444 million, I am taking the succeeding two years, I 14 am taking that as an increase on the previous base budget of 2007/08; I am using 15 2007/08 as my base, being the last year of actual or thereby; and, you know, big increases, I am sure there are good reasons but we would like to understand what 16 17 they are. 18 MR EDWARDS: OK. I do not have all the base budget information with me, 19 unfortunately. I can tell you some of the increases there would be that in 2008/09 20 we are certainly assuming the full year effects on job evaluation comes in in 2008/09 which accounts for £11 million. We are assuming quite substantial 21 22 needs led increases in health and care budgets which I mentioned before, which 23 were around £10 million. There will be increases in salary wage awards which will be around £6 million or £7 million. There are increases in the waste 24 management contract which from memory is around £4 million or £5 million. 25 MR STEWART: £3.4 million. 26 27 MR EDWARDS: £3.4 million. There will be increases in capital financing charges 28 of about £1.2 million. We do have an analysis, I think Councillor Stewart there 29 gave us it, which takes us to £37 million in total, and if I have missed anything 30 maybe Councillor Stewart could add one or two more. 31 MR STEWART: Councillor Stewart could if he had all the papers but I have only got 32 part of them so I am sorry. If you give me a moment I will have a look.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is whether no or not.

33

34

35

36

MR EDWARDS: An increase in account for the year of £37 million accounts for

salary wage awards of £6.1 million, loan and interest charges from the capital

programme of £1.4 million premises and energy costs to new contract, £2.8

1 million, landfill tax penalties and waste charges, £3.4 million; the ongoing needs 2 led commitments in social work is about £9.7 million, the equal pay and 3 modernisation built in to the pace budget for 2008/09 is just over £10 million, plus we have got a contingency provision of £1 million and some other general 4 inflationary uplifts which account for £1.1 million. That to me would add up to 5 just about £34 million, but if you want me to go into a bit more detail I would 6 need to spend a bit more time to go into a more detailed breakdown. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is the generality I am interested in just now. If you then 9 look at the succeeding two years these costs continue to go up other than, if you 10 like, on what you might expect to be a reasonable stab at general inflation. MR EDWARDS: Again what I would say for the previous two years, again I would 11 12 need to go back and get further detail on that. 13 THE CHAIRMAN: For the succeeding two years' budget. 14 MR EDWARDS: I am sorry. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: You have compared from 2008/09 with 2007/08, 16 and that has been helpful. 17 MR STEWART: Yes, but you are talking about succeeding years? 18 THE CHAIRMAN: These costs for the succeeding two years thereafter continue to go up beyond what seems to be general inflation, and I am curious just to 19 20 understand what the Council's plans are. 21 MR EDWARDS: Would you mind if I was to defer to the City Chamberlain there, 22 who will perhaps have a more detailed make-up? 23 THE CHAIRMAN: I am happy for anyone who can answer it to answer it. Could I 24 ask you, please, for the record to state your name and position. 25 MS COOPER: Thank you. It is Susan Cooper, City Chamberlain. Just to clarify that 26 we are talking about the years 2009/10 and 2010/11; is that correct? 27 THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. MS COOPER: The report to Council back on 14th February outlined a range of 28 29 uplifts, making assumptions in regard to salary cost pay awards, general 30 contractual uplifts, assumptions in regard to our capital programme and therefore 31 the potential impact on our capital financing charges, so a range of indicators 32 were applied in regard to that, general inflationary ones; assumptions about pay 33 award negotiations. We also made assumptions in regard to potential uplifts for 34 requisitions from fire, police and general valuation boards, so the types of things

that account for the uplift in those years, basically. We also flow through the

budget savings in 2008/09 some of which may be recurring, some of which may

35

36

1 be non-recurring, and that might also account for any kind of variation and 2 difference as well. 3 THE CHAIRMAN: So that any savings are included in those budgets, is that correct? 4 MS COOPER: Yes, that is correct. THE CHAIRMAN: What is the extent of savings in those two years? 5 MS COOPER: In those two years the flow through of the £27 million spoken about 6 before, yes, those do flow through into those years. I do not have the details with me but I do recollect that if they were achieved in 2008/09 and continued into 8 9 2009/10, in effect broadly we would have a balanced budget in 2009/10 and for 2010/11 we might have a small surplus, but that is subject to the underlying 10 inflationary uplifts used and any other changes, any factors in relation to that. 11 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I understand that. And it is £27 million, just to be precise, 13 which is the anticipated savings in each of those two subsequent years as well? 14 MS COOPER: I would need to get back to you on the detail of that because I do not 15 think it necessarily is the £27 million flowing through in each year. THE CHAIRMAN: Higher or lower, would you know? 16 MS COOPER: Off the top of my head I do not recollect, to be honest. 17 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS COOPER: All I do know is that they flow through. On the basis of the inflation 19 20 uplifts utilised on the face of it it would appear that we have an initial balanced budget for 2009/10 and 2010/11 but based on the underlying premises and 21 22 assumptions used. 23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I have one or two other questions of a 24 similar nature. I guess I will put them to the Leader and the Leader can decide 25 who should answer them. The amount budgeted for strategic leadership increases 26 from the base budget for 2007/08 of £22 million to almost £48 million a year 27 later and thereafter continues to increase. That is quite an increase. Can you 28 explain why that is? 29 MR EDWARDS: We did a bit of analysis into the base budget here for the two years. 30 I am just wondering, to save some time, I wonder if Abigail Tierney, the 31 Director of Strategic Leadership, might know something, to give us a quick 32 answer. 33 THE CHAIRMAN: As I say, I am quite happy for anyone to inform us of what is 34 happening. 35 DR TIERNEY: My name is Abigail Tierney: I am the Corporate Director for 36 Strategic Leadership. I can only say that we are delivering savings over the next

three years so I need to understand whether it is a typing error, because I am certainly not aware of that increase.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. I am sorry if this is tiresome for the rest of the audience but it is quite important that I get to the bottom of this. There is a line, three from the bottom, half way down there, where there is a sub-total of £409 million for the base budget £8.9 million. You do not have that? All right. I think in the circumstances this is probably not going to take us very far at the moment and we should probably take this off line and get explanations for it. But it is interesting to me that there is this very significant change in the amount budgeted for strategic leadership. Do you have that now?

DR TIERNEY: I think I can answer it now. I would need some clarification from Gordon Edwards but I think it has been a shift in the way we are reporting the accounting and that previous central management services were split right the way across and they have now been all recorded differently. That is how I understand it, so it is actually how it is being recorded that is different.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we are not comparing like with like?

MR EDWARDS: I think that is correct, it is not quite the same base, there have been more direct allocations now to strategic leadership. Now we have got a bit of handle on what each service delivers and what the support arrangements are there are better allocations now to that as a service, so it is not quite like for like.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. Can you confirm it is not an expansion and that the actual expenditure itself is not the expansion it suggests, therefore; is that right?

24 MR EDWARDS: It is certainly not the expansion, no, certainly not.

MR STEWART: It has not had political back-up, if there is an expansion there, so the answer is, no, it is not an expansion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was coming to that; thank you. Let us push on, then. The same budgets refer to general revenue grants showing significant increases for 2009/10 of 20 per cent on the year 2007/08 again, and there is a similar increase, 25 per cent, for the year after compared with 2007/08. Can you just confirm that these revenue grants have been agreed or virtually agreed with the Scottish Government or how much are they soft figures?

MR EDWARDS: I think what you refer to there, Chairman, is the fact that is the general revenue grant that we get from the Scottish Government.

35 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

36 MR EDWARDS: Previously we got it in two elements, if you like, there was the

1 general revenue support and a whole host of specific grants which were allocated 2 against individual services. Obviously it is all consolidated now. 3 THE CHAIRMAN: It is the amount, though. Those amounts have been confirmed as 4 part of the agreement, have they? MR EDWARDS: They have been confirmed provisionally as part of the three year 5 funding settlement. 6 7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. 8 MR EDWARDS: Obviously they may well be changed in years two and three by the 9 Scottish Government but those are the provisional allocations at this point in 10 time. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And the final question before we move on to another 11 12 topic altogether: again looking at the budgets for the same three years there is 13 shown an anticipated income of £27 million to £30 million over the three years 14 and it appears to be anticipated from such activities as sports and leisure, 15 learning, social work, shelter and environment. What is the source of those anticipated revenues? Is this new charges being introduced? 16 MR EDWARDS: Again I would need to look at the detail, which I do not have in 17 18 front of me. I suspect it would either be existing charges for those services or potentially a new range of charges, but I would need to look at that in some 19 20 detail, if you can give me some light. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: The reason that it prompted a question was that they do not 22 appear in previous years. 23 MR EDWARDS: Would you mind taking that one off line again so that we can have a look at that in a bit more detail. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. The thrust of my question is, are these new charges. 25 26 MR EDWARDS: We have introduced new charges in certain areas, that is the case. 27 THE CHAIRMAN: These aggregate to about £30 million by three years' time. Does 28 that sound about right to you? 29 MS COOPER: We are requiring all officers under standing orders to review their 30 charges and we are also looking at how we benchmark and compare to other 31 authorities as well. 32 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let us then move on to people management. Iain. 33 MR ROBERTSON: This is a question for both the Leader and the Chief Executive 34 but the first part of it is primarily for the Chief Executive. In all my years in 35 business in the public sector I have never heard of a culture of non-compliance, in 36 other words, your staff are not doing what you want them to. What has caused

such a culture?

MR PATERSON: I think we have got to look at two things. One is what the term which has come into currency actually means and then your point about what has caused that. What it attempts to describe is a situation which is the starting point that we had in 1996 and which we have been working on where decisions can be made by management, by committee to the Council, statutory issues, and there are varying degrees to which you can assume that there will be compliance with them.

It is not necessarily wilful lack of compliance by staff, it is the fact that new things are often difficult to build into people's working routines. That can go from anything from really serious issues like issues around health and safety back to routine things that would affect public perception, things like responding within the 15 days that we normally give to respond to the public, or into systemic things like you are trying to introduce a new appraisal scheme and some services will pick that up and run with it relatively easily and relatively quickly; others you may have real difficulty getting it established.

It is about how you get alongside people and that is why I was emphasising earlier on things like team planning and so on, to actually alter those behaviours, to get them to include as part of new routine behaviours things which are seen to be new and additional to them.

That was the situation we inherited and basically we are only making really rapid progress on it now, and it was some of the things I ran through in the morning, because we now have senior management down to third or fourth tier who are committed to picking these things up and making the necessary interventions to ensure that staff have the necessary structures and support to implement them.

MR ROBERTSON: So you think, let me put it simply, that this lack of staff understanding is going to be corrected by good old fashioned top-down management?

MR PATERSON: No, I do not think that was what I said.

MR ROBERTSON: It sounds very like it.

MR PATERSON: What I was trying to describe was a situation where it is not solely about the top-down management but it is about having the proper management structures in place to provide staff with clarity about what is expected of them and then support and challenge to ensure that they actually pursue those.

The kind of thing I am talking about is attempting to get safety audits done in

buildings. What we did there was sent out instructions and provided whatever support people indicated they needed, but you then have difficulty getting beyond, say, 60 or 70 per cent of actual establishments getting them done, so you have then got to provide further support and monitoring and checking to see that they happen, because in that case you are talking about a serious health and safety issue whereby it is your responsibility as an employer to see that is happening.

What that checking then leads to is potentially resentment among staff in terms of, "This is top-down, this is tick box management," and so on, but there are points that you get to whereby the risks of not ensuring that there is compliance outweigh the risks of actually going through that process. So it is not just about top-down management. We have been providing structures within which people will work where there should be much less lack of clarity as to what is expected of people. If you assume that most staff are genuinely trying to do a good job, but you are asking them to do new and different things which they may regard as additional to the routines that they have been traditionally involved in, it is much wider than just instructing them to do it. It is about training, it is about culture, it is about structures that are around them to assist the process.

MR ROBERTSON: That encouraging staff to own the process is what you have failed to do and now you are effectively saying that you have to resort to telling people what to do.

MR PATERSON: No. What I was suggesting was that there were different levels of commitment from managers previously to actually ensuring that it happened. When I say ensuring it happened, I am putting that in the context of what I said about the "ensuring" includes support as well as challenge.

I had an interesting conversation with a management team in the pre-2005 period where we were having real difficulty just getting basic returns back from a group of managers and it did not matter what went out to them, 20 or 30 per cent of them regularly did not respond and had to be chased up. When I talked to the directorate who were responsible for those managers and said to them, "What have you been doing about this?" the basic answer is, "We've just accepted it". What we are getting in terms of the work that is going on just now, because we have put a lot of investment into leadership and leadership development over the last two to three years, are that the people who are doing the leadership development indicating that often our managers have been more concerned in the past about being seen to be nice as opposed to efficiency in getting things done.

MR ROBERTSON: Can I turn the question a little bit to the Leader. There have been, for example, staff appraisals going on in businesses in Aberdeen since the 1970s, probably even before that. How are you going to tackle this now? It is not going to change overnight. How are you going to get the Council's aspirations met over the next couple of years?

 MS DEAN: I think a lot has changed in the last little while, there seems to be a difference in atmosphere there, but as elected members we are reliant on our officers. We get the reports back at the area committees and as we have said to Continuous Improvement Committee, one of which it is interesting that the performance indicator previously was the percentage of appraisals done this year. We have realised fairly quickly that that means next to nothing because, dependent on some teams who may have seasonal commitments or other things, then there are traditional times of year for doing the appraisals; so what we have done is we have asked for the percentage of appraisals done over the last 12 months rather than over a calendar year or a financial year, which should be running fairly near to the 100 per cent and 100 per cent would be the target.

So we are keeping an eye on that as elected members from that point of view and instructions will be issued if required, if those figures are seen to be slipping at all then instructions will be issued to ensure that these appraisals are done and, I think more important, probably, that the follow-up work, the support needs or training needs or whatever comes out of them, are actually implemented.

MR ROBERTSON: Paragraph 127 of the report expresses concern that the sickness absence rates are higher than the Scottish average. Is there any particular reason for those high absence rates, and again what are you going to do about that?

MS DEAN: Can you answer that, Douglas, because I think there have been improvements in the last little while.

MR PATERSON: That report in a sense is selective in the sense that it does not cover where we have been with sickness absence rates. If you look at the sickness absence rates over the last five to 10 years we have put a lot of work into it and brought them down really substantially. They are still above the Scottish average and there is no denying that but that kind of masks the effort we have put into bringing down the absence rates and the success we have had in that. My understanding is that they have come down by another ½ per cent in the last year, and that is a fairly substantial improvement. The efforts go on into reducing that.

I can talk to you about specific initiatives that are happening in terms of

absence rates, in terms of early contact with people who are off sick, support for them and so on. That in itself has been quite significant.

MR ROBERTSON: The reason I am rehearsing this with you is that paragraph 109 of the report indicates that the Council's transformation programme has the potential to provide some coherence for staff but the report also goes on to say that this is critically dependent on the Council being able to secure effective engagement from the staff, and I am just not sure that you are there.

MR PATERSON: I think I indicated in the questioning in the morning the extent of what we are doing to turn things around in relation to engaging staff. I would agree with you absolutely, we are not there. What I am seeing is the beginnings of significant improvement in getting there and turning things around from what in the past was a top-down, and we can go into some of the reasons for that approach, to one which is now more able to focus on building back up from front line staff in that way.

MR ROBERTSON: OK, thank you.

MR STEWART: Can I add to that in terms of transformation and staff involvement. I do not have individual figures of absence within groups but some of the areas where we have made significant progress in the last little while, including the likes of resolving the void housing problem, that has largely been down to front line staff who have bought in to the concept and have actually helped improve the service dramatically.

MR ROBERTSON: So these staff own their part in the change process?

23 MR STEWART: Yes.

24 MR ROBERTSON: So that is a communication sector exercise?

MR STEWART: Indeed it is, and it is a communication exercise and it is a communication exercise that we are trying to deal with at this moment in time to show folk that they should not be threatened by change and that change is actually beneficial for them as well. I think if you talked to these people who were involved in that process where they are now in terms of their work to where they were then, they would say that they are much happier because they are being able to deliver a better service to the general public.

MR ROBERTSON: There is a classic saying in corporate communications that the best way of communicating is to listen to people.

34 MR STEWART: Indeed.

MS DEAN: Absolutely, and I think I said that in my introductory remarks, that as the transformation programmes roll out across the Council then each one is the best

1 advert for the next one and hopefully to get the staff to continue with the buy-in that we have seen on that. 2 3 MR ROBERTSON: Thank you. 4 THE CHAIRMAN: If you infer a degree of scepticism I think it is because we are talking here about winning the hearts and minds and that is always difficult, and 5 it is a fact that until now, until recently at least, that was a battle you were losing. 6 You are now confirming to us that you are now beginning to win that battle, but 7 that is where the scepticism comes. Douglas, you have a question. 8 9 MR SINCLAIR: This is a follow-up to something that Councillor Dean said. You said that understandably you rely on the officers for information about how 10 staffing matters are going rather than what-have-you. 11 12 MS DEAN: Yes. 13 MR SINCLAIR: But clearly people in your position of a leadership role, because your attitude towards the staff and the way you treat staff helps define the culture 14 15 in the organisation. I just want to put a quote to you, albeit it was an anonymous quote from a group of concerned employees who wrote to the Commission, and 16 the quote is: "The work force has been recently blamed for the deficit by the 17 18 Leader of Aberdeen Council for not embracing Aberdeen's future in single status." How would you react to that statement? 19 20 MS DEAN: I actually do not think that is an accurate quote at all. I am surprised 21 actually at the credence that has been given to anonymous submissions but 22 obviously that is within your remit, but I certainly do not ---23 MR SINCLAIR: Maybe it is anonymous because that was the only way they could 24 communicate, to be fair. MS DEAN: I can understand that, but I certainly do not recognise that quote at all. I 25 26 do not consider that I have blamed the workforce. 27 MR SINCLAIR: Thank you. 28 THE CHAIRMAN: We now move on to something we have referred to several times 29 and said it would come later. This is later: property. 30 MS FAULDS: Thank you, John. I would like to ask some questions about the issues 31 raised in the Controller of Audit's report on property matters. You know that the 32 report had certain findings, one of which was that there were cases where accurate and relevant information was not reported to elected members. 33 34 Councillor Stewart, could I ask you, following on from that, if you could elaborate on your statement this morning about lies being told to members, but 35 could you respond in such a way that you do not name a name or a grade or 36

1 anything that would identify people? 2 MR STEWART: Indeed. What I am referring to in particular is the actual scenario 3 that I painted this morning with Councillor Jack Dempsey, a former Tory 4 member who has now gone, who asked a number of questions at full Council round about Carden House. He was given answers which satisfied him 5 eventually but I think it would be fair to say that those answers were not the ones 6 that should have been given. MS FAULDS: Do you think that was a deliberate attempt by an officer to mislead a 8 9 member or was it a misunderstanding on the part of the officer? MR STEWART: I do not know and I cannot comment on what is in somebody's 10 mind or why they would choose to say one thing or the other. 11 12 MS FAULDS: So you do not know whether the officer was lying or just 13 misunderstanding the position? 14 MR STEWART: What I would say is that we were lied to. We were given wrong 15 information which in my view is a lie. THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just clarify that. The wrong information could just be a 16 17 misunderstanding, it would not necessarily be deliberate, would it? 18 MR STEWART: We are going back a number of years now and I painted a picture to external audit round about this where I was asked a number of questions by them 19 20 as well which I could not give clear answers to because your memory over a 21 period of time tends to fail you somewhat. I remember how strongly Councillor 22 Dempsey put himself across that day and there were various points which stuck 23 in my mind which I gave to external audit. In hindsight you could say that Councillor Dempsey at that point probably highlighted that there was a difficulty 24 but that was assuaged by the answer that he got at that time, or the answers that 25 26 he got at that time. To expand on that, I would be afraid to do so because it is 27 somewhere in the region of five, six-plus years ago now. 28 MS FAULDS: Thank you. Councillor Dean, are you aware of the legal requirements 29 on a local authority not to dispose of a property for a consideration which is less than the best consideration without obtaining the consent of the Scottish 30 31 Ministers? MS DEAN: Yes, I am. 32 33 MS FAULDS: You are aware of that? So in any disposal of a property how do you 34 satisfy yourself that what has been put forward represents the best consideration? 35 MS DEAN: We rely on the professional advice of the service that administered those 36 transactions. The Resources Management Committee in most cases would

instruct negotiations, if a property is declared surplus or an interest is expressed 2 in a property and that is declared surplus then we would instruct officers to 3 negotiate the best possible consideration for the Council and to report back. 4 MS FAULDS: And that is the standard answer, Councillor Dean, but this morning you gave evidence to us to the effect that we were not taking into account 5 development value uplift due to planning permission. So were those comments 6 your own or are you just repeating what officers told you? 7 8 MS DEAN: No, those comments are my own. This morning I spoke to you of two 9 instances in neither of which case I took part in the decision but in both of which 10 cases I was aware of circumstances outwith the standard sale of a property. I have told you that I am aware of the requirement to get the best value. As far as I 11 12 am concerned as a non property expert and as a non many things expert, which 13 we still have to consider in terms of the Council, I rely on the professional advice of our officers. 14 15 MS FAULDS: But this morning you said that one of the sites was used as a medical 16 centre, and I took it by that you meant therefore the public sector use was less 17 commercial or less valuable in the market than a private sector use such as 18 housing which was the other example you had given. MS DEAN: Yes, I would assume that is, and again that would come from the 19 20 professional advice of our officers. 21 MS FAULDS: So if a proposal to dispose of a property, a public asset, to another 22 public body comes would you not expect to see in that report that this may not be 23 the best consideration and would that not be something that you would want to 24 have scrutinised before you authorised a disposal? 25 MS DEAN: Yes, I would were I taking part in that decision. 26 MS FAULDS: And you were not involved in the disposal in this case, the one you 27 referred to this morning? 28 MS DEAN: No, I was not, because of my interest as a member of NHS Grampian's 29 Board. 30 MS FAULDS: Thank you. Mr Edwards, I mentioned this morning that in the written 31 submission to the Council we were told that a far more stringent operational 32 quality assurance arrangement has now been put in place. I want to go through 33 that with you and I do not know which is the easier way, whether you want to just 34 give me an outline of how your processes on disposal of property will be 35 implemented going forward and how they address the deficiencies identified in

1

36

the report, or would you prefer if I took you through different stages in the

disposal of a property to see where the differences may be?

MR EDWARDS: If I may introduce it, then, on what procedures have been put in place at the moment.

MS FAULDS: Yes.

MR EDWARDS: Can I preface my remarks by saying that one of my fundamental standards is that I want full information to be provided to elected members at all times for them to take adequate decisions and fully informed decisions. Those are the standards I work by, those are the standards I expect my staff to work by and those are the standards that I would enforce. Obviously I have inherited the situation here with the former City Development Service, this was before my time. I do not want to talk too much about what happened in the past because obviously that still is part of disciplinary and police investigation. All I can talk about is what I have put in place now since I have inherited the situation.

Fundamentally when this problem came to light ---

MS FAULDS: Can I just ask you there, when you sat down to put something new in place did you have a check list of what was procedurally wrong and had to be addressed?

MR EDWARDS: Yes. At that time what was emerging through the internal audit report, which was not concluded at this time during 2006, were a number of issues they flagged up that were highlighted as being wrong and short of proper professional practice, so emerging through that period were the outcomes of the internal audit report which highlighted a number of weaknesses. That was emerging. I did not want to wait until that internal audit report was concluded before I put an action plan in place; I felt I had to act there and then to protect the Council interests and to ensure that elected members were fully informed.

One of the first things I did in 2006 when this became apparent was, I felt I could not put faith in the in-house asset valuation process, so we went out to tender, open competitive tender, with external valuation service. That is a valuation service to deal with valuation of properties in terms of acquisition and/or disposal and also around that quite clearly was full options appraisals around that as well.

So that our remit was whenever a property was going to be disposed of or acquired there would be a full options appraisal around potential other uses of the property, what the various values would be depending on the use of the property, development of property etc. That was one of the first things that was put in place in terms of property acquisitions or disposals, externalising that function.

