

TAYSIDE AND CENTRAL SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP**10 MARCH 2009****SINGLE OUTCOME AGREEMENTS**

This report updates the Partnership on developments in the preparation of Single Outcome Agreements covering the 4 partner Council areas, and seeks delegation of authority to the Chair and Director to formalise the Partnership's commitment to supporting Single Outcome Agreements.

1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That the Partnership :-
- (i) notes progress on the development of Single Outcome Agreements, as outlined in the report;
 - (ii) delegates authority to the Chair and the Director to formalise the Partnership's commitment to supporting delivery of National and Local Outcomes through evolving Single Outcome Agreements, as appropriate to each Agreement; and
 - (iii) receives a report on finalised 2009 Single Outcome Agreements to its next meeting on 23 June 2009.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting on 30 January 2008 the Partnership agreed to review the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and associated delivery arrangements within the context of the Government/Local Government Concordat and emerging Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs), as requested by the Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Sustainable Growth in his letter dated 7 January 2008 (Report RTP/08/02 refers). The finalised RTS, as approved by Ministers, aligns the RTS with Government's National Outcomes (Report RTP/08/27 refers). The Draft RTS Delivery Plan also seeks to align RTS delivery priorities with National and Local Outcomes identified in evolving SOAs.
- 2.2 At its meeting on 29 April 2008 the Partnership noted progress on the development of 2008 SOAs (Report RTP/08/12 refers). At the subsequent meeting on 24 June 2008 it was noted that officials had engaged with each partner Council in the development of their finalised SOAs (Report RTP/08/18 refers). The Partnership also authorised the Director to develop relationships with Councils and Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs), with a view to TACTRAN becoming formally engaged with each CPP within the region.
- 2.3 As previously reported, 2009 SOAs will be agreements between Scottish Ministers and CPPs. A Good Practice Advice Note was issued to Chief Executives of Councils and other public bodies in early February, setting out Scottish Government's expectations of public bodies with regard to Governance and Accountability for 2009 SOAs (Appendix A). Additional advice on SOA progress reporting was issued by Scottish Government and CoSLA on 3 March 2009 (Appendix B).

3 DISCUSSION

- 3.1 Draft 2009 SOAs were due to be submitted by CPPs to Scottish Government by the end of February 2009, with finalised SOAs to be signed by Ministers and CPPs by June 2009. These are intended to be “high level” strategic documents, which identify how each CPP will address local priorities within the context of the 15 National Outcomes identified in the Government/Local Government Concordat.
- 3.2 As noted in previous reporting on SOAs, there are few direct references to transport within Government’s 5 key Strategic Objectives and 15 National Outcomes. Ministers have acknowledged that effective transport infrastructure and services will be essential to ensuring successful delivery of outcomes at both national and local level. The majority of local outcomes within Draft 2009 SOAs will continue to relate primarily to the key economic, social and health & wellbeing outcomes, with similarly few direct references to specific transport outcomes or indicators.
- 3.3 TACTRAN officers have been contributing to each SOA as outlined below. The evolving mechanisms for RTP engagement with each CPP reflect the different structures which are in place within each CPP. It is the intention to monitor relationships with CPPs in order to ensure that the Partnership is able to contribute effectively to Community Planning and SOAs.

Angus

- 3.4 The Director has been invited to become a member of the Angus Rural & Environmental Partnership (AREP). Through this there has been input to the development of SOA Indicators and Measures linking with National Outcomes on sustainability and environmental impacts. Proposed Indicators for improving access to key services and facilities by more sustainable modes of transport are being developed, and TACTRAN is identified as a “Responsible Agency” in relation to these aspects of the Draft SOA.
- 3.5 It is understood that the finalised Draft Angus 2009 SOA will be the subject of further consultation with Community Planning partners during March, and at a CPP SOA workshop on 20 March, which the Strategy Manager will attend in the Director’s absence.

