

PE1489/A

Petitioner Letter of 22 October 2013

Attention: Chris Hynd – Committee Assistant

Dear Chris,

Attached are some notes for reference, which I believe will be constructive and beneficial for the PPC members relating to our argument in favour of the petition.

Perhaps you would be kind enough to see copies are provided to the relevant members?

Best regards,

John McLean

SIMPLIFIED LOGIC DIAGRAM 1

SPSO REMIT

BEST PRACTICE
BEST VALUE
PERTINENT LEGISLATION
STRATEGIC PLANS
TACTICAL PLANS

SPSO ANNUAL REPORTS

SIMPLIFIED FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

COMPLAINT REMEDY / REDRESS	COMPLAINT LESSONS LEARNT	END USER REPORTING	PUBLIC STANDARDS	KPI's	BENCH MARKING	RISK ANALYSIS	QUALITY ASSURANCE	BEST PRACTICE	BEST VALUE	COMMON LAW	COMPLAINT HANDLING AUTHORITY	STRATEGIC PLANS	BUDGET	SPECIAL REPORTS
NO PROCEDURE ----- NO INFO COLLECTED ----- STATISTICAL DATA NOT REPORTED ----- 2012/2013 NOTES RECOMMENDATIONS	NO PROCEDURE ----- NO INFO COLLECTED ----- STATISTICAL DATA NOT REPORTED ----- 2012/2013 NOTES RECOMMENDATIONS	PUBLIC NOT PART OF SPSO INTEREST & REJECTED FROM INPUT PARAMETERS ----- REQUIRED DATA NOT REPORTED ----- SATISFACTION SURVEYS WITHDRAWN	STANDARDS NOT FULLY APPLIED ----- MALADMINISTRATION STANDARD FOR COMPLAINT NOT ACCEPTED BY SPSO AGAINST THEIR ACTIVITIES	LIMITED TO SPEED ONLY KPI's ----- NO SPSO QUALITY STANDARDS EVER APPLIED ----- TIME IS NOT A STATUTORY FACTOR, BUT QUALITY IS!	NO EXTERNAL BENCH MARKING STANDARDS APPLIED ----- NO SPSO PROCEDURE AVAILABLE ----- NO DATA REPORTED	RESTRICTED SCOPE ----- POOR APPLICATION ----- QUESTIONABLE CONCLUSIONS ----- NO DATA REPORTED	NO VALID QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM DEVELOPED ----- UNSOUND & MISLEADING CLAIMS MADE IMPACTING ALL REPORTING	NO CREDIBLE BEST PRACTICE METHODOLOGY DEVELOPED ----- & MISLEADING CLAIMS MADE IMPACTING ALL REPORTING ----- NO EXTERNAL INPUT INTO SPSO	NO CREDIBLE BEST VALUE METHODOLOGY DEVELOPED FOR INTERNAL APPLICATION ----- NO EXTERNAL INPUT INTO SPSO ----- POTENTIAL TO MISLEAD AUDIT REPORTING	NOT TAKEN INTO PLAY WITHIN SPSO DECISIONS ----- LACK OF NATURAL JUSTICE ALLOW RESULTS TO BE SKEWED	CSA STANDARDS NOT APPLIED TO SPSO_NO QUALITY OUTCOME METRIC OR CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY PROPOSED ----- PUBLIC ACCESS AND INPUT TO CSA REFUSED	REPEATING CONTENT OF PLAN IS NOT REPORTING AGAINST IT ----- INCOMPLETE PLAN PROVIDED ----- POOR CHOICE OF REPEATED OBJECTIVES	REFLECTS A "CAP" BASED VALUE WITH NO RELATED PERFORMANCE OBLIGATIONS ----- ANNUAL COST REDUCTIONS ALONE CANNOT IDENTIFY AT WHAT LOSS "QUALITY"	REQUIREMENT HISTORICALLY IGNORED ----- NECESSARY REPORTS NOT ISSUED