Related to that obviously are reports to elected members, information coming back from the external firm of valuers and reports to elected members based on any findings and recommendations, and we have put a far tighter quality assurance process in place now that my Head of Resources Development and Delivery, Colin Hunter, who reports to me, scrutinises in a great deal of detail these reports. One of his fundamental tenets in looking at these reports is, do they reveal all the relevant information, do they look at all options, are they fully explicit in types of information which is contained in those reports, do they provide all the information that is required for the elected members to take decisions. So that is the fundamental principle that we have put in place now.

That is at the highest level, if you like, the kind of strategic level. On top of that, we are looking at putting in place a computerised asset management planning system, and again we have gone out to external market to provide that information for us.

At the more supervisory, managerial level we have had a fundamental review of file management, all asset files, documents now have been received and are fully documented, all the asset files. We have reviewed all the professional guidance which is there for chartered surveyors; I am not a chartered surveyor so I cannot talk in detail about that guidance but all the professional guidance has been reviewed and all processes and procedures have been reviewed to ensure there is full compliance with those processes and procedures.

So it is a mixture of the strategic level and the kind of detailed supervisory level, but all that will obviously be subject to a follow-up audit in due course and obviously myself and Colin Hunter will be held accountable for any issues that arise out of that.

MS FAULDS: I understand the principle of all the information going to members but do you now have a policy or a protocol on how the management and administration of a property acquisition or disposal will be dealt with?

MR EDWARDS: Yes, we do.

MS FAULDS: What sort of considerations do you expect to be taken into account in deciding whether to sell a property? What are these relevant issues that you think members should be aware of?

MR EDWARDS: There are lots of issues to be aware of, obviously, and it depends on individual circumstances. It depends first of all who the prospective purchaser is: is there a potential there for selling below what could be deemed to be open market value. If it was a partner organisation, for example, it would have to be

before elected members with the options there that they may wish to sell to a 2 partner organisation at what could be deemed to be below full market value. If, 3 for instance, a development proposal for a development of a set of flats was obtained through planning permission they might get a higher value than selling 4 to perhaps a public sector partner for use for a specific purpose or whatever, but 5 that information would need to be before elected members for them to take an 6 appraisal of that situation based on all the options in front of them. It is difficult to be absolutely precise when we are talking about a theoretical 8 9 property but those are the types of issues that are taken on board. MS FAULDS: But it would be usual, and all the circumstances 10 vary in each case but you would expect a standard check list in any council in 11 12 Scotland if they were going to dispose of a property, if they are looking at 13 suitable alternatives for the council or ---14 MR EDWARDS: Yes. 15 MS FAULDS: --- the process it would go through before you would have a 16 declaration by members that a property is surplus to requirements, and part of 17 that would obviously be taking into account planning issues. MR EDWARDS: Yes. 18 MS FAULDS: And I think there have been some comments about, "Oh, but if it had 19 been..., you know"; "It's gone for one use, had it gone for another use...". How 20 do you approach planning risk if you are disposing of a property? Who do you 21 22 think carries the planning risk and what is the role of the Director of Planning in this? 23 MR EDWARDS: Could I perhaps ask Colin Hunter, who is a bit closer to this, my 24

MR EDWARDS: Could I perhaps ask Colin Hunter, who is a bit closer to this, my Head of Resources who is more directly line managed to the asset management team. Can I ask Colin to give you a bit more information on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you just for the record let us know who you are and what position you hold, please?

MR HUNTER: Thank you, Chairman. I am Colin Hunter, Head of Resources
Development Delivery within the Resources Management Corporate
Directorship.

32 MS FAULDS: Are you a professional planner, Mr Hunter?

2526

MR HUNTER: No, I am not. I am a chartered quantity surveyor, that is my original profession.

MS FAULDS: So if there is a proposal that a property has been declared surplus to the operational requirements of the Council what role does the Director of

Planning have in providing information to assist members on commercial value?

MR HUNTER: If a property has reached the stage where it has been declared surplus tot he Council's requirements then the next stage is obviously to look at potential disposal. That disposal takes into cognisance several factors: its location, its planning brief, the option appraisal that is involved, and any expressions of interest that the Council may have received from external parties, whether that is partner organisations or private sector.

When a property is taken to the market an option appraisal, and I cannot speak historically because I was appointed in April 2006, is now undertaken with planners to see what could potentially be located on that site; would it be a redevelopment or would it be a demolition and new construction; what are the Local Plan proposals for that area in general terms, because at the moment we do not have a concluded Local Plan.

- 14 MS FAULDS: You do not have an up to date Local Plan, yes.
- MR HUNTER: That fairly quickly polarises the thoughts into whether it is housing, commercial or whatever.
- MS FAULDS: So going forward all, that sort of information would be fed in to a report to members?
- 19 MR HUNTER: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

- 20 MS FAULDS: What about legal due diligence, the Council's Solicitor, what role would he have?
- MR HUNTER: The City Solicitor is consulted where there are disputes or uncertainties over the property for sale: do we have clean title to it, do we have full ownership to it, are there any burdens on it, are there any restraints on it, and the Solicitor is generally consulted in any report as a matter of course, as is the City Chamberlain, before the report goes to committee.
- 27 MS FAULDS: So that would flush out if you were dealing with common good land or trust property and so on?
- 29 MR HUNTER: Yes.
- MS FAULDS: If you are entering into a contract, just going forward, how would an elected member be satisfied that if he was giving approval to enter or bind the Council into a contract, the proper authority was there and it was within the legal powers, you were not missing a requirement to go to the Scottish Ministers or something, that all of the legal boxes had been ticked and all of the necessary authority from the Council was in place?
- 36 MR HUNTER: The system that we are currently operating is that where a property

has been declared surplus we report at that stage to Resources Management Committee and ask for approval to go to the next stage, which is developing a planning brief with a view to taking it to the market. Once we have done that we take back the results of that and advise them on potential offers received, potential restraints that may have been applied by planning and advise the elected members of that. Where we are dealing with a valuation or an offer that in our view is less than market value then that is included within the report.

What has happened in the last two years that clearly supports that is that we have, shall we say, not exactly had a harmonious relationship with NHS locally because I personally have intervened and stopped properties being sold where I thought the market could return a higher capital receipt than the one that was proposed. That is fed back to the administration and as a result these sales are currently under discussion.

MS FAULDS: And what about scrutiny of these decisions, apart from going into maybe the Property Committee, the committee that would authorise the disposal? Is there another tier of elected members' scrutiny over what is happening?

MR HUNTER: Resources Management is the parent committee that all these reports go to. The reports as they are compiled, as my Director has already indicated, are subject to my scrutiny and the only signature that now goes on to these reports is mine. So there is the challenge role in my role as a head of service going into a report to make sure the various stages have been complied with and it is myself that takes that to the Resources Management Committee, prepared to answer any or all questions in terms of scrutiny or challenge that may come.

MS FAULDS: What about the relationship with the District Valuer?

MR HUNTER: We have used the service of the District Valuer where we have reached an impasse in that our valuation through using our external contractor that we have now engaged, which is a multinational company, to undertake these valuations on our behalf, where that is at odds with the offers we are receiving, and there is a steer from the administration if we were to get that, if it was to be used for community use and therefore sold at a lower value we would robustly check that with the District Valuer. So the District Valuer has a role, as they have had, and without making too much reference to it, into the ongoing investigations which resulted from Carden House.

MS FAULDS: And in your new process do you now have a system to monitor the purification of conditions of contracts of sale of properties so that if there were a future benefit accruing to the Council that would be collected?

MR HUNTER: Yes.

MS FAULDS: That is there and scrutinised. Mr Edwards, the decision to appoint external consultants for valuation, was that subject to an option appraisal? Was that the better way of providing effective valuation advice to the Council?

MR EDWARDS: Given the history of what I inherited at that time I felt the most important thing was to get some credibility back into our process and I went to elected members with an option to say we could continue with an in-house service but our in-house team was not up to full staff at that time, it was subject to heavy workloads, and my recommendation, based on consultation with Mr Hunter, was that we should recommend that we go out to the market and see what returns then came in, see what alternatives then came in from the market.

So that was my recommendation at that time, but obviously we fully appraised all the tender submissions that came in, it was quite a stringent appraisal process, and based on that we went with our recommendation to elected members that we felt the best practice at that time was to appoint an external contractor. But there was a fully spec'd out tender appraisal process at that time.

MS FAULDS: What is the term of the contract with the external consultant?

MR EDWARDS: Again Mr Hunter will give you a bit more detail than I have off the top of my head.

MR HUNTER: I cannot be specific on that, my recollection is it is a period of three years, but I would like the chance to check that one before I can be more specific.

If I can add to what Mr Edwards has said so far, the evaluation process of the contractors who expressed an interest was on a quality price tender submission followed up by presentations and interviews, which allowed us to ascertain resources and the CVs of the various people who would be delivering the service for us.

MS FAULDS: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Douglas, you have a supplementary?

MR SINCLAIR: Mr Edwards, you mentioned 2006 as being the mark in time when these things changed. I am interested to know what happened before 2006 because clearly the arrangements were far from fit for purposes, which raises in my mind what were internal audit doing; what was the proper officer of finance doing; what was the monitoring officer doing?

MR EDWARDS: We were all, certainly in my role at that time as a finance officer, we were all involved in consultation in our post to dispose of properties or whatever. In all those cases we had to advise on the professional advice of the

surveyors etc who were valuing properties that they believed it was in the best interests of the Council. So certainly there was involvement in that report but we had to go on the professional advice that we were given at that time by those suitably qualified officers.

There were a number of occasions where we did check out, in fact all the cases where we checked out those reports to make sure that what the officers were recommending disposal of or whatever were coming out with was based on their view to be the best offer for the Council. That was all scrutinised at that time.

In terms of internal audit they had a work programme as well to review the work of the Property Section. I cannot recall off the top of my head what that process would have involved but that would have involved checking files etc within the Property Section to make sure they were properly documented and there was proper evidence in place of a valuation. Again internal audit would have struggled the same as anyone else to see whether it was a good valuation or not and again they would have relied on the advice of the professional officers who came up with that valuation.

I think the same would be true of external audit as well in terms of their role at the year end. I know for a fact that they would audit some of the property valuation files as part of their external audit process and they restricted their audit process to a review of the files for completeness of documentation, proper valuation in the file etc, and that was properly reflected in the Council's balance sheet.

MR SINCLAIR: And there was no sense from that work by anyone that there was anything amiss in the governance arrangements?

MR EDWARDS: There was no sense from that work that there was anything remiss. You would have expected that to be flagged up at either internal audit or external audit. I think it is once you go down to the actual internal workings of that particular service at that time that the problems then came to the surface.

MR PATERSON: Can I just add, I think that touches on really important issues which I do not think were explicitly raised in any of the internal or external audit reports that we got in terms of areas of action for us. But thinking through these implications in the way that Douglas Sinclair has done, for me as Chief Executive it goes back to your point about what further scrutiny is there. You get to the point of saying this should have been identified as an area of high potential risk in our risk assessments.

On the basis that you as Chief Executive cannot check everything (a) because of the quantity of work that is going through the Council and (b) because you do not have the expertise, one of your fallback defences in terms of ensuring that things are done is (a) that they are identified as risks and (b) that either reports of your internal and external audit functions are picking them up. What that has led me to is in the light of just exactly what Douglas Sinclair was saying, reviewing that whole process.

What it has done is highlighted the fact that internal and external audit must have identified this area as an area of high risk because they had both checked it, but the checks which they had done had not been sufficient to identify these problems, therefore in a sense it was giving me false confidence that there was no problem.

Therefore what further needs to be done to ensure that when these further scrutinies are made of a process like that is that they will actually be robust enough to throw up any major issues and then also to look at, are there other potential high risk areas like that that may not be being identified by the risk assessments, and then examined by internal and/or external audit, and I am currently in conversation with our Internal Audit Manager about seeing what the lessons are from that, if we thought we had robust systems and they actually did not identify it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think, Iain, do you want to ask another question?

MR ROBERTSON: Yes, just a supplementary for the Chief Executive. I find it very difficult to understand how your management group, these were big ticket sales and surely these were being discussed in the corridors and in your management group meetings and things, you must have known what was going on here, you must have known what they were being sold for. When a big organisation disposes of big ticket items it is kind of part of the talk of the management group, at least probably further down the tree, and these were big sales.

MR PATERSON: I was aware of some of them and in some cases I actually went and sought the kind of reassurance from the officers who were dealing with them that you would expect me to do. One of them as I recall was with Carden House and I questioned the officer about the transfer value, about the fact that a private company was acting on behalf of the health service with whom we were dealing in terms of partnership working and filling a gap in terms of medical provision, and was reassured that everything was OK.

MR ROBERTSON: Were you not told about the other offers?

MR PATERSON: No, I think I was told about the other offers but this was being dealt with in the process that we are talking about through, I forget the actual section, section 75 is it, consents so that we got the proper approvals, and I was informed that that had been done. So I did follow it up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We now move on to services in the form of housing services. Again, Ann, can you ask the questions, please.

MS FAULDS: The Best Value report contains a number of criticisms of the Council's performance in relation to its housing function. Paragraph 207 contains a number of criticisms of performance, such as the percentage of dwellings re-let within four weeks was only 13.4 per cent compared to a Scottish average of 47.7 per cent, and the average time to re-let houses was 102 days compared to a Scottish average of 51 days. I just wondered if you would like to comment on that level of performance, Councillor Dean?

MS DEAN: I think that was certainly something that gave us cause for concern and that is why it was looked at. I would not have to hand the figures for now and I would ask if somebody from the Corporate Management Team could help me out, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful.

MS DEAN: I know that that is one of the areas where there has been massive improvement.

MR WHITE: Good afternoon, panel. My name is Alan White, and I am the Head of Service for Sheltered Environment and Neighbourhood Services Central.

The question is with regard to voids. I think you have heard earlier from the submissions, we have put a lot of work and effort into improving our voids. I think if I look in general numbers terms round about 2005 we probably had 1500 voids at any given point in time out of a housing stock of 23,000. We are now looking at round about 150 voids at any given point in time.

I think the figures you are looking at are historic figures for 2006/07. I do not have the exact detail for 2007/08 but I think our void rent loss, we just did a void stat, I am sure it was something like 1.3 per cent was void rent loss, I think it was about that figure, so it would have been nearer 5 or 6 per cent or whatever.

MR STEWART: In general terms, and it is very general terms, at one point the loss per year of void housing, rent loss per year, was touching almost £4 million and recent figures are that that is £800,000. This is an area where there has been major, major improvement in the Council in terms of reducing re-let, making sure that folks are moved in much quicker than previously, and also on the rent arrears

situation in the Continuous Improvement Committee last week it was reported that we had the best recorded level for donkeys' years, basically. I am sorry I cannot be more correct than saying just donkeys' years, but these are areas that have been tackled. We continuing to see improvement there and hopefully there will be further improvement as we go along.

MR WHITE: I think to follow on from Councillor Stewart, the average re-let times, 51 days was the Scottish average; I am fairly sure we have got this year 50 per cent of our voids re-let within four weeks, I am fairly sure that is the figure but again we can get the detail to you. We do track it well. In fact our initial challenge was to reduce the numbers.

It is a numbers game for a start, you have got 1500 houses out there, reduce the numbers. The second challenge was to reduce the re-lettings and that is what we have done. We were awarded the Abse Award, a UK national award, last year for best efficiency in a UK council, we were awarded that for our voids initiative. It is something that we are particularly proud of and we will continue to improve and use the model that we adapted for the change process for voids through other areas of service.

MS FAULDS: From your perspective what was the impetus for pushing forward these improvements? What changed?

MR WHITE: There was always an umbrella from the UK, there was always a drive to improve the voids. I think there were historical reasons why voids could not improve and I think it was just the old building services contract allowed them eight weeks to do a void re-let where you had painter work. You can imagine that eight week period, you would never meet the statutory performance indicator for the whole process within four weeks.

When the new CMT came into place I think in November 2005 they set down a challenge to reduce the voids by 50 per cent within I think it was a six month period. That was the challenge. They did not tell us how to do it, I can assure you, but what was set up was, there was a voids management team. I was the chair of the voids management team at the time, and the continuous improvement service got involved. We had workshops with staff, very much taking staff on board with us in exactly what the issues were.

We had a complicated void path, I think we had something like over 100 steps in the process; we took that down to 18 steps in the process, just simplifying the systems and whatever, listening to staff, a lot of great ideas there, a wee bit of reshuffle with some of the staff as well, some of the staff were not up for the

change, some new staff were brought in. It was very much a team effort and we just delivered the change and gave staff confidence on a follow-up kind of basis.

MS FAULDS: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We are almost at the end. We have one or two closing questions on the improvement agenda. Before doing so, however, I think it is important just to draw attention to one thing and that is this. This morning I was handed a note by someone representing the corporate directors and it is a note that expresses some solidarity with Mr Paterson. I think in the interests of equity I should read it. It is a short note but I think I should read it so that it is in the record.

"Statement to the Commission from ACC Corporate Directors

"While not all our Corporate Management Team have been put forward or called as witnesses today the directors as a group wish the Commission to be aware that we will be here in our entirety in support of our team of witnesses for the duration of the hearing. As a team we are strongly united, committed and determined to deliver the Council's vision. We would like the Commission to be aware that we would all be happy to answer any questions the Commission might have of any of us in that regard during the course of the hearing."

That is the end of the statement.

Let me then move on finally to the question of the improvement agenda which includes 15 specific points for improvement. Keith Geddes wants to ask a question before we get to the improvement agenda.

MR GEDDES: I am sorry, John. Just going back to this morning and the transformation strategies and the way in which you are hoping to achieve the £24 million budget reductions in the current financial year, according to Audit Scotland there is emerging evidence that the viability of these transformation strategies may be compromised by over-optimistic assumptions and limited ownership of the change plans amongst those responsible for implementing the change plans. In paragraph 117, which I suppose is the most up to date information that we have got, it states that the February 2008 budget monitoring report indicated that there had been an adverse movement of £3.4 million in the central area as a consequence of savings in many of the demand led services not yet being delivered.

My question is this, in two parts. I know we are only six weeks or so into the new financial year. What are the early indications in relation to getting towards the £24 million savings and politically what is plan B if it looks like after three to

six months you are way short?

MS DEAN: I can certainly begin to answer that from a political perspective and I think you have heard much of that this morning in terms of the work of the Budget Monitoring Board where plan B is already being discussed. I do not know if Councillor Stewart can add anything. Obviously I am not involved directly in the Budget Monitoring Board, it is chaired jointly on a rotating basis between Councillor Stewart as Chair of Resources Management and Councillor John Stewart as Chair of Continuous Improvement because of there being a sort of cross-over in there. But I am aware that there is a plan B in terms of that.

MR GEDDES: Can I just stop you there. I do not want to get into plan B because clearly it is being developed at the present point in time, but this morning and just now you have said you are not involved in some of the key decision making processes of the Council and you have got a rotating chair in terms of that last committee. This is only the second time I think that the Accounts Commission has done this since Best Value was instituted and it is quite a serious step for the Council to have to come and answer questions from the Accounts Commission.

MS DEAN: I understand that.

MR GEDDES: I think there needs to be recognition that there has to be a single point of responsibility for some of the key things that need to be done to get this council back on track and I do not think the Continuous Improvement Committee, which is not chaired by the Leader, is the place to do it. Do you not think there is a need to sort of centralise at least for 12 to 18 months some sort of control mechanism at a political level that will pull everything together that needs to be sorted out and then go back to the committee structure after that?

MS DEAN: I think that is a very difficult one to answer. While the Continuous Improvement Committee deals with a lot of the monitoring that is also reported through Policy and Strategy in terms of any changes that we require to make to the committee services. With all due respect, I cannot possibly chair everything, much as it would be marvellous to have that kind of overview, and I rely on my colleagues to ensure that I am aware of what requires to go on and to ensure that I am doing my best to support them in providing what needs to go on.

You are right, there is a plan B in terms of budget. The monitoring I am convinced is being robustly done in order to know if or when we require to implement that plan B. But I think also in terms of the transformation strategies there is also a deal of monitoring going on with those to try to ensure that they are coming on stream sooner rather than later to try to ensure that that budget is

robust.

THE CHAIRMAN: Councillor Stewart.

MR STEWART: It may well be that we have to move beyond plan B and look at plan C and plan D if that is what is required to balance this budget at the end of the day. In terms of the Budget Monitoring Board I think its role is immensely important. So far it has met twice. It has already outlined the kind of information that it requires and we will be scrutinising very, very closely and listening to what is going on across the board. I think that is a major step forward and the fact that we are knot only looking at this current year's budget but actually planning to work on next year's budget now is also of major importance to this council.

DR TIERNEY: I was just looking at our Chief Executive. As Corporate Director responsible for developing the transformation strategies I would like the opportunity to comment on a couple of your questions which I think are at the bottom of it: are they deliverable and do we have the capacity to deliver them. I think firstly just to highlight, they are evolving strategies and they were designed to be evolving strategies.

We have delivered the majority of the actions on time track. There were 67 actions in the overall strategy and 63 of them are on track. The ones that are not are because we have hit an unforeseen obstacle on the way and we have got processes in place to address that. The very ambitious three year programmes; for the first time during the process we were looking at data, benchmarking information, trends analysis, budget lines that had not been analysed before, so it is an improvement process in itself.

The way we actually estimated the budget savings and the time for delivery was actually by looking at case studies from other authorities that had implemented these programmes. They had to be estimates because very authority is different with different systems and different processes, so there have been some examples where some of the budget savings now look as if they were high and therefore we are adjusting them but adjusting the plans accordingly to meet that. And some of the timings have proved to be different and we are adjusting them accordingly.

So we have put measures in place to mitigate any risks with the transformation strategies. They are monitored regularly, monthly, at the Citistat, they are monitored through one to ones and they are also monitored through the Continuous Improvement Committee. We have also set up a Project Evaluation

Board to monitor the efficacy of particular projects to make sure that they do not just roll on and we see whether they are delivered both in terms of savings and improvement.

Where we have noticed that things are not going as well as we would like them to go we have put in additional capacity and we are continuing to put in additional capacity if required. We have tried different approaches, and the most important thing, as I think has been reiterated all along, is we are now in our third phase of the transformation strategies, we are learning all the time and we realise that the key to delivering these is the engagement of front line staff. In the ones that were developed in January we got written feedback from the front line staff that were involved saying how much they got out of it, how much they enjoyed it and how much they felt they were able to contribute, and we are building that constantly into them.

I think also in terms of actually delivering on the budgets these transformation strategies are three year plans. They have also been summarised along with budget targets as part of strategic context papers which are now feeding in to the team plans at area level. Those team plans have cash limited budgets so we are saying, "Here is the strategy that we have put in place, here is the budget you've got to deliver on your performance improvement"; the link between strategic planning and budgeting is now also much stronger and that link is there. So over the year that we have done this we feel each time it is improving and that the risks have been addressed and are being addressed.

I do not know whether anybody has any follow-up questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, that is very helpful. You might want to just sit there because I am going on to discuss the improvement agenda and of course what you said plays neatly into that. I guess from the Controller of Audit's report one can infer some scepticism about the Council's ability or capability or capacity to achieve the improvement agenda.

We have the capacity on the hand, we have got the staff commitment that we keep coming back to time and again, and I guess therefore those uncertainties are possibly compounded by Mr Paterson deciding to withdraw from the Council. There is clearly some uncertainty about the ability of the Council to deliver the improvement agenda. I guess, Councillor Dean, that is a question for you.

MS DEAN: I think, yes, if there were no questions about the Council's ability to deliver on this improvement agenda I do not think we would be here, so we have to take that seriously and we have the recommendations there. As we have heard

from Dr Tierney we have made significant progress in the last little while. While I will sadly miss Mr Paterson when he chooses to go he is not going immediately; that will be a decision for the Council, there will be a period of notice within that. I also have confidence in the Corporate Management Team that we the Council in general have established here that the direction of travel is very much set and that we will be able to continue.

I respect Mr Paterson's decision to look for early retirement at this point because, as he said himself, there is not quite a watershed, I do not think it is quite as dramatic as that, but this is a time in which we will be looking to review what has happened and to take that on, and given the fact that he does not see himself wishing to take that on for the next four or five years then I can understand his decision to leave that to somebody else now. But, as I say, I have every faith in the Corporate Management Team to continue that work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let just check with my colleagues that there are no other questions. No, I think we are all finished. Is there anything else that you would like to add to all that you have told us today before I ask you to step down?

