

EndDate	What are your concerns?
11/22/2010 08:07:30	<p>. The potential for reduction in services to the needy and those that deserve to have the support currently provided. . Lack of investment in ways which lead to improvement in the prosperity of Suffolk. . Lack of investment in ways which raise the quality of life and civic pride in our towns and countryside.</p> <p>1) Over time the money SCC plan to award out-sourcing/not for profit companies will inevitably reduce. The largest outlay in running an organisation is staffing. To a degree I can appreciate volunteers and job seekers can absorb some of the work, but surely there is a danger that becoming reliant unpaid work will dilute the quality of service provided. Unless you have an incentive, commitment towards the work, loyalty, thorough knowledge, experience etc will gradually be lost. 2) Job cuts. Ex employees struggling to find work who are on job seekers could end up doing the same jobs they were once employed for as part of benefit regulations or voluntary services. 3) Concerns as to whether the town/village gets a say over "who" exactly takes over the individual service. Are they a serious and responsible organisation who take data protection, freedom of information, equalities and diversity for example, seriously. Do they have the town/village people's best interests at heart or is this merely a business opportunity for them.</p>
11/09/2010 18:48	<p>1) that the council has the expertise to draw up contracts relating to these services so that risk and reward are transferred to the private sector, and not just reward as happened with many PFI schemes. 2) that the council is able to monitor the quality of services provided by the private sector and take quick remedial action if the contractor fails to meet clear and measurable performance standards 3) that smaller players - like me! - in the private sector are excluded from the process due to the lack of possible arbitrary requirements such as a lack of X years of audited accounts, or a min turnover of £X</p>
10/30/2010 19:23:06	<p>1) The policy may have sounded good on paper to the council but is been pushed through far too quickly and decisions have clearly already been made before the consultation period completed. 2) Devolving power to local communities may also sound ok but in reality outsourcing will reduce local democratic control. Councillors will not be able to effectively control services outsourced to private companies since the council will no longer have the capacity to deliver any services itself and will be hamstrung by legally binding contracts. The council are not carrying out pilot schemes or providing evidence to support such a radical change. 3. Local volunteer organisation e.g Focus 12 are already losing grants for next year Why? These and other charities have a proven track record and save a great deal of money (e.g for NHS, Social services, police) Why are they losing grants so early in the process when the council say they want to enable local communities? 4. The costs of transferring services is likely to be far higher than anticipated e.g. staff redundancy, legal costs, planning. Last week it was revealed that the civil service bill for agency staff had risen by 65% as a result of a drive to make paper savings in headcounts. The same pattern of cost and deskilling is likely to develop in the future in Suffolk.</p>
11/20/2010 18:25:29	<p>1. SCC may enter into contracts with providers that may fail to meet future requirements. As a result SCC may have to buy into extra provision which may not be as cost effective or buy out of the contract with increased expense for little gain. 2. Should SCC make a decision now, what provision will there be for a change in direction following changes to budgets or political will in the council or nationally? How would the current council cabinet feel if they obtained control of the council to find that they couldn't change anything as contracts signed by the previous administration were still running and would be expensive to remove. 3. Surely SCC should be able to run efficiently and be able to provide these wonderful and cost effective services other sectors are able to provide. If a private company can run a service and make a profit SCC should set the aim of the council providing a better service with no profit. 4. History is littered with many examples of public contracts where the government has entered into contracts only to find that it didn't have the expertise to spot problems that its private sector counterparts had created.</p>
11/09/2010 20:52	<p>1. Apart from saying we, and the country is in a mess, ( and it is not clear where this statement really comes from) NSD has not been fully costed, and I do not believe there is a clear case that this new approach will save money. I appreciate you believe SCC should be more risk adverse, but this is too large a gamble, without more fully understanding the risk. In my opinion this proposal should go no further until more work is done to understand better what this means. At the moment this is a political theological vision, rather than a clearly established financial business case. Some aspects I am particularly concerned about are set out below. 2.Services will not, cannot, be delivered locally to the same standard by this method across Suffolk. Some residents will lose out, even though all will still be paying their council tax. 3. It may start out OK, but in time, this approach of a mixture of divested services will be impossible to manage. There will be no clear accountability, or independent scrutiny of service delivery. Community run services sound very of the moment, but I live in an area where there is a 'community hall' run by local people. These people only really want the hall used by themselves, or a select few. Though I can see the site from my back garden, I have never been allowed to use the facilities, unless I want to use it for the things the 'local organisers' v</p>
10/31/2010 15:22:57	<p>1. Lack of in-house competence in putting in place the contracts required to initially define and secure the services required. This includes the ability to adequately define change management processes and controls against initial contract scope. Changes downstream have a habit of incurring heavy penalties. 2. Lack of in-life contract management skills within the remnants of the council organisation (post the change) to ensure that efficient contract management &amp; monitoring takes place and remedial actions are put in place as required when service failures or shortcomings are observed. 3. That local organisations will be usurped by larger national providers in the tendering process leading to lack of local focus in service delivery.</p>
11/16/2010 12:05:40	<p>1. not having the resource in the community to take on the divested services. 2. not having the expertise in the "leaner" council to manage divested services at arms length. 3. the primary driver for this change is to save money, rather than improve service delivery, so the focus is on the budget bottom line and not on the service - if it were not budget-biased then SCC would have implemented an effective version of this process three years ago as part of Securing the Future. 4. SCC is not fully capitalising on the opportunity to work collaboratively and share resources with other local agencies.</p>
11/24/2010 16:54:36	<p>1. The Council expects voluntary organisations and communities to deliver services on the cheap or for free. First, this is unrealistic and voluntary sector organisations must charge rates at full cost recovery or the council will, in effect, be taking money from the sector. Secondly, while some organisations may well have the expertise to manage contracts, this process is likely to have TUPE implications, meaning that the voluntary organisations would have to honour current salary, terms and conditions and pension rights. The latter on its own will be a huge disincentive to bid to deliver services. This may be avoided with break in service and "restructuring" but the result is likely to be a loss of experienced staff and a consequent drop in quality of services. Thirdly, the Council will have to find new people and the associated costs to provide a new level of skills required to procure and contract manage efficiently and effectively, with full risk management, contract</p>
10/31/2010 19:52:27	<p>compliance and audit requirements to be able to demonstrate that quality assurance and value for money are being achieved. Staff formerly focussed for years on delivery are unlikely to have these</p>

- 11/22/2010 12:32:24 1. The process has started already in a haphazard and unplanned way with some early redundancies and job changes without an overall strategic direction 2. I resent most strongly my council tax being used to fund private profit-making concerns delivering what are public services. 3. We all know from past experience that many private firms do not deliver services more cheaply and often not as effectively. Their motive is profit. The costs of the CSD partnership are a good case in point. 4. It is a nonsense to suggest the community and voluntary sector has the capacity to deliver the level of services SCC are proposing within the timescale 5. If the voluntary sector do take over the full delivery of a particular service, their role changes. They can no longer advocate in the same way as before if they are solely responsible for the planning and provision of their service. This will lose a valuable device for checks and balances. 6. With the haphazard loss of staff within SCC, it is hard to see how the organisation can retain the right sort of expertise for the very specialist role of commissioning, overseeing tendering and scrutinising services put out to a myriad of providers.
- 11/03/2010 19:37 1. This is not a 'Strategic Direction' but an auction of Council services that will affect the most vulnerable and needy in our County. 2. Divesting services to all and sundry, with massive job losses at the Council, will take huge amounts of money out of the local economy. Our economic base has no depth. Manufacturing and engineering have all but disappeared to be replaced by white collar jobs that can easily be exported. The public sector is a major employer and your proposal to privatise/outsourcise services will hit the economy hard.
- 11/05/2010 11:57 1. What criteria will be used by SCC in deciding which services stay in house and which will be delivered by charities, social enterprises etc? 2. Your publicity, New strategic Direction Explained, only uses positive illustrations, for obvious reasons! What percentage of creative solution initiatives fail within 2 or three years? Would the public accept a failure rate above 10 or 15%?
- 10/30/2010 08:56:30 a bout the money suffolk council pu into buzabout drivers sitting at home for 4to5 hours no calls and get paid
- 10/30/2010 21:45:14 A complete breakdown of social care in Suffolk. An abandonment of all environmental issues. In fact Suffolk CC has by this policy shown a complete farce -for small council such as ours we cannot on our own provide any services for which council will be seeking to disperse (? dump). If pursued we will just lose services therefore. We could only avoid this by forming a consortium of sufficient size to handle these services. We do already have such consortia- District/County councils. Why change?
- 11/19/2010 12:28:41 A reliance on the private sector to provide services will inevitably end up with cost being the prime motivator, rather than altruism. Whilst it will undoubtedly save money it will be to the detriment of the level of service. As a public sector worker myself I am motivated by ideological reasons and a shift to the private sector will dissipate the good will and morale that I know from first hand experience the vast majority of public sector workers have. It is a shame therefore (but perhaps alas a practical reality) that saving money in the short term has been placed ahead of the long term interests of the residents of Suffolk.
- 11/01/2010 09:47 Ability of the council to provide contract performance management at a level that will actually protect service levels whilst offering an overall cost saving Ability to adequately define service levels within contracts to prevent private concerns undercutting service levels to meet cost criteria
- 11/16/2010 10:41:19 ABOSOLUTELY EVERYTHING
- 11/13/2010 15:50:41 Above all, concerned that outsourcing won't necessarily be cheaper. Concerns about redundancies. I volunteer in community learning and am concerned it will seem like a soft option - an area easy to cut.
- 11/03/2010 13:47 Accountability is my great concern. Will the Council still be accountable for services to the handicapped and the elderly when all these are farmed out to businesses? I recall exactly what happened
- 10/30/2010 16:31:56 when hospital cleaning services were given to outside contractors.
- 11/01/2010 15:11 Accountability. Moving services away from the democratic process. Who gains? How can outsourced services cost less than efficiently managed in-house services? What mandate is there for this strategy? This appears to be driven by political dogma. There seems to be an expectation that volunteers will be able to take over the role of qualified and experienced professionals in some cases. There is a huge assumption that the public do not like the way local authority services are currently delivered when there appears to be no evidence for this. Although more services will be outsourced to voluntary and community organisations because this is regarded as a cheaper source of manpower - volunteers and funding are still required. Volunteers do not come completely "free of charge" and there are also costs involved for coordinating and administering duties to volunteers as well as covering any expenses incurred. At present, the volunteers we have are stretched and acquiring new volunteers is becoming more difficult.
- 11/11/2010 13:53 An amoral, incoherent set of statements masquerading as a political policy, driven by chief officers and senior politicians whose true intentions are the dismantling of the public sector
- 11/01/2010 12:39 An assumption that there is adequate volunteer capacity to undertake delegated tasks. Who will line manage and support the volunteers and make up for shortfalls if there are insufficient volunteers to cover the roles? Not sure how this will work when people are taken up with other duties e.g busy looking after children / out working all day and caring responsibilities.
- 11/17/2010 20:44:57 Apparent lack of clarity about how the proposals will be moved from the strategic/ conceptual level to the implementation level Sustainability of any changes over time (including quality control)
- 11/25/2010 10:21:28 Management of the transitional period -avoiding deterioration of essential services during this period Ability of the Council (as a large organisation) to bring about the fundamental cultural change needed to make the new direction work
- As a Manager of a Branch Library, I am concerned that the representation of any interested governing groups may not be fully inclusive to all members of the local community, as is currently the case with SCC. I am also concerned that my ever increasing workload will spiral out of control, as being a part-time library manager, I am only contracted for 27.25 hours per week, and I envisage having to attend meetings with the new Governing bodies on some evenings. I am extremely worried about the security of my pension, as I have only been in the LGPS since 2001. I like the security of the County Council, and do not want to be "Bullied" by local groups wishing to have their say, to the detriment of any other groups, ages, etc within the community. I am proud to be representing a Socially Inclusive organisation, and am concerned that this might not be the case in the future. I am concerned that a future Redundancy would leave me in a less beneficial position financially.
- 11/03/2010 11:57

