

## **Pauline Gordon (nee Graham)**

This is a transcript of a conversation between Pauline Gordon and Dr Gillian Murray recorded at Glasgow Caledonian University in October 2014.

**Biography:** Pauline graduated from Glasgow Caledonian University as a mature student with a BA (Hons) in Communications in 1995 and her career history includes marketing management in the further education sector, the community arts field and community regeneration. From 2001-2008, Pauline worked at SCVO and managed the Social Economy Scotland Partnership funded under the EU EQUAL Programme that attracted over £5M to support social economy developments in Scotland. The project won the best Policy Impact Award in 2008 and had a direct influence on the first social enterprise strategy in Scotland. Pauline also represented Scotland at European Commission level and has continued to participate in EU Social Entrepreneurship Networks. Pauline joined Social Firms Scotland (SFS) in 2008 - the national support agency for Social Firms. In 2020, Social Firms Scotland merged with Senscot and Pauline was appointed Director of Social Enterprise Network Scotland. Pauline is also a founding director of Ready for Business Procurement LLP which is the lead partner in a consortium delivering the Scottish Government's 'Developing Markets for Third Sector Providers' Programme'.

\*\*\*

### ***How and at what point in your life did you become involved in social enterprise?***

I became involved in social enterprise when I worked at Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations. I worked there for eight years.

### ***When was that?***

That was 2000. I kind of stumbled into it because I was in the FE sector doing marketing, which is what I did at Cale [Glasgow Caledonian University]. I got bored with marketing in the sense that it was just about marketing courses across the FE sector. I saw this job at SCVO, I didn't really know much about it. It was a European project but it was very much around the voluntary sector, as SCVO are. I was very surprised to get that job. I was in the door six months working with local Councils for Voluntary Services, very rooted in the traditional charity sector.

### ***Was that in Glasgow?***

Yes, I was based in Glasgow but I worked all over the country. Then there was an opportunity from the European Commission for this new programme called Equal. There was a theme in Equal called Developing the Social Economy and that really interested me. SCVO hadn't really been involved, they had done lots of European programmes but they had never done a community initiative programme. The language around social economy was quite new to Scotland, but we knew it included the third sector so SCVO applied as a lead project partner.

In my FE sector time I had been quite involved in European programmes, transnational programmes around education, so I was very keen to use my expertise in that field to help SCVO get this bid in. Six months in I helped to write the bid for Equal -the social economy

specific theme- and low and behold we got it and we were the lead partner. It was new to everybody.

***Who else was in on that bid, who were you working with at that time?***

We were working with the Social Enterprise Unit at that time it was Community Scotland, which was later disbanded as a non-departmental public body and brought into the Scottish Government. It was really a government level partner I guess, which was great. The other strategic partners we got buy in from was Scottish Enterprise and Highlands and Islands Enterprise. Highlands and Islands Enterprise was a great partner also because they had a tradition of community business and community development. That was great. We had a really good urban and rural mix of partners. SCVO was lead partner and we had Kilmarnock College because they were quite interested in developing a social economy presence. We had Forth Sector who were a leading social enterprise agency. They were the core partners.

It was just great to get the bid. I don't think even Scottish Government knew how this was going to pan out. Nobody knew how to do this new thing called Equal. For the first time there were three phases to it. There was a development phase of six to eight months where you got a pot of money to get your strategic partners together to develop a programme of work and consult people in the sector, in its broadest sense, the third sector. Then really focusing on the economic dimension of that. It was the first time in Scotland we started to talk differently about the third sector. There was this thing about the social economy and social enterprise within that context which was quite new to our discourse. That was brilliant because it gave a visibility to it. People started talking about, "Am I a social enterprise? I have a business orientation, I trade." But there wasn't that many voices being heard.

The first phase of Equal was good. We took that message out, "This is about the economic dimension of all this, not strictly about traditional charities." That stimulated a lot of debate. The second phase was the implementation phase. Equal is also about innovation, that was brilliant, it was a key horizontal theme. You had to keep thinking, how can we do and use this money to take a bit of a considered risk and test out new things around the social economy? How can it create more jobs? How we can start to define it better? How can we look at the ecosystem of support around it, does that exist? There was this whole new swell of interest around understanding the social economy and social enterprise. People navigated towards it I think, people who were generally interested.

This is probably a bit controversial but it is true. SCVO as the lead partner didn't really want to talk about 'social enterprise'. They wanted to talk about the voluntary sector. There was a bit of tension for me in how we drove this programme forward. I suppose people in the traditional voluntary sector felt a bit threatened that there was this new thing being discussed, which caused a bit of tension. It still does actually.

The implementation stage was great, we learned a lot. We learned a lot from what didn't work to be honest as well as what worked well. That is my mantra in life, learn from everything including the things that don't work, that you test out and they don't work. The final phase was a dissemination mainstreaming phase and you had a separate pot of money for that, which was fabulous. You still had to find matched funding but you still had that dedicated period of time where you disseminated learning from all projects and activities –

what worked and what didn't. That was quite successful in 2000 to 2005. I think we started in 2002.

Then there was a new programme of Equal, there was a phase two. We went back in and applied again and we got the second phase, which was wonderful. We had learned a lot from the first phase of Equal. I don't take credit for this but it was good for Scotland to be leading this EU programme with a clear focus on developing the social economy. That is the way Equal operated – A Development Partnership approach – a number of strategic partners and then delivery partners to test out innovations. We were the only social economy theme in Scotland. There was a lot of focus on our work. We also had a transnational dimension to it. That for me was the catalyst for a different dynamic in Scotland.

We had partners in Austria and Italy in phase one and so we learned a lot from them. In fact the Austrian partners were not really practitioners they were social researchers. They had done a lot around social economy, social enterprise development, gender mainstreaming and loads of social research issues in the context of social enterprise that were of great interest to us. We learned a lot from them and we learned so much from the Italian experience. Their model of social enterprise is a cooperative model. When I looked at Italy in terms of its growth of the social cooperative movement or social enterprise movement and then I looked at Scotland we were very much a poor relation. We didn't understand it enough. We couldn't evidence it enough. Where are these social enterprises? Do they call themselves such? But we tapped into something that we wanted to explore more and we had the luxury of this Equal programme and also lots of learning from our Italian partners.