MR EDWARDS: There is just one relatively small point that was mentioned this morning about the Council revenue account, whether that was in deficit or whatever; just the clarity the position on the revenue account, it has had a better than budget situation for the last five years. It has built up reserves. Obviously in 2007/08 the Council decided to use some of those reserves as part of the budget strategy, so that really was the reason for the situation in 2007/08. It is still coming out better than budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Is there anything else?

MS DEAN: I think just to thank you for the opportunity. I think we have answered the questions as fully as we can at this time. I would be interested to know in terms of the procedure, obviously you will be hearing from other witnesses, which may raise further questions in your mind. Is it likely that we will be recalled in order to answer those?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I put that back to you, Councillor Dean. If there is anything you hear from other witnesses that you would wish to respond to then in the interests of equity I am very happy that you should come back and speak again.

MS DEAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, can I thank you, Councillor Dean, gentlemen, and others who have contributed to this hearing. It has been a long hearing, there have been a lot of questions, and we are very grateful to you for your help.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

We now move on and we have two councillors to hear from separately. If you have the order of batting you will see that we have Councillor Alan Milne, Leader of the Conservative Group is the first but for one or two reasons we would like to hear from Councillor Leonard Ironside, Leader of the Labour Group first of all, so would Councillor Ironside please come forward. Just for the record, could I ask you, please, to introduce yourself and your colleague.

MR IRONSIDE: Councillor Leonard Ironside, the Leader of the Labour Group on Aberdeen City Council, and my colleague is Barney Crockett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I believe you have an opening statement.

Opening statement by Councillor Leonard Ironside,

12

Leader of the Labour Group

MR IRONSIDE: The committee structure was streamlined in the year 2000 in order to improve the decision making process. It removed the need for favours being asked around various committees and allowed all the relevant information to be placed before the committees making those decisions, so a proper balanced and informed decision making process would be there. There were links between the conveners of these committees and budgets. The present structure destroys that link. There is a lack of clarity as to who is in control. The public do not know who they are supposed to talk to, the business community are not clear who they should be addressing, and unfortunately even some of the councillors and officers are not clear.

The current committee structure in my view is purely driven by resources and the policy items have been reduced to simply a rubber stamping exercise. Instead of policy driving the policy of the Council it is driven through the Resources Committee. This looks purely at finance, so the rationale behind the decisions is not discussed, it is purely the financial aspect of it.

Far too many projects which are seen as strategic for the city are embarked upon without consideration beyond the revenue costs and the burden that the city will face in future years. For example Marischal College, originally reported to us as a £45 capital spend, has now increased to £80.4 million with no consideration given to the repayment charges and revenue costs in years to come, in fact a millstone around the neck of our city. I do not have documents for this which I can pass up to you.

Regarding the budget process, no impact study was carried out before the introduction of the £27 million cuts in services for the community and the

voluntary sector. In fact letters to these communities were issued the week before Christmas telling them that their home care, upon which many of them rely, would be ending. This was long before the budget process was announced. As a former Leader of the Council I had put in place a provision that where the voluntary sector was concerned they should be dealt with on a three year budget at least so that they knew exactly the starting point and they did not have to deal with the budgets annually. Unfortunately that has been removed.

In the Leader of the Council's budget speech not a single cut was mentioned; the only reference made was to the value of the voluntary sector. It required consideration of the appendices prepared by officers to discover the real seriousness of the budget cuts and restrictions. In fact in reply to a question from the Council the Leader of the Council claimed that she only knew about the budget cuts at the same time as everyone else, which would have been in January.

As opposition councillors, whose role it is to hold the political administration to account, we have great difficulty in obtaining Council papers on time. For example, the schools estates papers when the schools were being moved for closure, were only given to some councillors on the day of the full Council meeting. That was raised and it was not just my group, others groups were involved in that as well, it was raised but nothing was taken forward on that matter.

Opposition spokespersons are not briefed in the way they should be, although the Chief Executive, Douglas Paterson, has always made offers to do this. It is proper that the opposition spokespersons should attend the same officers briefings as the political administration because we are all elected to the chamber on the same demographic basis, but this does not happen. Consequently we are forced to submit many questions on balance to the full Council.

Members are prevented from raising questions on the Chief Executive's report to Council unless the questions are before officers 10 days prior to the Council meeting. Despite the Chief Executive's paper being prepared and placed before the Council we are still not allowed to debate that report.

There is also a prevalence of papers being tabled late. This prevents papers being properly scrutinised by elected members. For the current past year we have had 45 late papers before the Council, 44 late papers to Resources Committee, nine late papers for Policy and 10 late papers to the Continuous Improvement Committee, many of these containing key decisions.

There is also a prevalence on this Council of boards being introduced which

robs the elected members of participation in decision making. There is a current trend where the members of the political administration resign their positions on outside bodies but the next step is to withdraw funding. This was exactly the case in the Blindcraft workshops for the visually impaired, for Lemon Tree and the Old Bank School for children with behavioural difficulties. It is weak political leadership.

In previous years between 2004 and 2007 we have had budget decisions made without papers or without communication about how money was currently being spent. These decisions were made at the June meetings of full Council and usually tacked on to the audited accounts reports. I have Council documents here highlighting that. The only crumb of comfort was that on many of these issues the Planning and Resources Committee had a background paper, but nevertheless the decision to spend that money was made at full Council.

There is no evidence to suggest that the spend and save initiatives which we have heard about have produced any spend and save and many of the budget headings, which are under the terms of review of service and have budgeted some figures against them, have never actually been realised. There is no detail in that, it is just a budget heading, "Review of service," with a figure given, and it is very difficult to follow that up and scrutinise that sort of behaviour.

Recent inspection reports have highlighted key services for education, social work, housing and property sales. The lack of overall direction, the conflict between the area committees and standing committees, the over-bureaucratic burden on the central services of the Council would suggest that we need to review the current operation for a more accountable system. There is no obvious link between the budgetary process and the spokespersons in their areas of responsibility.

Budgetary decisions were made without attempting to assess the impact of these services, and again I see that as weak political leadership. Clear lines of management and political responsibility need to be restored and councillors need to accept responsibility for the monitoring and controlling of budgets following their decisions.

The Labour Group would like to see an independent review on the budget from the Commission, a freeze on all new spending until the review is completed and that the government be asked to consider assisting the city with its budget, allowing the conversion of capital into revenue. We would like the current organisational structure to be reviewed and as a Labour Group we are prepared to work with any organisation that looks to re-establish the city's reputation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. In a moment I will ask my colleagues to ask any questions. I have just one to start us off. You talk about the gap between aspiration and reality and I guess the obvious question that would come out of that would be how do you think that particular issue should be addressed? What would you do?

MR IRONSIDE: One of the links that we do not have now is the link between the budget holder and elected members. Where there was an Education Committee there was a Chair of Education, where there was a Social Work Committee there was a Chair of Social Work. There is no obvious link and in the three neighbourhoods firstly the idea, if it is a reasonable idea, there is no link between the neighbourhoods that the policy is current in all three neighbourhoods. We have heard examples of ideas and issues that are not dealt with in the same way in the three neighbourhoods, so there seems to be a lack of accountability for the service delivery in all of these area committees.

THE CHAIRMAN: And how would you resolve that?

MR IRONSIDE: I think we would have to immediately review the structure and put in place an accountable set-up which actually allows the conveners or spokespersons in these areas of responsibility to have input to budgets in a way that we do not seem to have at this moment in time.

THE CHAIRMAN: That general aspect may be pursued by some of my colleagues. I will ask my colleagues now to ask any questions they have.

MR SINCLAIR: There are a few points I would like to pick up in your submission. On page 2 you make reference to: "The culture of non-compliance identified among staff appears to be based on a genuine concern, particularly by senior staff, that the structures being implemented are not the most appropriate to the task". Can you expand on that, please?

MR IRONSIDE: I think from talking to some of the staff, some of them are of the view that the job they are doing now is not the job that they took on in the first place. We have people dealing with roads issues who were not employed originally under a roads connection. We have no real educationalists dealing with education on some of our area committees. That leads to confusion for members of staff, and also in terms of feeding back the information required from some of the questions that were put.

MR SINCLAIR: Just to tease that out, does that mean that the culture of non-compliance is in a sense a culture of, "We don't understand, we don't agree"?

MR IRONSIDE: I think there is an element of that. It is not always clear who is in charge of the service, who is in control of the service, who is running the service and who they should be applying to. That comes back again to when you want to put a question to someone it is not always obvious who you should put it to, so it is just put to the neighbourhood directors.

MR SINCLAIR: You also in your submission make the point:

"There is a case for reviewing the basis on which the formula on which local authorities are funded by the Scottish Government. However, there is no guarantee that Aberdeen would automatically benefit and ... always a possibility that it could lose funding". I can recollect at the time of reorganisation the neighbouring authority, Aberdeenshire, complained bitterly that they had lost out to the city by a substantial amount of money with disaggregation, despite the point that the grant distribution was a zero sum game. On the other hand, your council tax levels are one of the highest in Scotland and your spending per head is one of the highest in Scotland. Does the opposite have the view that the administration has not reduced its expenditure per head in line with its declining population over time?

MR IRONSIDE: I think that is the view that I would put forward, not to reduce the expenditure in accordance with the declining population. Also there was a lot of it taken out of social work services and put into roads. I think it does come down to local priorities and where the money has been spent, but I think whilst there is a case for having the formal review for Aberdeen city, as you correctly point out in a city that has virtually zero unemployment and is a very wealthy city it would be difficult to make cases in terms of other areas where we have got higher levels of recreation to actually benefit more from this. So it is hard to see how we are going to do that.

MR SINCLAIR: A final question which I want to ask is this. Given the Council's financial position, which you have described as precarious, would you agree that a reasonable man or woman walking down Union Street would have difficulty in arriving at a judgment whether the Council's leadership was not as effective as it might be and there is uncertainty on ...

MR IRONSIDE: I think two and a half thousand people marching down the street in Aberdeen did say exactly that. We are now at the stage where people have stopped believing what comes out of the City Council and that is not good for the City Council or for the reputation of Aberdeen, but it does seem to be a culture that there is no-one listening to what people are saying and if you only hear

yourselves then you do not get feedback from anyone else, and I think that is what is happening here.

MR SINCLAIR: My final question is this. You mentioned again that you are working as a group to help rebuild the city's reputation and to ensure that you have an agenda in common. Have you any practical ways as to how that might be done?

MR IRONSIDE: Well, before it could be done I would need to be included and given the information from the administration in order to enable me to do that. Certainly if we look at the structures, these structures are not working, clearly not working, and if something is not working you need to tackle it. We have had various statements given on how it could be improved and how it is working and how it will come to fruition, but there are no guarantees on this and as elected members we do not see those improvements coming through. We are still facing some of the issues that we were facing before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Just to pursue that a little more, are you saying that the evidence on the transformation process that we heard this morning is not as positive as was made out?

MR IRONSIDE: Yes, I would say that it is not clear, for example in area committees. We had a school in the north of Aberdeen city which had some serious issues. That never was reported to me in a committee, the very committee that deals with that never got a report on it, it was passed somewhere else. That is the sort of issue that you would expect the local members in area committees to be dealing with and looking at but they did not seem to see that. Similarly, education having been almost tacked on to policy is not giving value for money given the spend that education has in the authority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Iain.

MR ROBERTSON: Councillor Ironside, you say in your submission that the Council is now suffering from bureaucratic overload with too many corporate managers and too many plans giving rise to a lack of clarity about strategic and area based accountability. You also say that the current organisational chaos must be reviewed as a matter of urgency with a return to a conventionally departmentally based management structure with clear lines and responsibilities restored. In view of all these incoming bureaucrats that you are saying permeate the management are there sufficient resources there to go back to a departmentally based structure? Have you got the people, do you think?

MR IRONSIDE: I think you have got the people. You could never go back to

exactly what happened before because times move on and people move on and issues move on, and I think we are all struggling to deal with this concept of trying to deal with everything in one committee in terms of children, in terms of social care, in terms of education, in terms of community base and so on. But I do think it is possible to have a lighter structure because the structure we had was far too heavy, we could have a lighter structure where we have accountable heads of service as well as accountable politicians who keep an eye on what is happening.

MR ROBERTSON: So not all of the restructuring was wrong, some of the thinking was good and that could be used? You would not throw the baby out with the bath water?

MR IRONSIDE: Absolutely not. The gap was in relation to the strategic and the delivery and that is where the gap needs to be addressed. I think we can do that.

MR ROBERTSON: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iain. Keith.

MR GEDDES: You make the comment, Councillor Ironside, that the Continuous Improvement Committee has failed to establish itself. What would you suggest to increase the importance of the Continuous Improvement Committee and how should it go about establishing itself?

MR IRONSIDE: First of all the Continuous Improvement Committee I believe should not just be a tacked on committee, I think it needs to be a committee that operates almost outside the Council's structures. What we have got is simply a committee like any other committee that has got a political imbalance and an inbuilt majority for the administration. There is not really a scrutiny element in that respect. There is an inbuilt majority if you do not like what is going on. That should be the way that I think a scrutiny committee should deal with it. There is no scrutiny convener at the moment, it rotates, and you would want some person to take control of that and say, "This is my committee, I'm going to take it forward". I think that is the element that is missing. Originally when we talked about standards and scrutinies and committees like that, the idea was to have been to interrogate the conveners of committees in the way they do business, to make them accountable for the decisions they had made, "Why has this happened and why has this not happened? Why did you do it this way?" and conveners and officers would be interrogated to make sure their decisions were robust. But you can only do that if it is not a political committee, if it is a committee where the membership is equal, and that is why it should be taken

away from the Council.

MR GEDDES: Can I just say, on education, Aberdeen like Edinburgh is a wealthy city and it has a thriving private sector for parents who wish to send their children there. I suppose some parents when looking at choices between the state sector and the private sector look at the structure of the Council and see who is in charge of education. My view would be, not just in Aberdeen but elsewhere, there has been a diminution of the professional leadership in education and it might just encourage some parents to send their children elsewhere. The consequence of that of course is that you lose revenue support grant for every child that goes to the private sector. Can you just say a word or two about education and what you would do to give education a more central role?

MR IRONSIDE: Because of the importance of education, and education not just limited to schools but beyond that, the whole area of education, the whole thrust of education, I think it does need some kind of separate response for councils, a separate arm that can be dealt with. I do not think it has been given the credibility that it requires and needs. I do not believe that we actually discuss educational issues on the Education Sub-Committee for policy. I think that is where we are missing out on a lot of those issues.

I will give you an example of the area committee where the Northfields School Academy had serious issues and it was not discussed at the North Area Committee, it was referred back somewhere else to be dealt with. These are serious issues because we need to get a handle on education. We have had, I cannot remember how many head teachers it was but they got together and there was a vote of no confidence in the authority's ability to deliver on education. That is a serious thing to throw at a local authority and in my view it is saying from these professionals, "You are not listening to our professional view, you are not taking into consideration our professional view". I think that is where a lot of these issues fall down.

There seems to be an idea that if you produce a brand new building you have suddenly got wonderful education and of course it is a lot more than that. The people of Aberdeen have been saying loud and long that it is not being listened to. For people who have to send their children to schools for behavioural difficulties or other special needs, we have two facilities in Aberdeen, we have Old Bank School and we have Camphill; both of them are complaining about the lack of pupils being referred to them by Aberdeen City Council. So there do seem to be issues there that people are not sitting round the table and resolving.

MR GEDDES: You said that you felt that when the Council did issue documents from the Chief Executive the opposition should be included as well. When you were Council Leader did you include the opposition?

MR IRONSIDE: When I was Council Leader there was not proportional representation. We are in a different game now, and the game is that everybody should be working together. If we are given that opportunity we would welcome it. But I would have to say to you in terms of the budget we not only included the opposition in our budget deliberations but we took the budget round the communities, various community groups, and explained the budget to them as well to let them have a look at it. That does not happen any more.

MR GEDDES: In terms of taking the improvement agenda forward the important thing for Aberdeen is that accountability of local government is restored. What would your view be to play your part in taking things forward?

MR IRONSIDE: I think I would want to have some sort of role within how the decisions are arrived at by the administration. I am not looking for a convenership or anything like that but I would like to be involved in that. There is a lot of experience in the Council that is never listened to and never used. Some of us have been there, some of us have seen it and learned the lessons but that has not been taken into consideration.

It is interesting that when we had all the budget cuts all the groups that were affected had various solutions to those issues. They might not have been the whole solution but they did produce some form of solutions that could have been worked on. These have just been bypassed and ignored with the result that people in the city feel that the Council does not listen to anything they say. And of course listening to people is one thing, active listening is another thing, you have to be an active listener, to get involved. That is just not happening at the moment, and I would like to see a bit more of that restored to the City Council.

MR GEDDES: Finally, John, just going back to the question of scrutiny, you have indicated that over the last year a large number of papers have not arrived in time to allow members to give them sufficient scrutiny prior to taking a decision based on information. The second thing I wanted to add on to that was, over the years do you think there has been a culture within aspects of the official administration to minimise accurate or full information given to the Council?

MR IRONSIDE: I think there is a great deal of pressure, I would say there is a great deal of pressure on officers to produce reports, and one of the feelings of most councillors is they always call for further reports which causes a greater

workload. But in terms of the political administration, if they were tighter in the way they approached things then there would not be a need for all those reports. For example, we had a school closure programme before us at a special full Council meeting. No ongoing details were present there, we had to convene an urgent business meeting to deal with the ongoing effects of that. That was called at three days' notice and it means that all members of the Council do not have sight of that, only a handful of people. That meant it was just passed through, and it was exactly the same when we had the equal pay discussions, the papers were held back until the morning of the meeting. That was on equal pay and it was kept back, I think it was a £10 million spend and we did not get those papers until the morning of the Council, and that is just unacceptable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ann.

MS FAULDS: Councillor Ironside, do you think that the Council's capital projects should be put on hold until there has been a root and branch assessment of the financial implications? Can you tell us a bit more about that, please.

MR IRONSIDE: There are some aspirations in the city for things like a 50 metre pool, for Marischal College, for sports facilities, there is a whole lot of aspirational projects which have their place in Aberdeen and should be looked at. What we are not getting is the beyond cost, the revenue cost that will flow from that, the repayment cost to get involved in that. Obviously we start from the point of view that, "It's a good project to have, let's have it," but it has never been properly thought out, and this is back to the trouble we had then.

Marischal College is a good example because that is going to be a millstone round the neck of people in Aberdeen for many years to come and I am not sure it is the best solution. We hear of BP for example building a brand new building for £39 million yet we are going to be caught for this £84 million spend with revenue costs on top of that. I am not sure if that is consistent with what we are doing. I think it would be better to hold some capital projects until we know exactly where we are going on the annual budget.

MS FAULDS: You do not think there is certainty about the revenue implications of these projects, is that it?

MR IRONSIDE: Not given the budgets that we have just come through. If this is truncated next year's budget will be even tougher. There has got to be some point where we say, "What are our priorities and where are we going with these budgets?" and we have to learn to manage within those budgets. There was something like a £45 million overspend in the last four years, possibly more than

that. That is the kind of thing that we cannot afford to do.

MS FAULDS: It sounds like you think the Council starts with the answer and works back to the question, "We will have a pool," as opposed to, "Do we have a need for leisure facilities?" and coming up with the answer, "We need a pool". Is that what you are saying?

MR IRONSIDE: I think that is right and I think the report actually justifies that or suggests that is the way to go. It is not that it is a bad idea, it is that it is not properly thought through and it is patchy, so you do not get the overall picture. We have just approved a plan where we are building 72,000 new homes in Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire in the next 20 years. We are planning for new people to come to the city yet we are closing schools and reducing services for children and for vulnerable people. That is going to be putting people off coming to Aberdeen, and I think we have not thought of the big picture when we are dealing with these issues.

MS FAULDS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Councillor Ironside, I have one more, less of a leading question to ask you. Is there anything else you would like to add to your presentation and points?

MR IRONSIDE: No, I would just reiterate the submission that I gave say once again I am prepared to work with anybody who has the best interests of Aberdeen city at heart because that is really the way forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Your colleague wants to say something.

MR CROCKET: Thank you, Chairman. If I could just add one tiny comment in response to Mr Geddes, who quite rightly asked the question whether or not Mr Ironside had invited the opposition to run scrutiny in his case. I happen to know that Mr Ironside would favour such a thing if it was a minority. I know it was a clamorous demand from the present political parties in the administration to have such and they were certainly hoping that, but that is by the bye. The main point I would make is that so difficult is the present situation of the incumbent council that an offer to help even in something like scrutiny is in itself magnanimous because it would be more politically profitable just to throw things back. So it is a serious issue, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, thank you very much indeed.

Can I ask Councillor Milne to come forward, please. Welcome, sir. Could I ask you please to identify yourself for the record.

MR MILNE: Councillor Alan Milne, Leader of the Conservative Group.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe you have a statement you wish to make?

MR MILNE: Yes, please.

Opening statement by Councillor Alan Milne, Leader of the Conservative Group

MR MILNE: Can I give a brief history about my position. I was on the Council from 1999 to 2003 and then had a gap, I was not re-elected, and then came back again one year ago, so I am relatively inexperienced as far as the Council goes but I have some.

Our Council Conservative Leader, John Porter, unfortunately died about two months after the election last year so I ended up being elected as Group Leader. It is a group of four, one of whom has been on the Council for a long time; the other three of us are learning the ropes as we go along.

From my experience back in 1999 we were informed then that the single status agreements were going to be negotiated. The social work budget was overspent, we had a talk from Professor Midwinter about this, but no action seemed to be taken. The only action that started off was the reorganisation of the Council and its officers.

When re-elected last May I was speaking with the Leader at the time and he was part of the coalition with the Liberal Group in the previous four years, and he assured me that he was quite supportive of the reorganisation which took off in that spell between 2003 and 2006, so I must take vicarious responsibility for the reorganisation that he supported.

The one thing that we did find in my first spell was that we had the impression that the Labour Group running the Council, the Labour administration, really said yes all the time to the Council officers. John Porter told me when we came in next time the councillors took over and ran the officers. So I can only speak from a historical context about that and the officers may know there was a change.

In the case of improvement you have put out three topics you wanted to mention. The change of vision of the Council is profound and will not happen overnight. Like any business it takes time to get your staff and the public and the press on your side, otherwise you will never win the arguments. The capacity to secure change for the Council, even in these last few months that I have been here, we find that the trade unions seem to have a stranglehold on the work force and it is very difficult to implement some changes that you think are of benefit without the trade unions voting them off.

On the budgets of course I was landed with producing an opposition budget last February and it was not until two weeks before budget day that I had the figures presented to me of what dire straits the Council was in. I was also presented with suggestions from officers on how to make savings on this £27 million and they were frightened to see the selection of closures that could be implemented such that we pulled out, the Conservative Group pulled back from that and thought, "What else can we do?" We did make alternative suggestions on budget day but we could not have done it on the day, it needed a month or two months to implement our ideas. If you want me to expand on that I am quite happy to do so. But we certainly voted against the drastic cuts that were made and we will plan in the next year to try to find alternative ways of saving this cash.

That is all I have to say. I will be happy to answer questions if I have the knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Can I start by asking you to comment on what your Labour Council colleagues have just been talking about in terms of the difference between aspiration and reality. What is your view on that? You have referred to the vision being profound. Is this just an interim stage we have just now? What is your view?

MR MILNE: I hope it is interim. I really cannot forecast what is going to happen in the next six months. I have been involved in some of the transformation strategy groups and it all looks very reassuring, yet we have not had the savings brought forward. The ideas are there but until we know what the savings are it is very difficult to pass a judgment.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Let me put it slightly differently. Suppose you were Leader of the Council what would you do right now?

MR MILNE: Resign, sir.

28 THE CHAIRMAN: I was thinking of the Council with a Conservative hat.

MR MILNE: I would have to find a way of getting many more Conservative councillors in my group. If I suddenly became Council Leader for the Conservatives with four councillors I would be in difficulty. I think I would have to try to get a vote of no confidence in the current leadership and force further elections.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what I am pushing for is this; if you were there instead of the current regime charged with responsibility for Aberdeen City Council and given the circumstances that we see today what would you do?