As part of the voluntary and community sector I am slightly apprehensive about how we can expect so many people to volunteer, when the motivation for volunteering currently is to help get into a job, yet unemployment will be going up and more services will be involving unpaid staff, so where will these jobs be that volunteers are aiming to get into? Volunteering is by nature something people can stop and start as and when they wish. It worries me that if we are fully reliant on volunteers, things may just not get done. Just because it is called the voluntary sector it does not mean it is 'Free Labour', and those that allocate the money need to remember this. Some in the community will do a lot and some will do nothing, how can this be made fair?

11/04/2010 16:19 As someone involved with church life in Bury St Edmunds and the surrounding area, I know only too well the difficulties of relying on volunteers. I am concerned that instead of services being reliably delivered by people who are paid to do so, they will depend on a variable and finite pool of voluntary help. This has serious implications for the more vulnerable in our society, especially as there are few sanctions where volunteers are concerned. There is also a huge cost implication, as volunteers will need training. Since charitable organizations are also feeling the pinch of Government cuts, it seems rather illogical to ease pressure on one cash-strapped body by utilizing another.

11/18/2010 11:27:58  
11/18/2010 23:54:20 b

11/15/2010 17:40:09 Because I am a full-time carer I will not be able to participate. However, from volunteering before I did notice that the same people were always the ones that volunteered. If this pattern continues will these people spread themselves so thinly that they either give-up, leave or the project they are engaged in will fold?

11/22/2010 10:01:39 being buried under concrete! The excessive contribution being made by SCC to global warming! the promised regeneration we get now which turns out to be redevelopment to profit developers! Cannot see that handing over to private operators saves money, they must make a profit. Will quality of service suffer or will you have to employ an army of client officers and managers to monitor the contracts.

11/12/2010 12:39 Capability of County Council officers and systems to carry out this task in the most effective way Capability and intent of the County to engage fully with the VCS at a stage where their 'intelligence', expertise, knowledge, community links and understanding can help the County get it right. Pressure on statutory budgets will squeeze out funding to non statutory clients i.e marginalised, vulnerable especially single homeless people.

11/11/2010 15:43 Care for vulnerable adults, both in care homes and at home. Lack of volunteers with time and skill and commitment to take on 'volunteer' roles. Ridiculous salary of chief exec and senior staff.

10/31/2010 20:51:43 Cherry picking of clients by private companies.

11/08/2010 18:40 closing lehmann house wicker market suffolk

11/15/2010 18:51:32 Closure farming out of essential services particularly old peoples homes and libraries.

11/05/2010 19:22 Concerned that short term knee jerk cuts will result in unforeseen difficulties in long term

11/16/2010 14:44:37 -Concerned that this is a waste of time as our opinions are not being heard. -Young People have asked when they will receive letters explaining why their youth clubs are being closed and when - and why have they not been asked for their views. -Staff w

11/12/2010 13:51 Contract out models = where you contract out to private enterprise conflict arises between quality of provision and cost management. In addition to the above, no private enterprise will be able to maintain 'equality of access' as all free universal entitlement to services slowly erode - this will put the lower paid, less educated and less mentally or physically able, including the very young and old, at risk of being unable to access services. Whilst acknowledging something has to be done regarding fiscal control and it is obvious the Government is incapable of doing anything worthwhile - there is no way of masking, whatever you call the model, that redundancies will take place - Looking at the Stagnant Finance Model of fiscal management - the vast unemployed and unsupported will no longer access any services as charges for service will exclude them - this could be considered when looking at - rubbish collection, library, adult education, health or young peoples services - children's centres service a large number of underprivileged/economically and educationally challenged families, any privatisation would most certainly result in charge for services which are

11/22/2010 12:59:07 Core public services eradicated, from crossing patrols to Convalescent homes for the elderly. Major Unemployment rises & poverty - as prices & VAT rise. Class divisions widen

11/18/2010 18:18:50 Cut excessive salary to top Executives on Suffolk County Council by 75%, better still sack her!! Remove all free bus passes and replace with half price travel, and I AM a user!

11/01/2010 08:25 cvzav

11/05/2010 15:04 Diversification is not always seen as positive. Services may be open to even more corruption Accountability and openness of service providers What is the back up if the 'communities' don't come forward? How much support is available to establish community projects?

11/21/2010 20:09:15 Divestment = privatisation. Services for the people of Suffolk should be provided by the County Council in an accountable and transparent way, and not by individuals or companies motivated mainly by profit.

11/19/2010 10:31:09 Examples given are for the disadvantaged and although I can understand that these might be considered the easiest to obtain volunteers for. What other directions have the council considered to ease the burden on the ratepayers because as I see it whatever happens it will require extra money from the ratepayer for less services. I think this will mean that front line services such as road and transport, environmental services, educational especially repairs and cleanliness of schools, policing and fire services. Bureaucracy will increase if the council has to watch over voluntary organisations.

11/01/2010 18:19 External businesses will want to make a profit from services supplies. They are not necessarily more efficient than current delivery thus we will have a worse service or the working conditions of staff transferred will decline. This is ideology over-riding what's best for the taxpayer. Management of any external contracts is vital as is their construction. What expertise is there to do this? Also non delivery of an efficient service takes ages to prove so that contracts can be cancelled. If cancelled what chance is there of another supplier immediately available to take over. Also it is living in cloud cuckoo land to think that there is a large supply of volunteers to deliver services. Volunteers will give a certain amount of time but not in a regimented fashion so that there can be constant delivery of a service.

10/31/2010 16:03:02 Failure by SCC Managers to oversee new providers of services effectively. I have concerns about outsourcing certain services which are vital to the community, especially those provided to deprived communities across Suffolk. My concerns are compounded by the recent result of NHS Suffolk outsourcing 'after hours' GP services which have caused many problems for users.

First of all, this questionnaire doesn't make sense if you answer it on behalf of an organisation - so I answer it as an individual. My concerns are: large-scale redundancies, including my own (I work for a charity that is fully funded by SCC); piecemeal services; what about services to people that volunteers can't or won't help e.g. my sister who is a paranoid schizophrenic and who 'cares' for our elderly mother with Parkinsons; who is going to support me as a family carer if Suffolk Family Carers gets cut? replacing trained, supervised and experienced staff with amateurs who may not be able to give a long-term commitment; running front-line services with amateur but well-meaning volunteers - lack of quality control and accountability. I presume any paid staff will be higher up the food chain.

11/19/2010 17:05:19

11/22/2010 11:51:22 Flexibility of contracts to respond to changing circumstances Accountability hidden costs

11/19/2010 14:32:51 h

11/03/2010 09:45 Having been involved with LG for 20 years (now retired) I have seen very little gain from privatisation or outsourcing in the long term. Whilst there is a short term gain sometimes services have to be taken back inhouse (as I suspect the CSD contract would have been if there were sufficient get-out clauses) because the expected long term benefits and savings have not materialised. Far better to bite the bullet and reorganise inhouse to get the cost savings where you are fully in charge of the processes.

11/19/2010 16:11:39 Having read the consultation document, it comes across like a report by a first year student on a Business Studies degree course to whom I would provide the following feedback - lots of interesting ideas but where is the evidence that it will work. I found the case studies interesting in themselves but not in any way convincing that the the proposed changes can be implemented on the scale envisaged. A major fear is that the services will be taken over by large private sector companies who have no understanding of, or commitment to, local communities. Having worked in the charity sector, I do not believe they have the infrastructure and particularly the management skills to take on major areas of service. Frankly, it seems far-fetched that the proposed changes can be implemented in the timescales envisaged. There need to be carefully designed pilot projects which then need to be evaluated. Different approaches need to be explored and trialled. THERE IS NO IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Also, there is no evidence that SCC has the skills and expertise to take on the commissioning and monitoring role envisaged. The plan is frightening in its naivety. Highly paid managers will be sacking underpaid workers while ensuring their own futures are safe. There are opportunities for cost savings by reducing the layers of management. You could save a fortune by ending the chasing of stupid targets and layers of beaurocracy which checks the targets are met. It is hard to take a lecture on cost saving from a Council leader who is paid over

11/03/2010 07:42 £225,000 a year.

11/01/2010 16:34 How delicate services including child and adult social care can be the work of non public bodies that are accountable to boards, trusts, or possibly shareholders - rather than councillors. How smaller organisations each operating independently will really reduce overhead costs? That the major structural changes of the way the county provides services has not been subject to in-depth democratic discussion. The governing party on the council has no direct or even implicit mandate for such wholesale changes to the organisation of its services. How profit making is squared with effective regulatory work: child protection requirements: voluntary organisations are already required to complete a wide range of, I'm sure in many cases, necessary paperwork. If this is 'outsourced' to a private firm (or possibly a 'social enterprise') a) how will a separate organisation be held to account for any failing/shortcoming? b) how will the personal relationships of SCC staff with leaders and coordinators of voluntary activities be maintained? c) will the already large burden of compliance with child protection/safeguarding work be added to by costs for CRB check, processing

11/01/2010 14:32 How is this going to work? How long will it take to make these changes? How can you be sure that there will be people and organisations to take these roles over from the council? And what happens if no-one can be found to takeover a role?

11/11/2010 12:17 How savings can be made and services maintained Yes there are good voluntary sector organisations out there that could provide good services but:- There needs to be a simple and transparent system to make sure commissioning is fair. If you are going to expect the same level of compliance with "bureaucracy and red tape" then these organisations will not be able to offer cost savings as they will have high overheads that will need to be covered. How are you going to manage quality

11/17/2010 20:55:14 How the quality of provision will be maintained when services are divested. What will happen if a 'social enterprise' providing services fails. Why are frontline delivery services being cut rather than 'back office' functions. What responsibility an 'enabling authority' will have to ensure services are delivered. This seems an change in ideology rather than a means of making savings. Significant amount of savings frontloaded into year one rather than staged over 4 years.

