**BMC**:I can absolutely Imagine there's no problem at all. So have you moved out that department, but you still within the Scottish Government?

**INTERVIEWEE 2**: I'm still in Scottish Government, but into a different department. So one of the good things working for the Scottish Government is because of the way it's set up. If you work at Whitehall,, you'd have to move often between jobs. If you went from, say, housing to finance local you'd be moving actual departments. So like a new job, you contract my estimate, whereas in Scottish Government, because there's, there's so many different areas, but it's all within the same organization, then you can, you can move a bit more freely on the benefits of it,

BMC: As I said, all this stuff will be, it wouldn't be. There'll be no names. It'll just be like, you know, I'll be like, senior, senior position, blah, blah, blah, you know, it's all be, it wouldn't be any kind of it, because there's too many ethics problems with universities. We haven't named people and interviews and stuff. So I've just avoid all that and just go completely anonymous, you know. So it's, so anything that's, that's, that's written down here, then it's, you know, it just gets in the little quotes in my study, you know, it's such and such, you know,

INTERVIEWEE 2: yes, that's fine. So just, just to clarify, so, so you're this is for research project Edinburgh.

BMC: It's not, I'm doing it as Strathclyde, and it's about, it's my master's dissertation on urban policy and analysis. So this is a kind of, I guess, this whole thing that I'm doing here as a I'm trying to do a little kind of sideways step into something else, away, sell the business, and move into something that can, you know, get back to my first love, which is urban policy. And this, this whole thing is actually the subjective well being has really the past. It looks like the past 15 years, maybe even longer, has been a really hot topic, and about how the well being is measured, and what's the impact on policy, if any. So that, my my argument is, at the moment, that for Scotland, the are going on and the high quality data that has been produced, there's, there's not a lot meaning it through any actual you know, you know, results that can be seen. Well, here we go. This is the, you know, even though we've got things, you know, the child poverty data and all that, which is great, and all the stuff that come in with baby boxes and stuff, it's so there's, and I'm looking at an angle of more of the kind of, I guess, maybe the constitutional question of my better limits that are just keeping everything keep keeping everything back. So that's where I'm coming from with us.

INTERVIEWEE 2:Okay, so, grand. Okay. So, yeah, very happy to be involved. I am so happy to kind of share my experience, and oh yeah, on the basis it won't be identified as a participant. And yeah, make sure that any course or anything as such. But yeah, happy, happy to do that. And I'm conscious of time Brian, yes.

BMC: And so, yes, absolutely, absolutely. So the first one was the, let me see, it's about a wide one. I don't know if you can answer or not, but how does, how does NPF inform policy, directly or indirectly in your in your experience? Has it? Has it had any impact?

INTERVIEWEE 2: Okay, sorry, I just forgot to ask how you record this.

BMC: I've got a little thing called otter, so it only records what you and I are saying. Here it's and it goes straight down on your little file. And then I'll do a transcript or trim it down so there's no, you know, I'll take the top, top and bottom of it,