We kept the same Italian partners for the second phase of Equal, because we liked what they did and we thought we could learn an awful lot more and transfer learning. We kept our Italian partners and we also partnered with Finland and Poland. Poland were new to European funding and new to social economy -I guess if you were thinking about where we all were on the progress of the social economy movement - the Italians were far ahead. The Finnish partners were exploring social enterprise because they had a new law around social enterprise. There was a very clear legal definition for them and they wanted to develop new ones. Scotland, as in the UK, didn't have a legal definition. We had to start defining it ourselves. What did it look like in Scotland? What is the potential untapped around social enterprise? Does it have policy buy in? There was a policy dimension to this as well as an innovation test, evaluate and disseminate dimension.

That was good but we felt through that the programme in phase two might advance our efforts to develop the social economy in Scotland – I guess we felt at that point that England was making better advances. We were looking south of the border and seeing the cabinet office as it was then have a social enterprise unit, some people there who were dedicated to social enterprise. They had moved the discourse on a bit more than we had. They were talking about social enterprise, they were talking about what ecosystem they needed to support and mobilise the movement. Scotland felt a bit behind on some of that.

I have to say by the end of Equal phase two which finished in 2008, Scotland was ahead of the game. That is not to say we had sorted it all but that whole decade or part of that decade and focus on social enterprise brought new organisations to the fore. People who did social enterprise started to navigate towards others who did social enterprise. There was a policy

link. In Equal we also had the policy people saying, “This is something really dynamic. We think there is lots of potential to do more, can you put your policy weight behind it? Can you get some ministers behind it?”

On the ground there was a swell of movement and on a policy dimension there was a real interest in what could be achieved through this business model and that was all about social impact in the end. It was all about social outcomes and social missions but we were describing it in a slightly different way because it was around trading, business and business disciplines. We started to think, what would we do in phase two that would help the movement? We need to keep the policy links going. We looked at some of the barriers to growing social enterprises, start-up, scaling up and we also looked at developing the people side of that. Do we have some good leaders in social enterprise? How do we develop good leaders?

This notion of social entrepreneurship started to weave into the narrative. That is quite difficult to describe. I think we got somewhere in trying to define where it was in the space of the third sector, its relationship to the private sector and the public sector. When you talk about social entrepreneurship where does that fit? It is just about individuals really. But individuals do create social enterprises. It is individuals who make that happen.

Social entrepreneurship in that sense had to feature in the work that we were doing, the narrative around the support end. We had a number of things to tackle when we went out to speak to people about how we would deliver this programme, who wanted to be involved. We got some really good projects. What we didn’t do was go out and say to people, “There is a big pot of money for social economy work, who would like to bid in?” We didn’t do that, we took a different approach to this programme and I am very glad we did. We said, “We have got a chance here to use this funding and take some risks- be pragmatically risky to test social enterprise development in Scotland and to do some innovative stuff around the social economy.”

We tackled it in a number of ways. We went out and talked to people a lot about the programme, about the potential for the programme. The strategic partners defined the themes we wanted to tackle. We did that by talking to our European counterparts, by looking at what the commission level direction of travel was on social enterprise and taking some of that back to Scotland to say to the people who were doing this, they were doing it but they didn’t feel part of a movement, “What are the barriers to the development of your business, your social enterprise? Is it people, is it job creation, is it access to markets, is it access to finance, is it that the visibility of the sector is too low? What are the big issues?” We took the listening and learning back and the strategic partners decided on the key themes to tackle.

We had a developing people theme - a leadership dimension to that. We had Graduates into Social Enterprise, which was a peripatetic programme to give graduates who were unemployed the chance to understand, do a piece of work, and also get that “oh, this is social enterprise”. Get them interested. We also had access to finance. We looked at the financial products that are available to social enterprises that were specific to their needs as a business model. We worked with Social Investment Scotland and some of the charity banks around some of that work. We had an access to markets type theme which looked at public procurement and the barriers to entry there. We looked at a model that we took directly from

Italy which was around public social partnerships. What struck me and the other partners - going to Italy and seeing their experience was they had a very different relationship between the social sector and the public sector. They had a very positive, productive parity of esteem relationship with the public authorities that our sector just didn't have.

We did some early what we call Public Social Partnerships or PSPs to test some of that in Scotland. We got some poor results and some good results as part of that endeavour. Again as I said earlier it was all part of the learning, let's learn from the things that fail and then we can do things differently. In my view it is part of innovation that you do that, so we had that as a theme. We also had a horizontal theme around raising the profile. We needed a visibility campaign, we need a theme and activity that runs through all of this that raises the visibility and understanding of the sector and its impact. We did that, we held some early awards programmes. The first social enterprise awards we had people liked it, people like to have some kind of accolade.

We also gave the sector some tools because we can't do it all for them. We gave them some tools around how to deal with the media, how to write a press release, how to sell their story, how to measure their impact. Social impact measurement was another theme. Those themes were very important to us and we stuck to them. We said, "We can't do everything but we will tackle some of the key barriers that people have told us and that we are learning from our European counterparts about how to grow the sector and how to develop the sector." I think we did that pretty well during the course of the second phase of Equal. We disseminated as widely as we could things that worked and things that still needed to be tackled.

We won a policy impact award because of our social economy Equal programme. That was good recognition for us that we had started from a policy position and thought, "What needs to change?" We had good partners and we had tested lots of projects on the ground. We evaluated and then we disseminated. We mainstreamed some good stuff. We mainstreamed social impact measurement. The government started putting money behind helping the sector measure the impact better. Our learning from Equal was we tested a lot around social return on investment. We had some key social enterprises that said, "We want to be part of this, can you do a social return investment on our work?" The results were good but what we said at the end of that was one size can't fit all.

If I recall, one of the first people I ever met when I came into the third sector at SCVO, luckily, was John Pearce and Alan Kay. They came to talk to anybody who wanted to listen about social accounting. I said I would go and meet them. I was trying to standardise services and quality of services for councils of voluntary service across the country, so that was part of my project. I thought it would be interesting to have some social accounting tools or techniques that could be used by them or at least get people interested in the importance of social accounting, which John and Alan were very passionate about and Alan remains so to this day.

I will never forget that meeting. That changed my thinking about the sector that I was in, because it was about impact - how do you measure impact of any of this? On impact measurement there was no real dialogue around this in the voluntary sector at that time. I am sure now there is. It was really interesting to me that they were there to talk to anybody who

wanted to listen. You can do your financial accounting but you ought to be doing social accounting at the same time. Then you have got something else to say about what you do.