11/01/2010 10:06 I am concerned that services that might be vital to a few but not necessarily be cost effective will be cut. Local library buses, grants for rural transport, grants to rural leisure centres, home care and meals on wheels etc. I am concerned that there is not clear information about what is going and what will stay and that the general public are unaware of what changes are proposed

11/11/2010 15:14 I am concerned about the councils knowledge of what is available in the County they seem only able to comment on their own initiatives as social enterprises who have had masses of funding put into them. I am concerned with charities and social enterprises in other areas of disability that are better value than the Councils own brand but will inevitably go to the wall as funding decreases, personalisation is being pushed in at a phenomenal rate without the training given to the professional care co-ordinators resulting in services being refused to service users. I am concerned that the large national charities will be favoured by the council in this process and small charities will suffer/close down I am concerned that the service user will not have freedom of choice because there will be nothing to choose from

11/19/2010 17:26:53 I am concerned in the longer term about how the proposed system will work. It seems likely to me that you may get some bidders to take on some of the services and I know that there are private sector organisations around who could step in with a basic service straight away. There may also be groups of appropriately trained and experienced professionals around to carry on the services for now. My concern with this is about what will happen when this cohort of professionals has retired or moved on. Who will pay for the training and qualification of their successors. My next concern is about these private sector businesses taking their profit out of any 'waste' that is in the system at present. I do not believe that the services have been so badly run by the County Council to date that a reasonable profit can be taken out and still leave enough for services to be maintained and developed. They will have to be run more cheaply, cut costs and pay their staff less. Lastly, having served on the Boards of three Suffolk-wide charities over the past fifteen or so years (as Treasurer, Chair and Vice-Chair respectively) I believe that to suggest there is a reservoir of good

11/13/2010 10:37:54 I am concerned that existing services that are needed will disappear or become something people have to pay for and therefore will not be able to use. If it is no longer used it will be deemed unnecessary and dropped. New services that are required will not get up and running because you are either reliant on volunteers or money making enterprises. Standard services will be costed out of the range of most people and will only be accessible by the well off. Just like the NHSS when you need an op.

- I am concerned that the Council may dump public services on to poorly organised and poorly lead private organisations who will not be able to run at a profit and will therefore fail to provide adequate services. I am concerned that the Council is trying to divest itself of the duty to care for our most vulnerable and needy citizens. Private care and private services can be excellent, but they can also be very poor. It will be hard to pick up poor service until it has already happened. In some cases the poor service will not be picked up at all because it will be covered up by providers nervous about losing their jobs. I am concerned that Suffolk County Council is trying to cut services without first trimming its own top heavy bureaucracy. For example I have seen the services of the Horringer school road crossing attendant withdrawn while the Suffolk County Council chief executive is said to be paid more than the Prime Minister.
- 11/18/2010 21:05:11 I am concerned that the organisations who come forward to run divested services will be interested in making a profit and not maintaining or developing services for the benefit of members of the public. I am worried that some may start with good intentions and then fail, others may be attracted by the grant and considering the short time scale that the Council want to get things rolling proper checks or measures to explore different ways forward will not be explored.
- 11/08/2010 11:47 I am concerned that this in effect means there will be no public sector. I don't want everything privatised out (despite the rhetoric, it does seem that divestment is just a spin word for privatisation). I think this will badly affect the people of Suffolk, and the most vulnerable will inevitably be hit the hardest, as they rely most on public services. I think this is not being factored properly into SCC processes, and will result in greater inequality. It makes Suffolk a worse place to live and work, which is surely the opposite of your duty to the community. I think this is an experiment of the worst kind, where the people will suffer. Other councils are not doing it; ergo it is not necessary. The voluntary sector, who have also suffered cuts, will not be able to pick up the slack. I am really concerned about residential homes shutting; also about proposals to have less street lighting. This will encourage crime and we will end up living in fear in our homes. From my knowledge of council employees, it also seems that the structures remaining are top-heavy: i.e., managers are protecting themselves and getting rid of the front-line staff.
- 11/02/2010 13:12 I am concerned that this is supposed to be about local government. Local government is supposed to mean local services for local people run by local people. I don't see how awarding contracts to Crime Prevention Initiative, based on the south coast and to Open Road based in Essex complies with local government. Council staff lose their jobs and respected local charities close if this is a taste of what is to come. Basically services are being sold off to the lowest bidder.
- 11/16/2010 17:44:49 I am concerned that too much reliance is placed on volunteering. If there is an expectation that volunteers will provide essential services the whole concept of volunteering loses its meaning. A person volunteers because they want to, not because there is an expectation that they will do so. Essential services should not rely on volunteers even if volunteers can play a very important role.
- 11/05/2010 21:30 Volunteering is voluntary, to be initiated by the individual and not by some coalition government.
- I am concerned that you have adopted this new strategy without fully considering how you could make savings within the organisation. Suffolk County Council comes across to me as a very free spending and wasteful authority. I appreciate that you have to make large savings but your reaction to this seems excessive. I am sure you could make major savings by cutting out waste and stop doing the things that are not necessary.
- 11/18/2010 15:38:05 I am extremely concerned over the time scales planned and how these are going to stick to at the same time as making it a positive well planned out move. I am also extremely concerned about community assets and voluntary organisations picking up on the work done with the most vulnerable when their funding is being cut left right and centre making them vulnerable themselves and their future uncertain. I am uncertain that the review work happening with those receiving SCC dayservice to enable them to have an individual budget is being complete to the standard it should be, involving everyone it needs to to make it person centred rather than task orientated.
- 11/01/2010 14:51 I am on the management committee of three Village Hall/ Community Centres and I am confident that we will all be happy to take more responsibility I don't think we should have any concerns. I doubt that the use of volunteers will be able to cover many of the services that you are trying to devolve. My experience is that it's the same few people in any community who come forward to get involved. If they are already very busy they are unlikely to want to take on further responsibilities and especially not for little or no pay. There is also the difficulty already experienced with many communities of finding people to replace those who have been running things like village halls, churches and Parish Councils
- 11/01/2010 20:47 I feel that some services may not be offered as well as they were before using new organisations to run them, such as youth clubs. I also feel that these new organisations will charge more for the new service when perhaps before it was free. This is a major concern of mine towards youth clubs which aren't financially viable business opportunities meaning that they will charge a much higher price for young people to use them. Money which young people don't have.
- 11/09/2010 11:37 I find it very difficult to take an informed view on the NSD without even outline details of a business and action plan or timetable, and with no costing information. Equally important is detail on the strategy for recruiting and managing volunteers and ensuring accountability, none of which is discussed in the document. I am concerned that local SCC staff seem equally uninformed, including about their futures. A further, but key, concern is about the dangers of fragmenting successful countywide services and producing a patchwork quilt of provision.
- 11/18/2010 11:29:14 I have concerns around the protection and safeguarding of the most vulnerable. As an authority no clear and accountable plan has been drawn up to demonstrate how the council will make sure that the most vulnerable in our society will have the service they receive checked and maintained. There must be very very strict and clear contracts drawn up, which are public, open and transparent, with annual reporting and independent verification. And the council must have an "emergency" button available to step in and take over within hours when/if things start going wrong. The council is talking about delivery of less services, and yet it is not talking about passing on any of these savings to the public. Where services stop this money should be rightly returned to the taxpayer. And where care homes are divested... no elderly resident should suffer ANY stress, ANY discomfort, ANY loss in service level, AND receive one on one council support for 12 months once placed in a new home to ensure that their quality of care is maintained at the level previously experienced.
- 11/01/2010 16:13 I have many concerns The vast amount of lower paid staff who will be out of work Top paid staff will be unaffected Andrea Hill for one Suffolk County Council has many new buildings what will become of them Community based centres such as libraries which are an important part of many peoples lives will be greatly affected. Care home will suffer A large part of the population i.e. those with disabilities will be "lost" THIS IS A HUGE MISTAKE AND ONCE DONE WILL NEVER BE PUT BACK TOGETHER AGAIN. THINK ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE DOING TO OUR SOCIETY, AND WHAT IS LEFT OF IT.
- 11/10/2010 09:29