STATISTICS

ONLY COMPLAINT CASE DATA COLLECTED AND REPORTED WITH THE BENEFIT OF GRAPHICS_ NO DATA COLLECTED OR REPORTED FOR ANY OTHER ASPECT OF OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE_ NO TREND ANALYSIS DEVELOPED OR REPORTED FOR ANY FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES INCLUDING FINANCIAL_ LACK OF A VALID INTEGRATED BEST PRACTICE APPLICATION IMPAIRS OPPORTUNITY FOR GREATER GOVERNANCE VISIBILITY_ ABSENCE OF BASIC QUANTITATIVE DATA CONSTRICTS THE PURSUIT OF SOUND BEST VALUE PRACTICE_ MINOR DATA UTILISED TO DETRIMENT OF CRITICAL ANALYSIS_ ABSENCE OF EXTERNAL BENCH MARKING OPPORTUNITIES IGNORED_

AUDIT & ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AUDIT COMPLIANCE	QUALITY ASSURANCE	GOVERNANCE	SPCB REPORTS
OMISSIONS: SPSO OPERATIONAL <u>PROCEDURES</u> DEVELOPED_ NO HOLISTIC VIEW EMBODIED_ NO STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT COMPLAINANT SATISFACTION SURVEYS EVER IMPLEMENTED BY THIS OMBUDSMAN & ALL NOW CEASED_ RISK ACTIVITIES CONCLUDED IN QUESTIONABLE MANNER_ SPSO REPORTS DO NOT MEET NEED OF SCOTTISH PUBLIC_	OMISSIONS: FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH SPSO FULL TERMS OF REFERENCE_ FAILURE TO CORRECT SPSO MIS-REPRESENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AS AUTHENTIC SYSTEM_ NO CHANGE CONTROL REGISTER ESTABLISHED_ NO TRUE AUDIT TRAIL_ NO VALIDATION OF PROCEDURAL SYSTEMS EVER UNDERTAKEN BY A&AC_ ABSENCE OF FORMAL PROCEDURES IGNORED_	OMISSIONS: REMIT PERFORMANCE FAILURE NOT RECOGNISED RESULTING IN UNSOUND ANNUAL ENDORSEMENTS OF GOVERNANCE_ NO BASE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS DEFINED FOR ENDORSEMENT TO CONFIRM SPSO SELECTED ACTIVITIES COMPLY WITH FULL OBLIGATIONS OF REMIT_	REQUIREMENT: ACCESS TO SPCB FOR REPORTING "ILLEGAL" ACTS

PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE (PG) PERFORMANCE

ONLY CURSORY DISCUSSIONS IMPLEMENTED BT PG THAT DO NOT REFLECT THE "CONSIDERATION / SCRUTINY" REQUIRED BY THE PARLIAMENT_ NO QUESTIONS AS TO WHY THE ABSENCE OF VAST MAJORITY OF THE REQUIRED CONTENT OF THE SPSO ANNUAL REPORT CONTINUES TO BE IGNORED_ TOTALLY INAPPROPRIATE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE OMBUDSMAN ACCEPTED AS TRUE ON MULTIPLE OCCASIONS WHEN ALL ATTENDEES SHOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO IMMEDIATELY CORRECT SUCH IMPROPER CLAIMS **BUT DIDN'T**_ LACK OF A COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED PG METHODOLOGY EVIDENT_ GOVERNANCE IMPROPERLY EVALUATED AGAINST FINANCIAL DATA_ TIME, RESOURCES & SKILLS INSUFFICIENT TO APPLY CREDIBLE OR WORTHWHILE SCRUTINY_ CONSIDERABLE PUBLIC FUNDS LOST WHILE GOING THROUGH THE MOTION OF WINDOW DRESSING_

