

LORC 第1班、第2班共催講演会 記録

講演者: Professor Ken Spencer, Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham

コメント: 小山善彦 (バーミンガム大学都市地域研究センター客員研究員、第3班)

日時: 2004年6月5日 13:00 – 16:30

場所: 無隣庵 母屋2階

出席者: 白石克孝 (龍谷大学法学部教授、第1班)

田中宏 (龍谷大学経済学部教授、第1班)

土山希美枝 (龍谷大学法学部助教授、第2班)

新川達郎 (同志社大学大学院総合政策科学研究科教授、第1班)

的場信敬 (PD)

高井若菜 (秘書)

辻本乃理子 (第1班 RA)

新井健一郎 (第2班 RA)

内容:

まず、講演に先立って、各自、関心分野 (public-private partnership, modernisation of the government and its relation with citizens, local governance, human resources development for local public policy, sustainable development, partnership and participation in local decision making など) にふれつつ自己紹介を行った。講演の内容は以下の通り。

(ページリファレンスは当日配布資料、'The Modernization of Public Services and Demands for New Types of People in Local Government and the Voluntary and Community Sectors'を参照したもの。)

(The Institute of Local Government Studies (INLOGOV) is the oldest institution for local government management, established in 1983/4. In the beginning their focus was on training local government staff, thus on postgraduate training yet it expanded to research and teaching. Ken Spencer has been working at Birmingham for almost 40 years.)

Structure of the talk

1. Changing state policy frameworks, i.e. how government's policy framework is changing and how it affects citizens, local governments, and voluntary and community organisations.

2. Inspection and audit compliance.
3. Public-private partnerships.
4. Changes in local governments.
5. Voluntary and community sector - relationship of the voluntary and community sector to local government in particular. e.g. a commission which looks at the future of voluntary and community sector in the City of Birmingham chaired by Ken Spencer himself, which is changing government policy towards Compact.
6. 'Local governance' shouldered by newly created bodies other than 'government'.
7. New skills required for the managers in public sector (local government) and voluntary and community sector in the new era of the local governance. Birmingham University mediates the change and needs by offering masters programmes and shorter 'continuing professional development programmes', and generates income through these. (Income target is set for each member of the faculty e.g. 150,000 pounds per person/year for a professor. It is met by running practical seminars around these new skills, for example, for which participants pay 225 pounds/day.)

1. Changing state policy frameworks (pp. 2-3)

The relationships between the central government and local governments are changing significantly, as is the ones between the central government and other service agencies.

- Creation of 'Quasi-Autonomous Non-Governmental Organisations (QUANGO)', the body created by government which yet is autonomous. This system is however not accountable to the community since members are selected by appointment, not through voting. There is a big debate surrounding this issue and the government is about to reduce the number of QUANGO, to show that they do believe in local democracy, and that local political parties are/can be very active in local government.

- 'Hollowing out the state' – reducing the direct role of the state, by working in partnership with others etc, i.e. they are reducing the power of the state in local affairs. There has been a strong shift from 'government' to 'governance'. Inter-agency working (horizontal relationship, partnership) is much more common now, whereas 10-15 years ago each unit was separate and autonomous (vertical structure, 'silo thinking').

- Privatisation and contracting-out of public service to voluntary sector, as well as to private sector. Local authority has a list of items to be delivered, and private and voluntary sector bid for the services they want to deliver. Local government pays for these services and check if they are delivered properly. Voluntary and community sector now does more contracting-out than they did 4-5 years ago but they prefer to call it 'service level agreement' (to ensure the quality of service provided) and not 'contract' (which is more business like).

That is because if voluntary sector were *simply* delivering the service formerly provided by the government in the same way, questions would arise as to what distinct values and culture they have as voluntary organisations.

- Role of the EU. The EU passes laws and policies which apply to all member countries. The UK is also bound by most of them thus they must be taken into account. The EU money is poured into poorer countries and this means that the UK citizens are paying tax from which they themselves do not benefit, and this creates a tension.

- Role of devolved government in the UK, e.g. Scotland, which has its own parliament and devolved governmental system with a lot of power and influence on local affairs. (Wales is not as powerful as Scotland but has some power to influence the UK law/policy.) Within London there already exists devolved government, with regional assembly, elected mayor and elected politicians (half by constituency and half through proportional representation). England as a whole does not have devolved regional government but in November there are referendums in three regions (the North-West, the North-East, and Yorkshire) if they want to devolve their local governments. If devolved, they will have elected politicians and there will be an issue of how to relate the local governments to the central government. The central government will require the unity of local authority (i.e. the abolition of the council–county distinction) by law in case devolution proceeds since the fragmentation of government will cause citizens confusion.