That was a great meeting, I didn't know where to take it. How do we pay for this, how do we roll this out? How do we help John and Alan to do that? It really changed the way I thought about the sector that I worked in. That is why I hooked onto the social economy Equal programme. I wanted to look at the business end of the social economy and social enterprise. I was just hooked from then on. I had the privilege of managing the Equal programme in Scotland as it went through its various guises. After that programme I was like, what do I do now?

Having looked at the focus on the Equal Social Economy theme and the visibility around social enterprise itself the support landscape had also changed during that decade. Not just as a result of Equal but as a result of people talking about social enterprise, people doing social enterprise, people talking to one another and networking more. You started to get the emergence of my organisation, now Social Firm Scotland. There were only about five social firms in Scotland in 2000 when our organisation came into being. They needed a voice and SCVO didn't appear to give them a voice and nor did they want to talk about the business end of things. So, Social Firm Scotland was created to talk to people who were doing social firms, who were creating jobs for people who had a disability or a mental health problem. For me that just chimed with all the stuff I had seen in Italy. That is what they did day in and day out on a much grander scale. I was thinking, if we get the support landscape right, if we get policy buy in, if we get a strategy, we could really move this movement forward. That was really exciting for me.

I moved on from SCVO, but Equal was finishing and I wanted a new challenge if truth be told. I came to Social Firm Scotland as the temporary chief executive. The previous lady was on maternity leave and then she didn't come back so I stayed. I have been here for seven years. I just love it and I am very privileged to do my job, because I love the sector so much. I think people like me and others, loads of great people, have kept the momentum going around the sector.

As well as Social Firm Scotland emerging specific for work integration and social enterprises there was also Social Entrepreneurs' Network Scotland, so Senscot came into being and started to create local networks around the country. We started to look at other things that the sector needed and Development Trust Association was set up. That was specific to community anchor organisations, some of them do social enterprise, but not all of them do. It is very much about a community response to social problems in an organised way.

There were these different types of models of delivery vehicles, for want of a better word, delivering on social problems and creating social impact mostly using a business model. There was a Social Enterprise Coalition that came into being. The Social Enterprise Academy came into being to deal with the people side and the leadership development stimulating entrepreneurship in a social sense in schools and universities, so you can see how the ecosystem started to change.

We had a louder voice because we had more of a movement behind us. We met challenges too - so there was pushback from some of the traditional voluntary sector organisations who said, "You are creating a parallel universe here." No we are not, they need a voice, this is

quite organic how it has grown so we need to continue to challenge and we need to continue to have a voice for the people who are doing social enterprise on the ground.

***What do you think the more traditional voluntary sector was afraid of in the creation of social enterprise? You talked a little bit about there was a tension and a debate, some of it productive but there has always been a tension. Why do you think that is? What are people's fears or anxieties?***

That is a very good question. I think the tension at an organisational level is that organisations like SCVO or the CVSs had been on the landscape of voluntary sector support for so long. SCVO I think were established in 1955 or something. There had been these traditional organisations to support the voluntary sector endeavour and promote volunteering for many years. So I think because of their historical power and voice that is where the tension mainly came from. That is where they take a bit of a defensive position on this. They thought, "They are creating another beast here that we don't recognise. It is not really part of our world. We just dug our heels in and said, "This is too important not to have a separate voice."

***Do you think social enterprise does have different values from the voluntary sector?***

I think it has similar values. I guess part of a family of organisations but there are things distinct about social enterprise that need to be recognised and valued. I am not saying there is a hierarchy of worth or value around whether you deliver your social impact through a self-help group or whether you support people with disability, learning disability or mental health through an enterprise model. That is just a vehicle but actually there is a distinction and there are different support needs. There are different investment requirements very often. There are different skills and expertise that you need to run a business. You need to understand markets for a start. There are different skillsets required in many respects. That is not to be disparaging at all about the traditional voluntary sector or big charities who do amazing work and are very enterprising in their own way. They are slightly different. Some of them have social enterprises or social firms as subsidiaries for example and that is to be applauded. At the same time we felt very strongly and to this day I feel strongly about it that social enterprise is distinct in many ways.

***In what kinds of ways would you describe?***

It is an enterprise or a business, it is not just an enterprising approach. There is a distinction there for me. Of all the things I have said there about you need a viable business idea, you need to be able to write a pretty decent business plan, you need to deliver that business plan and you need to make a profit, profit is really important. However, you describe it, for many years it was not for profit. Actually we are very much about profit it is just what you do with the profit, it is always reinvested. There are some particular things that we have championed about social enterprise.

Eventually to describe it to others and ourselves we talked to the sector because we don't have a legal definition, could we have some kind of criteria or behaviours that we recognise one another by that are quite precious to social enterprise? Along with the sector, Sencot and others we developed a voluntary code of practice around social enterprise which has some criteria written down and some values and behaviours. That will evolve over time, there are

things in there around an asset lock which are really important to us. We see zero profit distribution. Whereas the direction of travel down south in our view started to dilute the definition of social enterprise.

The social enterprise mark that was developed down south, which anybody can go for in Scotland, leaves room for profit distribution. I think in Scotland we feel strongly that the no profit distribution argument stays and the asset lock is really critical. If you don't meet those criteria in Scotland now most of the organisations that support social enterprise, award them money or have a membership remit, use the code. That is not to be exclusive but actually it is quite precious that we write those values, behaviours and criteria down and that people use them as the parameters of what we are talking about here. The government seemed keen on it as well given we have no legal definition.

I think the code is useful. It is a voluntary code so we don't police it as such. Although if you sign up for the code you need to have two other code members endorse you. We have refused some people the code because they don't have an asset lock. We did recognise that some community interest companies and co-operatives have models that permit profit distribution but we still think the Code criteria is and should be the benchmark.

***That is very interesting. I would maybe like to go back and talk about when you were in the Equal project some things worked and some things didn't. Can you give me a couple of example of things that are memorable that you thought that is one of our stand out things that worked and perhaps ones that didn't as well.***

Some of the things that worked were the public social partnerships. One of them failed miserably, it was Edinburgh based – involving the council and a range of social economy organisations who came together who all worked in the employability field, some of them were social firms as well. Rather than the council going to tender an employability contract to support people, we said, do not do a traditional procurement exercise rather we can support the partnership to co-design or co-produce a suite of supports for the service users that would be better than just going straight to a tender opportunity.” And allow service users to inform this.

