

EMAIL CHAIN 1 – 26/02/2024

Hi [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Cab Sec has noted.

Thanks

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] Deputy Private Secretary | Office of Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice
Scottish Government | St Andrew's House, Regent Road, Edinburgh, EH1 3DG || Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] Email: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Please check our [Ministerial Preferences](#)

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 5:21 PM

To: Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice <CabSecSJ@gov.scot>

Cc: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>; Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] Linda Bauld <Linda.Bauld@gov.scot>; [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] Emilie-Louise Purdie <Emilie-Louise.Purdie@gov.scot>; Social Security Policy/Programme Parliamentary Business Unit <socialsecurity_parliamentarybusinessunit@gov.scot>

Subject: ROUTINE - Plans to publish labour market analysis of Scottish Child Payment

Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice

Priority: Routine

Purpose: To make the Cabinet Secretary aware of our plans to publish analysis of how Scottish Child Payment interacts with the labour market.

Recommendation: That the Cabinet Secretary notes our plans and advises of any concerns.

Context and Issues: This is a routine submission of plans to publish analysis of how Scottish Child Payment interacts with labour market decisions. Analysts in the Communities Analysis Division have regularly undertaken analysis of how Scottish Child Payment affects work incentives. Some stakeholders (e.g. Poverty Inequality Commission) have recently requested that Scottish Government publish this type of analysis. So far this work has found no evidence of Scottish Child Payment negatively affecting Scotland's labour market at scale. To address these stakeholder requests we plan to publish an analytical report in early June, setting out the evidence base of what we know and including new analysis. Further advice including a draft copy of the report will be sent to the Cabinet Secretary in advance of publication and we will look for opportunities to align with other publications when agreeing a publication date.

Best Regards;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

EMAIL CHAIN 2 – 21/05/2024

Just to say I've now reviewed this and made some changes in track, mostly wording tweaks. Overall it's an excellent paper. Really interesting and something we can cite going forward.

Please let me know if I can do anything else.

Thanks,
[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] Research Officer | Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation |
Communities Analysis Division | Scottish Government | [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:42 PM
To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: FW: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hey [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Are you ok to have a look at the below? Will forward it onto [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] once you've had a look.

Thanks,
[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:40 PM
To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi all – I'm attaching a reference to the planned SCP labour market analysis publication.

The 2 SCP evidence sessions at Parliament are this Thursday (23rd) and 6th June. We don't yet know if Cab Sec will be called for that 2nd one (she's not at the 1st one).

Given the holidays etc. I think its too tight to try and publish by then. We could always include key points in any briefing for Cab Sec prior to publishing.

There's some o/comments from me about things I might try and include if there's time but this is very close to a final version.

Track changes are on if you do want to leave any comments or suggested edits. Click on the link to open '2024 - February - SCP and LM Outline' - <https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk/documents/A47557690/details>

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you and/or [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] can look at the a) evaluation and b) client survey sections particularly.

For the client survey part, I've essentially copied and pasted [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] summary report, but I've re-formatted and cut down a little.

I've done most of that in track to hopefully make it easier for you to review. I've also largely removed any reference to figures in that section, but I've maybe been over cautious about not referring to the quantitative results.

I appreciate we'll also want to run it past **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** once you've taken a look.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you can look at the FRS section particularly but you'll also probably have an interest in the UC analysis part.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – I don't think there's any obvious overlaps with your work but would welcome any comments all the same.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – presuming you want to look at most of it, sorry its quite long!

There's other people who will need to review, at the policy side and then the senior folk, maybe LM analysts too.

If its possibly to take a look and come back to me with anything by COP Wednesday next week that would be great, I appreciate most of us will be off Friday and Monday.

Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

EMAIL CHAIN 3 – 21/05/2024

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]. I need to make some relatively small edits and updates but for your interests is this OK to go to Ian alongside other DDs when we are seeking clearance before publication? You'll be copied in too when that happens.

Looks like we'll need to postpone the publication date to after the UKG elections, but that only pushes it back by a few weeks.

When we have a final version to share with Cab Sec I can check with SPADS/her PO & comms which dates work best. You might have your own thoughts too. I'd not like to sit on it for too long but regardless it seems unavoidable it will have to go out during recess but I plan to have it all ready and sent to Cab Sec well before recess starts. I'm on holiday for 2 weeks immediately after the election so final publication might have to wait until w/c 22nd July.

Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 3:13 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Looks great – although I still struggle with METRs 😊 A great example of the analysts working together to produce a really interesting report.

Kind regards

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Unit Head

Five Family Payments, Funeral Support and Challenge Rights

Scottish Government

Mob: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – good point about the evaluation work, I can update that.
Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:43 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Thanks for sharing, I've had a read and it's super interesting. The qualitative feedback towards the end of the report does a great job of showing the complexity of trying to measure any impacts when people make such different choices.

My only very minor comment is that the evaluation next year is a combined Five Family Payments evaluation and not just SCP, but I appreciate you may have referred to it as the SCP evaluation for simplicity.

Thanks

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Team Leader – Early Years and Funeral Support | Directorate for Social Security

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 1:29 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: FW: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi all. I've produced a first draft of this SCP LM paper. Its long, not my usual style! But, its intended to be a discussion paper and I think its long through necessity. As per the below, its making its way around SSAFE being reviewed. Can I ask you for any thoughts and comments?

Track changes are on if you do want to add/suggest anything.

I appreciate Ian and possibly Stephen will want to see this. I will do a DD & above circulation including Mick and Ally once everyone else has had a chance to chip in.

I think it will be too tight to publish by 6th June and the potential Cab Sec appearance but we can definitely include as much or as little of the content from this in any briefing.

Click on the link to open '2024 - February - SCP and LM Outline' -

<https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk/documents/A47557690/details>

The SPICE evidence paper has been published now too which touches on much of the same themes: [8361 \(parliament.scot\)](#)

Thanks.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

EMAIL CHAIN 4 – 21/05/2024

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] that's helpful. Yeah I'll just cut this right down and omit the figures and talk about why we'd looked into FRS and maybe some of the variables it reports on but that the sample size is too small to be meaningful, and will stop short of mentioning anything about the DWP methodological changes. Hope the meeting with [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] went OK, catch up with you tomorrow.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 12:48 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

I agree that we probably shouldn't be giving sample sizes / no. of observations. And like you say, the sample size is prohibitive for any analysis really, so it probably would suffice to just say that if you did want to mention FRS.

I'm not sure that DWP's randomisation method is public info – it should be but I couldn't find it anywhere. Not sure if that matters in terms of what you put in this paper? Maybe doesn't matter but might be safer just to stop with the sample size issue?

Cheers,

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 4:18 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Thanks for the feedback [redacted - S.38(1)(b)], and it was [redacted - S.38(1)(b)], who came up with the low UC award hypothesis so I feel like I need to keep giving him credit for that!

On your point, definitely agree, its just a hypothesis that low awards could reflect a labour market effect but I can make the point that this could reflect other changes, like UC take-up, more strongly.

In terms of the FRS. I've attached the chapter here.

I can ask [redacted - S.38(1)(b)], if that makes more sense but I know you work extensively with the FRS.

The 2 issues with what is in here as far as I can see are:

- 1) Not sure what we're allowed to refer to as in the end user licence agreement it states material derived from the data should not be shared with non-registered users.
- 2) In consulting **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**, access agreement for HBAI/FRS, it states where underlying sample is <100 we should suppress completely. Everything I've quoted comes from a sample of 37 at most. It's surprisingly close to what we'd expect from other data but I'm not sure if this means I shouldn't really quote any of it. If that is the case, then I would just cut this chapter right down and explain maybe what variables are reported but that the sample is too small to quote any of it.

Happy to chat if easier.

Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)],
Economic Adviser
Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

From: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**,
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 3:22 PM
To: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Thanks **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**, this is really good – the UC analysis is very informative and a clever use of the data.

Just a thought – even if we did see an increase in low UC awards, that could be a take-up effect rather than a labour-market effect. I.e., there is greater incentive (or awareness) to claim small UC awards if they come with SCP. (Actually looking at it again, I think you actually make this point in passing in para 81.)

Happy to chat about FRS whenever.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 1:32 PM
To: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

*edit – after reviewing the UK Data Service licence agreement and terms of access etc. I've removed the FRS section entirely for now and can pick this up with you separately
[redacted - S.38(1)(b)].

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Economic Adviser
Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:40 PM
To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Subject: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi all – I'm attaching a reference to the planned SCP labour market analysis publication.

The 2 SCP evidence sessions at Parliament are this Thursday (23rd) and 6th June. We don't yet know if Cab Sec will be called for that 2nd one (she's not at the 1st one).