Dundee City

- 3.6 The Draft SOA identifies 11 Strategic Outcomes of which 5 – relating to the role of Dundee as a regional centre for employment; reducing health inequalities; improving physical and mental wellbeing; ensuring accessibility of local services and facilities; and promoting a more sustainable environment – are areas where TACTRAN can potentially contribute directly or indirectly through the RTS/RTS Delivery Plan. The SOA includes reference to key RTS priorities (e.g. Park & Ride) within relevant sections. The RTP is also identified as a Key Strategic Partner and the RTS as a “Relevant Plan” in relation to local economic, employment, and health & wellbeing outcomes.
- 3.7 In order to ensure close ongoing engagement in the development and delivery of SOA outcomes, the Director is to be invited to become a member of the appropriate Community Planning Partnership management group.

Perth & Kinross

- 3.8 The Director attends the Community Planning Economic Partnership, through which there has been direct input to development of the Draft SOA and the related Perth & Kinross Economic Development Strategy.
- 3.9 The Draft SOA includes reference to the RTS, primarily in relation to National and Local Outcomes concerning economic and business growth. There are specific references to a number of the transport priorities contained within the RTS, including improvements to the A9, continued improvement to rail passenger and freight connections; improved connectivity at Perth Harbour, development of Park & Ride; and improved transport interchange at Perth Station. The RTS is identified as a key “Joint Delivery Strategy” which will contribute towards sustaining a thriving and expanding economy and ensuring the area has improved infrastructure and transport links.

Stirling

- 3.10 The Director has become a member of the Stirling CPP Executive Delivery Group (EDG), which gives strategic direction to the Stirling CPP and oversees the activity of various Critical Partnerships addressing specific priorities within the Community Plan.
- 3.11 Through the EDG there has been input to development of the Draft SOA, which identifies 8 strategic priorities of which 4 – vibrant economy; improved wellbeing; high quality environment; and making Stirling more sustainable – are areas where the Partnership and RTS/RTS Delivery Plan can directly or indirectly contribute. Reference is made within the Draft SOA to the RTS and its implementation, in terms of supporting improved connectivity; accessibility; easing congestion; and improving environmental quality.

SOA Governance and Accountability

- 3.12 The guidance at Appendix A indicates that SOAs should be signed by all statutory Community Planning partners/public bodies. The guidance also indicates that Community Planning partners/agencies should seek to reflect SOA priorities within their own corporate or organisational plans. This has, in effect, been started through the “high level” alignment of the RTS with National Outcomes and initial work on aligning the RTS Delivery Plan with SOA priorities. This will be reinforced by the current work being undertaken on development of an RTS Monitoring Framework, as discussed in section 3.15 below.
- 3.13 Engagement to date has ensured that appropriate references to the RTP, as a key partner/agency in the delivery of SOA outcomes, and to the RTS as a key strategy/plan, are included within each Draft SOA, having regard to the strategic nature of these documents. Further engagement will continue through the liaison mechanisms outlined above, as CPPs engage with Scottish Government on SOA finalisation.
- 3.14 As indicated above, 2009 SOAs require to be finalised before the Partnership’s next meeting. It is, therefore, proposed that authority is delegated to the Chair and Director to formalise the Partnership’s commitment to each SOA, as appropriate to local circumstances.

SOA Monitoring and Reporting

- 3.15 In relation to the guidance at Appendix B, work is currently being undertaken by the MVA Consultancy on the development of a framework for statutory monitoring of the RTS, as discussed in a separate report on 2008/09 Revenue Budget monitoring. This work recognises the need to align RTS monitoring with associated performance monitoring and reporting for SOAs.
- 3.16 A report on further developments will be submitted to the Partnership's next meeting on 23 June 2009.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The report has been prepared in consultation with the Chief Officers Liaison Group and the relevant officers with responsibility for SOA development within Councils.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Other than staff time and commitment to engaging with CPPs and Councils, there are no additional resource implications arising directly from this report. The Partnership has a statutory duty to engage in Community Planning and officer time will continue to be committed to promoting closer relationships with CPPs as a key function of the Partnership, in line with this statutory duty.

