

Response ID ANON-WPFF-8JGS-F

Submitted to Community wealth building consultation
Submitted on 2023-05-09 11:39:07

General advancement of the Community Wealth Building approach

Q1. a) We are proposing a duty to advance Community Wealth Building, which form do you think this duty should take:

Option C

Please provide a reason for your answer:

For preference a combination of Scottish Ministers and public sector bodies being required to embed CWB into their corporate plans and wider strategies, with a duty requiring public sector bodies to produce a collective CWB place-based strategy and action plan with strong community input. LA's other anchor organisations should be required to report on CWB outputs to local communities through Community Councils.

Proposals should cover anchor organisations such as – LAs, Forestry and Land Scotland, Scottish Forestry, NatureScot, National Park Authorities, national forest management companies i.e. Tilhill, large forest owning interests, i.e. Gresham House and timber processors. Local anchor organisations can include large individual estates.

Legislation should include an obligation on Ministers to report at regular (5 yearly) intervals to the Scottish Parliament on measurable deliverables – numbers of new building plots, hectares of land in community management/control/ownership, % of public contracts to local small businesses.

Local communities and Community Councils should be better represented in relation to CWB decision making. Question – how many of the CWB Steering Group are locally based community organisations? Good place to start.

Q1. b) One way Scottish Government could support the implementation of the proposed Community Wealth Building duty is to provide statutory or non-statutory guidance. Would this be helpful to partners in meeting the proposed duty?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer.:

The CWB consultation text talks of cultural change within anchor organisations. These are organisations that are generally strapped for cash, under resourced and trying to multitask so whatever CWB guidance is offered by Government, it will need to be simple, easy to follow and delivered over a sustained period, and with its own set of monitoring indicators. To avoid the risk that guidance is overly general, not specific to the organisation or unclear, it may be wise to use a Govt. institution that is well versed in producing simple, clear guidance relating to community needs, such as the Scottish Land Commission. See SLC guide to CWB Community Wealth Building - Good Practice - Our work - Scottish Land Commission

Q2. a) Are there other non-legislative measures that you believe are required to accelerate the implementation of the Community Wealth Building approach in Scotland?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer.:

An overhaul (again) of the Scottish Government Procurement processes. The current Scottish Govt. procurement barriers include, tendering processes being overly complex, lack of staffing to engage with tendering, tendering lacking in transparency and much more besides. For guidance read Public procurement - views and experiences: research - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)

Q2. b) Are there specific actions required to advance delivery of the items contained within the Shared Policy Programme outlined on page 11?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer.:

An example of public sector procurement where contract tendering could deliver CWB is Forestry and Land Scotland. FLS-AnnualProcurementReport2021-22_pm_p3.pdf Many of the 6 figure contracts go to big, centralised companies (Jenkinsons, James Jones, etc.) – streamlining procurement processes, cutting red tape and sourcing more local forestry work from microbusiness at a community level, and making resources, such as land and timber, available to community groups and enterprises would assist CWB. As would packaging tenders in a way that permits SME's and community based enterprises to apply for work or service delivery.

Spending pillar

Q3. Are there ways in which the law could be changed to advance the spending pillar of Community Wealth Building?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer. :

Legal requirement for anchor organisations to source materials, labour and goods locally such that public bodies must consider the option for local and community-based suppliers, and where necessary explain 'why not'.

Forests adjacent to communities could be managed by communities rather than the current model of State Forest management, which is centralised and remote from forests. Scottish Forestry/Forestry and Land Scotland can make financial resources available to communities for managing State forests.

The current 'seagull' contracting model. Contractors from outwith local areas, fly in, make a mess (trashed roads & hillsides) and fly out again leaving no benefits.

Workforce pillar

Q4. Employment law is reserved to the UK Parliament. Are there other devolved areas where the law could be changed to advance the workforce pillar of Community Wealth Building?

Don't Know

Please provide a reason for your answer. :

Land and property pillar

Q5. Are there ways in which the law could be changed which are not already covered in the proposals for the Land Reform Bill to advance the land and property pillar of Community Wealth Building?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer. :

A requirement on significant land owners to engage with local communities, and to produce appropriate community plans as part of management proposals. Private landholdings over 500 ha should be required to work with local communities to identify portions of their landholding that may be jointly managed, community controlled or owned and used for community wealth building, such as for local housing.

A legal duty on absentee forest landowners to make a proportion of each forest holding available for community development, e.g. 1% for every 100 hectares owned.

Inclusive ownership pillar

Q6. Are there ways in which the law could be changed to advance the inclusive ownership pillar of Community Wealth Building?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer:

More devolution of State land towards community ownership and control, including the resources and finance to bankroll early development – without the need for communities to go through the tortuous process of right to buy (or Community Asset Transfer) resulting in a need to apply for money to the State to buy land that belongs to the Scottish people – this may require a change in State Aid regulation.

Land in public ownership – e.g. LAs, NatureScot, Scottish Water, Crown Estates should not require community purchase – state to community transfer, this may require legislation at Holyrood and Westminster for bodies such as the MoD.

Finance pillar

Q7. Are there ways in which the law could be changed to advance the finance pillar of Community Wealth Building?

Yes

Please provide a reason for your answer. :

More State aid to community groups and make loans available through the Scottish National Investment Bank – at non-commercial rates, i.e. give communities more access to low interest capital. A mechanism to allow LAs and enterprise companies powers to borrow and loan capital to communities at preferential rates, e.g. HIE and SOSE could hold loan funds that communities could access for local housing, renewable energy schemes and/or infrastructure works.

About you

What is your name?

Name:

Andy Rockall

What is your email address?

Email:
andy@communitywoods.org

Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

Organisation

What is your organisation?

Organisation:
Community Woodlands Association

The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:

Publish response with name

We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.

I consent

Evaluation

Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)

Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?:
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Please enter comments here.:

Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?:
Very dissatisfied

Please enter comments here.:

Copied and pasted from a pre-prepared response in word, inability to paste in links is frustrating and likely makes for additional work load at your end, assuming those links would be followed!

It's a pain, much simpler to send you a word document which appears discouraged.