Given the holidays etc. I think its too tight to try and publish by then. We could always include key points in any briefing for Cab Sec prior to publishing.

There's some o/comments from me about things I might try and include if there's time but this is very close to a final version.

Track changes are on if you do want to leave any comments or suggested edits.

Click on the link to open '2024 - February - SCP and LM Outline' -
<https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk/documents/A47557690/details>

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you and/or [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] can look at the a) evaluation and b) client survey sections particularly.

For the client survey part, I've essentially copied and pasted [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] summary report, but I've re-formatted and cut down a little.

I've done most of that in track to hopefully make it easier for you to review. I've also largely removed any reference to figures in that section, but I've maybe been over cautious about not referring to the quantitative results.

I appreciate we'll also want to run it past [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] once you've taken a look.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you can look at the FRS section particularly but you'll also probably have an interest in the UC analysis part.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – I don't think there's any obvious overlaps with your work but would welcome any comments all the same.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – presuming you want to look at most of it, sorry its quite long!

There's other people who will need to review, at the policy side and then the senior folk, maybe LM analysts too.

If its possibly to take a look and come back to me with anything by COP Wednesday next week that would be great, I appreciate most of us will be off Friday and Monday.

Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Economic Adviser
Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

EMAIL CHAIN 5 – 21/05/2024

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] (and others who have commented) – I'll look through the comments and address and then I've set up a brief chat on Monday to cover some of the broader questions around the audience and how we use this going forward etc. Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 5:29 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]. Looking good and I've added a few questions in the text - couple of macro points running through my head as I read (happy to chat this over):

- Is the intention of this to be the bible/one stop shop for SCP? And somewhat of a living document? Just wondering about how we'd go about updating (is it unwieldy to do so?) In any case we clearly want to signpost key facts and figures?
- Separately can you remind me has a big portion of this been published before or did the econ analysis part just go to exec team (the METR stuff and so on) - was it just the slidepacks?
- Just thinking about the audience - is the plan for this that the Minister can pick it up, finger through and be able to understand all the various issues and overlaps? (Obviously atm it includes sections on SCP and child poverty in addition to SCP and labour market)
- If we agree it's a bible and thus happy with length then we just need to make sure all pertinent bits are drawn out (and, given length, in the exec summary). I suspect they'll want clearer answers on the headroom we have/potential tipping points (really no mention in paper), what groups *are* being impacted (eval hints at some but need clearer conclusion), probably something to knock back anecdotal stuff (more on the people not taking promotion/more hours idea).
- Do we need a conclusion - good stuff in there but just add to exec summary if not already there? I think we can be a little more specific/less high level in the exec summary too so exec team can quickly understand why we are saying what we are.

Many thanks,

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:40 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Subject: SCP Labour Market Analysis

Hi all – I'm attaching a reference to the planned SCP labour market analysis publication.

The 2 SCP evidence sessions at Parliament are this Thursday (23rd) and 6th June. We don't yet know if Cab Sec will be called for that 2nd one (she's not at the 1st one).

Given the holidays etc. I think its too tight to try and publish by then. We could always include key points in any briefing for Cab Sec prior to publishing.

There's some o/comments from me about things I might try and include if there's time but this is very close to a final version.

Track changes are on if you do want to leave any comments or suggested edits.
Click on the link to open '2024 - February - SCP and LM Outline' -
<https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk/documents/A47557690/details>

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you and/or [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] can look at the a) evaluation and b) client survey sections particularly.

For the client survey part, I've essentially copied and pasted [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] summary report, but I've re-formatted and cut down a little.

I've done most of that in track to hopefully make it easier for you to review. I've also largely removed any reference to figures in that section, but I've maybe been over cautious about not referring to the quantitative results.

I appreciate we'll also want to run it past [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] once you've taken a look.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – would be great if you can look at the FRS section particularly but you'll also probably have an interest in the UC analysis part.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – I don't think there's any obvious overlaps with your work but would welcome any comments all the same.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – presuming you want to look at most of it, sorry its quite long!

There's other people who will need to review, at the policy side and then the senior folk, maybe LM analysts too.

If its possibly to take a look and come back to me with anything by COP Wednesday next week that would be great, I appreciate most of us will be off Friday and Monday.