- More working with stakeholders, such as private industries and commerce, the CBI (the Confederation of British Industry), and trade unions. Labour government used to mix only with trade unions but now the Prime Minister also, and more often, meets business community (the CBI).

- Introduction of a wide range of new initiatives with separate funding from normal governmental stream. Local governments, local communities, and voluntary agencies bid for these new funds, which usually last for 3-4 years. e.g. pre-school education scheme for children from poorer and minority background in Birmingham.

- Performance measurement culture. Those in managerial position in public sector are now assessed and in order for their contract to be extended, they must achieve significant performance. The performance of all hospitals and schools in the UK for example is also monitored, and the government claims that in this way they are providing useful information for citizens. Citizens too are now more concerned with the ways in which their tax is spent.

- Strong central government control over local authority budget. Most part of the local authority budget comes from the central government - only 25% raised from local taxation. Some argue that local tax should rise so that local government has more autonomy.

Describing theoretically how the government has changed in the UK (p. 4)

Social democracy (Labour government in 1960-69)

-> Neo-liberalism (Conservative government under Margaret Thatcher – market driven, minimum state role)

-> 'Third Way' (present Labour government– not old social democracy but the mixture of the above two).

2. Inspection and audit compliance (p.5)

- It is very important for the Labour government which measures everything. However, this contains danger. e.g. death rate at every hospital is measured yet some hospitals deal with more serious patients than others thus figures can be misleading.

- The government is using measurement to give people choice, and citizens can also invoke it to claim a certain standard of service to be provided for the tax they pay, in other words, performance measure can be used against the government too.

- There exist so many different measuring systems in all kinds of area. e.g. the housing association Ken Spencer himself is involved is inspected this year by four different groups for different purposes (and this is a typical example) – firstly by Housing Corporation (funder), secondly by Audit Commission (national body, which conduct inspection every five years and gives mark ranging from excellent to poor), thirdly by Charity Commissioner (the body which oversees all voluntary agencies in the UK and is responsible for their accounts, who spent only two hours) and finally by External Auditor. Impression is that there are too many inspections and people need to spend more time on preparing for inspection than for actually providing service, and now the UK is moving away from it, and new head of Audit Commission for example has a task of reducing the amount of audit.

Public private partnerships (p. 6)

- For government, it is one way of drawing in other people's money, and it is also one way of ensuring, when government does spend money, that it is engaging not only with government officials but also with the other key players in the voluntary sector, private sector, police et cetera.

- Trade unions do not like it for it means taking away of the jobs from the traditional trade unions.

- It requires different skills in local government, and in voluntary sector.

- 5 different ways of doing partnerships.

- a) Public leverage (p. 7). Government encourages private sector or voluntary agencies to get involved, for instance to invest on something by giving tax relief, or promising

another contract. It creates, it is argued, conditions which are helpful for economic and business growth and investment. Government (and the EU) can also make some funds available where matching money exists, i.e. a half (ratios vary) of the budget for example can be funded by the government / the EU, if another half is to be provided from other sources. (This can be done through competition, bidding by ratios.) e.g. European projects run at Birmingham University are half funded by the EU money, and the rest by the University. Yet the University does not literally pay the half of the 'money' for they count the value of assets such as the library and the income from the seminar too.

KSh: Is it easy for the UK local authorities to find matching money? Germans are finding it difficult.

KSp: Germans ought to be educated how to do with this without using real money. What money means is not only cash as they think, but also 'values' like services and potential salaries of academics that can be higher than the real salaries et cetera.

- b) Contracting-out and competitive tendering – there are dangerous elements as well as good. Birmingham University did a research for the Conservative government if local government saved money by contracting its services out, and the result was in some areas yes but in other areas no. Furthermore, what is usually not counted by the government and politicians is the 'transaction cost' (i.e. cost of doing business other than money, including for instance time which is not counted as cost in public and voluntary sectors), and when it is counted, it can be very high and make contracting-out more expensive. In addition, politicians often do not have a clear idea of how much it is costing them to provide a certain public service, and they simply cannot know if contracting-out can reduce the cost.