SIMPLIFIED LOGIC DIAGRAM 2

SPSO REMIT

BEST PRACTICE BEST VALUE

STRATEGIC PLANS

OBJECTIVES & PRIORITIES	TACTICAL PLAN PROPOSALS	ACTIVITY TIMETABLES	ESTIMATED COSTS TO
REPEAT OF 2008-2011 STRATEGIC PLAN WITH POORLY CHOSEN OBJECTIVES THAT AGAIN FAIL TO SATISFY REMIT OF SPSO_ NO ATTEMPT TO PRIORITISE PLANS_ DOCUMENT INCOMPLETE AT PRESENTATION	NO SUPPORT FOR THIS RESPONSIBILITY PROVIDED THROUGHOUT DOCUMENT_ THEREBY RENDERING THIS DOCUMENT WORTHLESS AS A MANAGEMENT TOOL_	NO SUPPORT FOR THIS RESPONSIBILITY PROVIDED THROUGHOUT DOCUMENT_ THE ONLY TIMETABLE CONSIDERED FOR THIS STRATEGIC PLAN IS A "ROLLING" 4 YEARS_	NONE OF THE COST DATA PROVIDED CONTRIBUTES TO EITHER MANAGEMENT FUNCTION CAPABILITY OR GOVERNANCE OVERVIEW_ ALL VALUES ARE TOP-DOWN GENERATED NOT BOTTOM-UP ESTIMATES_

BUDGET

LINE BY LINE ITEMS
ALL CURRENT BUDGET VALUES ARE DERIVED FROM A MAXIMUM "CAP" POSITION AND NOT A REFLECTION OF THE PLANNED COSTS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE THOSE SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS REQUIRED TO FULLY SATISFY SPSO REMIT_ THIS WAS NEVER THE INTENTION OF ESTABLISHING A "CONTROL" BUDGET_

STATISTICS

NONE UNDERTAKEN_ CURRENTLY THIS WOULD BE A WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS AS THERE IS NO DATA AVAILABLE_ BASIC STATISTICAL & TREND ANALYSIS ARE CRITICAL TOOLS ESSENTIAL FOR CREDIBLE GOVERNANCE OBLIGATIONS_

STATISTICS

AGAIN THIS WOULD BE A POINTLESS ACTION

PERFORMANCE REPORTING

NO VALID REPORTING UNDERTAKEN SINCE THERE IS NO POTENTIAL MEASUREMENT FACILITIES STRUCTURED INTO THIS KEY MANAGEMENT TOOL!_ SPCB INFORMAL MONTHLY MEETINGS DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO REPORTING FUNCTION_ NEITHER IS PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE ENHANCED BY ANY ACTIVITY OF SPSO OR PG_

PERFORMANCE REPORTING

END OF YEAR ONLY REVIEW REQUIRED_ EXPENDITURE EXTREMELY PREDICABLE NOT BEING PERFORMANCE BASED_

PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE (PG) PERFORMANCE

NO CRITICISM RAISED AGAINST THE SIGNIFICANT FAILURES PRESENTED BY THIS DOCUMENT EVEN WHEN EVIDENCE HAD BEEN SUBMITTED FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION AND ACTION_ NO INSTRUCTION OR DIRECTION PLACED UPON SPSO TO AMEND AND RE-SUBMIT THE "DRAFT" DOCUMENT WAS EVER INITIATED_ NO METHODOLOGY / PROCEDURE EVER ESTABLISHED TO CATER FOR THE BASIC HANDLING OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF A FORMALLY AMENDED DOCUMENT_ LACK OF NECESSARY EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PG PARTIES_

PG PERFORMANCE

PG METHODOLOGY IS QUESTIONABLE_ PRIVATE NATURE OF PG EMPLOYED RESTRICTS VALID COMMENT_ STRUCTURE OF BUDGET PRECLUDES ANY NORMAL POSITIVE GOVERNANCE OVERSIGHT