- I have no concerns about the strategic intent behind NSD - in fact I wholeheartedly welcome it as a major opportunity to redefine the relationship between local government and communities. My concerns are rather that the opportunity is not fully capitalised upon. In my view it is vital that NSD does not become obscured by, or confused with, a simplistic approach to 'outsourcing' or 'commissioning'. The company I run from Suffolk specialises in approaches to public sector 'value management', and in our experience, both of these traditional, monetary/procurement-driven processes have failed in practice to deliver much in the way of value for communities. They may have resulted in services being delivered more cheaply, but the opportunity with NSD is go far beyond just delivering the same stuff for less money, and to fully harness the latent desires that many people have in our county to engage with public service delivery in an innovative and creative way. Many of these people and groups have become very alienated by the 'target and cost-driven/ service provider knows best' approach which has prevailed in governments of all flavours for many years.
- 11/05/2010 18:17 I have no concerns.
- 11/02/2010 21:58 I live in a rural part of Suffolk with two teenage children. We already have reduced services and with the new strategic direction we probably won't have any services.
- 11/13/2010 17:40:45 I pay taxes to have services provided by a democratic county council, not a county council that contracts services out to companies based anywhere in the country. I am concerned that a lot of jobs are being put at risk by the proposed divestment, when a lot of services are run very successfully by hard working local people at the moment. I am also concerned that you expect people to volunteer to do things such as running local libraries - this is unrealistic and it is belittling to staff who already do these jobs - it suggests that the work that they do is not important. I think it is criminal and irresponsible to sub-contract services such as social services and privatisation of care homes. We need local services that are run locally, by people who know the area and the people that they are dealing with - council staff such as social workers, creche workers and retirement home workers know the people that they are dealing with very well, having built up relationships that work very well - it is immoral to get rid of these just to cut costs.
- 11/16/2010 21:04:39 I personally do not believe that today's society is capable of the "Big Society" attitude, when we live in a communities that 9 times out of 10 they don't even know their neighbours names - how on earth are these people expected to come together and take on local projects e.g libraries etc., to ensure that particular services are not lost to that community. In the recent Councillors response to the EADT it talks about the work of SAVO and it will be encouraging the volunteering community to become more involved - how are they supposed to do that when their funding is being cut. Another issue is Stress - it is already commonly known that stress is the biggest reason that people have of sick from work, especially in Local Government. How are people who already live extremely busy lives with family, caring responsibilities, volunteering, work responsibilities - how much are these people able to give without major health issues such as Stress/Depression becoming a factor? The Divestment of services is extremely worrying, is this privatisation or is it merely a project to make it look like SCC has reduced in size, employee's, office space etc.,. If privatisation is I see the County Council as being a service provider for the residents and business community of Suffolk. I'm especially concerned about the effects these changes will have on those the people who find it difficult to speak up for themselves, the most vulnerable in our community. I have an elderly relative who suffers from dementia who is not eligible for County Council help because he has savings over the financial threshold. He lives at home with his wife of over 40 years, both held down professional jobs before they retired and continue to pay Council Tax. The systems of communication with the County Council and CSD have been complex and confusing for them and this is only with one partner agency. I am aware that CSD is a contact point for social care from the County Council and yet letters sent about my relatives care come with the County Council logo emblazoned on the letterhead including a contact name from the County Council. Yet it is CSD and contacts within CSD who deal with my relative's social care, not the County Council. It takes my relatives over an hour to get through to CSD by phone and each time they speak to a different person.
- 11/04/2010 14:27 I share concerns with other organisations that we need to encourage so many more people to engage in voluntary work. Getting volunteer workers and people to help others has never been more difficult as more are at work, watching expensive entertainment centres and trying to work out how computers function. We need to develop new ways of encouraging community.
- 11/19/2010 12:12:13 I think capacity and fallback strategies are my major concerns. There may be some services that may not be attractive to charitable or commercial enterprises? What fallback strategy might be put in place if this is the case?
- 11/05/2010 20:25 I think the Councils approach is a JOKE, and you are making Suffolk the laughing stock of the whole country. The council should run services directly, granted some services are not needed, such as excessive teaching assistants, countryside services, culture and the woolly type of jobs. but highways/ trading standards/ libs/ social services/ waste should be under direct control of the Council. you should also not close any council care homes
- 11/04/2010 19:25 I think with funding being reduced, there could be a danger that organisations will have limited resources to be able to recruit and train volunteers appropriately. It is also a concern that too much will be put on the shoulders of volunteers, which could then possibly drive them away.
- 11/11/2010 14:18 I understand the comments about activities having "large overheads" but you don't seem to consider "economies of scale". Will effort and activity become fragmented and inefficient?
- 11/14/2010 19:04:52 I understood the presentation of the ideals, but fail to see, how you can actually interpret what you are sharing with us into a workable model. I can not see any evidence (other than the need to save money) which supports the option of divesting many of the services into the community. You were unable to inform the meeting what volunteer base you would be working with and show if the volunteer sector would be able to absorb the extra commitment that would be required. You need to start making the savings from day one and yet it is going to take months for communities to understand this new concept and probably even longer before they decide they need to be engaged or that they have time to be engaged. You were unable to guide how the new cabinet of County Councillors would be comprised. They act as spokes people for the residents and any reduction in these numbers would be a negative step.
- 11/04/2010 11:01 I would like the County Council as a democratically elected authority to provide public services in an accountable and transparent way. I would like to pay my council tax and get professionals to run the service; not volunteers, who I think are a good supplement but not a replacement. I think this new Strategic Direction is a way of selling off our valued public services. I am saddened at the thought that we will never be able to get them back, once they are gone. I have not seen any concrete plans for how "divestment" will work, and what support is being given to private companies to run it. I also cannot work out how divestment differs from privatisation - albeit to Suffolk companies and people. Re. the previous question about whether I understand the policy: I understand the words but they are void of meaning, as they are in management-speak and do not say what exactly it means. I appreciate that it is a strategy/roadmap but it is not clear what the impact will be on people's lives.
- 11/17/2010 13:41:13 I'm a school governor and I find the council services to schools to be largely efficient and professionally delivered. It will be less efficient for the school to get new contractors for these services.
- 11/08/2010 10:48

- I'm appalled that the council is even considering this. It's an experiment that could go badly wrong and would be very expensive to put right. The suggestion that it will put Suffolk people more in control of their lives is nonsense. I'm quite happy to remain in control of my life, thank you. I expect the council to retain control of our services, as we've elected them to do, not to delegate them all to unelected, unaccountable contractors and voluntary organisations. Having worked with volunteers for years, I don't share the rosy view of their capabilities as set out by the supporters of this plan. Volunteers can be hard-working and conscientious, but they can also be unreliable and incompetent. As for contractors; the evidence is that they don't necessarily save money because they expect to make a profit (at our expense), but their competitive tender may leave them with so little wriggle room that any unforeseen problem may force them to quit or go out of business. When it comes to sensitive areas like care for the elderly and children's services, I want professional council staff in charge. And how is it that Essex County Council is actually increasing its library service, while
- 11/02/2010 01:03
- 11/10/2010 09:38 Impact on the voluntary sector: more being asked of it when its resources are already fully stretched. Impact on vulnerable individuals who may fall between widening cracks in service provision. Important necessary public services are being handed to the private sector to raid them for profits, which is the primary concern for every private business. The public services should be run/owned by the community and county council. This is not progress it is a movement back to the victoria era. The best interests of Suffolks tax payers are not taken into account. This is purely a cut and slash project that is not required as there are many alternatives for central government to make.
- 11/15/2010 22:17:39 In the absence of any other large employers in the area, I am concerned that front line services are to be cut again resulting in loss of work for many individuals on low wages. I am also concerned that contracts placed with private companies will result in lower standards as they will almost certainly be under tendering for contracts and will be unable to deliver. In addition, public tax money will also then be spent on feathering the nests of private owners of these companies as they are bound to attempt to profit by cutting standards. If anything, I feel the council should attempt to increase front line services while at the same time cutting down on supervisory staff and overpaid leaders. I feel it unfair and unlikely that Volunteer agencies should be expected to fill envisaged voids in public service provision.
- 11/13/2010 17:25:09
- 11/08/2010 11:38 In your reply to the EADT you said that you were seeking the views of the people of Suffolk I have seen no evidence of this, no information has come through my door, no-one has stopped me in the street, I have received no information about NSD except through my work at SCC and this is all one way communication. When will the people of Suffolk actually be asked their views?
- 11/03/2010 17:49 Inappropriately long outsource contracts always lead to "tail wagging the dog" and supplier eventually dictates policy Lack of consultation (e.g. Â£680k "grant" to Suffolk Circle in May without consulatation with Districts)
- 11/09/2010 19:33 It is too rushed, and too little liaison with communities, third sector. It is too top down and authority driven. Too much about Coalition Government agenda and not enough about local priorities. It is very painful to cut services by 30% and make so Suffolk people redundant in order to save money in this economic depression. In addition you are launching a divestment programme and I wonder how you think such a poor market is going to respond to the prospect of running ex-council services? In the past the council has talked about economies of scale but NSD seems to be about very small enterprises doing their own thing so I am not sure how that is going to save money or provide better services more cheaply. I would like to know more about the council's track record in managing large and small outsourced contracts, more about the new role of elected members in relation to the provision of council services and I would like to know where programmes similar to NSD have been attempted before - I am told New Zealand tried it and it was not very successful but I don't know why and what makes Suffolk different? Also your documents talk about keeping services small and local but we used to have lots of small local services which were amalgamated and made bigger to cut costs and do more with less, so I am confused. Why is Suffolk the only
- 11/16/2010 22:21:43
- 11/03/2010 13:25 It never worked when in the USA the way it was meant to.
- 11/13/2010 18:26:47 it seems like the council wants to cut back on thier responsabilitys to the public to make sure they can keep up with there own pensions and perks
- 11/21/2010 14:01:43 It seems that the focus is on services that are orientated towards those who are disadvantaged in one way or another. Such services, one is led to believe, are already stretched, and already use significant volunteer support. Why not look to a service area where the thriving, capable majority would notice its absence if it were reduced or removed. It might save more money, and it might give those with less 'volunteer' experience the motivation to participate.
- 11/18/2010 00:20:18 It seems to be a way of handing responsibilities over to various bodies without necessarily the funding or support. Is there sufficient funding to set these up and monitor them? It must be understood that responsibility can never be delegated. t would be too easy to blame these new organisations for failure of delivery of a service.
- 11/17/2010 18:11:26 It's all very broad outline stuff at present. Communities don't have pools of waiting volunteers to do stuff. SCC has had to go as far as Australia to look for examples!
- 10/30/2010 18:23:45 Lack of accountability. Lower levels of service as a result of the drive for profit by private companies. Exploitation of volunteer groups.
- 11/18/2010 23:25:44 Lack of auditing and regulation resulting in the decrease in the standard of the provision due to over competition. Loss of Suffolk Youth and the connexions service
- 10/30/2010 09:35:39 Lack of control and accountability for the way services are run It is an experiment - whilst someone has to pioneer new ideas, it seems to me that users of council services will be guinea pigs and this concerns me. The council seems to get a lot wrong these days, particularly in the eyes of the public, I am concerned that the council will probably mess it up. With all the schemes to involve the private sector in public services, they generally, in my eyes seem to end up a raw deal longer term for the end user, costing the public more money and decreasing the quality of public services. There has been no consultation on this up to now with the public, Suffolk County Council feels like an incompetent dictatorship. I feel sure that this consultation is just a formality and if the result isn't what the council hoped for, will be ignored. I think that the council should improve itself and its perception by the public before beginning such an ambitious and controversial scheme. In my opinion the deserved, negative perception of the council at present means that the public will never give the council it's backing for these changes and they will always be greeted negatively. Ultimately
- 11/11/2010 15:31 Lack of funding of charities, voluntry groups and communities To much expectation being put on the above to deliver services Mass unemployment as the cuts bite Unable to recover after the cuts without lots of costs Could take upto 10 years
- 11/16/2010 17:01:39 Lack of strategic co-ordination, reduction in quality and accountability of services, loss of knowledgeable and quality staff
- 11/16/2010 18:28:17 Lack of volunteers to carry out all these delegated tasks. Its bad enough now obtaining help within villages or in many cases obtaining Parish Councillors. Lack of time for Clerks with their contracted hours.
- 11/10/2010 18:26 Less and worse services, comminities paying the cost in reduced living standards.
- 11/11/2010 10:47 Libraries will be lost

Library Services: Oulton Broad library offers an excellent, efficient, friendly service in Oulton Broad, much superior to the larger one Lowestoft. It has an intimate, welcoming atmosphere and provides a social meeting place for many groups of all ages, the only such facility in that area. It would be a devastating loss if it were to be closed either by the lack of an alternative service provider or by being joined with Lowestoft and therefore being deemed a duplication of the towns library requirements.

11/04/2010 13:37 Loss of trained staff replaced by volunteers Loss of resources/services as costs are cut Damage to local area/economy if public sector jobs are lost, in this weeks free paper there were no jobs advertised save those delivering papers, betterware catalogues and advertising executives.

11/12/2010 20:06

11/10/2010 11:45 loss of valuable knowledge and skills through loss of jobs. Inefficiency through loss of skilled workers. Loss of resources for those who rely on comprehensive service. Main concern is that if these services can be delivered by 'not for profit organisations' and secure the savings we need why can't Suffolk provide these services inhouse as 'not for profit' and deliver the services and retain skilled staff. Is SCC not already 'not for profit'.

11/02/2010 18:25

11/05/2010 18:46 Management of the libraries.