INTERVIEWEE 2: and it's so I worry if I pick my nose. No, okay. On the first question, how does the NPF inform policy directly on lifting my experience? Okay, so this is probably a theme I've gone through this, this kind of theoretical and then the practical, yeah, so theoretically, the NPF should inform policy at an early stage, because everything that's done in policy development, it should be aligned to the national outcomes. So in theory, if you're working in justice and you're working on a policy on, say, recidivism and how to reduce that, then you should be focusing on not just the evidence and all the policy dynamics around that we should be thinking about, what does this mean for the big picture? The big picture being the national outcomes and and that should be kind of played in early on, and it should also help in setting out why the policy matters. Because ultimately, what the MPA is supposed to do is to reframe what success is and we frame it, our societal well being in quite big terms, obviously quite broad terms. So that should happen. But I think that there has been examples. I know there's questions that you've got later on about this. There has, there are examples, and has been examples of this. And the second thing I say is policy making, I think, in academic terms, and certainly used to be kind of two schools of thought. There was a kind of rational approach and incremental approach. So rational approaches you can draw it out and basically have a nice circle, like the policy cycle, of all the various things that would happen, and that you just follow that, and that pretty much guides how it's done. And so that's nice and theory, but in practice, and policy is incremental. It's messy. It's about, you know, making the most of the opportunities. Is about trying to kind of get through the morass of all the things they get in the way. So, so when I'm answering here, I'm really thinking about policy being incremental, and the kind of theoretical terms as an incremental approach. So the NPF fits into this incremental approach of approach for policy. It's supposed to be a bit of a game like an northstar, yes, it's messy, but you should be able to sit around the bigger picture. It should be embedded in the policy process early on. However, it often isn't, and I think there's a couple of reasons for that. One is, in Scotland, we've got an awful lot of impact assessments, and those have grown over the years, and I think they're well intended. And the idea is to try and essentially, kind of really make it stick. And policy making. What are the impact sessions about, where it's about the environment, where it's about poverty, or for young people, whatever this is living and it's interesting that we've had to increasingly rely on these impact assessments as a way to try and ensure that these things are taken into account and can be shown to be taken into account in policymaking. Now, there is no impact assessment for the NPF, no suggestion there should be. But it's interesting that for all these other things policymakers need to take account of, there's a big list that they have to take account of. But again, you know, and when is that done in the policy making process, which is quite messy. So how does NPF inform policy directly? In my experience, I think that, given everything said, I've tried to simplify it, it used to inform a lot more in the past, in the Scottish Government, and a lot less now. And I think the reason for that is that it's got less support at a senior level. There's less bandwidth for people so they haven't focused on the here and now what needs done today, and therefore there's less time to be more strategic and to think about tomorrow in the future. So I think that that has been a big, sort of big impact on on how the NPF can inform policy. And what I used to see a lot of my previous role was either just not for informing policy at all, or basically people coming to us late in the day with a strategy or something and asking some really functional, basic questions. And it was, it was clear that actually, there was, this was kind of like near the end of the process trying to kind of put something in, as opposed to being in there early. So there's an element **of post hoc rationalization** or retrofitting, whatever you want to call it, which is a shame, and because the NPF shouldn't be about just trying to kind of add something then just show that you've done it. You're supposed to be in with the bricks and mortar. But to do that, need capacity and needs skill set and needs time. So I think that it's it's it informs the less than it used to, and what is set out, and quite often, is, has basically folk, officials been involved to do a particular task to demonstrate the NPF alignment, probably after the kind of real policymaker has been done,

**BMC**:that's an interesting point, and it kind of does chime with what ive been reading and been picking up some of the other, you know, snippets of research, because there's not been a great deal of research on it for Scotland, But there's been a few of the highlighted that the… maybe people not understanding the process, maybe, maybe to be kind with it, you know, I mean, let me be a kind of local authority level, for example. I've seen examples, say, South Lanarkshire, my own, my own gaff, you know, saying what we didn't really understand what it was asking us to do, and stuff. So, you know, they, yeah, and in that kind of case, did they just, they, they do, what you say is a kind of post hoc rationalization, where they sort of shite we better, we better come along and add something here, you know, to make sure that we take, not quite, maybe tick the box, but, you know, make sure that we're that we're doing what we're meant to be doing. So, I mean, you've can answer, maybe you can answer them, maybe a couple of the first questions here, because there's the a that looks at one of the one of the barriers, to the to the to the NPF being used to guide and shape policy. And it sounds as though it's a kind of, you know, it's, it's not getting in early enough. And that's feeling that's been worsening, I guess, over the over the past few years. Perhaps started off well, and then it started kind of tailing away. Is there anything that's been, that's been, that's been picked up from other, other kind of countries, for the for the NPF? I mean, I know, I know wales have been doing a lot of stuff on it. Northern Ireland on their own stuff as well. Has there been any kind of exchange in that regard recently?