Cheers.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Economic Adviser
Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

EMAIL CHAIN 6 – 12/06/2024

Thanks for going through the report in detail Mick – I think I can address all the below points. Definitely agree re-the demand side, can see now that doesn't really feature as you say so I'll put some of that in too. [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 2:01 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: SCP & LM analysis paper

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

An interesting read. I made some pretty minor tweaks throughout (typos and so on, mostly). Some comments here and there too, which I see you have addressed already in some places.

A few wider thoughts:

- I was a bit worried about using the phrase "earning too much" in a number of places. I mean, I know what you mean but perhaps we could reword along the lines of earnings which are above the threshold or some such?
- The METR stuff – esp in the Summary – is quite complicated. I know it *is*, but can you take a look and see if it could be simplified at all?
- I note the concerns re the amount of coverage of the taper stuff. I can see why, so I wonder if we should add some words to explain why that is there..?
- Can you step back a bit from the Client Survey stuff and make sure it's coming across correctly.... It's useful stuff, and adds some good colour to the more theoretical stuff above, but I wonder if the weighting, or balance, is coming across quite right esp as it's based on so few respondents (I flagged one sentence in the margin which I think gives an example of what I mean)?
- I think it falls into the common trap slightly of not setting out the demand side factors that are at play. It's a bit "if X then people will choose to do Y". But that's conditional on Y being feasible for a list of reasons (local job market, employer inflexibility, skills matching and so on)... Para 80 (I think – hard to tell with the tracked changes.....) makes a very brief reference to this but it's an issue across all the factors discussed. We should probably note this fairly prominently?

Cheers

Mick..

Mick Wilson

Deputy Director, Communities Analysis

I am currently working a hybrid pattern

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 9:01 AM
To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Subject: RE: SCP & LM analysis paper

That link doesn't seem to work for me...

On plans, then I agree with what you suggest below. I noticed the rec from the mini-enquiry thing about publishing (or at least coming up with) more evidence

Mick Wilson
Deputy Director, Communities Analysis
I am currently working a hybrid pattern
Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 5:52 PM
To: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Subject: SCP & LM analysis paper

Hi Mick, hope you are well.

Over the past few months I've been working on a report setting out everything we know about how SCP interacts with the labour market. You might remember a few months back we sent up a very brief note to Cab Sec advising of our intention to publish this and she was content with that.

This is something the SCP policy team have pushed for a while, but SG publishing our analysis of SCP & the labour market was a specific SCOSS recommendation recently as part of the SJSS committee and much of the content here came up during the recent SCP evidence sessions as-well. So the timing seems about right to me. I need to agree dates with comms, policy etc. but it will obviously come after the GE. There's a budget in policy to pay APS to publish and I'd like to send a draft of the report in a sub to Cab Sec before recess, ideally by Fri 21st June. Before that I'd also need to run past Ian D and I think Ally Mcphail. If you were able to take a look at this report next week and let me know what you think about the report and plans that would be great.

I appreciate this is quite long, although its intended to be, as there's a lot of ground to cover.

I have left comments in from [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] and a few others so you can see what has been discussed and I need to do some tidying up of charts and also run it past a few policy colleagues again as some of the content has changed since they first saw it, but this is very close to final.

[2024 - February - SCP & LM Outline \(A47557690\)](#)

Many thanks in advance;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)].

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

EMAIL CHAIN 7 – 13/06/2024

-----Original Message-----

From: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 4:21 PM

To: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Cc: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Subject: Emailing: 2024 - February - SCP & LM Outline - WM version

Hi **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** hope all is well with you.

I think **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** and/or **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** have been in touch with you in the past about our intention to publish an analysis paper including outputs from the client survey on the labour market question that was added.

I've attached the full report here (1st doc). This is still going through senior review, and we would ensure Ally gets sight of it at the same time as other DDs.

You'll probably remember **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** produced an internal analysis report of the labour market question client survey findings (2nd doc). And I've summarised that in this new report, pages 30-35.

Could you take a look and let me know if you are content or suggest any edits etc? Track changes should be on. I think **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** had one or two things flagged for you.

A question for all 3 of you really is, given **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** previous steer about the quantitative results being unreliable due to the mixed interpretation of the question etc., my OCD brain found it hard to talk about some of the numbers/%s and not others, so I took them all out, other than 1 reference about the overall sample. In some ways I think this works well as we can then just set out all the different types of responses to get across the complexity of decisions in different directions without really weighting anything or suggesting one theme dominates. But can I check what you all think? Better to just omit all the numbers or revert back to something closer to **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** summary?