Other forms of public-private partnership include:

- c) Franchising (p. 9)
- d) Joint venture (p. 10)
- e) Strategic partnership (p.11)

Local government changes (pp. 12-13)

- Re-organisation of boundaries and functions, which is constantly happening and confuses local governments.
- Major changes to the political system of local government. They now have cabinet system and a few elected mayors.
- They are now moving away from service specialism (professionalism) to more managerial structure, e.g. they do not have the education services for children and the social services

for children separately any more but a single unit dealing with the issues of children.

- Consumer satisfaction is a key element under the present Labour government which is very keen on measuring what citizens think, through for instance polling and the Prime Minister talking with the public.
- Community involvement in decision making
- Less bureaucracy and more service – they are more concerned with the transaction cost.
- Decentralisation of the service delivery – more local service delivery are now involving the community. e.g. Birmingham is now moving to 11 local districts for service delivery.

Voluntary and community sector changes (pp. 14-15)

- Danger of making voluntary and community sector another government like service provider, i.e. their distinctive function as voluntary and community sector being threatened. Government is now concerned about this and trying to fund the voluntary sector in such a way that it does not have to be dependent entirely on service level agreements.
- New pressure of leaning reasonably high level new managerial skills.
- Futurebuilders (that is the fund which helps voluntary sector to develop, i.e. capacity building money).
- Local Compacts (that are the agreements between the voluntary sector, local authority and other agencies about how they work together). Birmingham has created one Compact which includes everybody instead of making ones with each different sector, for the transaction cost is lower in this way and this made the Birmingham project a major national success.

Local Strategic Partnership and Compact (p. 16)

- Local Strategic Partnership originates in a new government initiative from 2-3 years ago, which requires all agencies of governance to come together in any individual local government areas and form Local Strategic Partnership to review various government programmes and deliver services as a group. Local Strategic Partnership in Birmingham has 30 places, and one of which is located to universities.

KSh: How are the members selected?

KS: Members are selected each by their own organisation, then among them a chair person is elected (usually politicians, though not always).

- They deal with 'cross cutting issues', i.e. issues which cut across all the agencies, e.g. crime reduction.
- A great amount of money is now given to Local Strategic Partnership rather than the local authority, and this creates tensions. Yet the local government still has more money than

any others in the group and is still quite powerful, though not dominant any more.

- Question of accountability – for the members are not democratically elected.
- Central government sees it as a way to avoid funding money through local government since the Labour central government does not trust the Labour local governments for the latter is considered to be still based on the idea of old social democracy.
- Compact is an agreement between the voluntary and community sector and all the public agencies in a city about funding, how they treat each other, the values of different groups, the independence of voluntary sector etc, i.e. a kind of relationship document. It is a written document with a significant authority, with an appeal system.
- In Birmingham, the document was commissioned by the voluntary sector and the City Council, but then brought to Local Strategic Partnership so that funding comes not only from the City Council but through all agencies involved in Local Strategic Partnership.

YO: Does it affect the existing funding?

KSp: Sometime it does. Overall amount of money available for community as a whole for a specific end (e.g. crime reduction) increases but a part of it may be raised by reducing the existing funding (e.g. for the police). In order for a particular agent (e.g. the police) to activate full budget, therefore, they have to persuade the rest of the community.

YO: Do you mean that government is reducing the mainstream money, putting them all together and giving it to the Partnership?

KSp: Government is transferring money out of individual public sector agencies into the cooperate body. Sometimes it creates a new programme and just gives extra money to this partnership body, which is used as a vehicle for delivering some of the government's new programmes which need more inter-agency working.

New skills required (p. 17)

- New skills of 'governance', not of 'government'.
- Wider analytical understanding of issues, and how different agencies can play a role – universities are very important in these, in acting to pull together different agencies.
- Networking, performance management, marketing, managing contract, public involvement, strategic thinking, political management, and so forth.
- New chief executives of service providers tend to be different people than few years ago – more women, fewer lawyers, can be from private or voluntary sector, a lot of them with MBA (Birmingham University runs an MBA in Public Service, that is distinct from private sector management qualification). Those want to work as top manager have to re-skill themselves constantly, and have to get more experience by doing a different range of jobs.

KT: How do you nurture these new skills? In what ways do you build a programme to meet

such needs?