Why did that not work? A bit of complacency on both sides, not enough hard work. I don't think there was enough commitment from the partners on both sides to innovate and properly work in partnership. At times there was a difficulty in how the providers, the social economy folk, thought they were giving away their intellectual property if they properly designed a service together. They were competitors very often. The council would put out a tender for something and they would all go for it and bang one another out the way. There was that, there was competition, not enough collaboration and not enough focus on the problem they were trying to fix.

When we did the dissemination phase we talked a lot about that Edinburgh PSP. We called it our crash test dummy, because it didn't work. That was surprising because Edinburgh and the provider partners had a lot of experience in employability services. We thought, “If the commitment is there and they are focused they could hit the ground running on it.” Anyway, that was a miserable failure but we learnt.



There was another PSP in North Lanarkshire which was very successful where three providers in the recycling space working with the Homeless Department, social work, and procurement in North Lanarkshire Council to redesign a service that was for people moving into short-term tendancies. There was loads of social impact coming out of that experience. They redesigned a service that was a better service, they piloted it as PSP over time. It was evaluated and the council then put a specification together based on that better service.

The social economy partners who delivered the pilot went for it but they didn't win it. In hindsight we learned a hell of a lot from them not winning it. People thought, "That PSP model is rubbish because it didn't work." I said, "It did work, let's look at the reasons why the social economy organisations, who were involved in the pilot didn't win the contract." Actually the bottom line was their costs were too high. They didn't get good advice on their tender submission, or they didn't take that advice and their costs were far too high. The quality of their bids scored very highly, the costs took them right down and a private company won it. In essence what people said to me for many years after that was that PSP model of redesigning a service using third sector providers doesn't work because they didn't win it. I think we have learned a lot from that experience.

What we were saying to social economy partners was, "If you want to part of a PSP, you have to understand after the pilot phase you step back so no organisation has favourable treatment. It is the commissioning authority's responsibility to write the specification, hopefully based on a better service so they are asking for the right things. Then you will be in a pretty good position to win it, but you need to be good at responding to a tender. This was a weak area for some organisations but we reacted to that by introducing a tender support programme.

There was another PSP in Renfrewshire which is now an organisation rather than a project - which was around low level befriending services for older people in Renfrewshire. I think that was really successful in the amount of partners we got working together. We had social work, we had NHS, we had a volunteer centre and we got the providers all working, "How can we do this better?" The redesign of that service was very good. They didn't go straight to tender but I think they subsequently will.

We have taken the good stuff about the PSPs in the mainstreaming phase to government and said, "There is something in this. There is something really good about this as a way of getting better services, engaging in the third sector and in the design of that." The government put their weight behind that and they had a whole separate programme of support, 10 PSPs, which I was on the advisory group for. I have to say that the contract was won by Price Waterhouse Coopers and Forth Sector did the impact measurement around it. It wasn't hugely successful. I am not being overly critical here but I don't think it was true to the PSP model. I think it was more about commissioning discussions and not enough redesign of services and not enough piloting. Some good stuff, but for me not true to the PSP model. However, the government were still interested and we were still pushing. There was something good about working with commissioning authorities whether a local authority or a non-departmental public body and the sector and bringing them together in a PSP to co-design or redesign a service for delivering better outcomes.

Subsequent to that the government put out a contract called Developing Markets for Third Sector Providers, which my organisation is a partner in delivering. We are now - after all of those early days of Equal tinkering with the PSP and learning from Italy- supporting five strategic public social partnerships. One in Edinburgh around the Royal Edinburgh Hospital redevelopment, a new hospital. How do we start to get the sector to work with the NHS to redesign services that could happen in the community setting rather than a hospital setting?

We are doing something around mental health rehabilitation. We are also doing something with a PSP with NHS Lothian around the green space, art space within the new hospital. How do you make this a better place for inpatients, outpatients, staff and families? So there is a mini PSP around that, which is fantastic I think. We have also got a community transport PSP in the West of Scotland. We have got Community Transport Network in the West of Scotland working directly with Strathclyde Partnership for Transport, who are the commissioning agency to do something about the MyBus service. They have got a responsive bus service, demand led where the private sector has pulled out basically and this is plugging some gaps.

The demographics tell us that people are going to need transport and there is going to be a higher demand on that service. How do they work with the community transport sector to shape some of that? Very exciting. I think it is also very exciting that during the early commitment to that PSP around community transport the sector said, “We really need some upskilling, we really need some capacity building around some of this.” SPT (Strathclyde Partnership for Transport) agreed that they needed some assurances that the CT sector had sufficient quality in the delivery of any transport service whether community or otherwise – a robust health and safety record, and quality assurance.

For me that is great because it takes me back to the early days of standing in the middle of Turin going, “In the name of God this is what we need in Scotland.” The scale of what the cooperative movement does there was huge. I was just inspired and I am inspired to this day. We have transferred a lot of that inspiration, learning and practice to Scotland and we are now seeing it in some of the PSPs that we are developing. There is now about 30 PSPs in Scotland all tackling different things.

The reason that has happened is we have tried to be true to the PSP model whilst still evolving, we can tell a story on what is good about it – why it is important for both the commissioning authority and the sector. It not only creates better outcomes because of that coproduction, it delivers efficiencies. That was very clear in the North Lanarkshire example where they were spending lots of money on lots of things to help people who were formally homeless maintain a tenancy. They were spending lots of money if that tenant went early. The PSP gives you a chance to completely look at the baseline, look at the problem, co-design a solution, test it, evaluate it and go to tender or make it sustainable or business as usual in that sense.

There are six PSPs being supported through the government’s change funds on reducing reoffending. There are 20 mini PSPs around early years. We have moved with the times and we have moved with the policy shifts. But the PSP model is still a good model but it needs to be implemented well. There is some continuity of support around.

Hopefully we have moved with the times because the SNP [Scottish National Party] government in particular were very explicit about their shift towards preventative spend both

at a national level and encouraging outcome agreements at a local level to reflect the prevention approaches. I think our sector have got a lot of things to contribute in that space. PSP is one way of them getting involved in some of that at least as a contribution to prevention. If you do PSP better in terms of reducing reoffending you are likely to get better outcomes for the public purse and for people.

It is very exciting as well that we are working at Low Moss Prison around a particular through care model. We have got the sector and the commissioning agencies, so social work, criminal justice, NHS, all the agencies that would have a feature in a prisoner's support pathway working together and we have redesigned the service. It is being delivered over three years and we have got a really good duration to test if we can make this work. It is specific to Low Moss Prison population of short-term prisoners. The response has been very positive from all the agencies and from the prisoners. A lot of these short-term prisoners don't connect with services. They are in for a very short time and then they are out but they tend to come back in.