Many thanks in advance;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

2024 - February - SCP & LM Outline - **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** version

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

EMAIL CHAIN 8 – 14/06/2024

Thanks Mick, I'll just hold off a day or two in-case Ally has anything to add and then I'll get this sent up. [redacted - S.38(1)(b)].

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>

Sent: Monday, June 17, 2024 2:41 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]; Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>; Deputy Director Organisational Strategy and Performance <deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] – looks about right to me.

There's always the next game...

Mick..

Mick Wilson

Deputy Director, Communities Analysis

I am currently working a hybrid pattern

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],. That looks good to me. We won't mention the other thing

Ian

IAN DAVIDSON (he/him)

Deputy Director, Social Security Policy

ian.davidson2@gov.scot

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 5:29 PM

To: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>; Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>; Deputy Director Organisational Strategy and Performance <deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Subject: RE: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Thanks for looking at this so quickly Ian and Mick. And noted around the sensitivities of wider interests – OCEA have had sight of this ([redacted - S.38(1)(b)] in LM analysis) and economy comms ([redacted - S.38(1)(b)] in copy) and I'd planed on copying Mr Arthur into the submission. But I've made reference to this engagement in the sub now and happy to take a steer on any further engagement we should take. Helpfully [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] advised today this isn't really on the economy radar and hasn't featured in conversations as an issue etc. which was partly behind the agreement not to undertake any pro-active media

activity. I should have made reference to the brief email exchange back in Feb – attached here – where after we agreed between CAD & SS policy we'd set out our plans to publish and Cab Sec acknowledged them. I have now added the detail of that to the sub, and also re-worded the recommendation to “if Cab Sec agrees” as you both suggest, so Cab Sec has more choice over the matter. And added reference to the unequivocal PIC [recommendation](#) which I dug out and agree is helpful as motivation to publish. Will also add this to the report itself. Attached an updated copy of the sub here too. Many thanks, [redacted - S.38(1)(b)].

Like many of us now off to watch Scotland beat Germany – will be interesting to see how this email ages next week – I suspect not well 😊

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 4:41 PM

To: Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>; [redacted - S.38(1)(b)],

Deputy Director Organisational Strategy and Performance

<deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Thanks [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

No substantive comment on the specific content etc.

On Ian's point, which is a good reminder of how we need to position this, I suggest we frame this along the lines of i) the issue having been raised increasingly often, featuring explicitly at committee, and recs made by SCOSS or whoever; ii) this paper is our substantive analysis of the issue (useful in-and-of-itself etc); and iii) our rec would be to publish if Cab Sec agrees.

MICK..

Mick Wilson

Deputy Director, Communities Analysis

I am currently working a hybrid pattern

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 3:46 PM

To: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]; Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>; Deputy Director

Organisational Strategy and Performance <deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: RE: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Thanks **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]** the analysis is clear and good to see that the findings in initial analysis borne out. I'm content with how you cover the points on tapering though appreciate that is likely to increase the calls for SCP reform as part of the Social Security Bill.

My only comment is around who has taken the decision to publish and on what authority? If this were a policy paper we would be acting on Ministerial instruction to do the work and to publish the outputs, and the former would not automatically lead to the latter. Given the paper surfaces sensitive issues Cab Sec is likely to have things to say if she feels bounced on a decision she believes should be for her. The rules may be different for ad hoc analytical outputs of course. Either way I'd suggest setting this out a bit more clearly.

That aside I'm conscious there are a lot of official and Ministerial interests in play with this and mindful of the difficulties with the recent OCEA publication on economic impact of social security spending, which had not been widely shared. It's right of course to go to our Cab Sec in first instance but you might want to say how those wider interests are to be engaged.

Ian

IAN DAVIDSON (he/him)
Deputy Director, Social Security Policy
ian.davidson2@gov.scot
[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

From: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 1:53 PM
To: Ian Davidson <ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>; Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>;
Deputy Director Organisational Strategy and Performance
<deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>
Cc: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Subject: RE: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Just sending again with updated email address for you Ally, so we are all in the same chain if there's any discussion. Word docs are in the attached email. Thanks.