KSp: It is impossible to train everybody with all these skills. Different types of programmes are made available. For example the programmes for the top managers (chief executives of local authorities, senior civil servants, police chiefs, chief executives of large voluntary organisations etc.) bring them together, for one week course plus several meetings of 2-3 days in the rest of the year, to share their experiences of managing across the traditional boundaries. The university facilitates their work, for example by showing theory to illuminate, or by giving them some case studies to work on. After these, each participant identifies the skills they particularly find wanting, and move on to individual session to fill the gap. MBA programme also incorporates various general skills listed above, with combination of theory and case studies. Some people are difficult to get their style changed and acquire new skill, and in these cases, '360 degree analysis' of the manager is applied. It works in such a way that their bosses and subordinates tell them what they think of them, and the University feeds this back as a part of their own confidential analysis of the skills, to identify their weakness. Apart from these there are highly specialised courses as well.

(break)

The concept and the practice of Compact and Local Strategic Partnership

Background of Compact

- In 1998, National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) discussed with the government as to what role voluntary sector could play under new Labour government. NCVO suggested the central government departments to have some commonality to the way they handle the voluntary sector, for different government departments had different attitudes towards voluntary organisations. Prime Minister agreed that the government would set up Compact with each government department, and began to talk to voluntary sector about how they should treat and value each other.
- By 2 years after they had written these down as an agreement, of about 4-5 pages long, to which separate Compacts in all different areas followed afterwards e.g. on financing, black and ethnic minority, community involvement etc. Compact was also an attempt to pull various different ways of government funding together to make it more systematic and to agree a framework within which they would work.
- In 2000/2001, the government suggested, as a part of its community strategy, that Local Compacts between local authorities and voluntary sector should be prepared by 1 April,

2004. The thoroughness of the implementation varies considerably, and about 20% of local authorities have not done it yet, and a half of 80% (which have done it) did so during this year, at the last minute, while about 30-40% moved quickly and had their Compacts running by 2002.

- They talked each other, not of copying national documents but to create the one based on the community, and for voluntary sector to take responsible role in wider civil society, as a liaison link between community and government.

- Local authorities use this framework to decide future funding, and this means that voluntary sector is now involved in some of the decisions about funding.

- Compact is not fixed with a piece of paper but has evolved through its implementation. There is now much more favourable condition for cooperation as a result of the accumulation. Nottingham City says for example that Compact has saved both politicians and voluntary sector from getting into conflict with each other by providing a place for discussion, through which they try to get resolution.

- Those local authority not having Compact cannot claim any extra money poured in by the central government for the development of voluntary sector.

- Some government funding is also for voluntary sector to develop their skills.

- There are quality assurance schemes for voluntary sectors, to ensure that they are providing high level of service and valuing the views of the users in the community, and a lot of which are written into the Compacts and helped by local authorities.

- Government wants more work to go into voluntary and community sector, thus those in voluntary and community sector have been required to enhance their skills, and this is what Compact is partly about.

KSh: There probably was not enough time to discuss and prepare the agreement, Compact at local community.

KSp: That was a problem for the government - not everybody was keen to follow government's advice. Some did not take much time to think about it and just downloaded others' Compacts from the NCVO website and copied it. Prepared in this way Compact does not mean anything for it works only if it is prepared jointly by local government and voluntary / community sector. A research conducted in 3-4 years ago asked if Compact made any difference, and the result was a half yes and another half no. In some areas Compacts are highly successful, or beginning to work, while in other areas they are total failure because they did not spend enough time working on it together.

YO: Compact is linked up with other evaluation measures. There is such a pressure on local authority to work with voluntary sector, and without having Compact they cannot do it

very well – that is now the basic condition they have to have. There is no choice if they are to have Compact or not any more.

KSh: Does it mean that they have to have Compact if they want to claim government money?

KSp: Yes. For example, in one of the new government programmes, the criterion for giving money is if they have good relation with voluntary sector, and one of the criteria for this is how well Compact is working. Audit commission also assesses if the local authority works with its partners, and not having Compact means a fatal disadvantage in the assessment. If they have Compact, then, they assess how well it is working by looking at both sides, local authority and the voluntary sector – and a good result means extra money.

KSh: Could you explain Local Strategic Partnership and its relationship with Compact in Birmingham?

KSp: In Birmingham, voluntary sector has Compact not with the City Council but with Local Strategic Partnership. All agencies under the Local Strategic Partnership sign the Compact and are all bound by it. Local authority does not control the Local Strategic Partnership – they are just one agency in it though the most powerful and influential (with most money, and in Birmingham the leader of the City Council is the Chair of the Local Strategic Partnership), tending to put more agendas on than anyone else. The leader of Birmingham City Council does not like the City Strategic Partnership (as it is called in Birmingham) for he cannot make decision on his own any more but has to persuade 25 other people. They now debate the issues and find areas of agreement, though they cannot always achieve it. It is supposed to improve working relationship between different agencies. Birmingham however is too big, and Michael Lyons, the former Chief Executive of the City for example argues that they should have 10 Local Strategic Partnerships to be effectively linked with community planning, yet the government ignores the size and applies it universally.