- MR MILNE: I have not thought about it, sir, but give me a moment.

 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, we will come back to that later. The other thing I
- wanted to ask you about was something you mentioned as well, whether you wanted to expand on the alternative to the drastic cuts

4 wanted to expand on the alternative to the drastic cuts.

- MR MILNE: What we did was, we were given the figures by the City Chamberlain of the various basic expenses. Salaries were very high, £240 million, and there was another lot called agencies which were £150 million, and while with some of the agencies we could not cut their budgets quite a number of them we thought we could. If we cut the agencies' budgets by 12 per cent we could save I think it was £16.8 million, so that would be a start.
- 11 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that £16.8 million per year?
- MR MILNE: Yes. And we did not actually say on the day but we would add that we would not take off the fire service and the police service, the joint boards. We also would like to see what we call zero based budgeting. Instead of a department saying, "We spent £20 million last year, we need an upgrade of," whatever inflation is, you start at zero and work out what your budget is. We were to look at the joint procurement for Aberdeenshire and some of that has
- taken place already but we would like to increase the number of joint
- 19 procurement ideas going forward.
- 20 THE CHAIRMAN: What specifically did you have in mind?
- 21 MR MILNE: The ones that are on the go are transport, vehicles, and I will look to
- anybody behind me to tell me the other two that are on the go just now. I think
- 23 there are three.
- 24 MR STEWART: There are more than two, Alan, including IT.
- 25 Everything is ---
- 26 THE CHAIRMAN: Could we hear from you tomorrow rather than today. Thank
- 27 you.
- 28 MR MILNE: Yes, IT was one, certainly.
- 29 THE CHAIRMAN: And did you have a kind of figure for that?
- 30 | MR MILNE: Yes. We were also going to abandon some EPN single status
- 31 negotiations which would probably save another £10 million.
- 32 | THE CHAIRMAN: When you say abandon ?
- 33 MR MILNE: Well, they are so far down the road just now and they are still
- negotiating but our view is that if we were not to go any further down anybody
- who wants to sue the Council or take action, it could be cheaper than the further
- 36 £10 million we are spending.

- 1 THE CHAIRMAN: You say "could". Is that something that has been costed?
- 2 MR MILNE: Yes, by one of my colleagues.
- 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me ask my colleagues. Douglas.
- 4 MR SINCLAIR: Can I just ask this. You mentioned that the late Leader of your
- group, John Porter, if I recollect what you said correctly his perception was that
- 6 the whole focus had been on the organisation but that was an identified problem
- 7 in terms of social work overspend and no action had been taken on it.
- 8 MR MILNE: Well, the problem is, this was eight years ago.
- 9 MR SINCLAIR: Yes.
- 10 MR MILNE: There was an overspend then, as far as I remember, of about £20
- million, and that had been carried forward over a number of years. The social
- work budget is difficult to predict because with the number of old people, as you
- know, it is a demand led service; it could be £20 million there and next week it
- could be another £1 million. It is a very difficult one to predict.
- 15 MR SINCLAIR: Is your sense of the Council that in a sense the bulk of the energy of
- the Council has gone into agenda reorganisation and structural reform rather than
- 17 necessarily focusing on the core services?
- 18 MR MILNE: No, I would not say that was true. I think there has been a focus on
- 19 core services.
- 20 MR SINCLAIR: Despite the HMIe Scotland report?
- 21 MR MILNE: The HMI report on -?
- 22 MR SINCLAIR: Education.
- 23 MR MILNE: Yes, lack of communication on leadership would be a bad mark, on the
- 24 performance of children I think it is very high staffing; yes, the leadership
- 25 problems were condemned.
- 26 MR SINCLAIR: And your point about the culture reorganisation and this perception
- 27 that the Labour Group always said yes to the officers, what is your perception of
- 28 the Council on this?
- 29 MR MILNE; I think it certainly happened in the last four years, the current
- administration has really said what it wanted and tasked the officers to take it
- forward. Yes, there will be blanks in it. We are a democratic group and we can
- have an argument about whether we should have a Director of Education and so
- forth but it is a miss when you are not quite sure who to go to. We are split on
- that in the group; you may look for unity in a group but we are so small we just
- 35 have differing opinions.
- 36 MR SINCLAIR: There is no such thing as unity in a political group! Thank you for

1	that.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Keith.
3	MR GEDDES: Just in relation to the comments you made about co-operation
4	between Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen city, it is a natural unit. In fact it seems a
5	pity that there are two authorities for what is effectively one unit in terms of
6	work, leisure etc. Would you go as far as having one education service for
7	Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen or one social work service? How far would you go
8	to make savings by removing duplication?
9	MR MILNE: I do not think it would go down very well to have a unified education
10	service for the shire and Aberdeen. We are all very protective of our own areas
11	and the shire is a very widespread square mileage with a lot of smaller schools. If
12	you applied the same criteria to schools there as you do the city it would not work
13	because of the remoteness of some of the county schools.
14	MR GEDDES: But you do think there is greater room for co-operation between the
15	two authorities?
16	MR MILNE: Yes, I do.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is all just now, Councillor Milne. Just let me stress
18	that Keith Geddes's views are of course his own personal views rather than those
19	of the Accounts Commission.
20	MR GEDDES: It is so long since I questioned a Conservative!
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Councillor Milne, is there anything else you wish to add?
22	MR MILNE: I do not think so. I will have to think. You asked me if I was the
23	Council Leader what would I do.
24	THE CHAIRMAN: You can come back to that. You did not want to anyway.
25	MR MILNE: I have not got round to thinking about it. I would need to think some
26	more.
27	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
28	Ladies and gentlemen, we come to the next witness, who is our last witness
29	today, and that is Karen Donnelly of Unison. Could I ask Ms Donnelly and her
30	colleague to come forward. Would you please introduce yourselves for the
31	record.
32	MS DONNELLY: My name is Karen Donnelly and I am one of the joint branch
33	secretaries of Aberdeen City Unison branch. My colleague is Fiona Smith, who
34	is the branch communication officer.
35	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do you have an opening statement you wish to give
36	us?

Opening statement by Karen Donnelly, Unison

MS DONNELLY: As I stated in my introduction, I am one of the two joint branch secretaries in Aberdeen City Unison. Unison is currently the largest trade union operating within Aberdeen City Council and we represent members from all sectors, services and occupational groups of the Council. Our members work in the front line, they work in the back office and across all the Council structures.

Unison is a lay led trade union. It is our members and not Unison's employees and officials who determine our policy and our procedures. We represent Unison members in negotiations with their employers and at disciplinaries and such-like. I am an employee of the Council, Fiona is an employee of the Council, and we combine that role with our trade union activity.

I would like to start with some of the issues that have been raised today around the property report. It is basically Unison's position that it is really inappropriate for the contents of this report to be discussed in a public forum at this time. As the Chairman rightly pointed out this morning, there are current processes ongoing both internal disciplinary procedures and external criminal investigations. We recognise the public interest. However, this must be balanced against the rights of individual employees to fair treatment within any of these processes. Unison was concerned at the publication of the report prior to completion of these processes and we believe that the wrong decision was made in terms of publication at this time.

We cannot comment on the impact of publication on the criminal investigation but I think we can comment on the potential impact on employment matters. Unison is gravely concerned at the discussion of the report today in a public forum and in front of members of the Council's Appeals Committee when the internal disciplinary processes have not yet been completed, and I think that is really all I would want to say on the matter.

Earlier in the hearing there was reference made to possible suggestions that officers of the Council perhaps do not co-operate with members of opposition parties to the same extent as they do with administration parties. Again this is not something that Unison is prepared to accept on behalf of its members. Whilst it would not be appropriate for me to name and identify officers at this time it is our experience that there is a growing concern being expressed to us by sour

2
 3
 4

members that in fact the opposite is true and that there are some elected members who, whether inadvertently or deliberately, seek to draw officers into commenting on matters which are essentially political in nature. Where officers rightly do not comment there are then suggestions of political bias.

You may then ask what we have done in terms of representing these people and in terms of challenging this. We gather and continue to gather examples of this. However, understandably the officers in question are somewhat nervous of us progressing with this on a formal basis. First and foremost our role is that of protecting our members' jobs and conditions of service and I think we need to look at the single biggest assault on that at the moment which is job evaluation, the single status.

The single status agreement was reached in 1999 between the three trade unions and COSLA. In Aberdeen city job evaluation outcomes were issued to staff in August 2005. For many those results represented equality of treatment and equal pay for the first time. For others those results were personally devastating with the prospect of significant wage cuts. At that point, prior to the issue of those results there was a lack of what I would call meaningful engagement with the trade unions; although there were discussions we were not given access to information and outcomes.

Ultimately the Council withdrew those results and embarked upon, I think, a more constructive dialogue. This included full access to information as it became available throughout the job evaluation process. Further results were issued to Aberdeen City Council staff in January of this year. Whilst some of those results were not as extreme as those in 2005 Unison remains unhappy at the financial impact on a number of its members. Without a doubt the single biggest challenge in terms of implementing job evaluation and equal pay is the lack of proper funding.

This matter was raised by Unison and indeed the Council during the Scottish Parliament's Finance Committee Inquiry into the implementation of single status. The cost of job evaluation and single status is absolutely phenomenal in terms of implementing new pay grading structures and meeting equal pay liabilities. Equal pay is a legal obligation which the Council cannot ignore and which the trade unions within this city will not allow it to ignore. Disappointingly, no additional funds were made available to Council's Finance Committee despite the position being identified by that committee as the greatest civilising force in the history of local government finance.

I turn now to the comments regarding a culture of non-compliance. I think it is fair to say that Unison do not accept that there is a Council wide culture of non-compliance. Where there has been or has been alleged out and out non-compliance or defiance then the Council has disciplinary processes to deal with this and we like other trade unions have represented members through those processes. But we do not actually accept that there is an issue of non-compliance nor indeed defiance.

There is confusion around structures and I think it has taken staff time to get their heads round where their place is in the organisation under these new structures. Part of that is communication. I think part of it is also the change process itself. We have been invited to comment at various stages in the change process and in each of those we have indicated that we felt the restructuring should have taken place from the front backwards rather than from the top down.

There have been many changes over the last few years and there is an element I think of change fatigue amongst the staff. There are workload issues which have been touched upon here today that have been caused by a number of reasons, and again Unison have been pursuing this for a number of years with the Council. I think we are now engaged in a pattern of discussions where we are looking at the workload, we are looking at the transformation programmes, we are looking at how we move forward, and we are looking at what the trade union's role is in assisting or in representing staff through the transformation process so that they understand their role in that process and the outcomes of it.

I think it is fair to say that staff have been demoralised for some years now. Significant changes create uncertainty and there have been a number of changes here. I think the decrease in budgets exacerbate that uncertainty to the point of fear, but Unison truly believes that the single biggest impact on morale in Aberdeen City Council is job evaluation and single status which is in common with most local authorities in Scotland.

As I mentioned earlier, our members received letters in 2005, many of them indicating a wage cut. These were hard working, committed Council officers who viewed this rightly or wrongly as a slap in the face or a statement that they somehow were not worth their wages. To be honest, there is no point in telling people that job evaluation is not personal because your wages, your terms and conditions, your title and your job are intensely personal. I think everyone in this room needs to understand what it has been like for people who have received those letters and how difficult it is to get over something like that.

I think also we need to not lose sight of the frustration of those who have not been paid fairly to date and are still awaiting that outcome. Again in common with other councils there have been compensation payments made but work needs to be progressed to deals with the full value of what further equal pay cases remain outstanding.

There was reference earlier in the hearing to the need for the Council to win hearts and minds and I think that is probably a fair comment. But, to be honest, Unison's position is that we are not quite sure how this will be achieved when the lack of funding available for single status means wage cuts. Our members are feeling bruised and have felt bruised over the last few years. There has been continual change, there has been uncertainty, the financial situation does not help. The single status I think for many was the last straw.

There is also a feeling that this process itself is leaving our members feeling bruised because they now feel that they are under attack from their communities and the citizens who they are striving to provide good quality services for. There is allegation or speculation that there is across the board feelings in services which is not how our members see things. Yes, they are aware that there are areas where there are challenges but on the whole we would say that the staff who work for the Council are hard working, they come in and they do a fair day's work, and they are absolutely committed to delivering the best possible services for the citizens who live here. We would just ask the Commission to bear that in mind in any considerations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms Donnelly. Before we go on can I just correct something that I said earlier. I said that this would be the last speaker for this session today. I have just received a note to tell me that one of the representatives of the other unions who is to give evidence will not be available tomorrow, and so we will take that evidence today. So it is a slightly longer session today but that obviously gives us the opportunity to speak to all the union representatives who are here today.

Ms Donnelly, thank you for your opening statement. I have two points to make, or one point and one question, and then I will ask my colleagues to come in with any questions they have. You referred to the property discussion as inappropriate. I note your comments and it is in the transcript, so I think we will have to leave that there. I think frankly the more we discuss it, it just would not be what we would want here.

MS DONNELLY: Indeed, but we felt it was appropriate to make that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I want to go immediately to the culture of non-1 2 compliance which has become a title of the discussion in some ways. You do not 3 accept it and I think you said that it is down to confusion and down to a top to 4 bottom approach rather than a bottom-up approach. Is that correct? MS DONNELLY: What I said was we do not accept it is a Council wide approach, 5 that there is a Council wide culture of non-compliance. 6 7 THE CHAIRMAN: How widespread if at all is it, do you think? 8 MS DONNELLY: I am sure there are individual cases but I can only comment on 9 those matters that are brought to our attention, the individual cases. When we are 10 called to represent members in those instances we do so, as do the other trade unions, but we do think that the issue is not about non-compliance, it is a lack of 11 12 understanding and a lack of communication, and it is all rolled up in the general 13 change fatigue, if you like. People feel that there have been changes going on 14 constantly. There has also been an issue of perhaps local government issues 15 running at the same time which I think has added to that confusion. THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just clarify for my own understanding. Are you saying that 16 17 the Council within the confusion to which you refer, that would be an aid towards 18 compliance? MS DONNELLY: I think whether "compliance" is the right word ---19 20 THE CHAIRMAN: I know, I am just playing back what ---MS DONNELLY: Yes. I do not know whether I accept ---21 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Neither necessarily do I, I am playing it back in shorthand just 23 now. MS DONNELLY: I am not necessarily accepting "compliance" is the correct word, 24 25 but I think there are issues about communication, there are issues about 26 understanding. I think the single biggest issue in all of this is job evaluation and 27 single status, the fear and uncertainty of those facing wage cuts, the fear and 28 uncertainty of those facing cuts in their terms and conditions aligned with the pressures on the budget and the lack of available resources to properly and 29 30 adequately finance that. 31 THE CHAIRMAN: And, remind me, how long has that particular issue been there, the single status, for you and your members, how long has that been in active 32 33 discussion?

MS DONNELLY: Well, leaving aside 1999, in terms of active discussions I would

say they probably commenced round about 2003 with letters being sent out in

34

35

36

2005.

THE CHAIRMAN: So prior to that, I will use the term only by way of shorthand, we 1 2 both understand what we are talking about, prior to that any culture of non-3 compliance if such a thing existed was done ... Is that correct? 4 MS DONNELLY: I would say so, yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Colleagues? Iain. 5 MR ROBERTSON: I would like to just ask about symptoms of change fatigue. Is it 6 the view that the staff are being asked and involved too much or they are being 8 told too much? 9 MS DONNELLY: I think there is a bit of both sometimes, to be quite honest with you. I think if you go back, obviously on the reorganisation I cannot comment on 10 what happened because I did not come to the Council until 1999, but in 2000, 11 12 2001 the Council embarked upon the change process in terms of the move 13 towards the input structures. I think sometimes people during that journey have either felt completely overwhelmed with the amount of information and perhaps 14 15 not understanding fully which parts of it applied to them. I think in other instances there are examples where perhaps people have not received enough and 16 there have been varying tactics. What I would say is that generally when we

is relevant to them but I think the answer to your question is --MR ROBERTSON: So you think management could have been more sensitive to this
overload in terms of development of the changes going on, they should have seen
some of the symptoms in the course of all these years and backed off a little bit
on some of the changes?

have asked for information as a trade union we have received it and where we have not received it and have escalated it through the management structure then

there has been intervention to ensure that we do receive it. We have tried to play

our part in informing our members in terms of what they need to know and what

MS DONNELLY: I think that is probably quite fair. It is a point that we felt sometimes they were trying to do too much at the same time.

29 THE CHAIRMAN: Ann.

17 18

1920

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

31

30 MS FAULDS: Ms Donnelly, what is your view of the local employment market?

MS DONNELLY: It is a fairly buoyant market, there is very little employment out

there. Certainly that is what the figures would suggest. I know that the Council

does struggle to recruit into some posts.

34 MS FAULDS: And does Unison have a position on market testing of local government services in Aberdeen?

36 MS DONNELLY: Yes, we do. We are a trade union, as I said right at the start, and

our job is or we see our role as being to defend jobs and services. We will challenge decisions to market test and we will not apologise for doing that because as well as protecting our members' jobs and services we are absolutely 100 per cent committee to the public delivery of public services as opposed to private profit.

- MS FAULDS: Do you have a view on staff appraisal systems?
- 7 MS DONNELLY: In general or specifically?
- 8 MS FAULDS: We heard today that new staff appraisal systems were introduced in the last 12 to 18 months. Do you welcome that initiative?
 - MS DONNELLY: I think in theory, yes, we would welcome it, so long as it is used as a positive experience. If it is about genuinely assisting our colleagues or our members of staff to improve their performance and identify training needs and ensure those needs are met then I think of course we would welcome that.
- MS FAULDS: What if there is a performance issue or a negative issue to be addressed?
- MS DONNELLY: The Council has competency procedures by which we would expect them to deal with that.
- 18 MS FAULDS: Thank you.

- 19 THE CHAIRMAN: Douglas.
 - MR SINCLAIR: Just so I have got this absolutely clear, I think what you seem to be saying to us is your view is that most staff are committed to doing the best possible job for the public and what you are suggesting as the difficulties that have arisen are I think twofold; one would be communication with staff just not being clear about what is happening, and also the change process. It strikes me, and I am interested to know whether this is what you are actually saying, that it is the volume of that change. At one and the same time you had single status, you had major structural change within the Council, and allied to that a growing financial problem. Is there a reasonable argument to make that on the one hand the staff are overwhelmed by that volume of change and, secondly, would any council have the capacity to deal with such huge issues at one at the same time?

 MS DONNELLY: I think it is fair to say that people felt overwhelmed and this was a
 - MS DONNELLY: I think it is fair to say that people felt overwhelmed and this was a point made on more than one occasion in discussions with the Council. Whether any other council would have the capacity to do it I cannot comment, I can only comment on Aberdeen city, and I think they were struggling to deal with all the issues that were ongoing in the city.
- 36 MR SINCLAIR: So in terms of how it runs in the future it is a huge challenge.

MS DONNELLY: It certainly appears so to the trade unions.

MR GEDDES: I understand that you have still to ballot your membership over the single status. Is that right?

MS DONNELLY: That is correct. The two other trade unions have balloted.

Unison's position was that we would not ballot until all of our members had the job evaluation outcomes and there was some delay because there had been some changes to jobs in the intervening period between the submission of job descriptions and the issue of results. We were quite clear in our branch that everyone had to be in possession of the full information before they would be asked to make a choice.

When the two other trade unions came back with their votes it became clear that it was thought they were inaccurate and effectively it was not worth us going through a ballot, so what we arranged then, the branch agreed that what we would do instead was issue a consultative questionnaire which could give us something a little bit more meaningful than just a yes or no, which was broken down into the various parts of all these things to be dealt with, job evaluation outcomes, pay line, various proposals, terms and conditions, and we are using that information to inform our ongoing discussions with the Council.

MR GEDDES: It is an obvious point but one would assume that the chances of a yes vote would improve if there was financial stability in the Council.

MS DONNELLY: To be honest, the chances of a yes vote will improve if the single status is fully funded. The feedback we have been getting from our members, and we can argue all day about whether it is realistic or not but it comes back to what I said earlier, that it is fine to sit and say that it is not personal and it has to be paid for and there is no additional funding. We accept that is the case.

As a branch we have campaigned very, very vigorously over the last three years to try to get the then Scottish Executive, now Scottish government to actually engage with local government and take some responsibility for funding this because of the impact it is having on staff, on services and communities. That was fine as an academic exercise but when you are someone who receives a letter that says, "Your wages are being cut by, £1,000," or £2,000, or £10,000, that is personal and there is no other way that you will look at it.

MR GEDDES: Assuming your objective argument solution to committing the time and so on, within the sort of framework of public services how do you engage with management to suggest improvements to the way in which your staff carry out basic functions?

MS DONNELLY: I suppose it comes back to what I said in relation to the comments that we submitted in the change process. At each stage in the process, we had a consultation process with the employer where at the basic level we got 14 days consultation on committee reports, in a number of initiatives we got longer than that. We have actually had some discussions recently in trying to sort of firm up those reports and look at the issues involving particularly around the transformation programmes where we want our local stewards involved right from the outset.

Part of that process is so that we can ensure that our members on the ground are getting the opportunity to feed in to that, and if you are doing the job then you have ideas about how things can be improved. These are discussions that have been ongoing for the last two or three months in terms of clearly identifying what the different roles are, where our role is and where our engagement is and where our safeguards are in terms of transformation programmes moving forward.

MR GEDDES: Thank you very much.

MR SINCLAIR: I hear what you say about funding for the single status but the Scottish government's position was quite clear that this was ... by trade unions and local government.

I was interested in your point about terms and conditions and I understand the role of any trade union is to try to protect members' interests and in terms of conditions the public sector are very good, but there is an argument for suggesting that in the way that life is changing, with more and more people with partners working, access to services needs to be more flexible, in the evening and on Saturday. How open is the local branch of Unison to that kind of thing?

MS DONNELLY: We will discuss anything and everything with the Council, I do not think there is anything where anyone can say, certainly in the last four years, that we have refused to discuss with the employer, but we will look for certain safeguards for our members which I think it is our role to do. But we are open to discussing particularly, we are well aware of the reality out there and the changing needs but also the pressures and the budgetary pressures there are, and I keep coming back to the point, first and foremost our role is to protect the jobs and the conditions and the pay of our members, and if that is the kind of discussion we need to get into to do that then of course we will do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else you wish to add before we call a halt to the session?

MS DONNELLY: No, I think that is all. Thank you for the opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much indeed. We now come to the final final group of people. Could I ask the other union representatives to come forward. Lady, gentlemen, welcome. I understand you have an opening statement.

Opening statement by Janet Adams, Regional Organiser GMB

MS ADAMS: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you very much for hearing us today. I am Janet Adams, regional organiser for the GMB trade union. On my right is Graham Tran, organiser for Unite (Amicus); on my left Grant Bruce, EIS, and on my far left Tommy Campbell, Unite (T&G).

I would like to put forward to you on behalf of GMB and Unite trade unions some of the main concerns in regard to the financial crisis that is happening in Aberdeen at present and the effects this is having on our members and the citizens of Aberdeen. We have serious concerns regarding not only the impact that cuts are having on members but also the manner in which the Council has made these decisions.

We along with the rest of Aberdeen learned of these cuts by reading about them in the press. The Council claim they work in partnership with the trade unions but chose not to consult us prior to the press release. Once we became aware of the proposals we immediately tried to get information so we could consult our members in regard to this. This information was not forthcoming. The more we studied these proposals the more it became evident that they were both ill thought out and unworkable. This resulted in the GMB and Unite declaring a formal dispute with the City Council.

Over the past two months we have attended numerous meetings as well as corresponding via email with the Council asking for detailed information in regard to these proposed cuts in jobs and services but all we receive is budget monitoring statements. We also feel that there has been an underspend in some departments on the previous years' budgets and we are suspicious that extra monies have been allocated over and above actual budget needs in some sectors where staff posts are not being filled but monies are still being allocated for these posts.

I would also strongly deny any suggestion that the unions and their members are not complying with change. There are many examples of modernisation changes having taken place in the past that we have been party. However, on these proposals our members are unwilling to commit to any change due to the

lack and withholding of any detailed information.