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]
Economic Adviser
Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling
CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)
Scottish Government
Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

From: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 1:51 PM
To: Ian Davidson <ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>; Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>; Ally MacPhail <Ally.MacPhail@socialsecurity.gov.scot>
Cc: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**
Subject: For Review - Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis Report & Sub

Hi all – I've enclosed an ERDM link and hardcopy of our Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis report & Ministerial submission – the intention is to publish this after the election, with a provisional date of 24th July agreed.

[2024 - June - SCP LM Analysis Ministerial Submission \(A48837373\)](#)

[2024 - June - SCP LM Paper \(A47557690\)](#)

Ian – I think this is mainly for your interest as you've not seen to date and there's obviously significant policy interest. Although Mick, I appreciate although you have already reviewed, you might have further comments. Ally – there is some Social Security Scotland client survey content contained that [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] provided and has reviewed, and [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] and [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] have had sight too.

I think we all know the background to this. That at times there's been anecdotal examples/concern among stakeholders and senior SG officials that Scottish Child Payment and the "cliff edge" could disincentivise work by clients avoiding losing eligibility through earning above the UC income threshold. This point also featured fairly prominently at the Scottish Child Payment evidence sessions at parliament at the end of May and recommendations have been made by some stakeholders that if SG has this type of analysis that it could be shared (at least 1 of Poverty Inequality Commission and Scottish Commission on Social Security).

This report summarises our own analysis of the issue – explaining the economic theory behind it, analysis of labour market & universal credit data, and qualitative evidence from the client survey. The overall conclusion is Scottish Child Payment is likely to impact labour market decisions in complex ways and opposing directions but there's no evidence it is disincentivising work at scale in the economy.

Although there's discussion of tapering in this paper – again since it featured prominently at the evidence sessions and is also a solution to the cliff edge – we are clear in this report this does not reflect SG policy intent, a taper rate is not a silver bullet, and in fact could reduce work incentives for a much larger number of people than it reduces them for.

Comms colleagues have agreed not to issue any pro-active media activity around this but to prepare reactive lines if needed.

The intention is to send this submission to the Cabinet Secretary by a week today (21st June), so there is time before recess begins on the 28th for her to take a look and pass on any concerns etc. So if it was possible to get anything I need to incorporate back by the middle of next week some time that would be much appreciated.

Many thanks in advance as always;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Mobile: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

EMAIL CHAIN 9 – 18/06/2024

This email is for the official record and confirms a Ministerial Decision. This email must be placed in the official record (eRDM) by your team [in line with SG records management policy](#).

Hi [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Ms Somerville is content to agree the recommendations in the submission.

Thanks,

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)] (she/her)

Deputy Private Secretary to the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice – Shirley-Anne Somerville MSP

The Scottish Government

St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG

E: CabSecforSJ@gov.scot

T: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)] M: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]



All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

From: [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2024 5:56 PM

To: Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice 2024 <>

Cc: Minister for Employment and Investment <MinisterEI@gov.scot>; DG Communities <DGCommunities@gov.scot>; Emilie-Louise Purdie <Emilie-Louise.Purdie@gov.scot>;

Emily Mackintosh <Emily.Mackintosh@gov.scot>; Julie Humphreys

<Julie.Humphreys2@gov.scot>; Director, Tackling Child Poverty and Social Justice

<DirectorTCPSJ@gov.scot>; Mick Wilson <Mick.Wilson@gov.scot>; Linda Bauld

<Linda.Bauld@gov.scot>; [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Stephen Kerr <Stephen.Kerr@gov.scot>; Ian Davidson <Ian.Davidson2@gov.scot>;

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]; Social Security Scotland Chief Executive

<ce@socialsecurity.gov.scot>; Miriam Craven <Miriam.Craven@socialsecurity.gov.scot>;

Deputy Director Organisational Strategy and Performance

<deputydirectorosp@socialsecurity.gov.scot>; [redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Subject: Routine for decision by Wednesday 26th June - Submission on Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis

Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice

Cc

Minister for Employment and Investment
Officials

Please find attached a Routine submission on Scottish Child Payment Labour Market Analysis seeking the Cabinet Secretary's agreement to publish and a draft copy of the report. A decision by Wednesday 26th June would be helpful to enable officials to proceed with preparations to publish on Wednesday 24th July.

Best Regards

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)].

[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]

Economic Adviser

Social Security Policy Analysis and Modelling

CAD: Social Security Analysis, Forecasting and Evaluation (SSAFE)

Scottish Government

Tel: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**

Mobile: **[redacted - S.38(1)(b)]**