Eric Guthrie
Director

Report prepared by Eric Guthrie. For further information e-mail ericguthrie@tactran.gov.uk or tel. 01738 475771

NOTE

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report :-

Draft Single Outcome Agreement for Angus 2009 – 2012

Draft Single Outcome Agreement for Dundee 2009 – 2012

Draft Single Outcome Agreement for Perth & Kinross 2009 – 2011

Draft Stirling Single Outcome Agreement 2009

Director-General Economy and Chief Economic Adviser

Dr Andrew Goudie

T: 0131-244 5598

E: DGEconomy@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Chief Executives of Local Authorities
Chief Executives of Health Boards
Chief Constables
Chief Fire Officers
Chief Executive of Scottish Enterprise
Chief Executive of Highlands & Islands Enterprise
Lead Officers of Regional Transport Partnerships

CC Chief Executive, COSLA
Chief Executive, Improvement Service

5 February 2009

Dear Chief Executive

**SINGLE OUTCOME AGREEMENTS (SOAs) 2009
GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SOAs**

Further to the Guidance for Community Planning Partnerships on Single Outcome Agreements which issued in October 2008 from the High Level Steering Group (HLSG) on Single Outcome Agreements, please find attached a good practice advice note on governance and accountability for SOAs. The note has been prepared by the Concordat Oversight Group (COG), which now includes oversight of Single Outcome Agreements as part of its remit.

The Guidance issued in October recognised that as second phase SOAs would be an agreement between the Scottish Ministers and Community Planning Partnerships and thus signed by Councils, statutory community planning partners and, as a minimum, those public bodies in the Community Planning Partnership, it was considered that there was a need to identify good practice and workable options for governance and accountability which will support the collective delivery of national and local outcomes. Subsequent discussion with councils and their partners have indicated that this was seen as desirable as the October Guidance was narrowly focussed on the expected structure and content of an SOA.

The attached note attempts to spell out some of the broader issues of governance and accountability and the expectations different partners and stakeholders might have of these. On the basis of that analysis, the guidance then aims to set out what councils and their partners are committing to in signing an SOA and the subsequent implications to them of these commitments.

The advice contained in the note is not innovative and is largely a statement of where we are currently. However, the members of COG concluded that this was the only public governance framework available for the next round of SOAs. Nevertheless, COG recognised that moving beyond this position and developing Community Planning partnerships as a more robust basis for collective governance and aligned performance management is an important task for the next phase of SOA development.

We hope you find the advice note useful.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Goudie', with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end of the signature.

Dr Andrew Goudie
Chair of Concordat Oversight Group

Governance and Accountability for SOAs

1. The Guidance to Community Planning Partnerships issued in October indicated that further good practice advice on governance and accountability might be useful. Discussions with Councils and their partners since then have indicated that this was seen as desirable, as the October 2008 Guidance was quite narrowly focused on the expected structure and content of an SOA, and the arrangements for the development, agreement and signing of SOAs in 2009. This note attempts to spell out some of the broader issues of governance and accountability and the expectations different partners and stakeholders may have of these.

Background

2. The governance and accountability framework for SOAs flows out of the Concordat between national and local government in Scotland who between them have the political accountability for the performance and good value of all of our public services. The Concordat combines support for an agreed framework of national outcomes with a commitment to SOAs based on local needs, local circumstances and local priorities. Phase 1 of SOA development was focused on initial agreement with Scottish Ministers and Councils: This next phase brings the SOA into the Community Planning Partnership.
3. Two points are worth noting. All the statutory public sector partners to Community Planning are ultimately accountable to Ministers and Parliament or Councils. In that sense, an agreement between Ministers and Councils could be seen to cover other partners as well. However, partners have an independent statutory basis conferred by Parliament, and powers, duties and accountabilities that flow from that. As constituted public boards, they will have to consider their commitment to the SOA against that background.

4. The second important background factor is the law and guidance with respect to Community Planning itself. That places a duty on Councils to lead the Community Planning process; on named partners to participate in the process and on Ministers to facilitate and support the process. For present purposes, two key points need emphasised. First, although there is provision for it in law, no CPP in Scotland has chosen to incorporate itself as a partnership. In terms of good governance and accountability for performance as public finance, CPPs operate on the authority of the parent bodies, not their own authority.
5. Second, Community Planning is not just about public partners but also about communities, the third sector and the private sector. Most CPP Boards in Scotland have that wider representation. Accountability for public finance and public performance however, still unambiguously lies with the public partners within Community Planning. It is important that the wider CPP engages with and agrees the SOA but public accountability for it lies with the public sector partners.
6. For those reasons, the Guidance issued in October noted that all statutory and, 'other relevant', public partners would be signatories to the SOA, not the partnership, which as an unincorporated body cannot commit the individual public sector partners. This is not to demote the CPP, or the community, third sector and private sector representatives on the CPP Board. It is to be clear about the current status of CPPs, and the fact that only Councils and their public partners can be ultimately accountable for public spending and public performance. The whole CPP should agree the SOA but the accountable signatories will be the public partners individually.