INTERVIEWEE 2: Yeah, there has. I mean. So basically, the Welsh example is interesting because Wales, because of the way devolution was set out in Wales, and that has had an effective one of the beginning to do. So first of all, sustainable development is in with bricks. So it's actually a principle in the devolution segment in Wales, in a way it wasn’t in Scotland, and a lot of what they've done around their version of the NPF is based on sustainable development, and in particular, guided by the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Secondly, they couldn't legislate. They had no ability to do legislation for the first 15 years or so of devolution, and that meant as they had a lot of time to think and do most than think, but a lot of time to basically decide what it is they want to legislate on when they when they had that power. So they effectively were able to do their version of the NPF, which is the future generations Bill,Act. It's not quite called that, but, you know, the 2015, yes, yes, yes, and, and they basically were starting my Blank sheet of paper. And they're also able to learn from other countries. So their their version of their NPF is basically informed by the Scottish version in 2007 we started our NPF and and it's came in a bit with journey. And say a little bit about that at the minute.

BMC:yes, please.

INTERVIEWEE 2:But basically they were, they were able to kind of go tell us what they did in Scotland. How do we take that to the next level, and how do we apply it to what we do in Wales, which is essentially through legislation. So their legislation, I think, is pretty good in terms of how it's set out. It's well drafted, it's clear and essentially sets out a kind of system for how their NPF works, and that's about the monitoring of it, the evidence is shared, and sort of scrutiny accountability of it, including with our future generations Commissioner and office as part of that sort of ecosystem. And also they've got Audit wales as well linked in there. So if you look at the act, you look at you can see that's actually quite a neat system. Now, in practice, it's not been straightforward, right? and there's been some really good PR and promotion and honest, but not a surprise perhaps, yeah, but you can see how they've got probably one of the most advanced types of well being approaches, certainly in terms of process and building a try to build a culture from that as well. There's other countries as well that have came on to this territory, New Zealand being one, yeah, Australia are there? Canada, and obviously, if you're talking about well being you've got other countries culturally who've been in a long time with Brunei,

BMC:Bhutan

INTERVIEWEE 2: okay, yeah, important to get that right. And I think Scotland, has we started well, we were leading the way, but unfortunately, I think we've been, it's almost like you're at something for such a long time, it's hard to keep up momentum, and I think that we've put things in place. And the initial years, you know, with what we were doing, I think we were doing pretty well, and genuinely, probably very well. But I think the problem is, is we've just not been it's just not a senior buy in, and it's just not being backed as well as it probably needs to be. And there's reasons for that and but I'm gonna say that what I mean is, within government, it's harder for me to say, what will it be outwith? But basically, if you take a safe, larges cale exam such as South Lanarkshire, yeah, yeah. I mean, I don't know that example, but I mean, I think that, you know, there are things that supposed to do, like local authorities and others should have regard to the national outcomes and what they do when they're setting up their plans, for example. And so you can see how it's sort of supposed to guide things, but it's, it's a wee bit light touch. And so for that to work, what you need is appropriate results and support. So you need to have, there's nose put in, to be able to engage at that level, to put out guidance and to basically demonstrate that it's worthwhile, and people take paying attention. So that's about, you know, from sharing, from picking up sharing best practice, to actually, kind of, you know, using it in engagements. And I don't think that that has been done as well as now, as it has been in the past. And so that that gives a signal of well, you know, this might be something which is, it's not as important as it used to be. And given the constraints and resources and everything else, you can see how it could be seen as, you know, a bit more optional

BMC: you say, kind of, there's been a bit of a light touch approach. There is, there's quite a few kind of theories of, you know, these kind of, like stakeholder engagement theories that academics kind of churn out with their post it notes on, on whiteboards and drawing lines between them. And there's quite, there's a quite a few theories where you say, Well, you know, if you're going to have stakeholder engagement, and you know, you need to coerce people into doing things, if you can do you think that's maybe been, that's maybe it started off like that? Do you think with the local authorities and central government, or do you think it's always been light touch and it's just kind of, it's faded away even, even more,?