10/31/2010 23:01:20 massive job losses poorer or non-existent services lack of democratic accountability

10/29/2010 12:30:30 money is always wasted in times of great change

11/04/2010 15:27 Moving too fast. Lack of consideration for charities and social enterprises that currently provide services for vulnerable adults. If these close where will vulnerable adults go

11/02/2010 14:12 My biggest concern is losing my job. We've offered a high quality service for many years in the face of cuts year on year. Now we face losing our jobs. The service we've worked for years on is just discarded as though it is of no importance. This is very demoralising.

11/13/2010 11:27:53 My concern 1 is that private enterprises need to have primarily a profit motive rather than a [public] service ethos. As a simple example, if they don't have to do something, however good for the community, but can keep the money, they will. Applying targets to private enterprises to try to control this tends to result in odd behaviour just to meet the numeric targets, not the target of the public good. Concern 2 - dividing public services between private companies leads to even more demarcation difficulties than within public services. Once again, a private company will rigidly not spend money or effort unless it contributes to its profit.

11/14/2010 14:37:33 My concern is in the ability of SCC to produce accurate and watertight specifications of what services are required. Along with other local authorities SCC has consistently demonstrated a quality of senior staff wgho, although financially over rewarded, are not in fact capable of performing at the required level that the local population deserve. Accordingly I am seriously concerned that we will end up with much upheaval, little improvement and typical local authority fudge and word games.

11/18/2010 16:05:29 My concern is that there will be job losses in the public sector which will increase the strain on services (such as housing and benefits etc etc) and so the problem of Suffolk being in debt (along with the rest of the country) will just be made worse. I'm also worried that those services who are taken over by the private sector will have less controls in place and therefore will provide a lower standard of care/service.

10/31/2010 12:33:49 My concern is that there won't be the people to take up the challenges. How would standards be set? What's quality; what's ideology?

11/11/2010 11:08 My concerns are mainly that we seem to be jumping on the big society bandwagon just as most people, even senior members of the conservative party have concluded that it is unlikely to work in practice and certainly not on the scale that SCC would like. I don't have confidence that senior officers in SCC have the necessary skill set to implement change of this magnitude. There are too also to many vested interests that undermine attempts at real change.

11/13/2010 20:02:10 My concerns are that once steps have been taken to divest services, there will be no turning back for re-uniting current joined up services such as libraries and record offices, the county council has a responsibility under the 1964 Public Libraries Act to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service, which the service is currently doing. By divesting services in an ad hoc way we are reverting to the era of parish reading rooms and mechanics institutes. As a council tax payer, I have already seen services contracted out which have resulted in increased costs rather than savings, ie Customer Service Direct. I am also concerned that if no suitable organisation or social enterprise body comes forward to take on an individual service that it will be lost forever.

11/20/2010 16:54:45 My concerns are that those who abuse their benefits will continue to find a way to completely do so and those of us who really need ours will lose what little we have or receive reduced "rates". I myself am not comfortable with receiving anything, but, as everyone else, I have to find a way to pay my rent, council tax, utility bills, etc.

11/02/2010 18:57 My concerns include:- using volunteers to do some of the smaller jobs, will they have the training, the no-how to do things with health and safety in mind? Will jobs be done properly or will people "dabble" in them and not really bother? I am a volunteer at Ipswich Hospital and work equally as hard there as I did when I worked for money, I have had training and am aware of the health and safety risks at work as a volunteer. I am also concerned with Council Tax and whether using volunteers makes a difference to what we pay. Will we pay less, or will we pay more with less professional services being provided?

11/09/2010 12:44 My concerns, as the parent/carer of a disabled child and in a low income family, are: that as there are so few of us, and that we are so widespread that it will not be viable for any organisation to help us. That what is already an unconnected maze of services will become more difficult to find and access, and that the burden of surviving as a carer will deepen as the onus on us as individuals to provide care, respite and support.

11/22/2010 11:23:29 My job prospects look far from promising working within Adult Education as I cannot see this being a priority in many local areas. Without support and funding there will be no jobs. This is hitting my confidence in the Council, my own self worth and adversely affecting my attitude towards my day to day. If nobody in Ipswich bothers with us then why should we flog our guts out trying to make things work? I have worked for SCC for 13 years and had always been proud of this fact but sadly not anymore.

11/03/2010 11:37 My main concern is how the individual bodies which take over the running of various services currently provided by SCC will achieve the economies of scale which the power of council commissioning now provides. Presumably they will be given a grant to run each individual service and will have to set up their own systems/bank accounts/utility providers etc. How can this possibly be more efficient if the current tendering process of SCC is working at optimum efficiency - if this is not the case surely it would be more cost effective to renegotiate council contracts and save money this way! I am also concerned that future development of our systems will go by the board. Again, smaller units will not have the IT capacity to develop new systems and Suffolk will soon be stuck in a time warp of outmoded procedures.



My main concern is that the often low-quality and low effectiveness of services that i am aware of have hidden behind a barrage of denial announcements. The new enterprises are therefore going to have to adopt the spin and aloof tactics of their previous culture in order to remain credible with the consumer and the public. Otherwise there will be a rebalancing of perspective, which will look like a crash, but actually it will be a reality adjustment of the stories relayed by political members and senior management.

11/17/2010 09:00:59  
11/11/2010 11:12 nklcndxkl

11/19/2010 16:32:03 No matter what you say front line services will suffer. Social capital will not solve our problems

11/01/2010 17:37 No safety net Not valuing knowledge of staff who do the job Passing work to national contractors rather than local ones Voluntary sector not having the capacity and service stopped before something acceptable is in place What happens if the divested service fails Pension protection of staff transferred

11/19/2010 10:02:31 No thought has gone into it.

11/20/2010 10:12:08 older people being forced to move from their scc homes. The scc special needs homes are second to none, what will happen to them with no or little understanding of the procedure for transferring to other accommodation all that is recognised is the people they have grown use to are not there anymore. I know this is not the only area being " look at " and only wish the scc are honest and open as can be.

11/19/2010 08:32:11 Our concerns are that services will be taken away and that staff are being made redundant in large numbers.

11/09/2010 16:43 Out-sourcing of services is simply wrong and will not save money. It will end up costing more or result in a worse service because if a profit making company takes something on, they need a profit margin (the council should be well aware of this due to the well-documented issues with CSD, but management prefers to ignore it as it would mean accepting mistakes have been made). Even if it is taken over by a not-for-profit company, it is likely that they will be smaller than the council, and therefore will not have the economies of scale savings the council does in terms of HR etc. The council needs to retain some services (like care homes) in house in order to be able to cope with a private sector failure (see Connaught in Norfolk). The idea that volunteers will take much of this on is fanciful. Perhaps in some of the very wealthy early retiree commuter wards (where most of the Cabinet live) there may be some people with time and money to spare. However, in the places where services are far more needed (Ipswich, Lowestoft), there isn't likely to be a pool of free labour.

11/05/2010 13:29 Passing services to companies will alter the context of service delivery to one of profit first. Overseeing quality delivery of services will still require resources within the council to try and rope in private companies. If private companies fail to deliver services, contract costs will still have to be met for the duration that services were not fulfilled, then further service acquisition costs will be incurred on top of the loss of service to potentially vulnerable people. Suffolk County Council heads will reap big bonuses for cutting costs where there are no real long term benefits to those paying council tax and requiring services. This is a typical Conservative mood to put power into the hands of business (i.e. rich conservatives) rather than individuals (i.e. poor council tax payers). People not being able to receive care. Have heard of somebody who's care has been taken away and cannot look after themselves. The high salaries paid to top management with the council far more than the P.M. When you outsource services these normally cost more in real terms, take the example of Connought.

11/01/2010 17:08 Possible inconsistent interest by communities and/or groups across the county which could mean that levels of service may not be at the same level in all areas of the county - whereas at present the County Council provide a consistent service throughout the county.

11/01/2010 17:56 Private sector works for profit. If they can still do it cheaper than SCC at present then SCC must be totally inefficient or why can't SCC operate to the same standards? SCC 'core' may be reduced but for monitoring/rectification of faults/complaint resolving etc there will be an increase in staff, premises, bureaucracy. Especially in the present financial climate cost will come before quality, short term before long term whereas present SCC staff have their own long term interests at heart as well as those of the public. With the devolution of powers and responsibilities to boroughs and parishes any economies of scale will be lost and there will be only a weakened central organisation to co-ordinate and monitor services.

11/04/2010 09:15 Privatisation, the ruin of our services by cuts, and the loss of democratic control over the council.

11/04/2010 10:10 Privitising (AKA divestment) does not work well - for example it did not work with the rail system - it has become very expensive and suffers from lack of investment Outsourcing was supposed to save money when it was done using the CSD service. Yet CSD costs much more than anticipated. This could easily happen again. Frontline workers do not have the time or resources to know the intricacies of health and safety, recruitment, finance and data protection law - how can they apply it if they do not have people they can ask, and people who can train them, or even take over and do that bit for them?

11/10/2010 11:36 Provision of Senior care might be downgraded by private enterprise, as is often the case with nursing homes etc in the private sector. Would suggest strict monitoring of all outsourced Senior Care, since these people are the most vulnerable in our community.

10/29/2010 11:51:37

11/15/2010 01:57:24 Public service provision will become increasingly unaccountable to the people to whom they are delivered. I do not see how divesting the responsibility for public service provision to a rag-tag collection of volunteer groups, charities and private sector companies can result in achieving and maintaining high standards of service. Regulating and monitoring this dog's breakfast will be an almost impossible task. Currently, if I have a problem with a service currently provided by the County Council, I know exactly who to go to to get it sorted out. Under the proposed free-for-all system I can see there being an increasingly layered structure of service commissioners, contract providers, sub-contractors, regulatory bodies and the rest. It will become impossible to decide who should take the blame when things go wrong. Apart from that, I am strongly opposed to the measures on principle and will oppose them with every means at my disposal.

11/06/2010 11:33 Quality of service will drop Vulnerable will suffer. No safety net for when divested services fail Dont believe that no national supplier will be appointed to do the divested services. The way its written there is plenty of wriggle room! eg no single supplier will take over all the services can mean any number other than one can or one national supplier can take over 99% of the services.

11/03/2010 09:24 Redundancies

11/15/2010 16:51:20 Schools-Raising standards and being inclusive

11/09/2010 08:58 Service provision for the residents of Suffolk will radically decline but the cost to the tax payer will remain the same.