Governance and Accountability

7. The logic of the guidance is that the public governance and accountability for SOAs locally flows from the Councils and the Boards of the statutory and other public sector partners. That being the case then it is important to spell out clearly what Councils and their partners are signing up to when they sign the SOA with Ministers. At minimum, this includes:

- (i) That partners are signing up to the whole SOA, not selected parts of it.
 - (ii) That signing up is equivalent to adopting the SOA as a formal corporate commitment of the Council or Board.
 - (iii) That such a commitment is to support the delivery of the SOA in all possible ways compatible with their duties and responsibilities.
 - (iv) That all partners are willing to review their pre-existing structures, processes and resource deployment to optimise delivery of outcomes.
8. What this patently does not mean is that each partner is signed up to deliver all of the services and infrastructure necessary to achieve outcomes: None of them has unrestricted general empowerment. What it means is they are corporately committed to the agreed outcomes for the area and its people and, within the constraints of their duties and responsibilities, will take every opportunity to promote and support the achievement of outcomes. For example, Health Boards are not empowered to be economic development agencies, but they are entirely able to review how they use their procurement and recruitment capacity to better support local economic outcomes.
9. In relation to the Enterprise Agencies, whilst they remain statutory Community Planning partners their remit has changed. They no longer have responsibility for a number of functions that are of importance to local economic development (*i.e. Skills, Business Gateway, and in the case of Scottish Enterprise local regeneration*). These are now the responsibility of Local Government or Skills Development Scotland. While the work of Scottish Enterprise in particular is now more firmly focused on the achievement of national outcomes, the Enterprise Agencies continue to have an important and beneficial role to play within SOAs. This role includes working with local partners to establish economic challenges and opportunities, to contribute to articulating realistic and

stretching economic outcomes and where national and local outcomes are complementary, to contribute to the delivery of local outcomes.

10. Once the Council, the Boards of partners and the CPP have agreed on the outcomes to be achieved (and it is critical that they explicitly decide and own the SOA), it would normally be delegated to Chief Officers to come up with appropriate recommendations about implementation arrangements.
11. This will be likely to include each partner looking at how they individually can contribute to outcomes and prioritising these contributions through their corporate, service and financial planning processes. It may be helpful here for each partner to think in terms of 'lead' and 'value added' roles with respect to outcomes. A 'lead' role is where a partner has a substantial primary role in delivering the outcome; a 'value added' role is where that is not the case but value can be added by innovative thinking, targeted partnering, etc. Each partner will need to do work on this themselves and, for accountability, show that a 'golden thread' runs from the SOA through their planning, resourcing and performance management processes. This individual work needs to be shared, and a matrix of contribution and performance commitments created for reporting individual and collective progress.
12. As importantly, most outcomes will need to be delivered on a partnership basis, from intelligent alignment through to integrated partnerships, and it will be important that the SOA drives review, development and innovation here. The SOA focuses questions about whether existing arrangements are 'fit for purpose', including the wider CPP itself or specific delivery partnerships that are part of it. The presumption of the SOA is moving beyond 'business as usual' and the whole process is developmental. Critically, the SOA provides the basis for strengthening and deepening Community Planning which remains a statutory commitment for all partners.
13. The potential of a Chief Officers Group here is important. Driving SOA commitments through partnership, corporate and service planning and improving budgetary alignment and resource

allocation is an executive leadership, not a co-coordinative role. Discussions with SOLACE, ACPOS, CFOAS and the NHS Chief Executives Group indicate that current schemes of delegation would encompass this role, and would bring more senior level engagement with implementation issues than has sometimes happened at earlier stages of Community Planning. Accountability will be directly back to the Elected Members or Boards.