Also there is the fact that the Council are making statements in the press about the privatisation of our members' jobs. Given that, could anyone really expect our members to co-operate with these proposed cuts?

That is all we would like to say in our prepared statement, Chairman. However, I would like to pass on to Grant Bruce from EIS for his statement.

Opening statement by Grant Bruce, Secretary Aberdeen EIS

MR BRUCE: Thank you, Chairman. Since October 2005 Aberdeen EIS has expressed concerns bout the structure, strategy and operational capacity of Aberdeen City Council. These views have been expressed in letters to the Chief Executive and elected members, at meetings with the Chief Executive and indeed second, third and fourth tier managers and also during informal and formal grievance hearings.

We feel that since the removal of the Director of Education post in December 2005 there has been no designated individual with the appropriate level of responsibility and operational capacity to ensure strategic leadership and support to schools and consistent and equitable delivery of said strategy across the three neighbourhoods.

Head teachers are consistently blamed for lack of pace in change or are seen as barriers to change. Over the last 25 years education has changed throughout Scotland and teachers have embraced these changes and I hope they will continue to do so in the future. The criticism has not been based on facts.

One of the problems about the transformation strategy, and we heard earlier from Abigail Tierney where she said four targets had not been met, and one of the four would be the restructuring of management within our schools in Aberdeen. It became Council policy in May 2005, three years ago, head teachers in schools then went about the job, collegiately consulting teachers in schools about the new management structure. Thereafter the paper was withdrawn, amended and then reissued. After that a second stage of consultation took place with our schools collegiately and indeed in one area the committee actually went ahead and produced a policy that seemed to differ from the original paper.

Three years on, the transformation document stated that the target was 2008, a paper was supposed to come to the 29th April Policy and Strategy Committee but my understanding is it was pulled at the last minute by the administration, and

quite rightly so, for lack of financial detail. I use that as an example of the problems that we have had in management change over the years.

Indeed the production of the most important document since the inception of Aberdeenfutures was the transformation programme and it amazed us at the time that this document was not placed by management on the formal consultative process we have in Aberdeen for teachers.

Finally on transformation, the document is flawed in its benchmarking exercise comparing Aberdeen's attainment with that of Edinburgh City Council. For example, Edinburgh City Council has 15 special schools, we only have five left in Aberdeen. The level of mainstream maintained additional support needs pupils in Aberdeen schools is much, much greater than you have in Edinburgh, and therefore in an attempt to compare 14 national assessments for Aberdeen compared to Edinburgh it is just a facile exercise and clearly also, as we know, as mentioned earlier, Edinburgh has a much greater percentage of pupils in the independent sector.

The capacity of the Council to secure change. In December 2007 a paper was produced outlining SEBN strategy, that is the strategy for social, emotional and behavioural needs for pupils in the city. This took place because of the comments from the INEA2 inspection. At the time the spending on out of city placements was reported as £9 million we spend for something like over 100 Aberdeen pupils that are sent outwith the city for education, and my understanding is that they are mainly SEBN pupils.

The report to Education Committee of 11th December 2007 outlined two key posts, policy officer secondments, that would be essential to progress this vital policy and to date unfortunately these posts are not in place. Added to this is the likely removal because of budget cuts of large numbers of support for learning teachers, behaviour support teachers and ASN teachers from classrooms from August 2008 which may inevitably if the support is withdrawn could lead to increases in the out of city placements that are causing financial damage to the city at present.

Staff do not understand the purpose behind Aberdeenfutures; all they see is a triplication of service support in a small city and a lack of consistency across the three areas. There is a perception among some EIS members as well that Aberdeen city operates a blame culture. There is a perception that staff do not feel involved, that they have change done to them, that they have never really been invited to have ownership of the change.

Finally, the current financial position. A great deal of money was spent in 2005/06 in severance payments to long serving, experienced staff in learning and leisure. A great deal of money has also been spent in establishing the neighbourhood structures, a transition which suffered from the early release of these experienced staff. We can only speculate on these large costs but we are certain that this has not been money well spent because the new structures have, at least according to outside inspections, led to a deterioration in the leadership provided to our schools.

If we are to cut back on these expensive out of city placements, and my understanding is that some of these placements can cost the Council £250,000 per pupil per year, it is essential to address the difficulties caused by inclusion in our schools by making sure that the resources are put in place to deal with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Does anyone else wish to speak?

Opening statement by Graham Tran, Unite (Amicus)

MR TRAN: Chairman, I am Graham Tran, Unite, Amicus section. I would just like to take a couple of minutes of your time to explain my involvement in the process and that is primarily in the craft workers in the Council, which are the electricians, plumbers, engineers etc. I totally refute what was said earlier today to the Commission about the trade unions opposing change. I think where we are coming from is we want to be in control of the change and not the change in control of us. In the craft sector we have demonstrated that.

In 2003 there were discussions about market testing, about outsourcing, but there was also a discussion about modernisation and the craft agenda and if we bought in to this process it would allow more work to be brought in house. It took longer than expected, some four years the discussions went on, and the Council's leading team decided to take voluntary service, to go back on track when it came back to consultants, but of course that upset some of our members.

Part of the process also, I have to say, was neighbourhood services and the setting up of the three areas. That was and still is some confusion for our members and we see it as triplication or duplication of some resources. The process that we have in place in the modernisation is in the early stages, it was only signed a year ago, but we do have a difficulty in that we are not seeing good returns in terms of work coming back in house; in fact quite the opposite. Since the agreement was signed there were a number of Council craftsmen who are

now going to work for contractors who are doing work for the Council. So they finish up with the Council on the Friday night and they come back for contractors doing the same work in the same area for more money.

Money is one element of it but not all. Morale is one part of it. Job satisfaction is another part of it. Part of the Council policy is when somebody leaves to have an exit interview, many of them do that. In the craft sector three weeks ago not one exit interview had been carried out to find out why staff had left, so how can you possibly address the problem if you are not following your own policy to find out why people have left the services.

It also raises questions of grave concern, Chairman, on the health and safety front as well. We have a number of contractors working for the Council and there does not appear to be a proper policy in terms of measuring the competency of the staff that the contractors are using. The Council are aware of it but it has not been addressed as it should be. We have also had situations where the trade unions have been bypassed and people have been recruited into craft positions who were not qualified to carry out that work.

When we found out what had happened there we raised it with the Council and we managed to bring it back on track and people were put into training, but it is not an ideal situation where I believe competency has been questioned, processes were put in place. You can make up your own minds about what that means in terms of morale in the work force and it has not been addressed properly. I only deal with the craft area but I think it is useful that the Commission are aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Mr Campbell, do you want to add anything?

Opening statement by Tommy Campbell, Unite (T&G)

MR CAMPBELL: Just a few comments to follow on from that. I listened very carefully to the evidence presented earlier by the City Council councillors and the senior management. I wish to bring to your attention that I noticed that the panel were very welcoming of the information presented to you by Alan White about the housing voids issue because that was a good news story. But my understanding is that it was predominantly private contractors that were used over a limited period of time, morning noon and night, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, to get those voids down.

When that happened there was a huge celebration by the management team, and they are welcome to it, but the question I think the panel need to find out is how much exactly did it cost the Council to get that number of voids down from well over a thousand and how much did they pay to private companies. That is an issue that we have now, as my colleague Graham Tran has rightly pointed out we have now got the crazy situation that when we bought in to the modernisation of the draft agreement it was on the basis that it would move towards building the organisation, retaining staff and recruiting staff because they were being offered salaries which were reasonably good at that time, but market forces have now dictated that people are selling their labour to the higher bidders in the private sector. We have now got the crazy situation of plumbers, joiners and electricians walking out of the Council, some with over 20 years service, walking out on a Friday into private sector companies on the Monday morning coming back to work on the same flats that they were working in, electricians doing electrical work, and earning up to £1,000 a week, and it is the Council that is paying for that.

We tried to persuade the management. Iain Robertson was very correct, the issue about communication is listening, and we find from our experience that there is a culture of non-compliance in the Council but it is at the very top of the senior management who do not comply with that simple principle of listening to what they are being told.

I represent as a general union a significant number of different types of Council workers and I can assure you that school cleaners and building cleaners who come to work in the morning comply with the terms of their contract because when everybody comes in to work the buildings are clean, it is not a magic fairy that does it, it is workers, willing workers coming in and complying with the terms of their contracts. Catering staff come into the schools and homes and they comply, they do not not comply, and they produce the food that the children and old people eat. We have got people who sweep the streets, collect the rubbish.

As my colleague Karen from Unison said, there are office workers who come in, and I can assure you my experience is that on a daily basis there are Council workers coming to work before their normal starting time, not claiming extra time for it. There are cleaners doing that in schools, there are cooks doing that in schools, people doing it right across the Council because they actually are good public servants, and the reason for low morale is that they are upset at the adverse

publicity the Council is obtaining, and particularly in more recent times, which is caused as they see it by the very senior management at the top and the poor political Council.

So housing voids is one I think you need to examine very closely. In terms of modernisation and trade union co-operation, we signed the cleansing contract in 2003. It was hailed and commended by the Scottish Executive as an agreement between the unions and the council that was in and the sweeping staff and that has worked very well. To be blunt about it, one of my colleagues spoke about wanting to keep services in house but I am not nervous about market testing if the playing field is equal.

We have a situation where there was a pilot scheme in a primary school, and I am still demanding and asking for information for an actual comparison of the cost, and we were told that the private company was cheaper. But we know that they are not because they have access to council equipment and we are asking to see the actual invoice that was paid to the private company for the work done because that way we can see whether the cost was cheaper or not.

We also have a crazy situation, and the point was made by yourself, Chairman, where we have people coming to us who wish to remain anonymous who as late as last night were telling me that they are working in the care sector, they have had clients taken off them where they had an hour's work to do with them, and there are private companies doing that work now and they know from local contacts within the local communities that they are spending five and 10 minutes. This sort of thing needs to be checked out. We raised these things.

In terms of the budget situation we consistently ask for information; we eventually get information in the budget monitoring situations but when we dig in deep we discover, and we are still pursuing this matter, that we are suspicious that in certain sectors of the Council we have had officials, who are maybe a dab hand at it, have been able to secure, maybe possibly just in the same form they are coming here, they are pretending they have given up cuts but in fact in some cases we believe they may have got extra money. That as far as we are concerned needs to be examined by the senior management and we are still in dispute on that particular matter.

In respect of listening I have to say that I was very shocked to hear Councillor Dean comment, and I hope it is clearly on the record so that we can challenge it later as well, when she said with a quip that we all know that those people who respond to questionnaires have an axe to grind. I think that sums up the attitude

of any politician, why bother asking people for their views if you believe that those who reply have got an axe to grind. I think that is a very unfair comment and I am hoping that Councillor Dean will have the honour to withdraw that remark and apologise, particularly to staff who have the decency to respond to questionnaires that the management have issued.

I have other issues about disaggregation and I am sure we will hopefully get a chance to give some answers to the members of the panel. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Again I have just one question and I sense my colleagues will have more to come back to you with. My question is a simple one, to Ms Adams, and it is the reference to the culture of non-compliance again. I think you said that there were many examples of compliance but that because of the lack of information now coming forward you have grown a bit suspicious about what to do and that is why there has been this sliding in action of moving things forward. Did I get that right?

MS ADAMS: Yes. When reading the papers about what is going to be happening to our members' jobs obviously we ask questions. When we do not get the answers to the questions we then cannot pass it on to our membership, so therefore the membership are becoming very distrusting of the Council and they feel that they do not have any input in any decisions that are made, that the decisions are more forced on them than requested.

- 21 THE CHAIRMAN: That is relatively recent?
- 22 MS ADAMS: Yes.

- 23 | THE CHAIRMAN: What happened before that?
- MS ADAMS: I actually was not up here in post before that so I would have to pass it on to Mr Campbell.

MR CAMPBELL: Years ago, as many will recall, going back to the OCCT days, that management in advance of contract dates, with the trade union representatives, who were conscious that it was a process we were all prisoners of, we shared information and the client side went and did their work and drew up all the contracts. We worked with the management side on what was the DSO which led to the DLO organisation, or CSD as it was in the old Council here, and there were cuts made. We had to tighten our belts, the management sharpened up their pencil and did their homework financially and we had to sacrifice certain elements of the terms and conditions of employment.

That is why staff take great offence then when they hear remarks like, "Staff are not for change". I have been dealing with the local authorities since I have

been an appointed officer since 1990 and I have been through most of the changes, I have witnessed them all, and some of them have been quite difficult, but the workers eventually have complied with the change.

For example, we used to in terms of the budgets of the Council, by November we would be briefed with what was management's thinking and it was done in confidence with the people in the room, the possibility of closing this home, or looking at this, looking at that, so that we would have working groups set up where we would enter into dialogue without prejudice so that we could keep and retain written evidence to support us, for example, in any decision that was made.

So we were aware in the past and in some respects could be criticised by our members for confidentially seeking information at an early stage but in terms of industrial relations and the like that process has to take place across the different parties. I would have to say now that basically in more recent times that trust has now gone. I came back and found out at the weekend the views about the Crown services, and that only happened in the past week. We need debate about it, even in the private sector, company management, managing directors, those meeting privately if there is something on the horizon that is potentially about to happen because you have sometimes real situations.

So on the one hand they say, "We're just market testing, there's no decision made on privatisation," but what does it lead in to? When we discuss the situation this is now the writing on the wall and that is it. Unfortunately that is the situation that has now been arrived at.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Colleagues. Iain.

MR ROBERTSON: Following up the point about change fatigue that one of your other colleagues in the last session of the hearing before us mentioned, I am concerned that the level of stress that all these changes are causing may be one of the factors in the high absence rates because the high absence rates apply to teachers as well; 35 per cent absence rate as a sickness absence rate is a high percentage. Would you like to comment on that? Is all this change fatigue affecting teachers as well and that leads to the absences?

MR BRUCE: I do not have the evidence to say that it is the rate of change that is causing the absence rate. All I know is that they talk about the lack of collegiality, which was the buzz word that came out in 1981, that was upsetting. I go round many schools obviously as part of my job and it is that lack of collegiality at that higher level that is upsetting some of the teachers in schools.

MR ROBERTSON: Thank you. I would like to ask Tommy Campbell on the

question of private sector companies taking over care in the community, I believe that many of these private sector companies elsewhere in Scotland had a job with staff retention and had quite a high turnover of staff. Is there anything done that you know of that tests the sort of customers, I know many of them are not able to fill in questionnaires but is there any work done to see whether the customers prefer council care to private sector care?

MR CAMPBELL: I have no knowledge of how they are monitoring the situation. I have asked recently in another group of care workers and they only advised me that since August of last year they have had no clients referred to them, they have all been referred to the private sector. They had 119 clients between them and when I met them a month ago I was told that was down to 94, so in that period of a couple of months the management had made the decision to outsource, i.e. get the private sector to look after the clients they were looking after. That is a significant cost to the Council because they are still employing the staff who were looking after them.

There is competition in the evidence given this morning. We heard I think it was Councillor Dean saying that the Council's social work staff and care staff are very hard working. I had a letter recently from the Corporate Director, Pete Leonard, who will support me, where I had queried a cost to the Council of £42 an hour, the staff are on £8 an hour, by the way, and I got an answer which made it quite clear to me, and it is the most ridiculous answer I have ever seen in my life, as to how they came to that conclusion.

I want answers and I want answers as to who the private companies are, how much specifically it is costing the Council to put those clients over to those private companies, who is making the decisions inside the Council, what mechanisms, and we heard the evidence today already, what mechanisms are in place to protect the Council from over-charging by these private companies once they see them flying through the door.

That is a very serious issue of accountability and in particular financial accountability, but the most upsetting thing for the staff, by the way, the ones who phoned me last night, is they are very concerned about people in the community they were looking after and giving an hour's care to them at night time for them being fed, washed and basically put to bed, it was now down to a five or 10 minute rush-in by what are allegedly, and I have to say this again, allegedly untrained and possibly staff that have not been SCRO checked.

This was fresh last night, I do not have anything formal to give to the Council

about this, but I am not giving up on this one. The answer I will get back when I say this information will have to remain anonymous, they will probably not want to deal with it because they will want names and places and all the rest of it. I understand that is quite difficult but I will drop them a letter saying, "I want to know what mechanisms you have in place guaranteeing that all clients who had an hour's work from the Council are definitely getting the hour's work from the private companies as well". Thank you.

MR TRANN: Could I come back for a moment on what Mr Bruce was talking about regarding sickness absence. I have been involved with a number of companies in Aberdeen and we actually have a formula within the trade union that helps companies, so we see ourselves as being part of the solution. You talk about the change and the reason for high absenteeism. That may be the case but I think what is missing here is the workforce involvement. If you take people with you in terms of the change programme, let them have an input to the change programme, then the stress related issues may not be the same.

I mentioned earlier about my own union having a system in place where we work with companies and we have been successful in reducing sickness absence in various work places, we have done it in the Ministry of Defence and so forth. The Convener, Joe Craig, and I actually met with people within Aberdeen City Council and the bottom line or the starting point is you have to know how much they are actually spending on sick absence for cover. It could not be provided to us so we never got over the first hurdle.

That was a number of years ago and nobody came back to us to take us up on that offer yet again. It did not work, and it is rather disappointing that when you go in and you ask, "How much are you actually paying on sickness absence?" they could not tell you because the system they have got in place is a win/win situation. But we did not get over the first hurdle and I think the Commission should be aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Douglas.

MR SINCLAIR: Mr Tran, Grant Bruce talked very briefly about management and the issue around restructuring, and I notice Mr Campbell said at the end that he would be happy to give some views on disaggregation. I would be interested in getting your thoughts on what you think about restructuring both from the point of view of starting equally but, and this is the test of any structure, is it adding value, is it delivering better services for the public.

MR TRAN: Better value for the people of Aberdeen in the services provided?

MR SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR TRAN: I think what we want to focus on is, the deal we entered into or the deal that I believe we entered into with Aberdeen City Council is delivering what is best for the citizens of Aberdeen. What I mean by that is firstly workmanship, certainly, because there have been a number of occasions where private contractors have been carrying out tasks not to a satisfactory workman level and we had to go back and actually re-do the work.

In terms of value for money that is important. It is important to us because if you look at the City Council like a business we need it to be successful and efficient for job security for our members. But when we get the dissatisfaction that we have for whatever reason it is not helpful. So I believe if we to focus on the deal that we have entered into with Aberdeen City Council on the modernisation programme and start to bring work in-house, we have actually given an example to the Commission.

A number of contracts were put out in terms of maintenance for lifts in a tower block. One contract was given to a company where the nearest person lived in Dundee. There was a memo put out from the management in the Council to officers that you waited one hour before calling for assistance. The residents did not know that they had to wait for one hour stuck in the tower block before they could get any assistance. I am glad to report there has been some listening somewhere within the Council because one of those lift contracts has actually been brought back in-house.

Given time we can demonstrate, given the opportunity we can demonstrate value for money and proper workmanship to deliver to the people of this city and that is what they deserve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr Bruce.

MR BRUCE: At an operational level I have fortnightly meetings with the three service managers, one for each of the areas, and a crucial part of that hour long meeting every fortnight is in looking at the implementation of the policies and ensuring that there is consistency across the three neighbourhoods at the operational level.

As I said previously, this triplication of service support in a small city the EIS believe has not helped. Clearly we have worked hard with the officers to ensure that there is consistency at an operational level but the three neighbourhoods in my opinion does not help.

MR CAMPBELL: Yes, it is a very interesting topic. I will give you a very simple

example of how it does not work. A school was in one area until the last few months but moved into another area. I do not know why it moved. The cleaner in that school happened to be doing chargehand duties in January of last year and had raised a grievance about not getting about not being paid a chargehand allowance. October was when the change took place. The new manager said, "I'm only paying you from October because you're in my area from then and I'm washing my hands of anything before then".

This was a Council employee, by the way, an employee of the area who is now, because of the procrastination by the management over this issue, despite comments from me, and this is my experience, I now have to file an Employment Tribunal claim for non-payment of wages to recover the woman's proper salary. That is something I have had to do hundreds of times with this Council because of the non-compliance with proper procedures in dealing with grievances.

As regards disaggregation on a wider issue we are currently in a trades dispute over the parking attendants, the trans-community wardens and environmental wardens. There is an alleged grand plan with the councillors to have city-wide city wardens and we made it clear it is a daft thing here.

I have recently been asking questions about the legislation, particularly parking legislation in Scotland, that I understand states that parking attendants have to be clearly identified to be separate from trans-community wardens and police officers and community workers, i.e. it must be identified that they are responsible for handling parking fines. I asked the Council management to confirm if they are implying by using the words "city warden" to describe the community, and I have been told, yes, they are, "We have been given the advice and we are adhering to the requirements of the legislation". So I asked them, "Tell me exactly what the central legislation is that states when you use the words 'city warden' you are using it to that effect". I simply have not been given that information and I suspect the reason why I have not been given it is because it does not exist, because their plan just will not get off the ground, it is not a good idea.

They are then going to disaggregate the entire team into the three areas and as a result of that they are creating a new management structure and they have fitted in an extra management post, at a time when this Council is claiming that they have no money. We have registered our dispute and we are clear that one aspect of our dispute is opposition to the creation of the extra post which is made clear we see as a form of empire building by a team within the Central area, and we

will pursue that dispute if necessary; we are still in dialogue with the management.

But it beggars believe that at a time when the Council is short of money that the councillors, whether they have noticed this or not or listened to us on the matter, are prepared to appoint an extra manager for recruiting staff who are going to be managed on a city-wide basis and when they are disaggregated there will be an extra manager in place. There it goes. Economics is a hard place as far as I am concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Keith.

MR GEDDES: Just to go back to the housing voids thing, I should make it clear that I am a member of Edinburgh T&G at the moment but after what I am about to say I may be expelled! In terms of the reason why you thought it was good news was, first, in terms of re-letting the average time went down from 102 days to 51, which must be good news for homeless people, I suppose and it is good news for the Council because they get extra rent and it probably reduces crime because vacant houses encourage crime. People feel good about a community where houses are let, it will improve the look of the local community. If former Council workers are earning £1,000 a week it is not bad for them, either. To cut through that, though, before it was hived off to the private sector were you approached as to whether or not workers would work in different ways to increase the number of re-lets more quickly?

MR CAMPBELL: The answer is no. I understand that some in-house team did do some work on voids but that is not the impression we want to leave with the panel. We will try to find out exactly how much money was spent in the private sector in bringing those voids down. I welcome the fact that the voids are down but how much money was actually spent by the Council in bringing that down so fast? I suspect there was a huge amount of money put into that operation, I have no idea what the amount is but I suspect it was many, many millions of pounds.

I think you have the authority to seek that information and I think it is interesting that the impression I got from Alan White's evidence was that it was the in-house team who were on board for that change and they did it, and I understand they did participate in it but were not a major player. If I am incorrect in that I will apologise for making the suggestion that it was the private sector and not the in-house team that were the prime movers in that and it was them that got the money or most of the money. But somebody needs to ask the question because I am not getting answers about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. That concludes our questions of you. Is there any final statement you wish to make or are you content?

MR CAMPBELL: I would just finally say we were glad to have the opportunity. I am confident that you have listened. Both myself and my colleagues have enjoyed your questions. I have enjoyed the way you have questioned the elected members of the political parties and the Council and Council officials. At the end of the day there is a major problem inside the Council.

I wish to take this opportunity to publicly say all the best to Douglas Paterson, the Chief Executive; I wish him and his family well in his retirement. I think that he has on some occasions tried his best, we have had our arguments in the past as well, but when Douglas retires the problems that we eventually do dig up hopefully will have been resolved. But my experience in the Council is unfortunately the attitude of non-compliance by the senior management in not listening. If they change their attitude and listen I can reassure you, as significant history has shown, we will co-operate with change as we have done in the past when it is change for the good, not change for the bad.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Lady, gentlemen, thank you very much for your evidence, we appreciate it.

Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the first day of this public hearing. We have some witnesses to hear tomorrow and of course I suspect that the Council will want to come back with some further views at the end of the session tomorrow. This is a thing we allow on the second day to let the Council have another word on any comments that have been made in the meantime. So we shall reconvene tomorrow at 10 o'clock. Thank you very much.