SIMPLIFIED LOGIC DIAGRAM 3

PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE REMIT FOR SPSO

BEST PRACTICE
BEST VALUE
COMMON LAW
STANDARDS IN PUBLIC LIFE
GENERAL PERTINENT LEGISLATION

EXAMPLES OF OBLIGATIONS / REGULATIONS

SPSO ANNUAL REPORTS	SPSO STRATEGIC PLANS	SPSO BUDGETS	SPSO SPECIAL REPORTS	ANNUAL OMBUDSMAN SPCB (EXTERNAL) REVIEW
<p>SPSO ACT 2002 AS AMENDED SECTION 17(1) OMBUDSMAN TO LAY ANNUAL REPORT ON THE EXERCISE OF HIS FUNCTIONS</p> <p>SECTION 17(3) SPCB MAY GIVE DIRECTIONS AS TO FORM AND CONTENT OF ANNUAL REPORT & OMBUDSMAN MUST COMPLY</p> <p>STANDING ORDERS_ RULE 3.A6 ANNUAL REPORTS LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT PROVIDED TO LEAD COMMITTEE BY CLERK_</p> <p>OFFICEHOLDER EVALUATION ANNEX "B" SECTION 2 ANNUAL REPORT_ COMPLAINTS RECEIVED ABOUT SERVICES_ SATISFACTION SURVEYS</p> <p>ANNEX "B" SECTION 3 FULFIL ALL FUNCTIONS OF POST AS LAID OUT BY LEGISLATION</p> <p>A&AC REMIT ACCESS TO SPCB FOR PROBLEMS_</p> <p>RSSB MINUTES REQUIRES MORE ACTIVE SCRUTINY VIA OPERATION & DELIVERY OF SERVICES & NOT THROUGH THE PRISM OF FINANCIAL RESULTS_</p>	<p>SPSO ACT 2002 AS AMENDED SECTION 17A (3) PRIOR TO LAYING STRATEGIC PLANS BEFORE PARLIAMENT OMBUDSMAN MUST PROVIDE DRAFT TO AND INVITE COMMENTS FROM SPCB</p> <p>STANDING ORDERS_ RULE 3.A6 STRATEGIC PLANS LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT PROVIDED TO LEAD COMMITTEE BY CLERK_</p> <p>OFFICEHOLDER EVALUATION ANNEX "B" SECTION (7) ASSESS FORWARD STRATEGIC PLAN_ STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED FOR CURRENT PERIOD_</p> <p>RSSB MINUTES NOTES REQUIREMENT FOR GREATER SCRUTINY OF ACTUAL GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE AND NOT THROUGH THE PRISM OF FINANCIAL RESULTS_</p>	<p>SPSO ACT 2002 AS AMENDED SCHEDULE 1: SECTION 12D (1) OMBUDSMAN MUST PREPARE PROPOSAL FOR USE OF RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES (BUDGET) AND SUBMIT TO SPCB FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>SCHEDULE 1: SECTION 12D (3) OMBUDSMAN MUST ENSURE THAT BUDGET RESOURCES ARE USED ECONOMICALLY, EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY_</p> <p>SECTION 13 (1) FUNDING OF SPSO OPERATIONS BY SPCB_</p> <p>STANDING ORDERS_ RULE 3.A6 BUDGETS LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT PROVIDED TO SPCB BY CLERK_</p> <p>OFFICEHOLDER EVALUATION ANNEX "B" SECTION 2 EVALUATE ANNUAL ACCOUNTS_ FINANCIAL AUDITS_</p> <p>RSSB MINUTES NOTES REQUIREMENT FOR GREATER SCRUTINY OF ACTUAL GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE AND NOT THROUGH THE PRISM OF FINANCIAL RESULTS_</p>	<p>SPSO ACT 2002 AS AMENDED SECTION 16 (3)(b) SPECIAL REPORTS TO BE PROVIDED TO SPCB FOR CONSIDERATION_</p> <p>OFFICEHOLDER EVALUATION ANNEX "B" SECTION 2 SELECTION OF SPECIAL REPORTS LAID TO BE PROVIDED TO SPCB ASSESSOR_</p> <p>RSSB MINUTES NOTES REQUIREMENT FOR GREATER SCRUTINY OF ACTUAL GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE AND NOT THROUGH THE PRISM OF FINANCIAL RESULTS_</p>	<p>OFFICEHOLDER EVALUATION REQUIREMENT FOR SPSO TO REPORT COMPLIANCE AND SUBSEQUENT PERFORMANCE AGAINST STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS_ SPECIFIC DOCUMENTATION DESIGNATED FOR SUBMISSION NOT AVAILABLE FOR CURRENT REVIEW PERIOD_ OTHERS NOT AVAILABLE OR DEVELOPED AT ALL_ OBLIGATION FOR SPCB ASSESSOR TO VISIT SPSO OPERATIONS AND REPORT BACK TO SPCB AUTHORITY_</p> <p>RSSB MINUTES NOTES REQUIREMENT FOR GREATER SCRUTINY OF ACTUAL GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE AND NOT THROUGH THE PRISM OF FINANCIAL RESULTS_</p>