11/22/2010 10:14:21 Service users will have a less robust system and they will be the ones loosing out. Given the state of the electronic information system for looked after children, services becoming very disjointed

11/02/2010 16:30

11/06/2010 16:14 Services falling into the hands of private firms. Whenever this has happened it has always cost the public more for the same or worse service.  
11/09/2010 16:16 Services for vulnerable children  
10/30/2010 22:46:01 Services need some support as they will not be viable to stand alone initially  
11/01/2010 20:43 Services no longer delivered by democratically elected and accountable organisation.  
10/31/2010 11:09:06 Some people appear in the council to be beyond scrutiny, and these members remain in positions of power, which is very worrying both for government and for the public

Speed we are trying to introduce changes - some communities are not ready and need time to get used to the idea of taking on services and see the good experiences of others. Skills available in communities vary. Local politics will come in and we will need different types of community arbitrators or development officers in some places. Overall concern is about the level of volunteers we will need and how we will find them. We will need to ask people - but they will need to be asked about appropriate skills - that they have and may not have used for a while.  
11/22/2010 16:44:07  
11/22/2010 09:50:40 street lights, old people, libraries, police

Sub-Contracting Councils have direct responsibility for their services. They are responsible for their accounts irrespective of the state of the National Finances. They must exercise direct control over their operations and finances, not devolve any of that to a second party Cuts in Service A well run, financially sound organisation ought to have been taking action long before this. Those responsible to the electorate have the moral responsibility to admit to their failings and offer themselves for re-election or removal. Also, I do not accept that (deep) cuts or sub-contracting are necessarily the answer to the currently reported financial problems. Summary. The Council must stand up for its responsibilities. It must halt its plans to devolve those elsewhere.  
11/01/2010 17:46  
10/31/2010 16:47:15 Suffolk County Council does not have a mandate for this.  
11/01/2010 19:32 Suffolk County Council should be a public service, not a profit business with share holders

Suffolk has an ageing population which will mean increased numbers of older people needing help with daily living both to stay in their own homes and also in other accommodation when they can no longer live at home. I am not aware that there are voluntary or other organisations who will be able to provide such services to the numbers of people who will require it. I am also aware that a very large proportion of these people will not have the personal financial ability to pay for any of these services themselves. How can this be overcome??  
10/30/2010 21:51:58  
11/03/2010 13:48 That Council Tax is not increased.  
That divesting the County Council of its services will not work. It hasn't been thought through properly - purely with the sole intention of saving money. This was already the plan before the cuts so the Coalition and the cuts they have made cannot be blamed for the situation. People who have an interest in volunteering already do so on their terms - those who don't; don't want to. Services will be lost and those that go to the Private sector will suffer as has been shown time and time again. Services that are taken on by Private companies will also take money out of the County, jobs away from Suffolk residents and offer a poorer service to the people who live within Suffolk  
11/03/2010 13:41  
10/30/2010 13:18:03 that I will be out of a job as a branch assistant in the library.  
That it will be an excuse for degraded services. That private companies newly involved will be extracting profits by providing less more than from efficiency savings. It is not apparent to me that overall efficiency savings are even possible, given that the Council will need to establish new bureaucratic layers for commissioning and for oversight of providers. I am also concerned that where handover to communities is preferred, insufficient transition and preparation will be provided, understandably as these will be expensive.  
11/03/2010 08:46  
11/23/2010 16:54:48 That it will not save any money. The service will be too separated.  
That our communities and services will be taken over by large corporations and not as stated in the NSD, by community groups. Community groups will not be as well organised, trained and funded as corporations to step in, which will lead to 1. The NSD is only talk to mask corporate takeover.  
11/15/2010 09:37:11 that people are stretched and concerned about their own family and futures and have not the time or inclination to volunteer time and effort free of charge. If organisations take services over they have to make an operating profit so in the long run it will cost the council more.  
10/30/2010 17:51:42  
11/10/2010 13:23 That people who work for the council will be made unemployed  
That perfectly good and low cost services are being trashed for the sake of political ideology and a CE currying favour with the current Government. Costs do indeed need to be reduced given the overspend by SCC and reduced government support, however reducing levels of overpaid senior managers and instituting cuts in the service according to need and efficiency are an approach used by the majority of other local authorities.  
11/06/2010 13:24  
10/31/2010 15:47:08 That public services should remain directly under control of the democratically elected councillors and experienced professionals. That services to the most vulnerable, which are important for the long term continuity and development of Society, are not placed at risk because of political agenda.  
That SCC believes its our master rather than our servant. If this NSD (divesting of services) had been included in the Conservatives manifesto and the people of Suffolk had had the opportunity to discuss these plans BEFORE we put our crosses next to their names it wouldn't be so much of an issue. Where is the democracy??? My other concern is that certain people may have vested interests in allowing private enterprises to make profits from services, staff, training etc that has already been paid for by us, the council tax payers of Suffolk. If these services were properly managed by SCC they would not be the drain on resources they currently are. SCC employs far too many managers which impacts on clarity and direction for staff delivering the front line services.  
10/31/2010 13:53:56 SCC are admitting that they don't have the skills and business acumen to deliver services efficiently and professionally.

That services affecting the more vulnerable sections of the community (the elderly, disabled, at risk children etc.) will simply be cut, or the availability and quality of these services be severely curtailed as voluntary groups etc. now expected to provide these will simply be swamped and unable to cope with the volume. These services will probably be the first & hardest to be hit as the recipients are those least likely to "cause a fuss". Meanwhile no effort will be made to cut the number of staff going on "fact finding" trips, "team bonding" days etc.  
10/31/2010 07:18:55

That services currently provided by Councils that make Suffolk a pleasant place to live - such as access to Arts, Countryside open spaces, Wildlife sites etc will be lost as these are not profit making if provided for the general wellbeing of the Community. Already SCC are selling off one Local Nature Reserve (Rede Wood) on the open market. Once sold its LNR status will be lost and the public probably excluded. That the Council accepts that it is the large overheads (backroom staff) that make front line service delivery so costly. The failure of CSD to drive down backroom costs has made matters worse

11/08/2010 10:57 That services for the most vulnerable will be lost That professionals will be replaced with amateurs That only the most available and vocal will get involved That there isn't the capacity in the voluntary sector to run services That costs will rise rather than fall as individual schools have to waste time commissioning services

11/05/2010 12:22 that services may not have funds to survive, or that local organisations may not wish to be involved in running their local services, or that the local community may not have capacity to run the services

11/19/2010 16:18:58 That services provided now will not be provided efficiently by others. Part III Accommodation we have seen that some of the former Old Peoples Homes sold off in previous years have closed as their new owners could not afford to run them and make a profit as well. Many private old peoples homes have closed for the same reason. Once the Local Authority "Service" provision has been replaced by the Private sector there is no alternative if the private sector then collapses. Caring for the elderly has no profit motive. Hence the Local Authority "Service" which is provided by the Local Community ie the Local Authority on our behalf.

11/14/2010 19:34:06 That services to vulnerable groups will be miss managed by underqualified, cheap staff of a divested service

11/12/2010 17:05

that services will be cut and people will loose out, probably the most vulnerable and probably services that were their lifeline. I am concerned also how these decisions are to be made as to what things will go or change. how can a communities be thought to be the way forward to run some services with society at the moment that finds, most people don't know the people living next door to them and so much apathy. Some communities are more well off than others so this will not be particularly a fair method. Also looking for volunteers, this would be ok if you were in an affluent area were people had the time, money and resources to do this Similarly setting up charity run services will fair better in the more affluent areas. private companies can charge over the odds for services they know are needed. They also are target and profit led. i am concerned that yes money has to be saved but strongly believe privatisation is not the way forward

11/06/2010 00:33 That services will be diluted, reduced and quality will suffer

11/15/2010 12:27:06 That services will cease or become less productive for the people that require them. If done on a charity/voluntary basis this can be pulled at any time due to lack of funds etc. People currently employed by the council will still lose their jobs, services being provided on a voluntary basis will not create employment for the hundreds that are going to find themselves out of work and there are no tax credits or benefits for those that do voluntary work

10/30/2010 12:54:06 That some very valuable services will cease in Suffolk for the most vulnerable. The concept of asking communities to deliver services whilst on paper seems a good idea is in reality unlikely to happen. Generations ago this may have been the case but so many communities are already disengaged and have very little contact with each other. Our lifestyles have changed dramatically - most parents work, children have lots of extra activities outside of school life and therefore parents are too busy to even be school governors never mind looking to run other services. Most families do not live close by and are scattered across the county/country - tight knit communities are in the minority. There is also the issue of trust. No matter what people may think of SCC there is something about the organisation that brings about an element of trust - people know who they are dealing with - with other organisations delivering services how will people know who is the 'trusted' organisation. There will be many opportunists out there who will approach the vulnerable and mislead them with regards to services and possibly take money from them.

11/01/2010 10:51 that specialist small organisations like ours will not be included in the opportunity as there is no indication of SCC support around capacity building or indication of how and what services are going to be supported

11/16/2010 21:56:45 That the big society does not exist. At least in a form to take effective responsibility for a wide range of services. Localism does not appear to me to be destined to deliver the stated goal of more 'joined up' services.

11/14/2010 15:36:42 That the consultation period has come to late and that many affected individuals will not have the opportunity to respond. That those bodies who will deliver future services are accountable and able. We want better services not less, we want to keep services and if they must be divested let it only be to Suffolk based local councils or bodies. This will ensure that employment opportunities will exist in Suffolk and stimulate what is left of our economy. We don't want to pay our council tax and then pay again, my children are at an important age, my income is limited. My son wants to go to university and is at sixth form and my daughter is studying for her GCSE to take this year. I don't want their education to suffer because cuts when I work full time and always pay my way. It will be a travesty if they are affected adversely. It is generally perceived that there has been little if no transparency and that despite the late consultation it is a done deal. What can you do to reassure me that this is not the case? What moves are the council taking to ensure that all of their staff (& those connected) are supported and assisted to find alternative employment at what is a very

11/04/2010 20:21 That the Council as it stands currently is not listening to staff as widely as it should, and that its CEO is not talking to or communicating with the staff, when this is the time that the staff need to be heard. The NSD and its way forward was decided a long time ago, far before the new Government, and therefore time has been available to listen. The Council is now going to put many out of work (not therefore assisting one of the county's 'priorities' of having a dynamic job market), move about (at least) many vulnerable people and ensure that top management still have 'strategic' jobs after all this. No one is going to be able to provide services as the current staff do now - private sector or volunteers. Your 'new' ideas of this 'Easy-Council' are misinformed, ill-judged, and not at all as 'forward thinking' as you think.

10/30/2010 21:51:29

That the council is expecting local volunteers to take over many of its services without providing the funding necessary to deliver these services. In areas where local people do not have the capacity to take on the delivery of services (for example where they are busy with work and family commitments or simply do not have the skills to do so) these services will simply fade away leaving communities isolated and vulnerable. It is insulting for the council to expect us to believe that simply divesting itself of services actually saves money overall - just because the funding is coming out of someone else's pocket doesn't mean it is not being spent. Indeed, fragmenting provision will lose any economies of scale and will therefore increase costs, as will putting services out to the private sector which exists to make a profit. In the unlikely event that services are delivered more cheaply by the private sector, they will not be of equivalent quality.

11/12/2010 22:00 That the council will remain too bureaucratic which will prevent small businesses benefitting from the change

11/16/2010 10:21:09 That the council will dismiss savings, using old values that can no longer be justified under the present financial constraints.