INTERVIEWEE 2: I think that so the NPF started as essentially a framework that was about giving a single purpose statement, a single mission, essentially for Scottish government and public bodies. So from 2017 to 2018 the NPF is really a it was, it was built when the Virginia performs model in America, and John Main and so on, as the kind of key thinkers on that, and practitioners. And the idea was about demonstrating public value a different way. And it was about creating this this way of trying to help those senior people, for example, but also others involved in policy development, policy delivery and services and all of that, actually all understand what the central purpose of the work was. So you had the purpose statement and you had the outcomes. And then thinking about things like this, it was be able to draw a line aside from what you were doing right through to those now, in those days, initially, it was less about well being and it was more about trying to just have a common alignment to what the priority was, right? So if you look back at the whole purpose statement, you'll see that they were effectively about sustainable economic development, so a lot of it was economy focused and but there were other aspects to it. So if you are going for a job in Scottish prison service in 2013 then you would probably be asked as part of your interview to be a prison officer about the national performance framework, right? Because the point was, is that you're supposed to be able to kind of go, this is my job in the public sector. But what does this mean in the big picture? And it's to encourage that sort of thinking. So it's supposed to be there to sort of help with that thinking, to help with collaboration, to help the sharing. So the NPF very much, was in line with the Scott what was what became known as the Scots approach, the policy again, from 2007 which recognized that actually Scotland, perhaps we've got a different kind of ethos, perhaps in terms of how we do we've got a different scale. So we're a smaller country to Westminster. We've got different institutions, you know, etc. And actually you could do things in a different way, and we probably will do things in a different way. So the NPF is kind of in part, reflective of that. What happened in 2015 is we had legislation which set out a bit more about what the NPF was in legal terms. And in 2018 made there was a first statutory review undertaking of the NPF. And that changed the game, because in 2018 the NPF was relaunched after that first statutory review. And it was, it became more of a Wellbeing Framework. It became a framework for the whole Scotland, not just for government in the public sector, but for everyone. And COSLA were asked and to cosign it and did. And so you can see the NPF has moved from this SG, public sector thing through to in the 2015 act, something which public authorities, including local authorities, have to have regard to when planning their work, fed through to local outcomes improvement plans and all the rest of it as well. So this outcomes approach to work in is all about how Government and Communities local authorities work together. And then in 2018 and with the first refresh, the statement that you know, the policy approach taken from them was this isn't just a framework for government, local or Central. That's for everyone. And if you haven't already, I go to the Scottish News Forum website and look at the accountability and scrutiny subgroup data, but they produce a report about three or four years ago, and that's looking at how the NPF is used and what needs to be done to basically help the barriers and basically knock down some of the barriers to make further progress. That's worth the reed. It's also worth a look at Scottish Parliament evidence session. So there was a finance and Public Administration Committee inquiry on the NPF, and in that inquiry, and it's worth reading the report. It's worth reading the Scottish Government's response and looking at the evidence there, but it's also really insightful. If you go on the website and look at the I think it's the first session that was done for that, and you had Jennifer Henderson, and I can't remember the person's name, but basically they were there talking about because they were the cochairs of that subcommittee, and just watch the interaction between the committee and then and what they talk about. And that kind of really demonstrates quite a few things about that reset, and basically where it was at that time.

BMC: That's interesting. Thank you.

INTERVIEWEE 2: So it's worth doing that, because I think it speaks to, perhaps the kind of hope for what the NPF is jumping ahead of where it's kind of at the same time as actually, there's just not been enough resource and buy in, given everything else that's going on to really make that leap forward. And so some of the addressing the barriers is thinking about what are the other ways that can what other things that can be done to try and bring it forward. And so in my previous unit, I had responsibility for the NPF, the wellbeing, sustainable development bill, future generations Commissioner, analytical work around NPF, the US sustained development goals being localized through the NPF pretty much site. So that's a package, and you can see that in that package some of the things that had had been called upon, and some of the kind of was made around that, like, you know, and doing, doing a wales, basically, was what the well being Bill was about, including the future generations commissions, kind of doing the Wales in Scotland. And was, was a way of trying to kind of make this further progress. And so the post debate, and I think the NPF review of national outcomes, is in parliament this term, so this session. So there's been a document late, sitting out the statute review. The second one that's been done, it's in Parliament. Call for evidence has been made. So all this stuff's up in Parliament. But the next thing is, there'll be the committee calling witnesses to end up happening over the course of the next six to eight weeks, that include the lead minister, which is the DFM. So it's probably off keeping an eye on that as well Brian to see what the latest debate is at. But that includes this idea of, where is the NPF at, what's in, what is the kind of mission of the NPF, and what more needs to be done to help deliver that