Key Points

14. It is clear that external scrutiny, and the performance and accountability frameworks for public bodies, will progressively be focused on national outcomes and SOAs. The Guidance on SOAs for public bodies emphasises this. The Guidance to Health Boards makes contribution to local outcomes a key part of their performance and accountability framework and BV2 will provide a similar framework for Councils. This means that individual and collective performance management and self-assessment around outcomes is critical. Strong baselines; robust measure of performance; challenging targets and comparability with others need developed at the outset as a basis for governance and accountability.
15. The guidance already issued emphasised that outcomes cannot be 'done to' people and communities, geographical or community of interest. Public services need to engage people and communities, and work with them to achieve mutually shared outcomes. The immediate challenge for the public signatories of SOAs will be to assess whether the mechanisms and levels of engagement achieved to date are sufficient for the delivery of the SOA and, if not, how these can be strengthened and improved.
16. Finally, the development of SOAs is a work in progress, and has been explicitly and repeatedly defined as a 'developmental process'. It would not be inappropriate therefore to have short-term outcomes related to developing and improving governance, performance management, and accountability to local communities built into the SOA itself, accompanied by progress measures

and targets. This could certainly flow from National Outcome 15, but is, in any case, an entirely legitimate local priority.

Conclusion

17. The above is not an innovative proposal: It is largely a statement of where we are. It does not preclude possible future developments (e.g. widespread incorporation of CPPs) but it does spell out the only public governance framework available for the next round of SOAs. Moving beyond this position, and developing the CPP as a more robust basis for collective governance and aligned performance management, is an important task for the next phase of SOA development.

Director-General Economy and Chief Economic Adviser

Dr Andrew Goudie

Chief Executive, COSLA

Rory Mair

Council Chief Executives
Community Planning Partnership Chairs
Chief Executives of Health Boards
Chief Constables
Chief Fire Officers
Chief Executive of Scottish Enterprise
Chief Executive of Highlands & Islands Enterprise
Lead Officers of Regional Transport Partnerships



3 March 2009

Dear Chief Executive

SINGLE OUTCOME AGREEMENTS: REPORTING TO THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT

Introduction

As you will be aware, an important element of the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) approach is the annual reporting process, with the first reports, on progress made in 2008-09, becoming available in September 2009. The SOA guidance published in October 2008 explained that the reporting process will have a dual purpose: first, an outward focus reporting to communities and the public on the delivery of outcomes in the local area; and second to report to the Scottish Government a Council or CPP's contribution towards delivery of outcomes which support the National Performance Framework. The SOA Guidance confirmed that the SOA will be subject to annual reviews and that the annual reports to the Scottish Government will be integral parts of the reports to local communities which Councils prepare under their duty of Public Performance Reporting.

The Concordat Oversight Group (or COG, the membership of which comprises senior representatives from Audit Scotland, COSLA, the Improvement Service, Scottish Government and SOLACE) has considered how this should be taken forward. We are writing now on behalf of COG to explain the approach to reporting which the Group has agreed.

Objectives of Reporting

Both the Scottish Government and local government wish to demonstrate the credibility and benefits of the SOA approach as a cornerstone of the Concordat between COSLA and the Scottish Government. In particular, the SOA approach has been introduced as a significant advance on previous arrangements for planning and delivering public services, and the Scottish Government and local government need to be able to demonstrate how this is promoting continuous improvement by local government and Community Planning partners in

the governance, management and delivery of local services (which will be reflected in the framework expected from the Accounts Commission's proposed approach to Best Value audits of local government (BV2)).

The annual SOA report to the Scottish Government will set out how a Council or CPP has contributed towards the fulfilment of the Government Purpose and National Outcomes. This material should inform the annual review and updating of SOAs, and the planning and delivery of local services, by CPPs (including the lead contact Scottish Government Director). It should also inform Public Performance Reporting to local communities.

At the same time, COG has been concerned to ensure that reporting arrangements place the minimum administrative burden on Councils and CPPs that is reasonably possible.

This reporting process is not intended to capture feedback on all elements of the Concordat. In particular, separate reporting channels will apply for recording progress towards commitments referred to in the Concordat.

Components of the annual SOA review

The approach to reviewing the SOA which COG has agreed features two main components. The first is the SOA Annual Report, which is a factual statement covering progress against national and local outcomes. This report will be made in September each year, on the basis of data available for the previous financial year. COG has agreed a template which Councils and CPPs should use in presenting this information, completing one table for each National Outcome (see Annex A). This template is closely modelled on the one contained in the SOA Guidance for CPPs. As a result, both the template and the information sought within it should be familiar to Councils and CPPs, and can be used or adapted for Public Performance Reporting to local communities. The template also provides space for supplementary narrative information, which can be used to record progress made towards outcomes in the absence of robust performance information and to note changing local circumstances.