CODE OF AUDIT PRACTICE REQUIREMENTS

PART 1: INTRODUCTION (5)_ AUDITS TO PROVIDE ASSURANCE ON FINANCIAL, CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, INTERNAL CONTROL & REGULARITY / LEGALITY, PROPRIETY, PERFORMANCE AND PRINCIPLES OF "BEST VALUE"_ **SECTION (24) OBJECTIVES**_ OBLIGATION TO MEET EXPECTATIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS_ **SECTION (25) GENERAL PRINCIPLES**_ AUDIT SHALL FOCUS ON PUBLIC SERVICE OUTCOMES FROM A USER PERSPECTIVE_ APPLICATION OF A MORE HOLISTIC APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE_ AUDITS SHOULD HELP THE PUBLIC GAUGE HOW WELL THE SERVICES ARE BEING DELIVERED_

SUGGESTED EXAMPLES OF DELINQUENT PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE (PG) RELATED TO THE OVERVIEW OF SPSO

1. STATUTORY SCOPE OF PG REMIT OF SPSO OBLIGATIONS NOT COMPREHENDED BY PG BODIES_ SPSO FUNCTIONAL & REPORTING OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY NEVER CONSIDERED BY PG PARTIES_
2. SCOPE OF THEIR STATUTORY PG REMIT UNDER ESTIMATED AND MIS-CONCEIVED BY SPCB_ CREDIBLE OVERSIGHT IS IMPRACTICAL WHEN THE FULL SCOPE OF OBLIGATIONS ARE NOT COMPREHENSIVELY APPRECIATED_
3. SCOPE OF THEIR STATUTORY PG REMIT UNDER ESTIMATED AND MIS-CONCEIVED BY LG&RC_ CREDIBLE OVERSIGHT IS IMPRACTICAL WHEN THE FULL SCOPE OF OBLIGATIONS ARE NOT COMPREHENSIVELY APPRECIATED_
4. INADEQUATE GOVERNANCE METHODOLOGY APPLIED USING FALSE UNDERSTANDING OF REMITS (1)(2)(3) ABOVE_ FACILITATING AN UNACCOUNTABLE UNFIT FOR PURPOSE SPSO TO IMPROPERLY FLOURISH_
5. OVERALL SCOPE OF GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES ENACTED AND REPORTED BY SPSO INSUFFICIENT AND INAPPROPRIATE TO SATISFY THEIR PARLIAMENTARY REMIT_
6. SPSO ANNUAL PERFORMANCE NEVER SUBJECTED TO RIGID SCRUTINY_ RSSB INSTRUCTIONS TO SCRUTINISE SPSO GOVERNANCE AGAINST FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY NOT BUDGET - TOTALLY IGNORED_
7. NO FORMAL, COMPREHENSIVE INTERFACE COMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPED FOR BENEFIT OF ALL INVOLVED PARTIES_ NO INTERNAL PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE CONTINUITY OF COMMITTEE KNOWLEDGE BASE_
8. SPSO ANNUAL REPORTS LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT IN FINAL FORM WITHOUT ANY EARLIER CONSIDERATION BY AN INDEPENDENT PG BODY_ LEAVING PARLIAMENT OPEN TO BE MIS-LED_
9. NO CONTROL PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY PG BODIES TO FACILITATE THE ABOVE CRITICAL NEED OR EVEN THE PROTOCOL FOR INITIAL "DRAFT" FOR ANY DOCUMENT REQUIRING FORMAL "APPROVAL" STATUS_
10. MSP's IN PARLIAMENT INVARIABLY "RUBBER STAMP" SPSO ANNUAL REPORT APPROVAL INCORRECTLY BELIEVING ALL REQUIRED VALIDATION HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN IMPLEMENTED BY PG BODIES_
11. SPSO ANNUAL REPORTS ARE REQUIRED TO BE LAID "NO LATER THAN 7 MONTHS POST CUT-OFF DATE_ THIS HAS NEVER BEEN IMPROVED UPON UNTIL THIS YEAR_ RESULTING IN WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS BY CONSIDERING SUCH HISTORICAL REPORTS_