(Adjourned until Wednesday, 14th May 2008 at 10 am)

ACCOUNTS COMMISSION FOR SCOTLAND

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL: REPORTS BY THE CONTROLLER OF AUDIT ON THE AUDIT OF BEST VALUE AND COMMUNITY PLANNING AND ON THE PROPERTY SALES INVESTIGATION

HEARING

at

Town and County Hall, Town House, Castle Street, Aberdeen on

Wednesday, 14th May 2008

BEFORE:

MR JOHN BAILLIE
(Chairman)
MS ANN FAULDS
MR KEITH GEDDES
MR IAIN ROBERTSON
MR DOUGLAS SINCLAIR

DAY TWO

From the shorthand notes of Ubiqus Cliffords Inn, Fetter Lane, London EC4A 1LD Telephone: 0207 269 0370

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the second day of this public hearing. I will not bother with the rules of procedure that I explained yesterday and I think we can probably take the health and safety notice for granted, unless someone is desperate to hear it again.

Our first witness today is Rhonda Kelly, Chief Executive of Aberdeen Council of Voluntary Organisations. Could I ask Ms Kelly please to come forward. Good morning. Could I ask you to give your name and position for the record, please.

MS KELLY: My name is Rhonda Kelly. I am the Chief Executive of Aberdeen Council of Voluntary Organisations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe you have an opening statement.

MS KELLY: Yes, please.

Opening statement by Rhonda Kelly, Chief Executive of Aberdeen Council of Voluntary Organisations

MS KELLY: Thank you for allowing me to put forward the views of the voluntary sector.

The sector in Aberdeen is a vibrant, diverse one and employs well in excess of 5,000 staff who provide high quality services to the most vulnerable people within the city. Volunteer hours account for over 3.7 million hours worked per annum and the sector is estimated to be worth over £269.9 million. Twenty-four per cent of beneficiaries of services are children, young people and families, and people with disability or health issues account for a further 23 per cent.

The sector provides a huge number of services on behalf of the City Council, many in the care sector. The impact of the financial position of the Council is wide ranging for individual organisations within the city and also for the sector as a whole. In a survey carried out on line recently, 79.4 per cent of the respondents stated that the City Council budget decisions would affect their organisations directly with 38.2 per cent being affected by the transformations programme. A further 81.8 per cent expected indirect effects from the budget cuts with 48.5 per cent expecting indirect changes as a result of transformations.

The transformation programme has already begun to affect voluntary sector providers of services. The change in eligibility criteria which came out of the transformation programme will result in the closure of many services who provide

for low or medium level needs, and this comes despite Oldham Council stating fervently at a recent Aberdeen City Council conference that they had tried this approach and it did not work, and that the end result of this change was simply that more people moved upwards into high and critical levels of need much more quickly.

When the Council began looking at their transformation strategy they stated quite openly that this would be an inward looking process and that this process was to ensure best value. However, as the impacts of these decisions affect many partners and in particular the voluntary sector it would have been much more prudent for the decision makers to involve us in their deliberations.

The voluntary sector has a history of being innovative, adaptable and pragmatic and we could have helped to identify ways forward had we been involved. Organisations have found it intensely difficult to glean information as to their funding situation. Contributing to these difficulties is the lack of a contact officer for particular funds. Organisations are being passed from officer to officer with an apparent unwillingness to pass on information or, even worse, with each officer telling organisations something slightly different, leading to confusion, mistrust and frustration. It seems that officers are confused about the current funding situation and are being caught on the hop by requests for information, and our experience is that they do not know what the local authority is committed to.

The recent changes in structures, including the introduction of neighbourhoods, has caused difficulties with communication and there is a lack of understanding, we feel both within the Council but certainly from outwith, over who to contact when, in what region, whether strategists or operational staff. This would certainly go some way to explaining why the staff commitment to the programme of change has not been achieved.

Although the Council expects the sector to provide high quality services it does not seem to be committed to funding core services such as support for trustees and training for trustees, and one cannot help but feel that it is a matter of luck that the current unfortunate situation with Scottish Charity One Plus has not been replicated here. Unless the local authority has a commitment and makes a reality of full cost recovery then organisations will struggle to provide services. The OSCR report made a list of such recommendations to funders of services.

At this point it is worth pointing out that in 2005 Aberdeen City Council was a

leading partner in the development of a compact for Aberdeen. Essentially this is a standards framework for how partners will do business with each other, but sadly the shared principles, values and commitments have not been adhered to over the last while.

Overall the concerns from the sector are:

- 1. Lack of communication leading up to and after the decision making process.
- 7 2. Not knowing who in the organisation should be contacted to access information.
 - 3. The Council not offering general briefings on a regular basis despite us requesting these since last autumn.
 - 4. Conflicting information coming out of the Council from officers, both strategic and operational, and elected members.
- 5. The feeling that this is short term change with other changes to follow; this is worrying for the sector.
 - 6. A lack of consistency of approach in the way the administration have spoken to organisations and a feeling that those who shout loudest seem to be listened to, but everyone needs to know what impacts are going to affect them.
 - 7. Council officials do not know what changes have been made and therefore are not able to make decisions or have informed discussions.
 - 8. The Council's apparent lack of understanding re consultation and communication; we have not been consulted but we have been briefed on occasion.
 - 9. There appears to be no clear plan and with all this confusion and misinformation we are finding it difficult to retain staff.
 - 10. We are concerned as to the economic impact of cuts in the voluntary sector and particularly in regeneration areas as people who would normally be employed by the care sector enter unemployment. Also, voluntary organisations bring in huge amounts of money to the city through added value and grant funding, and this will no longer be the case as voluntary organisations either close or scale back their operations.

We would ask that any recommendations include a requirement for timely consultation and communication with the voluntary sector, allowing opportunities for boards to meet and discuss these recommendations; more than this, however, the acceptance that there may be room for negotiation, in other words, we might be able to find efficiencies ourselves along with different ways of working. For instance, there is a feeling that the planned redevelopment at Raeden may not necessarily need

1 to go ahead as there is already provision within the city for these services but this 2 would mean a partnership of public, private and voluntary sectors. 3 MR SINCLAIR: I am sorry, I missed that. Could you just repeat what that was 4 regarding planned redevelopment? 5 MS KELLY: At Raeden; it is schooling for children with learning disabilities. We would ask that we be included in budgeting processes and planning processes 6 7 so that we can seek efficiencies together. We recognise the situation the Council 8 finds itself in and that savings have to be made. However, a process of honest, open 9 discussion can be the only positive way forward. If we are kept informed and 10 involved in a transparent, open process then we can work together to effect change 11 and to ensure a better life for the people of Aberdeen. 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I will start with one particular question. 13 You referred to a number of difficulties there. One of the difficulties you referred to 14 was the lack of a contact officer and communication difficulties. Is this a relatively 15 new thing in your view or has it been going on for some time? MS KELLY: I think that it has always been recognised that there is a difficulty in that 16 17 many organisations get maybe five or six different grants from the Council and they 18 contact five or six different people and go through five or six different monitoring 19 processes for that. I think since the transformation programme began things have got 20 worse, but I do think there is a recognition within the Council that that is the 21 situation. 22 THE CHAIRMAN: That the situation has got worse, you mean? 23 MS KELLY: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Douglas. MR SINCLAIR: Good morning. It would be helpful to get a copy of your submission. 25 26 Can I just take you back, given the picture you have painted of lack of 27 communication, of the voluntary sector not knowing who to contact and the other 28 difficulties you have outlined. You mentioned back in 2005 the compact for 29 Aberdeen, which is presumably the compact between the Council and the voluntary 30 sector which set out presumably the way that the two parts were going to work with each other. Could you just describe what was actually in the compact and was there 31

MS KELLY: Although the compact involved the City Council it was through the

Community Planning Partnership so it involved all the partners, but, yes, there was a

a mechanism within the compact to review its effectiveness?

32

33

34

mechanism in it to go back and review it naturally. It was reviewed across the end of last year and it was agreed that the compact was not effective and that it needs to be rewritten, and we have been tasked to try to rewrite it and put more teeth in it by December this year.

MR SINCLAIR: And why was it considered that it was not effective?

MS KELLY: I think we recognised that the reason it was not effective was faults on both sides. There was not enough information went out with it, there was not enough education as to what it was about, and people just did not know about it, both within the Council and in the sector.

MR SINCLAIR: That is quite common. Can I also ask about the transformation programmes because I am interested in this area. Do you think there has been a lack of agreement or understanding of what the transformation programmes were actually about? I get the sense from you that there is a perception that what the Council have said to you is that this is an inward looking process that was essentially looking for efficiencies, but it would appear or one could get the impression that it was more than just efficiency saving, it was actually driving policy changes in terms of eligibility. Was it the voluntary sector's understanding that the transformation programme was simply to try to make the delivery of services more efficient rather than necessarily to change the policy framework in which policies were being delivered?

MS KELLY: We did not know. I think the feeling was that we just did not know what it was all about; we just knew that there was change afoot. I think the feeling was that the Council had a problem and were trying to fix it and so got together to try to do that but we really did not know anything about it until after decisions had been made and we had a briefing from a senior official.

MR SINCLAIR: You also indicated that you felt that you could have made a contribution had you been involved earlier in terms of driving efficiencies and you mentioned one of a public/private partnership. Are there other examples that you could give where you think the voluntary sector could have played a part in helping the Council to reduce its costs?

MS KELLY: It is difficult for me to give instances myself because we are a infrastructure organisation, but certainly when I asked people to give me information for coming here today another one that was mentioned was the fact that there seems to be a culture within the Council of sending children with difficulties outwith

- Aberdeen when there are places within Aberdeen but they will not be considered because they are not Council. That is anecdotal, I do not know, but the feeling is that we can be quite innovative and we could have, we would have worked together to save services I think is what the feeling is within the sector.

 MR SINCLAIR: But you would agree that public services do not have to be delivered
- MR SINCLAIR: But you would agree that public services do not have to be delivered through the local authority; public services can be delivered in a variety of ways and the voluntary sector is a key part in delivering services?
- 8 MS KELLY: Absolutely, yes.
- MR SINCLAIR: Can I also ask, in terms of your point about confusion about who to contact, and this may be more a question for the Council but it would interesting to hear your perspective. The issue with the link officer, if there was a situation, and I think you instanced where a voluntary sector might be dealing with four or five different parts of the Council, was there one co-ordinating link officer?
- 14 MS KELLY: Not that I am aware of, no.
- 15 MR SINCLAIR: And you would have thought that was good practice, would you?
- 16 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 17 MR SINCLAIR: Thank you.
- 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Keith.
- MR GEDDES: Just going back to the Aberdeen compact, 2005, you said that was a compact between the community planning partners, of which you were one, and the
- 21 Council. Is that right?
- 22 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 23 MR GEDDES: Do you have a concordat between the ACVO and the City Council at all?
- 24 MS KELLY: No, we do not.
- MR GEDDES: Do individual organisations that are funded by the Council have a three year funding agreement with agreed outcomes?
- MS KELLY: Not that I am aware of, no. It was spoken about in the compact but as far as I am aware it was never implemented.
- 29 MR GEDDES: And is funding to the voluntary sector done on an annual basis just now?
- MS KELLY: Yes, as far I am aware it is. Certainly that is how we receive our funding and most organisations I know of, yes.
- MR GEDDES: In terms of the recent reductions in voluntary organisation budgets what was the consultation process before the reductions were implemented between the
- 34 Council and the voluntary organisations themselves?

MS KELLY: As far as I am aware there was none. My understanding is that organisations were contacted as soon as decisions were made but I have not been told of any organisations that were consulted beforehand, and we were not. In the past we have always had a briefing about the budget decisions very soon afterwards, sort of the day after the budget decisions are made. We had asked for it to be earlier this year, we had hoped to get it round about October time, and that was through a group called the Voluntary Sector Liaison Group. However, we have never been able to put that in place, the Council seem to have been unwilling.

MR GEDDES: Can you say a bit about the Voluntary Sector Liaison Group and how often that meets and what its functions are?

MS KELLY: The Voluntary Sector Liaison Group is a group that I think essentially, it started before I came into post but my understanding is it was started as a way of the voluntary sector getting a direct line in to elected members and senior officials. It is a group that meets at least four times a year and has a set agenda, although the voluntary sector can call a meeting at any time it needs if it feels the need. It has been an effective group, it has been a good group, but it is also the group that was tasked with developing the compact. The Voluntary Sector Liaison Group is currently undergoing a review alongside the compact as to how we can make it more effective and possibly link it in directly into Council policy and committees so that it has more clout, I suppose. But essentially it is a group of voluntary sector representatives, elected members and senior officials who meet to discuss issues of relevance to the sector.

MR GEDDES: Is there a perception in the voluntary sector in Aberdeen, and this may apply elsewhere in Scotland as well this time around, that the scale of the cuts, the proportion of cuts in the voluntary sector has been greater than the proportion of cuts in the statutory sector?

- 27 MS KELLY: There is definitely a perception that that is true, yes.
- 28 MR GEDDES: Thank you.

- 29 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Keith. Iain.
- MR ROBERTSON: I would like to ask you just to rehearse or elaborate a little on the point you made about Scottish Charity One Plus because I did not understand quite the point you were making.
- MS KELLY: Scottish Charity One Plus was a big charity that went into liquidation and OSCR have actually produced a case study on why that happened. The lesson to be

1 learned for funders was that organisations that fund services delivered by charities 2 should fund an appropriate proportion of core services; they should ensure their 3 evaluation and monitoring systems allow them to assess the charity as a whole; and there is a list of things for charity trustees and such-like. But the gist of what OSCR 4 5 were saying, or part of what OSCR were saying was that although the whole organisation was mismanaged perhaps the funders should have taken more 6 7 responsibility to ensure that funding was put in place so that trustees and chief 8 executives and such-like had time to understand what their obligations were as 9 trustees, the company law, the charity law, the types of things that quite often 10 trustees do not understand.

- 11 MR ROBERTSON: And you feel that clearly was not done in this case?
- 12 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 13 MR ROBERTSON: Thank you, that is fine.
- 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iain. Ann.
- MS FAULDS: Could you tell me, has your organisation been involved in the neighbourhood community action plan?
- MS KELLY: The Council has tried very hard to get our organisation involved but we just have not had the capacity. We are slowly beginning to get involved through using representatives in the community but there are 37 neighbourhoods I think at the moment and they meet a lot and it is proving to be very time-intensive to try to get people to go and sit on these groups, but certainly we have been invited from the very beginning.
- 23 MS FAULDS: Were you consulted on the draft plan as it was emerging?
- 24 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 25 MS FAULDS: Did you give input to it?
- 26 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 27 MS FAULDS: So it is the implementation stage that you are finding difficult through
- 28 resources?
- 29 MS KELLY: Yes.
- 30 MS FAULDS: Thank you.
- 31 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Kelly. Is there anything else you would wish to
- 32 add?
- 33 MS KELLY: No, thank you.
- 34 MR SINCLAIR: Could I just ask one more question.

1	I think you mentioned in reply to Keith Geddes that the funding in the voluntary sector
2	was on a year by year basis. Does that feel fair given the Council is now effectively
3	funded on a three yearly basis?
4	MS KELLY: No, we would always ask for three year funding wherever that is possible.
5	MR SINCLAIR: And would you be happy for that funding to be on the basis, as Mr
6	Geddes has indicated, of agreed outcomes in the sense of contract between the
7	Council and the individual voluntary organisations to deliver certain outcomes in the
8	same way as they might be with a private sector firm?
9	MS KELLY: Absolutely, yes. I am sorry, I maybe misunderstood.
10	I thought Mr Geddes said concordat. There are contracts, voluntary organisations do
11	have contracts with the Council, and service level agreements and grants, there are
12	various different ways of getting funds from the Council. But, yes, we would
13	certainly want some sort of paper work to be in place for every grant and award that
14	is given.
15	MR SINCLAIR: Thank you.
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Kelly. I was in the course of asking you whether
17	there was anything further you wished to add.
18	MS KELLY: No, thank you.
19	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming along and telling us your story.
20	Can I now ask Mr Paul Hannan, the Chief Executive of the Cyrenians, to come
21	forward and give us his evidence. Welcome, Mr Hannan. I gather you have an
22	opening statement, with the usual 10 minute limit. Would you care to introduce
23	yourself for the record.
24	MR HANNAN: Paul Hannan, Chief Executive of the Cyrenians in Aberdeen.
25	

Opening statement by Paul Hannan, Chief Executive, The Cyrenians

The people of Aberdeen become aware of certain aspects of the mismanagement of Aberdeen City Council when high profile issues hit the press. However, people like me see what happens week in week out and there is nothing more frustrating than working with this Council. If the Commission is only going to enquire of senior staff and elected members then you will only get a very partial picture of what goes on in this Council. You need to ask the staff to whistle blow and to get the real day to day issues into the public domain. There is considerable anecdotal evidence of

 managers padding out their budgets to safeguard against cuts, of there being inappropriate financial controls in place, of workers being asked to do things that they consider illegal and of money just being wasted.

I know that officials within the Scottish government are frustrated about the Council delivering the goods. Aberdeen in the past has not got dedicated funding because their applications have been so poor, not because there have not been needs within the city. I know of others who have been round many councils in Scotland who consider working with this Council as amongst their worst experiences. I receive pity when people know I have to work with this Council.

The Cyrenians have considerable experience in relation to how Aberdeen City Council manages the planning and delivery of services. We have not routinely spoken out on all of our complaints, instead we have tried to influence how the Council manages service delivery and strategic development through direct involvement with the Council. Whilst the Council has moved to neighbourhood structures and has to some extent developed community planning in relation to neighbourhoods, they find it extremely difficult to engage with communities of interest where these extend across the city. They seem to see voluntary organisations as being out to self-perpetuate rather than seeing them as advocates for the needs of the community.

Cyrenians service users state that we are able to provide the flexibility of approach that appears to meet their needs. Yet the Council do not appear to want to listen to these service users.

Although my detailed submission concentrates on how planning was done in relation to homelessness we have experienced similar frustrations in relation to drugs, alcohol, getting our priorities right, looked after children etc. For instance, since the last chief social work officer left several years ago the Council has shown little commitment to being involve din drug strategy initiatives until the recent SWIA report on drugs. Generally the Council starts out on a course of action but rarely follows it through. Groups like the Cyrenians spend considerable time and effort contributing to such areas of work but very little happens.

In homelessness our experience is that the strategy has not been taken forward. It has not been meaningfully reviewed. They changed the advisory group structure without any improvements in how it operates. Operational matters such as issuing contracts have been subject to unacceptably long delays and meetings are regularly

cancelled. At the moment I do not even know when the next meeting is due. Over many years we have offered positive contributions to assist in this area and the Council appears to ignore the criticisms from the D grade that they received from Communities Scotland's inspection, particularly in relation to involvement of partners.

The Council appear to know that they want to spend less money but I see little evidence of them knowing the range of services that are required and in what proportion they want these. I have rarely seen concrete outlines of services along with the rationale for these. They want improved services for people with substance misuse problems but are cutting wrap around services that contribute significantly to meeting some of these needs. They want improved outcomes but do not understand the current outcomes that are achieved.

We were invited to a consultation event on the adult transformation strategy but wrote afterwards expressing our concerns with this process and the fact that a press release had been issued prior to it, making a nonsense of any pretence at consultation. Is it little wonder that there is no buy-in?

A number of reports on Aberdeen City Council have criticised its management as weak and they have indicated that the ability to move forward with their vision has been held back. It is our contention that the very staff who are charged with implementing the Council's vision have not shown leadership nor basic management skills in that they have not consistently engaged with organisations like the Cyrenians in a professional way.

Other voluntary sector organisations have stated similar frustrations in terms of little progress being made on issues, the difficulty in identifying who to relate to, and the heads of service and above not having the professional understanding of issues to take them forward. For instance, we have never had any contact with the head of service for social work since the person was appointed two years ago.

Voluntary sector organisations have expressed the view that they did not want to complain too much or too publicly as they felt that they would be dealt with more harshly if they took such a stance. The Council are viewed as bullies and I have complained formally about bullying. The Council also do not like people protesting. We see no signs that their communication with other agencies has improved or will improve.

We recognised that the Council was going through a process of change and we

were proactive in engaging with the new senior staff from 2005 onwards. The Council expressed a desire that both parties would engage in more collaborative ways of working, putting in place robust mechanisms to ensure the development of our partnership in relation to operational and strategic matters and setting up a key contacts scheme. This has not happened.

Not surprisingly, we are very concerned about the huge cut of £880,000 in the funding to the Cyrenians, and that came out of the blue. We have concerns about how the Council has made the decision on this matter, particularly as they state in a freedom of information response that there is no information recorded anywhere on how they came to the figure of £880,000, despite the involvement of nine senior officials in drawing up the committee report.

The report to the Council proposed a cut in social work funding and indicated that resources would be required from Supporting People and/or Housing. The only impact assessment, dated December, repeats that there would be no impact from this social work cut if the funding was got through housing. Through our intervention the recommended action was changed but Council officials appear to have still just worked on their interpretation of the original recommendation. They then included the cut in the base budget despite the agreed recommendation being that the Cyrenians services would be reviewed, and no review had been carried out in the subsequent 18 months. The whole process causes me grave concerns about public accountability. Is the Council clear about the decisions it makes? Do officials act on actual decisions and do they report accurately to elected members?

I have heard elected members make statements about the Cyrenians which are not based on facts and I wonder to what extent this comes from inaccurate reporting from officials or officials not correcting factual inaccuracies. Even yesterday in Councillor Dean's opening remarks about the Fonthill project she seemed to give the impression that the problem for them was that it added to their budget. The issue was not about the budgets in any way; this service was commissioned by them from the Cyrenians and the argument was about where the project was to be located, nothing to do with money whatsoever.

Talking about voids yesterday another issue that was not added in to the equation which has made the situation a lot better for the Council is the huge number of allocations that have been given to Eastern European people and people from the Baltic States. The Council want to connect issues where things are meant to have

4 5 6

7 8 9

10 11

12

13 14 15

16 17

18 19 20

21 22

23 24 25

26 27

29 30

28

31

32 33

34

improved but they do not connect the issue in relation to homelessness assessments where the situation has deteriorated considerably, where people now have to wait four to six weeks for an appointment from the Council.

All of what I have submitted and said so far demonstrates inefficiency and ineffectiveness through not carrying through decisions and wasting resources in the process. Where is the continuous improvement? Things are getting worse, not better with this Council. The lack of review and the lack of knowing what is required means that the Council cannot possibly improve what they are doing. This coupled with their lack of responsiveness to others, their unwillingness to engage in meaningful consultation and poor joint working means that it is highly unlikely that they can achieve best value.

The Cyrenians have had a range of services commissioned by Aberdeen City Council over many years. Each year we have submitted annual accounts, an annual review, and latterly more specific monitoring information. The Council has rarely if ever asked to meet with us to consider the operation of specific areas of work. Each year we have just been asked to submit budgets. Any requests to meet to discuss the operation of services has come from the Cyrenians.

Statement after statement has been made about reviewing the services provided by the Cyrenians and even when changes in funding were dependent on such a review these have never happened. In the absence of a review we put forward a range of proposals that would assist the Council to transform current services and we await further meetings on this.

The Council appears to operate double standards when it comes to Best Value, or is that value for money? I think they seem to confuse the two. It does not appear to apply the same standards to its own services as to services commissioned externally. One example was where they would not increase the hourly rate of a service provided by a charity and they took the service in house, paying themselves more than they paid the charity. Another was in relation to a service handed back by a housing association where we understand they are now paying more to the private sector provider. It also appears very arbitrary which services are commissioned externally and they do not appear to have formal procedures in place for commissioned services. (I know I am going over my 10 minutes.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you perhaps just take another two minutes, Mr Hannan? MR HANNAN: OK.

The Council makes comment on and queries management costs within the voluntary sector, yet appears unable to quantify their own management costs in relation to the delivery of service. The Council has received ring fenced funding from the Scottish Executive over the past five years and this funding has consistently been underspent and we do not know where the balance of that money has gone to.

Yesterday we were talking about implementing the cuts and we were told that it is vital this is done. If this is so, how come that we have had to draw up the agenda for the meetings that we have had with the Council. We have had to prepare the proposals about what the cuts should be; we have had to chase up the dates for further meetings; and when we asked them to provide information at a meeting we have not had it. We do not know when the cuts will happen from, so how are they going to implement it?