This model is looking at how it is much more seamless as soon as they enter the prison. We have got some of the third sector organisations involved, Turning Point Scotland are the lead in this case who are very experienced in this. We have got agencies from our sector in the prison as a team working alongside the prison officers. I don't think that has happened before. I think there have been lots of great third sector interventions done to prisoners but they have been short-term ad-hoc interventions. A basket of good things rather than a much more holistic person-centred way of delivering support. I think that is working and we are going to have to prove it, but the early response is very good. In my view that is how we have taken things that didn't work in Equal but used the learning to apply them much better at a later date in a different setting. That wouldn't have happened had we not had Equal. We wouldn't have been able to say something about this model of doing things differently, we need to continue to learn from that.

***I think it is very interesting what you said about co-production in PSPs. You have got policy people on board, how do you encourage or engage people on the ground? How do you convince them it is worth talking to you and engaging with these things?***

That is a very interesting question. The public social partnership model and engaging people in that has generally come from the public sector, which is interesting. What has changed over the decade and a half since I got involved in the sector is amazing. We are no longer the poor relation we are ahead of the game. We have still got lots to learn from our European counterparts many of whom are further ahead. But because we still work on a transnational social enterprise network, myself and Kim Wallace from Sencot are involved in a European network. I think we are saying to ourselves, "We are doing an awful lot, which tells us we have moved on significantly from those early days of social economy." It is an amazing story we have to tell now. We have got 20 odd social enterprise networks across the country. We have thematic networks across social enterprise in health, social enterprise in sport, community food, culture and that still makes me excited because I think, "My God, I wouldn't have thought we would have come so far." People understand social enterprise a lot better. Certainly people in the third sector and policy people. We have got a bigger job to do on consumers. We have to think very seriously about that. We talk a language that if you are in the sector you understand it but it is very difficult to talk to other people.

To answer your question on the coproduction side it hasn't been awfully difficult because they recognise how important social enterprise and the third sector are in delivering services. Actually their experience and their closeness to service users gives them an added value dimension. Also they like the fact that they want the sector to work together and PSPs certainly do that. This isn't about one agency on the public sector side or the third sector side. It is very much a collaborative, they see providers coming together.

We have got a PSP in Glasgow around learning disability day services and we have got 13 providers working generally very well together with Glasgow City Council, with Glasgow Life. We are scaling up our ambitions around that. The public sector don't need convincing. They come to us and say, "I would quite like to think about a PSP around older people's services or homeless services or addiction services." Because there is a hell of a lot of pressure on them financially in terms of savings. There is an efficiency argument that looms large with the public sector and that is fine, we all have to buy in to that. We want efficiencies, we are all tax payers at the end of the day, but we also want better services delivered. The germ of the ideas usually comes from them [local authorities], then we go in and speak to them and try and galvanise support from the sector.

The two change funds that have applied PSP as a criterion we were involved a bit in helping them with the guidance and stuff. Actually if truth be told we were also quite up front with them, "If you are going to apply a really challenging model of PSP to co-design and get better service outcomes don't do it as part of a competitive fund." People in our sector navigate towards money. Really the motivation for getting a PSP out of that is going to be they are going to their local authority, they are going to sign there and get some money and deliver something. I was quite explicit about that.

There is a way to apply the model in my view that is much better done through our strategic PSPs rather than as part of a change fund where there is a competitive process and people just want money, so they hook up with people along the way to get that money. That is not to say there aren't some good PSPs in that space as well but it is a different way of applying the model. It is a different genesis from the strategic PSPs.

NHS Lothian rather than the sector were completely the catalysts for the Royal Edinburgh Hospital redevelopment and they have embraced the PSP model beyond anyone I currently work with on this and that is fantastic, it is just brilliant. I think you have now got a different dynamic and a relationship that is much healthier between many commissioning authorities, public sector agencies and the sector. Lots has happened in 10 years around public procurement and I have been very involved in that space. But there is still some bad practice. There are different ways of doing it and PSPs are not a way of funding cheap services. It is not a way of avoiding procurement regulations. We have to myth bust a bit around it at times. It is not the panacea but it can be very useful and I think our sector are really up for being involved in it.

***In these areas where you feel a PSP model is useful what kinds of impacts can you distinguish? Why is it better for patients at the Edinburgh Royal or wherever these are being delivered?***

Why is it better? At the heart of doing a PSP apart from doing that redesign and coproduction between the commissioner and the sector at the very heart of PSP is, "Let's go and ask the

service users.” At Low Moss we did desk research. We know what works in reducing reoffending. This is what research tells us. This is what evaluation tells us. This is what all the reports that have been done tell us. We kind of know some of that, but Low Moss isn’t a geography. I think there are 750 releases a year. Again in Low Moss it was really the governor who was the leader, he showed great leadership. He was resistant at first, “I don’t know about this.” It was a new prison and he wanted to make it work. He was like, “Are you going to introduce something else challenging?” He was eventually completely the ambassador and he remains so to this day the ambassador for doing this and I think that is fantastic.

This PSP then spoke to inmates at Low Moss, and prisoners in the community who had been released as well so there were genuine focus groups around what prisoners told us how they engage with services, why they don’t engage with services, or why they are confused about services, both when they are in prison or when they are on release. There is a dynamic to PSPs that keeps checking back. Have we listened? Are we addressing the barriers, changes and things they have told us? It is an iterative process as you are doing the pilot - because you keep checking back with the prisoner. “How is this different for you?” As well as measuring reducing reoffending or the indicators towards. That is what you have to do all the time - keep learning. Are we improving the efficacy of this model? Because if it is to be sustainable the onus is on the partners to tell their story. Nobody is going to commission if you haven’t got the evidence base.

There is a lot around that which is important and that reflects back to what I said earlier about John Pearce and Alan’s work around social accounting and getting that importance of measuring the impacts and evidence that never left me from the moment I met John Pearce actually. I am not saying I am an expert in that field but I certainly do promote the importance of it. We have some impact measurement training and stuff for our members because people can lose sight of it. You can’t just anecdotally say, “We have got great values and we deliver lots of great stuff.” Prove it. That is what we have to keep doing even with the PSP models.