12. AN UN-NECESSARY PERIOD OF 2-3 MONTHS NORMALLY ELAPSE PRIOR TO ITS SCHEDULE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE LG&RC_ THIS IS NOT AN EXTERNALLY IMPOSED DELAY BUT ONE REFLECTING A LACK OF CO-ORDINATION_
13. POOR DRAFTING OF SPSO ACT 2002 IGNORED WHEN AMENDING SAME WITH PUBLIC SERVICES REFORM (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010_ NON-COMPLIANCE WITH "SIMPLE ENGLISH" & SOME ANOMALIES REMAIN_
14. REQUIREMENT FOR AN INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY (ITP) TO ATTEND SPCB REVIEW OF OMBUDSMAN'S PERFORMANCE NEVER IMPLEMENTED_ REQUESTS FROM THIRD PARTY TO ATTEND AS ITP REJECTED_
15. SERIOUS SPSO CONCERNS IDENTIFIED TO PG BODIES BUT INAPPROPRIATELY DISMISSED_ ALL REMAIN ESSENTIALLY UNADDRESSED_
16. UNSOUND & UNWARRANTED GUIDANCE ON PUBLIC PETITIONS DIRECTED TO BOTH LG&RC AND PPC BY SPCB_ RESULTING IN ARGUABLY QUESTIONABLE RESULTS FOR ALL THOSE PETITION SPONSORS & SCOTTISH PUBLIC_
17. MONTHLY MEETING BETWEEN SPCB & SPSO ON STRATEGIC PLANS_ TOTALLY UNDOCUMENTED_ NO INFORMATION PROVIDED TO LG&RC_ STRANGELY SPCB CLAIM NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THESE FUNCTIONS?_
18. NO AUTHORITY DELEGATED TO LG&RC TO DIRECT "FORM & CONTENT" OF SPSO ANNUAL REPORT_ INAPPROPRIATELY LEAVING SCRUTINY UNDERTAKEN ONLY AGAINST "AS SUBMITTED" DOCUMENT_
19. NO DIRECTION EVER GIVEN BY SPCB TO CORRECT "FORM & CONTENT" OF SPSO ANNUAL REPORTS_ SPCB STATE THAT THEY WOULD NEVER ISSUE SUCH DIRECTION_ LG&RC CLAIM A SUGGESTION ONLY WOULD SUFFICE_ IRRESPECTIVELY NEITHER OPTION OR PARTY IMPLEMENTED THIS CRITICAL AND NECESSARY OBLIGATION_
20. FAILURE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW AS A VALID OPPORTUNITY FOR SCOTTISH PUBLIC PURSUIT NEVER IDENTIFIED OR OTHERWISE CONSIDERED BY PG BODIES DESPITE MUCH CRITICISM SUBMITTED ON THIS MATTER_
21. INABILITY OF PUBLIC TO OBTAIN "PRO BONO" LEGAL SUPPORT RELATED TO POTENTIAL JUDICIAL REVIEW ACTIONS NEVER CONSIDERED BY PG BODIES_ YET THE RECORDS SHOW ZERO UP-TAKE BY PUBLIC_
22. UN-NECESSARY USE OF "PRIVATE" INFORMATION CLAIMS FOR MATTERS IS HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE_ DEFAULT CONDITION TO OPENNESS FOR THE PUBLIC IS NOT APPLIED REASONABLY OR TO BENEFIT PUBLIC_
23. CLAIMS BY SPCB THAT SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS ARE NOT REQUIRED FROM SPSO ARE NOT FACT-BASED_ AS SOME ARE DEFINITELY LISTED (SATISFACTION SURVEYS), OTHERS ARE A REQUIREMENT OF FUNCTIONAL PARAMETERS_
24. INAPPROPRIATE AND INACCURATE STATEMENTS TABLED BY OMBUDSMAN NEVER CORRECTED BY ANY PG BODY DESPITE THESE MATTERS BEING RAISED BY EXTERNAL PARTY_
25. THE OLD ADAGE: "TO FAIL TO PLAN IS TO PLAN TO FAIL" IS ALWAYS TRUE AND IS UNFORTUNATELY EVIDENT IN THE DISJOINTED ACTIVITIES COVERING PG OF THE SPSO BY FAILING TO COALESCE THE DOTS_
26. PG OF SPSO CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS - DIRECTLY THROUGH LACK OF EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT, INDIRECTLY FROM SUBSEQUENT DOWNSTREAM CONSEQUENCES_ APPLICATION OF PG OWES NOTHING TO EITHER "BEST PRACTICE" OR "BEST VALUE". THEREFORE UNFORTUNATELY BY DEFAULT, TENDS TO HIDE THEIR TRUE CONDITIONS_ REMARKABLY THE PUBLIC DISBELIEVE SUCH PG CONDITIONS COULD EXIST_