11/01/2010 09:47

- 11/21/2010 17:10:58 That the council will still monitor standards of practice.
- 11/01/2010 15:06 That the divestment will be done too quickly - recommendations from other authorities undertaking this type of task suggest doing it slowly and thoroughly eg; Lambeth. Massive risks for quality and accountability. Lack of consultation to date - too little too late??
- 11/02/2010 09:57 That the 'national financial crisis' is being exaggerated and used for political purposes, in particular to excuse the undermining of essential services and outsource to the private sector, which will ultimately cost everyone more due to the increased overhead or reduced quality required to generate a profit for those behind it.
- 11/08/2010 22:39 That the political social and age demographic leads to NSD changes not reflecting the real demographic of the county. This in turn leading to a movement of resources from services such as education, training and youth services to be moved into services for other groups of people. The idea of a "Big Society" in terms of capacity is not large enough in the county to provide efficient and outstanding services. Divestment of services was not intended even by those who introduced the concept to be so fast and deep. When services are out sourced pay and conditions along with pensions will be eroded. Who will verify quality and value for money of service if capital, human and physical are outsourced? This is a massive experiment with little historical or cultural evidence to suggest that it will work in Suffolk in 2010.
- 11/10/2010 19:59 That the process is driven by political ideology first and foremost rather than a rationale approach. The SCC track record on effective and efficient contracting out is not one to be proud of - just how much did CSD cost and just how much did it save. I fear that divested services will be sold short as the contract managers at SCC will not necessarily know or understand the service to be divested and will not get the correct or best arrangements. 'Community involvement, individual choice and control....' How does this apply or work for vulnerable children in our society? We need a strong and effective child protection service, earlier intervention with struggling families and frankly, more social workers to carry this out. I am not a social worker but an adopter of a traumatised child and I fear that NSD will do nothing to help children like him.
- 11/22/2010 10:49:36 That there is not enough capacity within the voluntary sector, or local communities to effectively manage projects. No real sense of any opportunities for my own local groups, who struggle annually to find volunteers that are experienced enough to manage effectively, and funding. There is an expectation for example, that youth clubs will work towards achieving high standards, but no reality check on what this might mean for individuals who are locked into a constant battle to achieve minimum funding and remain viable with staffing/ volunteer related issues.
- 10/29/2010 13:22:39 That there will be a shortfall or patchy provision in some service areas. There will be insufficient funding at local level to deliver divested services. There will be insufficient capacity both in terms of skills and time to deliver some services locally. There will be a lack of cohesion in the delivery of services. Communication across the County will be complex and difficult.
- 11/14/2010 18:26:50 That there will be an even greater gap between those at Endeavour House and those delivering services than that which has already developed over the past 5 years. That those who work effectively with small numbers of vulnerable people will be brushed aside in favour of organisations big enough to tender for Council contracts (this has already happened). That senior managers in the County organisation will still be vastly overpaid. There is no one working at Endeavour House who is worth more than £120,000 a year. And yes, it does matter a lot, because it is part of a degenerative culture that separates governors from governed.
- 11/17/2010 07:59:33 That this is an exercise in foolishness based on political theory rather than the best way forward for Suffolk, run zealously by people who have not considered and do not care about the consequences. Historic research in this country and New Zealand has proved that divestment, devolution and/or out-stationing does not work in rural areas.
- 11/22/2010 11:25:09 That vulnerable people may not have the protection they need i.e. that the accountability of provision is weakened. That the "economy of scale" may be lost by more smaller providers needing to duplicate activities. That terms and conditions of people working for service providers will be worsened. People may lose their jobs and unemployment rises. That the changes appear to be highly complex to introduce and seem to be moving very quickly.
- 11/08/2010 17:12 That you are going to cut the Youth Service, which today has helped lots of young people. This was recognised at an SNT awards event today
- 11/05/2010 20:11 That you will hive off all your responsibilities onto the voluntary sector
- 11/02/2010 12:14 The broad principles are readily grasped, but the examples of alternative ways of delivering services are very restricted, and rely heavily upon effective community engagement and significant volunteer resource in many cases. Experience of other "outsourcing" from SCC does not convince me that there are sufficient savings to be made to justify the changes. Larger organisations may bring economies of scale rather than necessarily additional bureaucratic costs. There also appears to be a heavy reliance upon decision making by councillors at a local level, which needs proving in its quality.
- 11/13/2010 11:03:27 The concept of the BIG SOCIETY is an ideological smokescreen hiding the Tory agenda of cuts, cuts, cuts! It is merely a way to persuade volunteers to provide services that were once carried out by the government and local authorities.
- 11/18/2010 02:25:13 The council has responsibilities which it is abrogating by handing them over to other bodies and private companies. Council tax payers should not be used as a source of profit for private companies. If the council isn't capable of performing efficiently the elected members should all be sacked for incompetence.
- 10/30/2010 17:35:41 The county council has no mandate to embark upon this type of exercise. Residents and taxpayers should be consulted over the whole issue of whether they actually wish to see cuts in services or would be prepared to pay extra to retain them. The idea of being able to get the same or better levels of service from the private sector at lower costs is preposterous, staff have seen the results of CSD which clearly demonstrate that the level of service is dramatically reduced and costs continue to climb while more and more work is passed back to SCC.
- 11/04/2010 14:02 The CX salary. It is far too high for what she does. Cost saving starts at the top and just because a couple of pay rises have been given up does not mean that the base salary is correct in the first place. If the County cannot employ school crossing operatives or provide direct care for the elderly then why should we in Suffolk stand a huge salary for a CX. We are all in this together supposedly!!!
- 11/03/2010 19:57 The democratic process is being undermined, as the people of Suffolk did not vote for this. The divestment of services was not included on any election leaflet that I saw at any level. I believe people want Suffolk County Council to provide good public services, not pass the responsibility onto other organisations.
- 11/16/2010 10:39:55 The future of my position at SCC. What libraries and record offices will be like in the future.
- 11/18/2010 18:57:48 The future of the Suffolk Record Offices and their excellent service

- 11/04/2010 10:01 -The ideological dismantling of the county's facilities by a group without a mandate. -The emphasis on councillors to do local things. Mine has two priorities, which are getting his expenses and allowances and being loyal to the Tories who have bought an
- 11/17/2010 14:45:28 The impacted on the people in Suffolk both service users and staff  
The items you detailed in there as success stories from other areas of the country seem to be the icing on the cake services and not the hard nitty gritty services - how would you glamorise refuse collections or day care workers to make them seem attractive propositions to the private sector. Also how do you envisage volunteers working, many of my customers have indicated that they don't mind volunteering for a charity, but not to help out the local council.
- 11/02/2010 17:40
- 11/03/2010 14:04 The lack of consultation with staff and service users. Managers are not communicating That service users will be disadvantaged and their needs not properly considered. How will outsourced services be monitored and surely the level of service/care will deteriorate The fact that it has all been very gung ho instead of concentrating on one piece at a time and doing that well.  
The loss of experienced personnel and the fragmentation of services. In particular the loss of officers who deal with difficult cases involving those who are most vulnerable in society; young people with special needs, welfare cases involving multiple agencies and older people who need assistance. I do fear that the plan will get bogged down in legal contracts and agreements that will create
- 11/17/2010 10:46:38 work for lawyers and protect the council against claims but will not help anyone else.  
The only one of the SCC's 3 stated aims that will be furthered is the Divestment - even if you do believe in the Conservative's idea of a 'Big Society', it will not materialise and democracy will be further eroded - people will become further disenchanted with local government and local politicians will become even less popular - people will stop voting for you. I have campaigned against the recent proposals for SCC to be split up into separate unitary authorities - it would be totally hypocritical for SCC to now claim that its proposals for an unstructured (and under-regulated) thicket of competing outsourced service providers won't be bringing about exactly the same problems that those for smaller unitary authorities would have done. The proposals claim that the most disadvantaged will not be neglected yet fail to explain how those who have the least resources in terms of finances, time or abilities will be able to get the assistance they are supposed to still be entitled to in the competition with others in this 'Big' new society who are also entitled to services yet have more of those resources. The council has not explained how it might be intending to target
- 11/08/2010 10:53 The outsourcing of the management of Mills Meadow Care Home in Framlingham 1. This should include a similar arrangement to that of the affordable housing criteria to allow priority to the facilities for Framlingham residents and those with a strong connection to Framlingham. 2. Mills Meadow should continue to provide Day Care facilities as well. 3. Respite Care should be provided
- 11/11/2010 14:47 and not be allowed to lapse. The Town Council would like to be kept informed and involved in any discussions The loss of the Public Library
- 11/02/2010 11:34 The speed with which changes are going to happen. It's not giving us time to work out the best way to do things or to try them out first. We seem to have one option which we are just going to do and I'm not sure we know it will make the required savings. I am also concerned there won't be support for staff running services across the county when new groups or organisations take over. They will have a lot more responsibility but no more hours or money with which to do the work, I think it is a lot to expect of people. I'm also concerned for my job, I would rather find another job than wait around in this uncertainty as I feel I am worth more than that. I don't think staff feel valued at the moment because of the lack of specific information.  
there are many services that are provided for the people of Suffolk that are non profit making and tick along in the background without the people knowing that is being done. These services offer support and safety that is often skilled and not the sort of thing the community could take on; communities may not understand the potential outcomes of the loss of service and may not know how important it is. If the service provision provided by the council is outsourced then there will most definitely be a profit margin to consider. The new providers will be given less money - as part of the savings drive - and from that remaining money they will take a % cut as profit, leaving the people of Suffolk with a further reduction in service. The county council have so far demonstrated that they are incompetent with the management of contracts, HR and relationships with 3rd parties, what will suddenly change to remedy this? we will undoubtedly end up selling the high quality services off to lowest bidders and then end up having poorer services and a system that would take years to repair.
- 11/03/2010 13:40
- 11/01/2010 15:20 There are many words and not enough substance as to what is actually being proposed in terms of cuts to services, care for the more vulnerable in society  
There is a risk that some services may not receive the financial support they need. The benefits of some public services are underestimated and add far more to the wellbeing of the community than many people imagine. As an example, having free libraries with reasonably long opening hours provides a resource to the local community and a generally accessible public place. The public library is an integral part of a local community and the local authority needs to ensure that it is fully funded.
- 10/31/2010 11:49:48 There is an implicit assumption that divesting the council of services will lead to cost savings and that no in-depth studies have been carried out; large number of redundancies that will entail;
- 11/02/2010 17:27 services that the council are not obligated to provide will be cut  
There is not enough information about which services will be divested, what the actual cost will be to tax payers, how services will be affected. The document makes it all sound wonderful but I am sceptical that it actually will be. I think it is unrealistic expecting some services to be run by volunteers since it is difficult enough to get reliable volunteers as it is. People have less time available
- 11/08/2010 17:44 these days and in the current economic climate need to earn money!
- 10/31/2010 23:12:34 There is very little information on how it will work in practice, I get the feeling that volunteer organisations will be expected to take on the responsibility of many of the County Council Departments but without any clear indication on how it will be funded. I consider that it will be a disaster to close retirement homes, it will not be easy to find anyone to take over the vacant positions that will be required. The ever growing number of people with dementia and the fact that more of the population is living longer means that there will be more retirement homes required in future not less.  
There will be a need for the County and/or Central Government to put money into community projects at least as pump-priming grants. Some things, like work with drug abusers and other health and age related services, will need long term funding. This will be costly and many of the cuts the county seeks to make will have a knock on effect on other services. There is a finite amount of money and
- 11/10/2010 11:16 volunteers in the community.