THE CHAIRMAN: One more minute, Mr Hannan.

MR HANNAN: It is clear to me that the Council officials do not appear to be able to construct realistic action plans. For instance, they want everybody who comes to the Cyrenians, 2,000 people, to be assessed by the Council prior to them coming to the Cyrenians. They do not have the resources to do that. We need to look at what the money is actually spent on.

The Council talked yesterday about having robust procedures in place in relation to the sale of property but what about properties that they lease out? We have not been invoiced for the last six months for one of these properties and I assume that is because the lease was terminated. On Monday we received a cheque for £7,000 from them in relation to the drugs, alcohol and HIV forum and we have not dealt with their accounts for two years. The Council are really in control of their procedures, are they not?

The Council does not consult, it does not manage effectively, it wastes resources, it overspends, but reduces funding to commissioned services who stick within their budgets. Aberdeen City Council does not appear to have taken forward the action plans from external reports and if they cannot act responsibly in relation to external regulators who might have more detailed knowledge how can the general public trust them? The senior officials and councillors have been given every opportunity over the last few years to address important issues. They have not done so and there is no evidence that they can or will do so in the future. They have failed the people of Aberdeen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Can I just reassure you that to the extent that I have cut you short and it is not covered in questions you will have another opportunity at the end to say anything else you might wish to say. It is important to hear everything you have to say but I was keen to pursue the questioning which might take care of some of the points you were making.

Let me therefore start by asking the same question that I asked the last witness as a starting question. You have a lot of criticisms there, clearly, of the Council. How far back do these criticisms go? Is this a long extended period or is it a very short period since transformation strategy, or where is it?

- MR HANNAN: It is certainly over the last three or four years that we would have our main criticisms of the Council.
- THE CHAIRMAN: And what changed, say, in that last three or four year period to cause these criticisms to arise?
 - MR HANNAN: I think one was the taking away of specialist or professional people, say in social work, that I think is an issue; knowing exactly who to go to now in relation to different issues is certainly part of that; and I think there are certainly aspects of the neighbourhood structure which do cause us difficulty.
 - THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. No doubt I think my colleagues will be keen to pursue some of that with you in a moment or two. You mentioned at the beginning of your presentation one or two issues poor financial controls, money wasted (I am quoting you), the Council should be asking staff to whistle blow etc and you mentioned that you had anecdotal evidence of this. I suppose I am bound to ask you this: do you have any more substantive evidence than mere anecdotal because it is difficult to take into account anecdotal evidence.
 - MR HANNAN: I am well aware of that, just in the same way as the anonymous information you got, but I think there are hints there that need to be explored and there needs to be a method of exploring those.
 - THE CHAIRMAN: I understand; thank you. You mentioned at paragraph 3.10 of your submission, for which I should have said many thanks earlier, and I just want to quote it to you to then follow it with a question. I will not quote it, I will summarise it. You say that on 5th July 2006 one of the Council officials wrote to you and said, "I want to assure you that we all recognise the importance of the relationship between the Cyrenians and ACC. We are setting about putting in place measures to try to ensure we build a relationship that adds value to our organisations. We have

been busy with all the internal issues related to the structural but the next step is that
we intend to notify key organisations in the city very soon of our intention to set up a
'key contact' scheme". And then you go on to say no key contact was ever set up.
This is an example of the lack of follow-through I think you are giving us there.
MR HANNAN: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: You also mention that meetings have been cancelled as another

- THE CHAIRMAN: You also mention that meetings have been cancelled as another example. Has any reason been given to you why meetings are cancelled or why in your words there has been no follow-through?
- 9 MR HANNAN: No.

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

- 10 THE CHAIRMAN: No explanation whatsoever?
- 11 MR HANNAN: No explanation at all.
- THE CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. You mentioned again, and I am pursuing substantive evidence if I can, you mentioned or hinted at bullying.
- 14 MR HANNAN: Yes.
- 15 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any substantive evidence?
- MR HANNAN: There is substantive evidence. I have put in a formal complaint to the Council in relation to that.
- 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.
 - MR HANNAN: I have heard a councillor say things like "not biting the hand that feeds you". Some people got hold of some particular information and they were then coming back saying, "Paul Hannan gets sixty thousand a year and he's only in it for the money". There were attempts to discredit people. We were accused of taking down one of the fences around Marischal College when we had a protest when the Council took the fence down themselves.

There is a range of these minor things which I think are all about attempts to discredit and certainly I organised a meeting of quite a number of voluntary sector organisations a year or so ago in terms of looking at cuts and things like that and most of them said they were not prepared to stick their head above the parapet because they felt that they would be adversely affected by doing that, so they fear bullying.

- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for that. I will pass on now to Douglas Sinclair.
- MR SINCLAIR: Good morning. There are a couple of points I would like to pick up.
 What is your understanding of what is meant by the transformation strategy?

1 MR HANNAN: I have read all the documentation. Essentially I think there are two 2 major aspects. One is related obviously to finance and the Council cannot afford the 3 range of services that they currently provide. Within the strategies they want to change the way services are delivered, so they are looking to reduce the level of 4 5 residential care, for instance, and concentrate more on home care, changing the kind of overall practices, but normally with the notion that one thing is cheaper than the 6 7 other, which is not actually the case; I do not think it has been looked at overall. 8 But generally it is about doing things differently. 9 MR SINCLAIR: So it is both looking at policy and looking at the scope for efficiency? 10 MR HANNAN: Yes. 11 MR SINCLAIR: And do you think that is well understood by the voluntary sector? 12 MR HANNAN: I do not think it is well understood by everybody in the voluntary sector. 13 I have taken time to look at those types of issues and I have the capacity to do that 14 that not every voluntary organisation will have. Maybe some of the larger ones will 15 all understand that but certainly a lot of the smaller ones would not. MR SINCLAIR: And in looking at the transformation strategy do you think from what 16 17 you have said that you are not of the view that the Council is open in terms of Best 18 Value, which is option appraisal, in terms of its view as to whether something should 19 be in house as opposed to maybe delivered by the voluntary sector? 20 MR HANNAN: I have never seen any consideration as to how they will determine whether something goes in house or ---21 22 MR SINCLAIR: So there is no objective framework? 23 MR HANNAN: I do not think so, no. 24 MR SINCLAIR: I was also interested in the comment you made about the difficulties, 25 and the previous speaker alluded to this, the difficulties for the voluntary sector in 26 terms of capacity to cope with the new neighbourhood structure and the fact that 27 many voluntary organisations are organised on a city-wide basis. Would you like to 28 say a little bit more about that? 29 MR HANNAN: Obviously it does depend very much on the nature of the services and 30 the service delivery as to how people can be involved in the neighbourhood 31 structures but the neighbourhoods also do not have a focus maybe on, say, things like 32 homelessness, it is a central thing, so how do you give your time to the 33 neighbourhoods when it should be dealt with in the neighbourhoods as well because

there are issues. It is about trying to be able to spend time with a variety of different

34

areas.

The meetings I tried to set up with the Council in 2005/2006 were trying to look at how we were involved in that structure and we never really got anywhere in relation to that. And even where we are involved in those strategy bits they are not getting anywhere, so trying to commit to doing things in three neighbourhoods when you are not getting anywhere city-wide is difficult as well. You need an incentive that your involvement will actually be worthwhile as well.

- MR SINCLAIR: What is your general view of the new structure?
- 9 MR HANNAN: I am not really sure that it is working at all.
- 10 MR SINCLAIR: Is that because you think it is too early to come to a view on it?
 - MR HANNAN: No. I think some of the issues that were raised yesterday about the lack of certain professionals in this sphere, I think quite a number of the heads of service do not have enough professional knowledge of some of the issues and therefore do not have an understanding of the day to day stuff to be able to take forward these matters.
- 16 MR SINCLAIR: Thank you.
- 17 THE CHAIRMAN: Iain.
 - MR ROBERTSON: Mr Hannan, you mentioned ring fenced funding there and you have also mentioned it in paragraph 4.16 of your submission where you say: "Aberdeen Council has received ring fenced funding from the Scottish Executive/government over the past five years and this funding has been consistently underspent. We do not know where the balance of these funds are held which would amount to at least £100,000 per annum or whether they being utilised for other purposes". Can you be more specific about which ring fenced funding you are referring to so that this matter can be looked into?
- 26 MR HANNAN: Homelessness ring fenced funding.
- 27 MR ROBERTSON: Thank you.
- 28 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iain. Keith.
- MR GEDDES: I am struck by the fact that the majority of the 37 appendices that you have given us -- thank you very much for the 37 appendices, by the way I am struck that the majority of them are communications between yourself and senior officials.

 The real decision makers are not the senior officials, the real decision makers are the politicians. What sort of communications have you had between yourselves and
- 34 appropriate leadership politicians?

MR HANNAN: Quite a lot of these communications were also to the councillors as well and at times, I think prior to 2003/04 generally our communication with elected members was very good. As was said yesterday the issue over Fonthill was quite divisive and caused a lot of issues, and since then the relationship that we have had with some officials has not been very good. That is also then dependent on, we may have had good relationships with people while they were in opposition but when they go into power they are then having to implement policies and the relationship is not quite so good. But we have tried regularly, we provide regular information to elected members, providing them with reports; we have offered them opportunities to come around to our projects to get more information and any time we have sent a report to councillors we have had little response from that, when we send an email to councillors very few ever respond.

MR GEDDES: In paragraph 4.3 of your submission you say here that in November 2006 you actually found out from the local press that the Council was considering a recommendation by the then temporary chief social work officer to cut your budget by 50 per cent. Was that literally the first time you were aware of that?

17 MR HANNAN: Yes.

MR GEDDES: The final question I have in relation to your submission is, in paragraph 2.7, going back to communications with elected members, you say that you sought the opportunity to speak directly with elected members on 9th April to raise concerns but you were not permitted to do so. Why was that?

MR HANNAN: That was, we asked for a deputation at the Council meeting and the Lord Provost rules that we were not able to do it. We did subsequently have a deputation to, I think it was, the Resources Management Committee.

25 MR GEDDES: Thank you very much.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Ann.

MS FAULDS: Mr Hannan, can you tell me about the frequency of contact between you and the Council? There are quite a lot of letters, emails, lots of meetings. How often are you in contact with the Council?

MR HANNAN: It depends, at different times it varies, but not myself personally all the time but we were involved in a whole range of strategies and meetings with the Council and I would imagine at least once a week that either myself or one of my senior staff are involved in some kind of meeting with the Council.

MS FAULDS: How many requests have you submitted to the Council under the freedom

1	of information legislation?	
2	MR HANNAN: Recently, quite a few.	
3	MS FAULDS: Thank you very much.	
4	THE CHAIRMAN: I have just one further point and it pursues something that I was	
5	looking at a moment or two ago with you. Paragraph 4.2 of your submission talks	
6	about the City Council having commissioned consultants but the consultant work	
7	was abandoned, I think you say it was not finalised and this is the second time this	
8	has happened. Was any reason given to you for that position?	
9	MR HANNAN: No.	
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Hannan, I earlier on said to you that you would have a proper	
11	opportunity to do any summing-up you wished to make. Do you want to take just a	
12	few seconds to gather your thoughts and then give us any other points you wish to	
13	make to us?	
14	MR HANNAN: There are no other major points. I have presented obviously	
15	considerable information in writing to you. I suppose finally I would like to take	
16	issue with the comments that Councillor Neil Fletcher gave that were supported in	
17	the press where he said that the people protesting were taking succour from holding	
18	back change. We have consistently put forward proposals for change. We want	
19	change, but we want change away from the many bad practices that blight Aberdeen	
20	City Council.	
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much again, Mr Hannan, both for	
22	coming here today and also for your very full submission to us.	
23	Ladies and gentlemen, we now move to our last witness, Mr Sultan Feroz of	
24	Aberdeen Trades Union Council, if I could ask Mr Feroz to come forward. Good	
25	morning to you; welcome. Could I ask you please to state your name and position	
26	for the record.	
27	MR FEROZ: My name is Sultan Feroz; I am the Secretary	
28	of Aberdeen Trades Union Council.	
29	THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have an opening statement?	
30	MR FEROZ: Yes.	
31		
32	Opening statement by Sultan Feroz, Secretary, Aberdeen TUC	
33		
34	MR FEROZ: Mr Chairman, members of the panel, good morning.	

Aberdeen Trades Union Council is a non political organisation and I myself do not belong to any political parties, so whatever I say in my statement is not biased towards anybody or any particular parties. But on the other hand Aberdeen Trades Union Council always promotes and supports people who are exercising democracy and we always support and defend the human rights, the worker rights and also civil rights for any individuals or organisations who have been deprived either from the present administration or previous administrations or from anything in our society, locally, nationally and internationally. We always support democracy.

Since we have been engaged I as a main organiser of Aberdeen Trades Union Council have arranged three public meetings bringing everybody round the table, including all the organisations which have been affected by the budget cuts and all the political parties, MPs, MSPs, all the councillors from the present administration and previous administrations.

Also I arranged two public marches. The first one was all...most... on the CCTV police record, over eight and a half thousand people participating including all the organisations that have been affected from the budget cuts, the councillors, the MPs and MSPs from all the political parties. The other not political but public march was under the banner of Mayday and also under saving our services where almost two and a half thousand people participates and the speakers consisted of all the organisations that have been affected and also the councillors, MPs and MSPs from all the different political parties.

In conclusion from what we gathered, the information and what we gathered from all the facts and figures from the present and previous administration, also from MPs and MSPs and from employees of city councils and from the organisations being affected by the budget cuts, we established that there was a total lack of communication, lack of information, lack of supervision and lack of consultations.

Due to information we received it was clear that the consultation was consulting with the wrong people. They said they were employing consultants. They were spending fortunes on the wrong consultants but did not consult with the right organisations such as us. We can consult, we can offer our consultations on a free basis, without money. We have got consultants from MPs, MSPs, councillors, excouncillors, accountants, legal figures, so we can advise free the City Council which we have done before and we do it to anybody for the benefit of our society and the benefit of our city for progress of democracy, but we never received any

communication from the present administration.

Also the lack of communication of information given to their own employees and given to their own councillors I think brought our city to crisis. I know fully that what information I am giving you, that is completely neutral based on the facts, but the previous administration stated that they left a balance of £11 million in the pocket which on accounting basis or on a (*inaudible word*) basis open balance or flow, as you call it, or budget that you can work on as a starting point.

So that £11 million has to be established and it is not my job obviously, you have got the best capacity and ability to establish whether that was £11 million, and some figures say between £11 million and £17 million was left on the balance. So that one has to be in the public domain and I hope you draw your conclusion from my information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I will ask the same question I have asked the last two witnesses in terms of some of your complaints, lack of communication, lack of information, lack of consultation, lack of supervision, and you indicated this had come from a number of sources which you explained earlier.

MR FEROZ: Yes.

 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have hard evidence we could use, either now or later?

MR FEROZ: We have had public meetings in both the present and previous administrations and also the organisations being affected from the budget cuts, and the previous and the present councillors actually say that they do not receive enough information regarding the budget cuts. Information is received at the last minute, has never been debated properly, has never been discussed and never been negotiated with the organisations. Everybody is for change. Aberdeen Trades Union Council always moves with the times and I believe everybody should move with the times, but providing that you consult with the people you are surrounding.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. That is a question I wanted to put to you. To the extent that you have other evidence that you might want to submit could I ask you to do so, if you have it, off line, not necessarily right now.

MR FEROZ: I can easily submit by writing to you but the figures we received from the councillors from previous administration was that they left in a very healthy situation. They have been blamed, at every public meeting we have had the present administration was blaming the previous one, so the previous one said, "You can't live in the past, you are in charge at the moment and you have to make decisions for

the good of the people and for the good of our society, you cannot live in the past.

Whoever made a mistake made a mistake; you must move on"; but due to all that

Whoever made a mistake made a mistake; you must move on"; but due to all that mistake, they never admitted it but they said, "We left you a good balance to work on".

- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Douglas.
- MR SINCLAIR: Good morning. It is clear from what you have said that you believe the level of confidence, the level of trust that the public has in the Council has been seriously eroded and the lower, I suppose, at the end of the day is the city of Aberdeen. What kind of steps do you think should be taken to recover the city's reputation? What would you suggest?
 - MR FEROZ: I would consult with more professionals and with organisations like us that can provide on a free basis any consultation which is good for our society and will affect all the organisations, and if any change has to be done it has to be done collectively.
- 15 MR SINCLAIR: Thank you.

3

4

5

11

12

13

14

22

23

24

25

26

2728

- THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions from my colleagues? No. Mr Feroz, thank you very much. Is there anything else you might want to leave us with as a closing statement?
- 19 MR FEROZ: No, that is OK. I can leave my statement with you.
- THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. Thank you very much indeed for coming along.
 - At this stage, ladies and gentlemen, having heard all the witnesses, we did agree yesterday that the Council should have the right of reply to any points that have arisen during the giving of evidence. So can I invite the representatives of the Council now, please, to come forward and to make their closing statements. I should also say that we may have one or two questions but only one or two as a consequence of the closing statements. Again for reasons of record, Councillor Dean, could I ask you to introduce yourself and your colleagues.
- MS DEAN: Thank you. I am Kate Dean, Leader of Aberdeen City Council. On my right is Douglas Paterson, Chief Executive; Kevin Stewart, Depute Leader of the Council; and John Tomlinson, Corporate Director for Neighbourhood Services North.
- 33 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You have a statement, I gather.
- 34 MS DEAN: Can I further introduce Dr Abigail Tierney,

Corporate Director for Strategic Leadership. I think Douglas will start us.

 MR PATERSON: In terms of taking up your offer to make a closing statement and to respond to some of what we have heard, what we would propose to do, with your approval, and we will attempt to keep it time limited, is to have John Tomlinson, who has been introduced to you, deal with some of the factual inaccuracies that have arisen. Abigail Tierney will deal with some of the issues that have arisen around the question of the interface between the strategic and the operational side of the Council. With your indulgence I would also like Ewan Sutherland, who is our Head of Service for HR, to talk about what we are doing in relation to the staffing issues. We are trying to address the key things that you have raised quite rightly over the last 36 hours or so, and then Councillors Stewart and Dean would conclude for the Council. Is that acceptable?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is fine. It is important that everyone feels they have had a fair hearing.

MR PATERSON: OK. Before we move to John in terms of factual inaccuracies, just one or two things that have arisen this morning, and I have a sense that there may be critical misunderstandings about dates and events which we need to keep putting right.

In relation to what is becoming known as the new structure and timing that around the last few years, what is known as the new structure in its key elements came in in 2001/02 with the total support of the Council then, it went through unanimously, and that was when the major shift from a traditional professional structure to the new one came. What happened in 2005/06 was a second phase of that which was actually set out and agreed unanimously by the Council in 2001. These time periods are actually quite critical to the history of events and how they have rolled out.

A second factor that has arisen this morning in specific terms and it has arisen in a more general way is about the nature of the professional qualification of our heads of service. The point was raised by Mr Hannan that as he saw it part of the problem was that we did not have or we did not have as many heads of service qualified in social work. That is not the case. The number of qualified social work heads of service now is the same as it was before 2005/06 and if I remember rightly it is the same as it was before 2001/02.

We have been very careful to make sure that professional advice was available

within the Council and again if you read back through the papers it is quite clear that the councillors were aware of the risks around that. As I attempted to argue yesterday it may actually be that some of the confusion that staff are alleging has been caused by the fact that we were over-cautious in those.

The final point, and it is one of detail but it is a matter of ethics for me, was that Mr Hannan raised the issue of bullying. He raised the issue of bullying with me, not by me but with me in terms of Chief Executive. There were no specifics in his letter. I wrote back to him immediately making it clear that bullying was not something that I would tolerate and if he could give me evidence I would see that it was dealt with. I have had no such evidence. I think you need to know that latter part of the story as well as the fact that the issue was raised.

Can I pass, then, to John Tomlinson to deal with some of the factual stuff because there are some fairly major issues that need to be clarified for yourselves and for the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR TOMLINSON: Thank you very much. I will not take too long in this. What we would want to do is provide points of factual accuracy in relation to the submissions that you have received yesterday and subsequently today. All I want to do is, there are a number of those where because this is in public we feel we should just comment on today, and I will do those quite quickly.

First of all there was a suggestion that the area committees are not considering significant items in relation to their areas. Northfield Academy was suggested. In actual fact the North area committee considered that issue at its last two committee meetings on 19th February and on 15th April.

In terms of capital projects and the revenue implications then I can say that the revenue implications of the Marischal College project have been fully costed and budgeted and budgets forecast and that is the standard that applies.

In relation to comments around the added bureaucracy and costs, just factually, the move from 10 to six directors saved the Council some £515,000 annually. The move from 28 heads of service to 25 is costed at some £250,000 annually.

The other item I want to mention is, there was a suggestion that trade unions were not provided with information on market testing details. That information was provided both in relation to committee report and in relation to discussion with the trade unions at a management/union/agency meeting and the offer is there to follow

that up, and indeed I will be doing that.

The final point from yesterday is the use of reserves; it is an important point. £12 million has been used from reserves over three years, not £70 million, which was being used as a figure yesterday. The 70 million figure was not put into its context. For example, it includes significant transfers from the capital fund to meet one-off compensatory payments relating to single status.

Not scripted for me to come up with but there were obviously some significant issues that have been raised today, again in public, and I think we are conscious that we will need to go back robustly on those to give to yourselves but also in the two-way street that our relationship needs to be with the organisations that have presented those. I am aware of a number of significant factual inaccuracies in what has been presented.

- THE CHAIRMAN: Of what has been presented this morning?
- 14 MR TOMLINSON: Yes.

- THE CHAIRMAN: Is it possible for you while we go on with the other discussion to give us a summary of those?
- MR TOMLINSON: Just a flavour, on the ones which you yourselves picked up on --MR STEWART: Sir, I will be dealing with some of those in mine because there was a
- very serious allegation about £100,000 worth of funding on two financial years, which I will cover later, if you do not mind.
 - THE CHAIRMAN: That is perfectly fine by me. Is there anything else you want to say?
- MR TOMLINSON: I should probably mention that in terms of offers to be involved in consultations, those are there and evidenced, and offers to be part of the key account management scheme, those are documented as well, but we do not really want to get
- into tit for tat. This is about relationship building after this event.
- 26 THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed.
 - MR TOMLINSON: If I can hand over to Abi just to mention, she did talk about the strategic and operational interface yesterday and that is obviously a key issue, as you were teasing out. I would just like to emphasise that as one of the area directors we are currently using the transformation strategies into the team plans, the team plans being at the level of housing, social work, environmental teams etc, and taking that into the performance measures, into the key projects and into the cash limited budgets. I just think I should put that on record in terms of the joint work that is creating that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1 2

 DR TIERNEY: Thank you. It is really just to take the opportunity to summarise what I said yesterday and what John has just picked up on. The work that we have been doing in strategic leadership to develop strategies and policies, we absolutely realise that the people who really know how to improve the Council and how to improve the services of the Council are front line staff, and we are working hard and have been working hard to involve front line staff in policy and strategic development.

As the transformation programme has evolved that has become stronger and, as I said yesterday, we have written evidence from front line staff about how much they have valued that involvement and how that is enabling the continuous improvement to really start to gain traction at the front line.

We are now at the stage, having developed strategies with the front line staff, of embedding these policies and strategies in their everyday work and to actually drive the improvement through that. As John said, we have provided all the operational teams with what we are calling strategic context folders. These include all the key legislation and all the key local and national policies that they need to be aware of and working to as a team, so they have that available and they are also all available on the zone.

We have also set for all our KPIs city-wide targets over the next three years that will take us through to 2010 and when achieved will ensure that we would be a leading council in Northern Europe. So the next step is that the teams will be saying in terms of that performance, "Where do we need to be as a team in 2010 to have contributed to that performance and that level of improvement?" That is the work that is taking place right now as well as looking at the policies and the strategies and the legislation that they need to be working to and what that will mean for them in terms of improvement every day.

So, to conclude, it is really important to us that we have a really strong link between strategic and operational. We have a front line back or a bottom up process that influences strategy, influences policy and influences transformation in the Council and, most importantly, influences strategic planning. We know where we are now, we know there is a gap between aspiration and reality, but we also have a road map that will take us where we need to be in three years' time and we are working hard to communicate that to the staff and to help them in their hearts and minds.