BMC: you mentioned a lot there. The the the bill is that the Sarah boyack's bill that she had been…

INTERVIEWEE 2: no so, So basically there's a the government committed to a well being and sustainable development bill, and Sarah Boyack essentially launched a members bill, which basically shadowed it. And so I think it's fair to say that there's an element of politics in this where, in order to, you know, have some leverage over the government, and Sarah Boyack said basically bought you do a bill, or I'll do a bill. That's and that's kind of where we're at. So, so her bill is it came later, but the stakeholders are the same stakeholders. Basically, there's kind of two routes to try to do this, and it's either through a government bill or through a member's bill,

BMC: right? Got you know that makes sense thank you. I see the recent update for the for the of program government. Then there was another publication from Carnegie, UK, calling again, calling for more, as you did. You quite really pointed out as well about, you know, taking more of the more of the Welsh examples, and tying up the tying up the bill with the NPF and making it more, more targeted. I guess, I guess I think, I think was a guy at Northumbria University, Max French. I think who was, who, who led that up. And, and that kind of, that kind of, that could, does that kind of ring, does that kind of chime with you? Because I think what you were saying there about, about time, maybe tying things together with the bill in the in the NPF, it can, it could maybe have a bit more impact if it had that early legislation behind it, you know, the kind of like, you know, with people, here's the here's the legislation that kind of grounds it. And so therefore it needs to be involved, right, some right from day one.?

INTERVIEWEE 2: That's certainly what they're calling for. So I mean, max French has been an academic who's worked in this territory for some years now, and since we're looking at his work, there's another guy whose name escapes me, Ian Elliott, I think..I mean, Carnnegi, I've been some Canadian, essentially, obviously it's Andrew Canadian. That foundation is based from him, yeah. And if you look at what they are about, then obviously they have funding. But then essentially, they're kind of like a core mission for Carnegie's as well being, is to basically, sort of promote wellbeing, to wellbeing, and the NPF is is as an obvious place to do that, very strategic level for Scotland. So they've been involved in NPF for a long time, as Oxfam Scotland and two of the kind of big stakeholders have been engaged. So in 2018 and after the first statutory review, the key stakeholders involved were Oxfam Scotland and Carnegie and a few others, and they actually did some of the work. So they were so involved, they actually shared some of the work for the review. And so they've been in this territory for a while. So I think kanehi, you know, do quite frequently produced reports which looks at the NPF and when we can be done. And then fairness as a stakeholder, part of their job is to lobby and push the government to do more to kind of deliver on what their what their kind of raison detre is. And but you can see in that report what they're saying, which is essentially they are saying that the way forward here is to have a bill and the future genes commissioner and all the things that those would do that essentially would make it to what the legislative and procedural approaches in Wales

BMC: the center of this, as you saey the Carnegie and Oxfam really do stick out. As you know, major stakeholders. Is there anyone else before you'd kind of left that role that had been, you know, majorly involved in it. ?

INTERVIEWEE 2: Yeah. I mean, there's a lot of stakeholders. I think the thing to do is, if you go online and look at the expert advice group of the NPF, then you'll see that the minutes are published and and there's a list of kind of who's involved. That's probably a quickest, a current, a good way of getting your head around who's involved and who the main kind of stakeholders and what their positions are.