There will not be even, equal and accessible services for all Suffolk residents. Some areas may not have certain services provided at all, if private or community organisations are not able or willing to run them. Poorer areas of Suffolk are less likely to have sufficient voluntary staff to keep services open. Services which help support the less wealthy/assertive parts of society will apparently be the first to go, e.g. public libraries, children's centres, youth services, care homes. Families on lower incomes and the elderly will suffer the most from losing these services. How are private companies offering services to be monitored? Will anyone have that responsibility? Will volunteers be monitored? Voluntary help is likely to be shorter term than paid help, with greater turnover and more need for training. Where are the experienced staff/trainers to come from?

11/21/2010 12:12:54 This has not been fully thought through. It is not democratic as there has been no consultation with the community (and only, in the month before the decision will be confirmed) some "engagement" which has given hardly any indepth information to communities and very little time for them to get together, discuss and respond. It is based on divesting services, regardless of type. The assumption being that the harder to run services will be the ones that will suffer (as no group or private company will want to run them - too difficult / no profit) yet some of these services might be the most valuable. The idea that if no group comes forward to run a service then they don't value it is insulting to the people of Suffolk. Comments, at a presentation on this, that there is "no plan to privatise absolutely everything" and that suppliers will "not necessarily be the private sector" do not inspire confidence and imply that, ultimately, many services will be run for profit - regardless of the needs of the community. No cost savings have been identified. No business plan has been produced. There will be far greater bureaucracy, not less, as it will be more fragmented and spread over

11/19/2010 09:34:40 This has not been thought through - in terms of fully understanding the impact of such a dramatic shift on the business of providing government and local services. This will undermine local democracy - because services will now be delivered through long-term fixed contracts with external suppliers and elected officials or their representatives will have little ability to influence these contracts once they have been negotiated. This might be acceptable in areas such as the provision of refuse collection, but is not acceptable when it comes to provision of the likes of education and social care. The approach to the provision of services will shift from one based on the needs of the community to the ability to find and negotiate terms with a suitable provider - some important services are therefore likely to fall between the gaps if suitable providers cannot be found. In reality it is likely that the level of services provided by local community groups and third-sector

11/01/2010 10:11 providers will be minimal - with large private sector corporations stepping in to deliver and administer the bulk of services. Following on from this - there has been no research done in order to This is trying to get services delivered on the cheap - a renegading of responsibility - if anything goes wrong you and/or contractors can say "its not in the contract". The private sector has to make a profit to survive - not guarantee standards of care, quality and service - customers and employees could suffer. Have you taken into consideration the costs of making so many staff redundant -

11/17/2010 11:34:57 the effects on the local economy and population?

10/30/2010 19:42:19 This will simply transfer services that are meant to be carried impartially and offering full access to all to the private sector. The private sector is interested only in making a profit. They'll offer poor service and endeavour at every opportunity to wriggle out of contractual obligations.

11/02/2010 16:30 throwing out years of dedicated work by public sector workers

11/05/2010 19:09 Today's announcement that Care Homes will be sold off, affecting the most vulnerable people in our society.

11/17/2010 20:01:50 Too far too fast too soon. I am appalled at the lack of content in the reports on adult care and the youth service. No matter how you hype this up this strategy marks the death of vital services. No community in its right mind will wish to take on services with hugely reduced budgets laying the way open for private profit motivated businesses to step in and run them on the cheap. Too little engagement with those who could be presumed to be providers, particularly the voluntary sector. SCC still remains far too top heavy and appears to be introspective in its approach

11/01/2010 09:58 ensuring the Business Development team is well

10/31/2010 17:44:41 Too much concentration on management style and not enough focus on skills. Also worried that that SCC does not really know how this is all going to turn out - theory easier than reality.

10/30/2010 10:47:35 Unproven way forward. Loss of expertise as staff will leave and go elsewhere. Profiteering from private sector. Loss of jobs. Not what the ratepayers of Suffolk voted for.

11/08/2010 12:14 Very vague, there were no specifics as such and no "this will actually mean....." statements.

11/05/2010 12:45 What 'event'? I've not seen any notices. Waste of time as the 'private/third' sector is not interested in a sparsely populated rural county, too expensive to make a profit.

10/31/2010 18:33:05 What exactly is proposed to be privatised?

10/31/2010 17:30:53 What happens if communities don't have the capacity to take on wider responsibilities. what happens to disadvantaged communities with multiple issues and less capacity to provide help to others from within. What happens if your vision doesn't work or works in some places and not others, what is the contingency? We know that some voluntary sector organisations are good and give good value for money although a lot are only just understanding the need to develop as organisations, justify costs and give value for money rather than just receive grants or be deficit funded.

10/29/2010 16:36:19 What is plan B when you cannot divest the services you want, ie there is no market to take them on for the funds that you are willing to provide

11/06/2010 11:20 What will happen if other groups/agencies are not interested in running the services you want to divest. How will you ensure that standards are kept high if other people are run services previously run by you. How will you protect the most vulnerable people in society. Youth clubs are already marked for closure surely this will put young people on the streets in the evenings making for more anti social behaviour, something that already concerns people greatly.

11/02/2010 15:59 When did the Council obtain a mandate from the electorate to react in such a dramatic fashion? Are the members of the Council unanimous about this proposal? If not was a vote taken and what was the result? Has the legality of such an act ie outsourcing major services been checked and if so by whom? It has all the flavour of a panic reaction.

11/03/2010 22:00 Where are the charities and trusts who are expected to start up or take over services going to receive their funding from? If some of this funding ends up coming from SCC or the Government surely this will create more bureaucracy and you will get less end result for your money. The policy seems to be likely to hit the vulnerable and poorest members of society the worst. It has been noticed closing/selling of care homes for example has no mention, how would volunteers take over such a crucial job which affects the entire lives of not only residents but relatives and all the staff too who may lose their jobs? I understand savings are required however there must be ways of making savings by reducing other things across services which can take it e.g. reducing hours a place is open, charging a little more for a service etc.

11/18/2010 08:47:52 Where will all the volunteers come from? It is already difficult to find enough people to become school governors, trustees etc Who will regulate the work of all these voluntary organizations? The very nature of a volunteer is that they are not tied in to a contractual responsibility - how can public services be delivered in such a way?

11/01/2010 15:41 Whether other organisations will have the confidence to take up and engage the challenges that this change of approach will deliver. Whether sufficient resources will be retained to help support them through this change period

10/30/2010 13:34:34 Whom will be responsible for services 'farmed out' if they are lacking?

11/17/2010 16:21:19 Will the services that are going to be divested suitable for purpose. Where are these volunteers coming from? Will our Children and Young people remain safe? How will these divested services be monitored by the Council? How will the skills that we have in the workforce be linked to these divested services?

11/21/2010 10:03:54 With reference in particular to Suffolk Record Offices, it is vital that the high level of professional expertise within the staff is retained and supported by the County Council. Services such as this are too fragile and the benefits and guardianship of years of accumulated resource and expertise quickly diminish if not retained under the control of the representatives of the local democratically elected members. Any attempt to outsource guardianship and operational responsibilities, albeit through keen and sometimes well informed volunteers, may result in the lessening of the completeness of this current excellent service and puts into jeopardy the certainty of their comprehensive retention for future generations. Any reduction in funding for this service and in the library services in general will quickly result in a loss to Suffolk of a public record that is one of the finest in the whole country. Ensure that you strategically plan with great caution over any major change to the provision of this service.

11/16/2010 09:15:31 Withdrawal of services and provision without an alternative in place. This is something the Council is doing TO us - the decision has already been made and yet we are expected to be a part of the solution.

11/11/2010 14:06 You are going to cut young peoples services as an easy target

11/14/2010 09:46:12 You do not care about or value your existing staff or services and believe anyone especially if they don't get paid can do it better. You certainly do not have any care or concern for the vulnerable or the needy because they cost too much money to care for.

11/21/2010 15:03:47 You have already decided, this is not a real consultation. You are not just saving money, you are permanently transferring council services to the private sector, or killing them off. Most of the money you save will be by job losses and closing buildings, why can't you do this whilst keeping most council services as council services. There is no point in Suffolk County Council existing if it has no control over services, and individual members will have scant influence on the bodies which will allegedly deliver services. You are trashing over 100 years of Suffolk history and investment just so that a few senior Conservative members can make their name with their national tory party masters by carrying out their wishes.

11/01/2010 12:29 You state that a key objective is to use plain english. Divestment is not a commonly used word, however the Oxford dictionary definition of divestment is to 'deprive, disposes, free or rid'. Is this really what you mean or do you need to drop this word? Voluntary groups usually start for a specific objective, led by a particularly driven person. Eventually that person stops leading the group and/or the objective is met, and the group winds down or turns its attention to something else. If the council hands over delivery of a function, for which it has legal or social responsibility, to a voluntary body, how will it ensure quality and continuity of service? One of the aspects of voluntary work is that individuals will not enter into contracts, they are free to stop when they wish. Why did you not enter into formal consultation prior to committing the council to this strategy? Most organisations consult prior to a decision. You are now faced having to make a regard action to find organisations prepared to take on work you have already decided to transfer out. If you cannot find organisations to take on the work, will you stop doing it?

11/03/2010 16:45 You want the public / stakeholders to 'volunteer' to manage some areas? You want to encourage officers to tell the public how to do their job for free? You think you're saving money by axing front line jobs? I've heard that in some areas people are being made redundant and then the recruitment freeze is being lifted to then advertise those posts externally? How does that save money?

11/02/2010 17:17 You will lose professional and technical expertise, work performed will be less well done, staff will lose their careers and will not be paid what their ability and status demands. The Council will have to pay inclusive profit within contracts and there will be no benefit to the community.

11/05/2010 01:03 you're expecting the community to pick up the slack left by your 'divestment' of services. what if it doesn't? what do you mean by the 'community' - the private sector? if so, do you have any firms in mind - how can you guarantee they will be able to provide a high quality of service? what evidence do you have that this divestment approach works? where has it previously been successfully tried, and what were the failings? who will pick up the bill if a company or community fails to offer a decent level of service? what safeguards are in place to ensure a decent level of service - will it end up costing council tax payers more if services have to be taken back in house if the community/private sector turn out to be unable to provide them? what provision have you made for those requiring a higher amount/level of services? if it costs them more than currently, will you be able to help them financially?