SPSO PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE (PG) SELECTIVE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT HIGHLIGHTS

CRERAR REVIEW _SEPTEMBER 2007_ PROFESSOR LORNE D. CRERAR

AN ESTABLISHED POINT OF FIRST REFERENCE FOR COMPLAINT HANDLING_ RECOMMENDS "PUBLIC HAVE A LEGITIMATE STAKE IN EXTERNAL SCRUTINY AND THERE SHOULD BE A GREATER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN EXTERNAL SCRUTINY PROCESS"_ HAVE BEEN ECHOED BUT IGNORED BY THOSE WITH THE AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH CHANGES NEEDED_ PROPOSED THE SPSO AS NATIONAL COMPLAINT HANDLING AUTHORITY BASED ON HIS RESPECT FOR PROFESSOR BROWN BUT WITHOUT ANY PRUDENT INVESTIGATION OF SPSO OPERATIONS EVER BEING IMPLEMENTED_

FIT FOR PURPOSE COMPLAINTS ACTION GROUP REPORT _JULY 2008_ DOUGLAS SINCLAIR

A FURTHER ESTABLISHED POINT OF REFERENCE FOR COMPLAINT HANDLING_ CONFIRMS THAT COMPLAINT HANDLING IS TOO BUREAUCRATIC, NOT CUSTOMER CENTRED & UNRESPONSIVE_ KEY POINTS STRESSED INCLUDE: SIGNIFICANT ADVOCACY SERVICES, SPSO TO SHARE & PROMOTE "BEST PRACTICE", SPSO TO COORDINATE AND REPORT OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES TO IMPROVE SERVICES_ NONE OF THESE ACTIVITIES HAVE YET ADVANCED_ ONCE AGAIN THIS BODY DID NOT INVESTIGATE THE SPSO BEFORE MAKING THESE RECOMMENDATIONS_

JERRY WHITE REPORT _SEPTEMBER 2009_ JERRY WHITE

COMPRISED OF AN EVALUATION OF A SINGLE "COMPLAINT CASE" UNDER PROFESSOR BROWN'S INCUMBENCY_ THIS NOTED FAILURE OF THE PREVIOUS OMBUDSMAN, PARTICULARLY ABYSMAL TIME-FRAME ACHIEVED_ ALSO HIGHLIGHTING NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION OF SPSO PROCESSES_ SPCB REJECTED THIS NEED BASED ONLY UPON AN UNSOUND OPINION WHICH WAS NOT FACT BASED_ A NECESSARY AND OBVIOUS OPPORTUNITY TO ADVANCE THE TREATMENT OF THE SCOTTISH PUBLIC WAS REJECTED BY SPCB FOR REASONS NOT EXPLAINED_