BMC: Good 12 members on it, I think, at the moment, but yeah, be good to look at the minutes, because we'll probably pull out individual names even from that, right? Well, I think I've got absolutely loads of information there. It's absolutely great. Did you want the did you want me saying, you any segments so you can just see what I've said, just in case of, you know, you think which he see if I never said that, you know, or are you quite happy to, to be honest, I'd be interested. I mean, I would be if you're gonna kind of say something that I've said, but, I mean, it's fine if you say, you know, you spoke to somebody that said this, but if it's gonna be a quote, I would like to kind of see that, even though it's not gonna get my name on it, whether that's but whether you do that, like, you know, maybe easier for you if you do that near the end, but you got almost final draft, yes, and you can just highlight it Then, that gives me a chance to kind of go, Yeah, okay, I suppose to snippets along the way. So if you could do that, that'd be, that'd be good, yeah, I think, I think, I mean, there's a couple of things I can say right away. I mean, I think, I think your, your, your, your post hop rationalization phrase is great. That'll really sums up quite a quite a lot with what you'd what you'd say previous to, you know, and it's a good little kind of, you know, insert other things, like the stakeholders. I would, you know, like to mention what you said about the Carnegie and Oxfam, because that, again, points to where I've been going as well with it, you know, I think it kind of confirms what I'd been thinking about, how they've been operating, and about the the the differences in the in the bills and a probably, you know, I would keep it as vague as I can, but I think I'd probably like to mention about boyacks

aks, Bill shadowing. You know, the the government work and why? Maybe perhaps… I'll do some more digging on a separate, separate bit of research. But I think there's a that's certainly worth mentioning in some way, because I think, again, it ties into this whole Scottish constitutional conundrum. You know, that's that's been going now for the for the past 10 years, probably..

**INTERVIEWEE 2:** you know, it seems to be quite, yeah, I mean, I mean on that. I mean, I think so on the boy. But I think, I mean, I think that seems fine, but, and like, actually, to say that works be chatting, I think it's fine, because that's just an observation, and it stands out, I think, as well. And in terms of post hoc rationalization outcome, if you look at the F-pack inquiry report in NPF, that'll come out, so it's so basically like it all comes out in terms of the observers and the inquiries. And if you said, and you know, from research, speaking to officials, there's, there's some, I think that's, I think that that would stick. There's two things I was going to say. The first one, just, it would be interesting not to say, there are some good examples. So if you go on the the NPF website, there's, you can find examples there, and good examples of how the NPF has been used in the past and more recently. So there are some good examples. So it's a lot in the environment, for example, where you can see how the strategic strategy for the environment, where they've really kind of done a good job of applying what they try to do in the environment to use sustainable development goals and the National Performance Framework, and think about all an outcomes sense. Outcomes sense. So there's, there are examples of where this is done well, and it is a house set, another place to go, be justice, particularly 10 years ago. So it's a wee while ago now. But again, essentially, there's a whole, there's a whole program of work done in justice, which was brought around in an evidence driven way through logic models and look into outcomes that basically, basically prioritize where to put the effort in the policy work. Yeah, and that, and that, I think that in fairness, achieved fair amount. So again, you can look into, I think it's on the website. So there are, there are good examples of the NPF in which I think we can fairly hold up and say, here is how you could do it. And, you know, in an international context, we probably have done as well. And but I think a lot of common texts would say that it's lost its way a little bit, and you can see that in some of the stakeholder engagement. So there might well be something that the other thing, I'd say you mentioned the constitutional question a couple of times. And to be honest, I don't think there's anything to do the Constitution. I think that the national performance framework sets Scotland apart. So there isn't one in England, and I think that that sets Scotland apart. We're able to have that perhaps, but we have one so we're able to connect this is back to how you can take the Scottish approach, but a different size. We've got different institutions. Maybe we've got a bit of a different ethos. Maybe we've got some different values to what we say that. But that's not necessarily about the Constitution. I don't think, I don't think the NPF would be necessarily improved by independence. I think you could, you could do it either way. Yeah, so the NPF really is about a way of working, and it's about, it's about setting out that way of working, and it's about supporting that we are working. So finally, the big picture sense here is we're away in the world, right? We need to think long term, because our biggest challenges addressed are long term. And we need to just know demography is a long term challenge from the Western world, including Scotland's long term thinking. Think about health and social care, for example, right? The challenges around doing that, the environment clearly, is a big in the climate crisis and all of that in the biodiversity crisis. You know, again, you know, we need to think about beyond the now to be able to resolve that. So what the NPF brings is, firstly, a reframing of what success is, so it's beyond narrow economic measures to a whole well being approach. So anybody who's working in policy should be thinking, what is success? And it shouldn't just be more growth or more this, more jobs. These are things are important. It should be, what is success? Is actually this thing well being? What that means the API should do that. The second thing it should do is provide a longer term framework, and it currently does, because outcomes don't have a date on them. Yeah. So should be able to bring in that. How do you make consensus on what he's done? How do you do that? Is a framework to be able to work with to help build consensus on what we need to do in the longer term. And that's why things like sustain, the sustainability element is just as important as a wellbeing element. But politics is driven by short term things, yes, and so that's why you've got a dilemma. So one of the ideas behind in Wales, I'll take the example of Wales, I'll let you go. One ideas in Wales is, if you have a future generations Commissioner, not a politician. If you want to try and help with longer, longer term ism, then what do you do? You have somebody who's not a politician, who's there going over the longer term, right? And then you also put in place things, like in Wales, they have a requirement to report. They've got, like, a, basically a horizons report that is put out a year ahead of a Welsh election to inform the debate, and that's set in legislation. And it basically says, Here is longer term picture. So you've got, again, you can see where that, what that can do that's about, you know, trying to put evidence into play, to say look, but when you've got a commissioner who's basically trying to bring people together longer term support, and need to make decisions now to address it, but also they're bringing in evidence to support that, and they're doing it ahead of an election, so you can see what they've tried to do there. And then finally, the whole public sector has these well being objectives, and they have to report on them, and then so that so they're set out as objectives, and then they have a recorder putting them, which means that audit Wales can hold them, as well as the futures Commissioner, as well as the public, as well as the parliament, they can be kind of more held to account, to the clarity of those objectives. So you can see what they've done with a framework around trying to address this dilemma of building more consensus on what he's done longer term, and then bringing that more into the political debate. And you can see where the NPF could go depending on, like, certainly, what some stakeholders are calling for. That's not about the Constitution. You know,