The prisoners’ response has been very good. It has also been independently evaluated. That gives us a degree of integrity around what we see and what the evaluator says because the prisoners have told us. It has been very positive I have to say, very person centred in the true sense. I just think there is something great about a tangible example of person centred services. If you follow a prisoner’s pathway you can see it. You can see, “We sorted that bit for you. You then had family support.” You have to learn along the way. In the Low Moss example, the partnership manager for the PSP told us quite early on the prisoners that are being released the main thing they are presenting with is a homeless issue, they do not have a home. They have a bag and nowhere to go, so they are sofa surfing and all sorts of things happen when you sofa surf. You generally come back into Low Moss.

It is very much an iterative process and continuous learning and that is good. That is what I like about the strategic PSPs. I like the dynamic, changing relationship between the commissioners and our sector who are delivering this really well. There is a mutual respect. There is a commitment to the vision for why you are doing this in the first place. Everybody is trying to solve the same problem. Where the early PSP in Edinburgh failed because there is

a lack of focus and commitment. Hopefully we are learning to apply that much better in this phase.

***That is interesting. I was also intrigued by a comment you said at the beginning of the interview when you were talking about Equal and how there was the Highlands and Islands Enterprise as well as initiatives in urban settings. In Scotland that can make a very different dynamic in the community you are involved in. I was wondering if you would talk a little bit about how that dynamic has evolved and how it relates to barriers or opportunities for scaling up PSPs because you are working with such different contexts.***

It is great to have Highlands and Islands Enterprise involved because as I said earlier they have a history of supporting community development in its widest sense. Community business development, community responses to things, community activism and community taking over services. There has been pockets of that happening all over, not just Highlands and Islands but rural parts of Scotland. This is just from my experience of being in the sector, there is very often faster responses from communities in rural areas because they have to do things quicker. I am not saying there is more of a sense of community but if you are remote and rural and a service shuts down or a community shop shuts down you have to move fast. You have to have a community response to that. I think that is why Highlands and Islands have supported community development so well. They haven't done it all, communities have done it across rural areas. Individuals in those communities have done it. But HIE have certainly facilitated that and should be applauded.

I was thinking at the beginning of Equal, "How do we get a rural urban mix to our innovations, to our projects?" That might be very different in a rural context. The expertise of having Highlands and Islands Enterprise and all their networks as a strategic partner was really helpful. I think it was up to them to go and speak to their stakeholders and say, "What is it that we could do up here?" I had lots of conversations with Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Head of Communities about what we could do with Equal up here? We had these things called social economy zones in Equal as well. It was to make sure before the social enterprise networks were in the landscape to get lots of partnerships happening locally that would start to do what we were doing on a national level which was stimulating debate around social enterprise and putting the right support in place and raising the visibility and understanding of it.

We set up these things called social economy zones in different parts of the country. The social economy zones were developed on the premise, if we put money or if we put resources into a geography and we get those local partners working together – would that stimulate the social economy in those areas? It wasn't a PSP as such. It wasn't about service delivery, but it was about supporting infrastructure. We had the local authority, the development agencies, so Social Enterprise Lanarkshire or Social Enterprise Renfrewshire, they don't exist anymore. But those agencies and a couple of third sector reps come together and say, "What could we do with this resource?" A dedicated geographical resource around social enterprise development. They all had their own action plans. It wasn't for us to be prescriptive about what the local sector needed.

With the bit of money that we gave from Equal we started to see a dialogue of the main stakeholders that were interested in social enterprise development at the local level. You

started to get agencies like Communities Scotland saying, “We are going to put some money into a fund to see if we can scale up social enterprise development in this part of the country. Highlands and Islands Enterprise were keen to consider how a social economy zone could work for the Highlands & Islands. There was lots of dialogue around it.

Quite a few months went by and Highlands and Islands Enterprise were a very good partner on Equal but they wanted their own project. Many things happened in Highlands and Islands but it didn't have anything big. They came back one day and they said, “We are going to propose a Highlands and Islands Social Enterprise Zone.” There was a great deal of interest from stakeholders across H&I. We wanted to connect people in different geographies of the Highlands and Islands, so let's just do it. I just thought fantastic. Highlands and Islands Enterprise were ambitious for this project and we soon got a team of people in place to establish a social economy Zone across the Highlands & Islands and we deployed resources under Equal to make it happen.

Although I wasn't there at the time, my organisation [Social Firms Scotland] managed the staff and the activities under the H&I Zone work. But then Social Enterprise Zone Highlands and Islands became a community interest company, so became its own entity and Social Firm Scotland pulled back. There is an important role for intermediaries in social enterprise space. Had we not done that and Social Firm Scotland not said, “We will take the staff and then float it off,” it wouldn't have happened I don't think. They needed an agency to coordinate it to make it happen.

During the lifetime of Equal they had a Social Enterprise Highlands and Islands conference every year. It was really high profile, great speakers, exhibition space so you were starting to visibly see a sector. People turning up with their banners and talking to one another about social enterprise developments and what needed to happen next. A real momentum started to build. To see that in the Highlands and Islands having been quite scared that we were setting up this Social Enterprise Highlands and Islands Zone, it is still there today. It is still under government contract that supports social enterprise in the Highlands and Islands.

If we put all of these components together we start to see something a lot bigger, certainly a lot faster than we might have thought it would have happened. I am very proud of that. Not because I did anything, but to be part of that was a real privilege to see the cogs turning and then more and more people navigating towards a movement, and it felt dynamic. That is why I am still here because I really feel privileged to be part of developing that movement and supporting it and representing its interests.

I think importantly now that we have a movement and networks we don't have to create much more. The infrastructure is there. There is a good, healthy ecosystem around social enterprise, which means that we now have access to ministers who want to talk about our world and the opportunities around it. We're engaging the sector in writing this new social enterprise strategy vision. I think we are calling it a vision document rather than a strategy, for the next 10 years. That is how ambitious we are now after treading carefully in the early days. Equal is very important to me because it was my catalyst and I think it was the catalyst for Scotland to focus on this. It brought a lot of money for social enterprise development. I think over the piece £5m plus. That was a lot of money for social enterprise. It is not all down

to that but for me as a personal experience that did make a difference from 2000 to where we are now.

We are a more confident movement. We are an ambitious movement -I think we could be more ambitious actually. We are certainly more confident. We have a voice so when government want to talk about equalities, disabilities or third sector general strategy developments then we have a voice round the table alongside SCVO and Development Trust Movement or Community Movement. I think that is very important to hold firm. We very often talk about a three legged stool. If we think about the third sector we have the voluntary sector traditional charities, which is diverse and vast in its own sense. Then we have community sector, and then you have social enterprise. Our sense is that social enterprise is, as I have said earlier quite distinct in terms of certain behaviours and the business model and the trading effort. It requires different things. Different investment approaches, different support arrangements sometimes. That is what we are there to do.