The key to that is actually they have helped create that, so they own it and they understand it, and we realise we are not there yet but we are working and will continue to work to ensure that that is there. So we have now a 30 month plan that takes us through month by month where we need to be. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR SUTHERLAND: For the record, I am Ewan Sutherland, Head of Human Resources.

Chairman, I will talk you through very quickly what we are doing in terms of raising morale and motivation of the work force with particular reference to the transformation programme. This will be a brief run-through, there are quite a number of actions ongoing, so this will be a flavour of what we are doing.

What we are doing probably comes down to four major headings: management skills and competency; communication; recognition of achievement; and employee support both for equal pay and modernisation for single status and the transformation programme.

For management skills and competency we are training our managers to better understand their role in terms of motivation, inspiration and leadership. We are encouraging managers to better contextualise the messages that come out of the corporate centre, to add a local dimension so the change is real to our employees, not something that is just done to them. We are operating a system of 360 degree appraisals for senior staff to raise their self awareness in terms of their own personal effectiveness.

We have devised a competency framework with four specific management competences and we are testing those of recruitment in terms of job descriptions, personal specifications. We have brought assessments centres for senior management posts and tested those competences also. We really want to bring into the organisation people willing to motivate and inspire staff.

We are spending a lot of time in communication. We are looking at the way we communicate with our employees. We are looking at, for example, making some of the communication more light-hearted. In the past there was a lot of good feedback about some of the personal interest stories we run in the staff newsletters; we are looking to reintroduce that.

In terms of recognising achievements we continue to run two corporate recognition of achievement ceremonies a year. These ceremonies recognise achievement from large number of employees in a range of different factors,

including external qualifications, contribution to significant corporate achievements and, importantly, contribution to customer services. Linked to that we are encouraging a management style which actually recognises good work and performance as it happens.

In terms of support we are offering employees in terms of equal pay and modernisation we are specifically targeting individuals who suffer pay reduction. We are looking to re-engineer their posts during the course of a three year protective period, to add value into their posts to ensure they come out of protection as quickly as possible.

Specifically on the transformation programme I believe we are taking a holistic approach to staff support, ranging from re-drawing the Council's culture statement to ensure that it describes the organisation that we want to be in terms of attitudes, behaviours, relationships. In terms of employee development we are going to continue to offer a whole range of development opportunities for employees at all levels in the organisation. We are looking to further develop team and individual plans to ensure that the key link between individual, team, service and corporate plans is absolutely robust.

In terms of service improvement groups we are looking to involve employees at all levels in the transformation teams and for services not directly involved we are encouraging them to set up their own improvement groups to look at improvement of service delivery and addressing any remaining inefficiencies.

In terms of workload you heard yesterday from the trade unions that they believe this to be a major impediment to improved motivation and morale. We are working very closely with them firstly on a weekly basis, and the early action we have agreed is that workload is going to be a core item on service/union/management committee agendas and also specific items for discussion between managers and employees during one to one meetings.

That is just a flavour, Chairman, of what we are doing.

- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and the document from which you are reading, is that available to us?
- MR SUTHERLAND: I believe you may have it but if you do not I can certainly provide it.
- THE CHAIRMAN: If it is what we already have, that is fine. Thank you. Councillor Dean.

MS DEAN: If you do not mind, Councillor Stewart had a few points.

MR STEWART: Thank you, Chairman. It is just that there were some serious allegations this morning regarding money, £100,000 in two financial years, in each of those. (Inaudible comment) Well, I picked it up as two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we just go to the appropriate reference point for that? Was it during the Cyrenians' submission?

MR STEWART: Yes, indeed. I have in front of me a note:

1 2

"The underspend in the last two years, 2006/07 and 2007/08 has been used to offset the £880,000 approved saving that was not realised. This amounted to £100,000 in 2006/07 and £100,000 in 2007/08. This was reported to the Homelessness Strategy Advisory Group so that should have been made aware of.

I would also like to pick up some other things in the financial aspects round about the Cyrenians' presentation. In terms of the social work budget cut which was said to be 50 per cent, it is actually 47 per cent, but it is a 27 per cent reduction overall in the monies that the Council gives to the Cyrenians. That 27 per cent reduction is in line with the overall reduction in adult services, and I will provide you with these and any other information you require you can get from either myself or Craig Stillett, who is the Head of Adult Services.

I just want to pick up one other point in terms of meetings. My door is always open. I actually met with Mr Hannan after the budget. He was unhappy with what I had to say, I think, sir, but I did speak to him. He knew that my door was always open; he came in a lot when I was in opposition which he hinted at. I do not know what has changed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Councillor Dean.

MS DEAN: Thank you very much. I would just first say how much we appreciate the opportunity to give a response to what has been said. There are many statements beyond the ones which have been mentioned which require rebuttal and we will submit in writing our views on that given the time constraints.

I will continue to avoid falling into party political traps as befits someone that holds the position that I was elected to. What I would like to do is just in conclusion here to agree with the assertion that was made earlier on that the Council needs to come together to work through these difficulties. I hope that this can be done but I would say that it will require a change of heart and a change of attitude from some members of the Council.

I believe that our budget, while it has not been an easy one by any manner of means, is part of the solution rather than part of the problem in this case. We as an administration have the will and the majority to see this through. You have heard Dr Tierney talk about the road map for the future which will help us to reach our aspirations. In addition to that road map I will look forward to your recommendations and to continuing to work with you and with others for the future good of the city of Aberdeen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I did say that there might be one or two supplementaries. I will just check where we are with that. Are there any supplementaries from anyone? Iain.

MR ROBERTSON: Could I just say, I am sorry but I have heard and awful lot of management buzz words this morning and I just feel that if you could try to simplify your language it would make it a lot easier for everyone to understand. We have heard everything from transformations to embeddings, and "contextualised" occurred in so many places in the Chief Executive's submission; I am not surprised that people cannot understand what you are talking about. Have you done all this management consultancy stuff in house or have you had any professionals advise you on this? There is an old saying, "Keep it simple," and there is another word added to that usually which I will not say.

DR TIERNEY: When you say management consultancy, can you be specific about it in terms?

MR ROBERTSON: Advice on structuring from outside the organisation.

DR TIERNEY: I will need to refer to Douglas because I actually came in as part of the new structure so I was not involved in that restructuring; if I can refer to Douglas on whether any external advice was given on that.

MR PATERSON: No, we had no external advice. The work that was done over 2000 and 2001 was done by a team which consisted of our own HR people, some of the OD people, the organisation and development people, and the team was actually led by a very experienced secondary head teacher. That was the group which actually led the process of working through the kind of high level stuff about where do we need to be as a council, what kind of structure would deliver that, and then produced the detail to go with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Douglas.

34 MR SINCLAIR: Maybe two or three points. Could I just ask for the record whether the

1 Council has a whistle blowing policy. 2 MS DEAN: Yes. MR SINCLAIR: And has it been used? 3 4 MS DEAN: Yes. 5 MR SINCLAIR: It would be interesting to see a copy of that, please. Secondly, I was interested in the comments made about what you are doing in terms of engaging with 6 7 staff. You mentioned communication and trying to improve the quality of the 8 communication. What about the other side of communication, which is listening? 9 The last time you had a staff survey was 2005, I think. Have the Council got plans to 10 do another staff survey? 11 MR SUTHERLAND: Yes, Chairman, we do plan on doing another staff survey at the 12 top end of this year. It is fully appreciated that it is a two-way street and listening is 13 important, and that is obviously part of the message that is being imparted, that it is a 14 case that we must listen and staff have got a chance to deal with line managers in the 15 team briefing and the one to one meetings. So it is very much a two-way process. MR SINCLAIR: And my final question is this, and I am not clear as to who might 16 17 answer it. Mr Tomlinson corrected the factual inaccuracies as to what colleagues in 18 the voluntary sector said this morning but even if one accepted there were some 19 inaccuracies, and I am not in a position to say who is right or who is wrong, I wonder 20 if you would agree from what we have heard this morning that the relationship 21 between the Council and the voluntary sector does leave a great deal to be desired. 22 MR STEWART: I will pick up on that, if you do not mind. One of the things is that this 23 budget has been particularly tough for everyone and communication maybe has not 24 been at its best. What we have already said is in terms of the commissioning board 25 which we already have in place we will have voluntary sector input into that and that 26 will help in a lot of regards, I am quite sure. 27 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Keith. 28 MR GEDDES: Just a point of clarification again from what John Tomlinson said in 29 relation to the transfer of, I think, £70 million from capital to revenue, he mentioned 30 that part of that had been one-off compensation payments in relation to single status. 31 How much was that? Could we get a breakdown of that, either now or later on, just

MR EDWARDS: Yes, Chairman, we would be very happy to provide a breakdown of that later on. Essentially for the compensatory payments what actually has been paid

32

33

34

to see where the money went?

and what is in our provision totals £30 million. We do have some ongoing job evaluation outcomes payments going forward also which is accounted for. I would be happy to provide a more detailed breakdown of that in early course.

MR GEDDES: My final question, Chairman, just arose out of appendix 35 from the evidence submitted by the Cyrenians and it is not a question about the Cyrenians at all, it is a question about process. It is something I am struggling to understand. The question was from somebody called Councillor Kiddie who I have never met before, may never meet at all, but the question is put in relation to the serious charges presented by Homelessness in Aberdeen, will the Chief Executive explain. My previous experience of councils is decisions to cut budgets to the Cyrenians or to anybody else is a political decision. Why are these questions not addressed to the leadership and are addressed to the Chief Executive?

MS DEAN: It is a difficult one to answer. Obviously the way that our Council works then questions can be addressed either to the Chief Executive or to the convener of any of our committees, so it was obviously Councillor Kiddie's choice to address his questions to the Chief Executive.

MR GEDDES: Do you think that Council standing orders should be changed so that the people who take the decisions, the politicians, are the ones that should be questioned?

MR STEWART: We are questioned.

21 MS DEAN: Yes.

MR STEWART: The standing orders allow for questions to the Chief Executive or to the conveners of committees, and we on a regular basis, particularly over the past year where folk have used questions to Council rather than finding out facts from elsewhere, we are questioned on a regular basis and give public answers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Douglas.

MR SINCLAIR: Just to pursue that point, I really find that very strange. I have not come across in my local government experience when a question is asked which is based on a political decision, if it is the political decision of the council to make the cut then the responsibility for answering that question would lie with the political leadership of the council, not with the Chief Executive. I think it is a very odd set-up that you have an ambiguity in your standing orders. It seems to me that the questions can be asked either of the Chief Executive or the Leader when, clearly, when a decision is made by a council that responsibility does not lie with the Chief

Executive, that responsibility lies with the leadership of the council.

MS DEAN: I think what we have in the standing orders is a provision to ask questions on many other things than decisions of the Council because in many cases the Chief Executive is asked on the progress of various things which although they may result from decisions, I have not actually looked in detail in the last few days at that particular example but I think it is only right that it is open to councillors to question either the Chief Executive or the leadership or any of the committee conveners.

MR SINCLAIR: Would you not accept, Councillor Dean, that that depends on the nature of the question and if the question lies within the responsibility and lies within the ambit of the political leadership then it is right and proper and indeed to stop public confusion that the answer is given by the leadership of the council, not by the Chief Executive? That gives a false impression.

MR STEWART: But it is up to each individual councillor who they address their question to. Councillor Kiddie is now a convener in this Council and has to answer questions as a convener of this Council. He chose to address his questions to the Chief Executive.

17 MR SINCLAIR: I think there is a fault in your standing orders.

A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Councillor Kiddie is here. He can answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is up to Councillor Kiddie whether he

wants to speak or not, I will leave that to him. As ever, Councillor Kiddie, could you just state who you are.

MR KIDDIE: Councillor Jim Kiddie, SNP councillor for Torry and Ferryhill. Given my age my memory is failing me more and more these days but I seem to recall, Chairman, that this question that is being referred was one that I asked when we were part of the opposition. I cannot recall the detail of it. (Same handed) It is in front of me here. I will read it out: "In view of the serious challenges presented by Homelessness in Aberdeen will the Chief Executive explain how the £800,000 annual cut in the homelessness budget is to be achieved without seriously affecting this vulnerable section of society?"

I make no apology for asking that question; I think at that time being an opposition councillor it was important to tease out what was behind the cut, why it was being made, the reasons for it and the ramifications of it. I think that is quite within what I should be doing as a councillor in opposition.

MR SINCLAIR: Can I say I think that is absolutely the right and legitimate role for an

opposition councillor. My query is that if there is a degree of public confusion within the public of Aberdeen as to who is running this Council, and we have heard evidence of that, I think, and views expressed to that effect, I am simply making the point that in every other council that I know of where a decision is made by the council as to a budget cut the responsibility for that decision lies with the political leadership of the council, not with the Chief Executive, and it is proper for the political leadership to respond to a question like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Councillor Kiddie.

MR KIDDIE: Can I merely add that at that time my recollection is that a decision had been reached by the previous council, this relates to the previous council, and that what I was anxious to obtain was clarification about the implementation of that decision which is an officer responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Ann.

MS FAULDS: Councillor Dean, can I ask, are you confident and satisfied about the revenue implications of the Council's capital project and in particular the Marischal College project?

MS DEAN: Yes, I am. I have received assurances along with other councillors. I sit on the Project Development Board for Marischal College. I have seen the reports as they are ongoing. I actually believe that once this project is completed and we are talking about the ongoing running costs of this building it will be cheaper than the one that we presently occupy.

MS FAULDS: But you are satisfied and you are confident in the assurances that you have received?

MS DEAN: I am completely confident in those assurances.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Is there anything else before I finally wind up that anyone would like to say in front of us? No? You are content?

Let me then formally adjourn this hearing. In doing so the Commission will proceed to consider its findings in far less splendid surroundings than these and these findings will be made public in the usual way. Let me thank all the witnesses who have helped the Commission in giving their evidence. Let me add to that our thanks to Aberdeen City Council for their help in making the arrangements for this hearing, thank you very much indeed, and can I also thank the public for their interest which I and my fellow Commissioners greatly appreciate.

This hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.

Vibrant, Dynamic & Forward Looking



ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO THE ACCOUNTS COMMISSION

The following schedules are submitted to the Commission Secretary under the right of reply which has been sought by Aberdeen City Council and granted by the Commission Chair.

This evidence is based on our consideration of the verbal evidence given by non ACC witnesses during the 13th and 14th of May hearing.

We thank the Commission for the opportunity to submit this further evidence and are content that it is added as an addendum to the transcript for the public record.

Audit of Best Value & Community Planning – Public Hearing

Points of Factual Accuracy

	Issue	Comment
1.	Northfield Academy – Plans not considered at Area Committee (North)	The North Area Committee on 19th February 2008 received a verbal update on a meeting with staff held that day.
		The North Area Committee on 15th April 2008 received a report providing an update on the action plan.
2.	Tenancy Changes – Use of Private Sector	The figure for the number of empty properties was 1,597 in 2005 with the current figure of 179 void properties a reduction of 1,418 properties.
		To state that the success of voids was down to the private sector contractor being paid millions is incorrect. A private contractor was used for a short period for the following reasons:
		1) to benchmark against in house delivery 2) to supplement in house resources to ensure that targets were achievable 3) as a pilot to carry out upgrades to the Scottish Housing Quality Standard whilst the property was void (this is recognised as best practice).
		The contract was for a period of one year carrying out 139 properties in Jan 07 – Jan 08. The value of the contract was £975,000. It was paid primarily from the Housing Capital Budget. In context, there were 2,197 void properties in the year 07/08 i.e. only 6% were carried out by the private sector. In March 2008, 44% of properties were let within 4 weeks.
3.	Capital Projects – Revenue Implications	Major capital infrastructure projects have revenue implications fully costed. Comments were specifically made on Marischal College and the 50m Pool.

		Revenue implications of the Marischal College project have been fully costed and budgets forecast.
		A professional business planning consultancy is currently working on the detailed business planning for the 50m Pool which will include revenue implications.
4.	No Consideration of Impact of Budget Reductions	Risk assessments were completed on the proposed budget cuts. Copies of these risks assessments can be provided to the Accounts Commission.
5.	Access to Information for Elected Members is restricted to opposition groups	All elected members have absolutely equal access to the same information. Group Leaders have been twice, this year, offered briefings by the Chief Executive prior to Committee meetings. The Conservative group has taken up this offer, the Labour group has not.
6.	Late Circulation of Papers	The papers referred to on Equal Pay which were circulated prior to a Council meeting were held back at the request of the Trades Unions to ensure that the first people to learn of job evaluation outcomes were the staff themselves.
7.	The structure has caused increased bureaucracy and costs	The move from 10 to 6 Directors and the move from 28 Heads of Service to 25, plus support staff, has saved the Council approximately £1m p.a.
8.	Triplication as a result of Area Structures	Any redesign for Area delivery is predicated on reducing costs as demonstrated above.
9.	Rotating the Convenorship of the Continuous Improvement Committee weakens it	The Convenorship does not rotate.
10.	No account is taken of changes in population in allocating expenditure	The Transformation Strategies took account of the changes in population. The School's Estate Strategy and the reduction in the teaching staffing formula are in response to the falling school roles. Increased expenditure in areas of Health & Social Care is as a direct result of demographic change e.g. numbers in elderly population.
11.	Officers Negotiating the Craft Agreement returned as consultants to continue this	This is simply not true. The craft agreement negotiations were taken up by members of the new management team. The Craft Agreement was recently commended by the Municipal Journal.

12.	Stress is a cause of absence and has been worsened by the change process	The Council monitors the effects of stress on absence. The latest occupational health monitoring shows the percentage of occupational health referrals attributed to stress as 3%. There has been no growth in this over the change process.
13.	Home Care: Staff employed through the Private Sector not trained or SCRO checked; and	It is part of the Council's standard terms and conditions with external care providers that all employees involved in the care of ACC clients are subject to satisfactory and appropriate Disclosure Scotland checks. All 'care companies' must be registered by the Care Commission and are subject to the same standards and scrutiny as our in-house service.
	Numbers of clients	Client numbers have dropped across the sectors due to amended eligibility criteria for care. It is simply not true that we are stopping care with ACC and then commissioning from Private & Voluntary Sector.
14.	City Wardens Uniforms and Powers are questionable	This is not the case. There is a legal requirement for parking attendants to wear appropriate uniforms when issuing certain notices. They will. The Officers will be known as City Wardens (Parking Attendants).
15.	Director of Education Post	Aberdeen City Council has not had a Director of Education since 2001, not 2005 as stated.
16.	School Cleaning Market Testing Information Not Supplied	This is not the case. Information on contractor's costs and productivity was supplied to Trades Unions as part of Committee report circulated 20th July 2007 including shared confidential data on benchmarking costs/productivity rates. This was followed up on 24th August 2007 to members of the Management/Trades Union Agency meeting with an email providing detailed breakdown of costs and productivity comparing the in-house contractor against the private contractor. If further information is required and / or a meeting to discuss this data then there is an open offer to follow this up.

17.	Use of Reserves	£12m has been used from reserves over three years, not £70m as reported.
18.	Restructuring of School Structures Agreed at an Area Committee	The Policy has not been made at Area Committees. This referred to a retirement case at an Academy. The Head of Service referred in Committee to the faculty structure that was being put in place. A new Labour Member challenged this in saying that no decisions had been made yet on management structures in Schools. It was explained to the Member that the school had developed and had approved a faculty structure as a result of the policy agreed by Council in 2005.
19.	Budget Information Provided to the Trades Unions	High level budget information was provided prior to the budget together with substantial detailed information thereafter. Trade Unions were invited to workshops on Transformation Strategies which formed the basis of budget decisions.
20.	Additional Post Associated with City Warden Service	This is not true. There are 4 existing management posts and the new structure will have 4 management posts. Front line supervision will increase from the existing 4 supervisors to twelve supervisors. This is because there are an additional 32 staff who have transferred from Police management to ACC, plus the operating hours of the service have been substantially extended to provide a wider public safety and environmental enforcement service. The supervisor role has been re-designed to make it more field based than office based.
21.	a) No Key Account Manager was appointed for the Cyrenians.	a) A key Account Manager was appointed to the Cyrenians. The designated point of contact wrote to Paul Hannan requesting a meeting. He received no response. This was followed up with further requests to meet, which also received no response. Copies of this correspondence can be provided.
	b) The Cyrenians deal with 2,000 clients per annum – ACC want the Cyrenians to refer these clients to ACC for (statutory) assessment of need – ACC could not cope	b) ACC has a statutory duty to assess the needs of any citizen who declares themselves homeless – if there are wider support/care needs the citizen is assessed as to whether the Council's support officers can assist or whether a care needs assessment is required. This may result in care being provided by

with this	in-house services or through commissioned services. The Council dealt with 2,500 such homelessness presentations last year – to suggest it does not have the capacity to handle referrals from the Cyrenians is unfounded. To suggest that there is another 2,000 homeless persons who never come near the Council is also unfounded. ACC seriously doubts the Cyrenians claim that they assist 2,000 homeless persons per annum who have a connection with the City – it is considered that the Cyrenians are double/triple counting their clients.
c) Only Cyrenians can provide the flexibility of service required to meet the needs of homeless people in the City and ACC is not listening	c) ACC has consistently stated since the 1 October 2007 Council decision that it would commission more integrated Adult Services (as opposed to purely homelessness services, supporting people services, or care services) and this has been confirmed in writing. With the decommissioning of some Cyrenians services ACC aim to have the commissioning of new integrated "wrap around services" in place by March 2009. Mr Hannan is involved in discussions with ACC on this matter.
d) ACC has made no progress on its strategy and has ignored its "D" Grade - in particular stakeholder relationships and partnership working.	d) In March/April 2007 the Cyrenians wrote to the Scottish Executive and Communities Scotland to complain that ACC was not delivering on its Homelessness Strategy and its service improvement plan (for homelessness). ACC subsequently reported to the former Scottish Executive (letter submitted 22 May 2007) on achievements made on delivering on strategic outcomes and notified the former Communities Scotland (letter July 2007) of the improvements through the Service Improvement Plan. ACC is due to be re-inspected either at the end of 2008 or early 2009.
e) Mr Hannan made a statement to the effect that ACC had missed out on additional grant funding because of the poor quality and	e) This statement is non-specific and whilst there have been occasions where grant submissions have been unsuccessful – this failure is over shadowed by our success – for instance the former Community Services and now Strategic

	management of grant submissions	Leadership Adult Services HECA team has been successful in attracting over £15M in home energy grant which has ensured that the Council has met its CO2 reduction targets for domestic properties.
	f) Press release was issued prior to the Consultation event for the Transformation Strategies. This implied the event was not genuine consultation.	f) The workshop was part of the formal consultation on the Transformation Strategies, and was genuine consultation with the voluntary sector. The purpose of the workshop was to provide the voluntary sector with an opportunity to comment on the draft strategies which had been developed with front line staff. This was clearly stated in the invitation and in the introduction to the workshop. The press release was to inform the press and the public of the content of the draft strategies, and the potential proposals we were considering. The final reports that were agreed at Council on 4 th October were adjusted to take into account feedback received through the formal consultation.
22.	Cost of Marischal College	The reported cost in 2005 was in the order of £47 million noted as being caveated appropriately to allow for further work (on all options) to set a time and scope context. This further work was undertaken in 2007 and the results placed before full Council.
23.	Market testing of Grounds Services emerged through press reports with no Trade Union involvement	The Council approved the Transformation Strategy on Environmental Services in February 2008. This commits to market testing of grounds services. Trades Unions were consulted on the Strategy.
24.	Use of Management Speak	The Council chose the word "Transformation" for its change programme, firstly because this is an accurate description and secondly to retain consistency with the Scottish Government Transforming Public Services initiative to link work as opposed to being charged with yet more work.
25.	Assertion that the previous Labour Administration Budget Steering Group was all- party	This only happened after the Labour Group lost overall control of the Council in late 2002. Prior to that, it was Labour Members only.

26	6.	Assertion that "rescue packages" proposed by	The success story of Aye-Can, and the ongoing work with Ice Rink users,
		groups affected by the Budget have been	Friends of Doonies and Glencraft disprove this.
	i	ignored	