RIGHT FIRST TIME _FEBRUARY 2010_ PROFESSOR ALICE BROWN

A DETAILED PRACTICAL APPROACH ON THE PROVISION OF DECISION MAKING_ NOTES COST IMPACT (40%) ON PUBLIC PURSE DUE TO CORE FAILINGS_ REQUEST'S GOVERNMENT TO EMBED RIGHT FIRST TIME INTO COMPLAINTS POLICY_ NOTES NEED TO MOVE FROM QUANTITY TO QUALITY STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE_ NO ADVANCE MADE ON THESE CRITICAL MATTERS_ **NOTE:** INTERESTINGLY NO MEANINGFUL INPUT TAKEN FROM THE SPSO_ A SIGNIFICANT & POSSIBLY TELLING OMISSION GIVEN PROFESSOR BROWN WAS THE FIRST SCOTTISH PUBLIC SERVICES OMBUDSMAN_

CHRISTIE COMMISSION REPORT _JUNE 2011_ DR. CAMPBELL CHRISTIE CBE.

A DEFINITIVE WORK AS A FOLLOW-UP TO THE CRERAR REVIEW_ NOTING CONTINUANCE OF SYSTEMIC FAILURE WITHIN PUBLIC SERVICE PROVIDERS REQUIRING FUNDAMENTAL OVERHAUL_ NON-ADOPTION OF DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY PROPOSED BY CRERAR REVIEW REMAINS_ REQUIREMENT FOR SYSTEMS TO BE DESIGNED WITH OUTCOMES IN MIND HIGHLIGHTED_ NOWHERE IS SPSO NOTED AS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR TO THESE GOVERNANCE FAILURES FOR NOT PROVIDING CLEAR DIRECTIONS FROM SPSO "LESSONS LEARNT" OBLIGATIONS_

LG&RC 9th REPORT _PUBLIC SERVICES REFORM IN SCOTLAND (STRAND 3)_ JUNE 2013

A VIEW OF ONLY 3 STRANDS CONSIDERED BY LG&RC (1) PARTNERSHIPS & OUTCOMES (2) BENCHMARKING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT (3) NEW WAYS OF DELIVERING SERVICES_ THE IRONY IS THAT DURING THE 16 MONTHS OF THEIR REPORT, ALL OF THE KNOWLEDGE GAINED WAS IGNORED BY LG&RC IN THEIR ONGOING SPSO SCRUTINY OBLIGATIONS_ IT IS THEREFORE REASONABLE TO PROFFER THAT THE CURRENT UNACCEPTABLE STATE HAS BEEN AIDED BY ABSENCE OF STRICT SCRUTINY OF SPSO BY PG BODIES_ OBVIOUSLY A POINT NOT NOTED_

GENERAL: THERE HAS OVER RECENT YEARS BEEN A PLETHORA OF "AUTHORITATIVE " REPORTS & REVIEWS - ALL OFFERING A GROWING CONSENSUS OF GUIDANCE FOR THE FUTURE OF THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES INCLUDING COMPLAINTS HANDLING_ YET THERE EXISTS NO SINGLE INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP WITH THE OVERALL REMIT TO ACTUALLY RESOLVE MATTERS_ RATHER THERE IS CONTENTMENT WITH THE PIECEMEAL STATUS QUO - A COMPLAIN & SPEND ATTITUDE TO THE PUBLIC PURSE. PURSUING EFFECTS AND NOT THE CAUSES_ THE SPSO IS A CRITICAL EXAMPLE OF SUCH CONVENIENT BLINDNESS FOR WHICH THE PUBLIC CONTINUE TO PAY_

CORRECTIVE ACTION INDICATIVE LOGIC FLOW-CHART