***Just thinking about that a bit more and reflecting on the issues of procurement that you mentioned earlier. How do you think that relationship you have with people on the ground, your firms who you are listening to all the time and “what are your issues?” How do you think that dynamic of procurement affects your relationship with them and your ability to fund or procure funds for different initiatives and the type of work that they do?***

I have been very involved in procurement reform programmes since 2006 at a government level to try and influence the way procurement is done for the benefit of my members and the wider social enterprise sector. Procurement was poorly done so the catalyst for the change in reforming policy & practice was the McClelland review in 2006, which basically said public procurement is not very good in Scotland. There is no uniformity of good practice. For me representing social enterprise interests in this space has been very important.

Contracts are too big, whilst we have some really big, exemplar social enterprises in Scotland, most of them are very small, most of my members are very small. Small is good, but to get into the public procurement market they can't go for contracts that are aggregated up. Other barriers to entry for social enterprises centre on the bureaucracy associated with the process - too onerous, too bureaucratic - asking for insurance levels, accreditations and things that are very often not relevant to the purpose or value of the contract.

Since 2006 there has been huge amount of progress around public procurement in Scotland. How it is done, its strategic importance is seen very much as a strategic lever to job creation, to community benefit and to loads of things that I think were not even on anybody's radar. In fact when I was in Equal early days we couldn't get anybody in procurement to talk to us. They were like, “Why would we want to talk to you?” I couldn't get anybody in the sector interested in talking about public procurement, “That is not for us.” We have moved on significantly on many levels.

John Swinney in particular- invited us in as supplier reps to be part of the reform programme. We have been very involved in challenging, in championing, in actually doing some stuff as well. Alongside the wider business community, although we don't always agree - we are the supplier reps so we are there to challenge, support and be champions what is good about reforming public procurement. We are there to tell our sector all the time things are changing



and listen to them about how that policy which looks very good at a national level is implemented at a local level.

Actually the problem is very much how it is implemented locally. I think that is changing too. I think there is an awareness around social enterprise locally because Senscot have set up the networks and the networks are flourishing on their own very often with supporting facilitation. I think that is really dynamic. You have then got local level responses to what their sector needs locally.

Things are changing even, at a local level I think the public agencies are responding well. There is a lot of financial pressure on them but they know what our sector can do. Some of them connect with the networks regularly, some of them have their own strategies around social enterprise, some of them have their own mappings and have a genuine healthy respect if you organise yourselves and that can only be good. We can only go from strength to strength if that is the case and the networks gain traction across every area of Scotland.

That was one of the things that struck me about the growth and acceleration of that growth of social firm movement in Italy, Germany and to some extent Spain and other countries. Our European counterparts organise themselves well. Working together collecting via consortia and then that consortia being part of a bigger consortia and those consortia being part of... That really struck me because how they organised themselves meant that there was loads of learning and peer support and there was a voice, a really strong representational voice. People bought into that. They paid their fee and they got support. That got them into all sorts of business opportunities. It got them contracts because the big consortium will write the bids and include all the members of that particular, if they were in that field.

I saw it first hand the huge business opportunities through procurement given to a lead social cooperative, quite a big one and the recycling/reuse field. Then underneath they had all these subcontractors, partners in delivery. It blew me away because it was a multimillion Euro business. But because they had organised themselves the proposition was good and their costs were good. The social impact was huge because they were creating volume of jobs for people who were ex-offenders, had mental ill-health problems, people with disabilities and huge numbers of people who were proudly working for the social cooperative and delivering on a huge contract. Some of the social co-ops had the cleaning contract for every school in Turin. I am like, "That is where we need to be."

***We have talked a lot about networks and infrastructure for social enterprise, the importance of that and how it has evolved over time. Now I would like to think a bit about people who are in these networks. You have said that people are very important and training and whatever. Back in the early 2000s what kind of person was inspired by this thing called social enterprise?***

That is a very good question. We had people like John and Alan who although they maybe didn't talk about social enterprise they talked about the community business sector which was the nearest thing we had to social enterprise. Then we had some interesting people. There is a guy called Kevin Robbie who was involved in Equal with me. I worked with Kevin for many years, he was the chief executive at Forth Sector who set up a number of social firms many years back for people recovering from mental health. Kevin had done a lot of European type projects, he was certainly connected to Europe. There is another lady called Sheila Durie who

is still around who was on my board for many years, a founder member of Social Firm Scotland who had a lot of experience. She was a researcher as well a practitioner in the field who looked to Europe and the developments in Europe. I think they were really quite important people in our world.

People like John knew Kevin and Kevin knew John and Alan. We picked up people, connectors, really key people along the way. That was brilliant. Gerry Higgins was at Social Firms UK, at the time but he was a key influencer. He had been in Scotland and lived in Scotland. He was a good person for me because I connected in with him even before I joined Social Firm Scotland. Then he joined as the chief exec of one of the main social enterprise support agencies, Community Enterprise in Scotland. I think Gerry really saw opportunities as well, he really brought a lot of experience and vision. So there were leaders popping up and there was a sharper focus on those leaders. For me personally I think Kevin Robbie and Gerry were important and Laurence Demarco and Aiden [Pia] from Senscot. I connected with their world quite early on. For me they were really important on the landscape. We had a very small Social Firm Scotland, it was just very new, we didn't have a Social Enterprise Scotland or a coalition. We had individual leaders, individual people who were recognised as sector leaders.

Senscot seemed to have a stake in the ground that occupied a space that was really important. That has galvanised my interest even more because Laurence Demarco used to write his bulletin and then there was all these snippets of information about social enterprise and social entrepreneurs. That is when that dialogue started. Interestingly Senscot didn't become a partner in the second phase of Equal. The reason they gave me was, "There was too much money going into the public sector, we thought this was about social enterprise." I was like, "Actually I am going to argue against you because we need matched funding and lots of partners are bringing matched funding." A lot of the work that we are doing is about changing the dynamic between the public sector and our sector and creating a better understanding and a better relationship. I thought that was very important. They left for their own reasons, that was fine and we have had a very good working relationship since then. In fact, we worked very closely with Senscot, which is great.