Where a CPP has used another agreed format of template for the SOA (rather than the template provided in the SOA Guidance), that template can be used or modified for the SOA Annual Report - so long as the information identified in Annex A is clearly presented.

The second component of the annual review is a qualitative assessment, designed to provide the Council, the CPP and Scottish Government with information about the effectiveness of the SOA approach which cannot be captured from the SOA Annual Report. In particular, this will cover how the SOA is being supported by continuous improvement (e.g. the effectiveness of partnership working, including with non-statutory partners such as the business community and Third Sector; the nature of community engagement and how it is informing priority outcomes; and the review and alignment of arrangements to support the delivery of agreed outcomes). The qualitative assessment provides an opportunity to identify further support which the members of COG may be able to provide.

This qualitative assessment will not take the form of a report or audit. It will be a process which informs the annual review by drawing on the Council's annual Priorities and Risks Framework report, in particular those aspects covering Community Planning and partnership working. It will also reflect the ongoing dialogue between the lead contact Scottish Government Director, the Council and the CPP. As a result, Councils and CPPs are strongly encouraged to keep their lead contact Scottish Government Director informed of work they

undertake to review and promote continuous improvement. This work will, of course, also be an important contribution to each public body's preparations for external scrutiny of their arrangements for supporting their delivery of national and local outcomes.

Next Steps

COG will continue to monitor the need to provide supplementary advice on reporting on the SOA, both to the Scottish Government and as part of local Public Performance Reporting. The nature of reporting will evolve in future years as the SOA approach as a whole matures (e.g. future annual reporting will be for CPPs to undertake; reporting will reflect SOAs that are more strategic in nature, and which contain better quality performance information).

We hope this letter is helpful in clarifying what COG expects from the SOA reporting process to the Scottish Government. Please feel free to contact any member of COG if you would like further assistance from the Group or its member bodies.



A GOUDIE
Chair, Concordat Oversight Group
Scottish Government



R MAIR
Chief Executive
COSLA

SOA ANNUAL REPORT: TEMPLATE FOR CAPTURING INFORMATION ON PROGRESS AGAINST OUTCOMES

Purpose

The template on the following page should be completed as far as possible for each National Outcome.

Information sought

1. Narrative on progress in improving the delivery of the national outcome

- Progress in taking forward that National Outcome in overall terms, whether through activity referred to in the SOA or, if helpful, through other activities.
- Achievements and particular successes to date and anticipated challenges for future years, including what support or actions are required to sustain continuous improvement and the delivery of improved outcomes.

2. Progress at March 20XX on local outcomes

- Provision of the most up-to-date key performance information / evidence, (where this is available), to measure progress against each local outcome at March of the previous financial year.
- Where robust or timely performance data is not yet available to measure progress against local outcomes, provision of a narrative around progress to March of the previous financial year and an indication of when and how data is likely to become available.
- Provision or revision of progress targets and end targets.

3. Narrative on progress on local outcomes

- Description of what benefits and changes in outcome terms to the quality of people's life and opportunities have become apparent which indicate progress in the achievement of the local outcome.
- Explanation of how on track this outcome is.
- Where changing circumstances have had an impact on delivery of the outcome/proposed progress, explanation of what is happening and what is being planned to address the issue.

Where a CPP has used another agreed format of template for the SOA (rather than the template provided in the SOA Guidance), that template can be used or modified for the SOA Annual Report - so long as the information identified in this Annex is clearly presented.

SOA ANNUAL REPORT TEMPLATE (2008-09)

National Outcome -					
Narrative on progress in improving the delivery of the national outcome					
Progress at March 2009 on local outcomes					
Local Outcome	Indicator/s <i>(noting frequency / type / source)</i>	Baseline at 2006-07	Progress at March 2009 <i>(indicators where available)</i>	'Progress' target/s to 2010-11 (where available)	'End' target/s & timescale/s or direction of travel
Narrative on progress on Local Outcome					
Local Outcome					
Narrative on progress on Local Outcome					