YO: Birmingham is now divided into 11, are not they?

KSp: Birmingham is now divided into 11 areas for devolution purposes.

YO: There are going to be partnerships at that level too, do you think?

KSp: Yes, they could have some form of partnership at that level. Each represents a parliamentary constituency, and a lot of local services, like refuse collection, parks, street cleaning, lighting and library services will be run on that basis, according to the needs of local community.

YO: They are going to be done in partnership, are they not?

KSp: They should be. Yet one of the disputes that may hinder it is that while local communities wanted to control planning applications in their community, the City Council

refused this, since they believe that the Council must be overseeing the decisions of local communities as a whole and overall legality.

KSh: There probably is distrust within Local Strategic Partnership. Given that, how do you manage the Local Strategic Partnership well?

KSp: For the very first six months, the members of the commission argued each other, reflecting the views in the City at that time. So the first year was spent to try to get them to talk to each other in a sensible way in the community, so that they understand different perspectives. There indeed was distrust but everyone agreed that the relationships need to be improved and they have to move forward. A part of the problem was an old voluntary sector forum, created in 15 years ago, which does not represent the present voluntary sector, and within which they did not trust each other. They wiped it out and created a new organisation with new people who are very positive about the relationships, and there the old negativism was replaced by the positivism.

YO: Local Strategic Partnership has a problem. Do you think Birmingham City can overcome this? Local Strategic Partnership is in my view an experiment, in which smaller local governments are more successful. Government wants to invest the future money for regeneration through Local Strategic Partnership, and the government will check if Local Strategic Partnership is working through accreditation. Birmingham has to catch up this trend quickly if they want to receive government money.

KSp: Birmingham has a big problem. Political leaders are very powerful and influential, and they do not talk to the government officers in the region but go down to London and talk to Ministers or Prime Minister. These politicians do not like and resist the Local Strategic Partnership since they feel it is pulling power away from them. In June, however, there is an election, and Labour party will most likely lose. When others come in, the situation surrounding the Local Strategic Partnership may improve for they are not used to having power. The chair of the Local Strategic Partnership may also be replaced and taken up by a person who is not politician, and this would allow it to develop in non hierarchical manner.

KSh: About the issues of social inclusion. Such a large movement as Local Strategic Partnership may have difficulties in involving minorities who are not sufficiently represented.

KSp: Local Strategic Partnership is trying to overcome this by bringing in a person representing minority, e.g. a person elected by the black and minority ethnic voluntary groups, like Race Action Partnership. There is however a problem. Those represented are more well established black and minority ethnic groups, whereas recently there have been a new growth of grassroots black activist local pressure groups which are not part of formal voluntary structure. When the City is devolved into the 11 areas, these groups ought to be engaged. There are different levels / mechanisms of inclusion – the City

Strategic Partnership cannot involve those local community grassroots groups for the City Strategic Partnership deals mainly with wider agendas and strategies, whereas what matters to those grassroots groups are more detailed local issues. Local Strategic Partnership cannot do everything – they draw distinction between the City Strategic Partnership and localised groups, and set up sub-groups within the former to look at specific issues.

YO: Included in the package of Local Strategic Partnership is the so-called 'Community Empowerment Network'. Birmingham for example has a quite large one with about 15 paid staff. They talk to local community, network people to enhance their power. It has been run 3-4 years and seems very effective.

KSp: In South Gloucestershire (population of 150,000) for example it is working very well, and influencing decisions.

TM: Local Strategic Partnership is now trying to encompass local people, and the central government gives funding directly to Local Strategic Partnerships. This means that Local Strategic Partnerships have huge resources and potential to deal with a wide range of local issues. What, then, will the relationship between Local Strategic Partnerships and local governments look like?

KSp: The central government does not want to keep on giving money to local governments, and shifting it to Local Strategic Partnerships (local governance) over time. i.e. moving away from relying too heavily on local government to relying on networks, and forcing people to work in networks. Behind this is the idea that local government should concentrate on fewer, core services which are to be covered by local taxes. Local government is given more power, if at all, not to provide services but to regulate others who deliver services – local government is not expected to be deliverer but enabler.