With agencies like Senscot, Social Firm Scotland and Gerry at CEiS, we came together as individuals and said, "Now it is probably time in terms of the maturity of our sector to have an overarching body." We called it the Social Enterprise Coalition, which I still think is the best name for it. It was properly a coalition and that was the ambition for it. It would be member agencies and other key leaders and support agencies coming together. That is what it was originally set up to do. It has lost its way a little bit I have to say.

Some people have asked me before what the difference is between a social entrepreneur or somebody running a social enterprise and an entrepreneur? I think it is an attitude. I don't think there is a right and wrong. I don't think one is lesser than the other. I am just so passionate about social impact that I would rather apply any entrepreneurial skills that I have or others do in responding to social need. If I ever wake up and that is not the case then I won't be here. I really do feel quite strongly about that. I know from the people who I work with and talk to every day that people who run social enterprises who are social entrepreneurs have an attitude that it is beyond a job. It is more than a job and maybe that attitude is around

motivation. I am the same. I have aspirations one day to set up my own social enterprise and then be in the front line. Then other people can help me, turning the tables a bit.

***What would that social enterprise be tackling, what would it do?***

Maybe it is why I love the Low Moss project so much. I have a thing about ex-offenders or people who are at risk of offending. I don't know where that has come from. I can't tell you because I have never worked in that space really. I think it is the hopelessness. I think having a hopelessness and then having somebody believe in you and helping you because they understand what you are saying and they listen and respond to that. I don't think people listen to people enough. If you're feeling helpless and hopeless and nobody is listening what could happen? You are dangerously going down a slippery slope.

There are lots of great stuff I think we could still do well but I do have a thing about... I think some people have beaten me to it though. I am meeting a man on Friday called Matt Fountain who is setting this thing up for ex-offenders or people who are at risk of offending called the Freedom Bakery. I am really interested to hear what he is going to do.

I also had the privilege of hearing from a project in the States set-up by a Jesuit priest for the gangs in a particular part of LA I think, I can't remember. He basically looked at the gang culture and thought, "Oh my God, everybody is hopeless here and they are all bashing one another to death." There were a lot of fatalities. He set this thing up called Home Boy Industries. He has a range of social enterprises around people who have offended or are at risk of offending. It has been very successful. One of the previous members of the gang came to speak to Low Moss prisoners. You could have heard a pin drop. I think that man spoke for an hour just telling his story and there wasn't one single sound. After that the prisoners were like, "Governor, how can we get one of them? We want a job." For me that is why I love social firms so much because they focus on employment and support. They open their doors to anybody who wants to work but needs a bit of support to do so. I think that is really important. One day that is maybe what I will do.

***I have just got a couple more questions for you. I am aware that I am taking up a lot of your time. I have got a couple more questions if that is okay?***

Sure.

***You mentioned earlier when you first started out in social enterprise you felt Scotland was late to the table and it has transformed over that period. Do you think there is something distinctive about social enterprise in Scotland?***

That is a very interesting question. If you had asked me five years ago I would have said, "I don't think so. I just think there has been a lot of stuff happening around it so we have managed to create a bit of momentum and get ahead of the game if we measure ourselves by down south and others." Now I think there is something really quite distinct about social enterprise in Scotland. Maybe that has come because of a maturity and a confidence as the whole eco-system has developed and the political support has been quite explicit. We now have a social enterprise strategy and more visibility. People talk about it on the radio, not as often as I would like but people are starting to talk about social enterprise, a different way of doing business. That is good. As that confidence has developed we haven't just followed what is happening down south. We have had the luxury of an SNP government on the back of

Labour who have strongly affirmed social enterprise support at the highest level and more and more across government, so that is very specific to Scotland. They have a Scottish view that is informed by us, the sector.

We have been able to influence the next iteration of policy developments around social economy. We have had Scottish specific things that our sector understands, welcomes and seems right, a pipeline of support. First Port money is for start-up and then you have got support agencies like ourselves who are representative agencies Then you have got the Academy [Social Enterprise Academy], you have a dedicated business support programme, you have developing markets, and social investment. That is all specific to Scotland and it is all because we are in that dialogue together. All credit to the Scottish Government I have to say for listening and responding so well to the untapped potential that is social enterprise in Scotland.

In terms of leadership, we have good ones I hope – who will champion the cause and challenge others. What I am always mindful of is we cannot overhype the hype. We need to make sure we are grounded in the reality of what social enterprise looks like in Scotland. Whilst we champion it and are ambassadors for it we don't want to have some kind of hyperbole around it that says, "It is a fabby sector and it is ready to deliver everything." It is not. We would be failing the sector if we overhype the hype. We need to balance those messages I think quite carefully.

***My very last question is you mentioned you would want social enterprise to be more ambitious in the future. Could you reflect on the future of social enterprise in Scotland a little bit? If you talk a little about your ambitions and where you think things can go?***

I think it is definitely a more confident sector. I think the level of ambition will be driven by that confidence. I mentioned earlier that we are developing a vision document. I think that shows a confident sector that we feel that some of the leaders, really Senscot and myself actually said, "It is probably time that we had another strategy document, another something about that ambition. Where do we want to be in 15 years' time?" Not two years' time or five years' time, let's go for the 15. I think that shows a higher level of ambition. It is certainly not finished yet and we have still got lots of consultation to do but it has certainly started. It has created a lot of debate about what are the big issues, priorities and risks associated with the ambition to make Scotland a social enterprise nation where everybody understands it, where it is visible both in a media sense and on the high street.

I am not too precious that every business should be a social enterprise. I do want to get into everybody's psyche. It is great that we live in Scotland because we have got loads of social enterprises doing great stuff. I would like to build on what has gone before. I think the ecosystem, the policy development, the investment, the business support, the opening markets, I think those themes are all very relevant I just think we have moved them on a bit.

Unlike other people I don't think we should stop and start to look at what else do we need to be doing? We need to build on the foundations that are already there. We are not there yet. We do need more financial products that are specific and relevant. We need to help people assess risk both in our scaling up new ventures but also in an investment sense. All of those things have started. People are more investment careful. I would like to continue the

momentum on those issues about capacity and scale – but not as an end in itself – to create more jobs for people that need them and create more social impact within communities.

***Brilliant, thank you very much. That is everything that I wanted to cover. Do you have any questions for me?***

Not really I don't think.

***Brilliant that is me off the hook.***

Thank you very much.

***Thank you very much Pauline, I will stop the recording.***