BMC: that's true.

INTERVIEWEE 2: The constitution is not unimportant. But in this case, actually, I honestly think the Constitution is, you know, it's important for lots of things, yeah, but for this, it doesn't really make too much difference. We're independent. Would this change? You still be doing it? I don't think, I don't think you've necessarily changed. Change things, yeah, still be having this debate about what we've talked about, or a different constitutional arrangement, right?

BMC: I guess there was one of the, one of the the professors of Strathclyde, made the point of, you know, I kind of off the cuff remark about the, not quite the Constitution, but he says it was quite a few political bad actors in Scotland that would undermine anything if they could, just because, just because, you know, it's either opposition or your orders. They use it as they use it as leverage for something else, you know. And I guess that was a kind of where it was going with the kind of that's my term for the constitutional question. Becomes not just the legal setting, but actually the the the adversarial setting. I think that can be sometimes, you know,

INTERVIEWEE 2: that just sounds like politics to me. Yeah, it's fair enough. So I think, so hopefully that gives you enough to kind of go but I think postdoc rationalization, I think is a fair bit of that, and you'll see that. I mean, you know, you'll see that in as I said, evidence has been given to Parliament and what Parliament's reported on. Others have no doubt, can I convey that that's part of the challenge? The stakeholders probably mentioned that, but I think, yeah, there's something there. And I think that then is a question about just what is opportunity? You've got an NPF, it's been a long time. It's got a lot of support, you know, it's got, you know, it's got heritage, but it's also particularly out of government, in this sort of third sector, and a lot of the public, sort of wider public sector, there's actually kind of a decent amount of support still there for it and but it's about what do you do next? How do you how do you take it? Where do you take it next? I think we're a kind of important moment with all the things in play about what that is.

BMC: I think I'm about to be cut off by the university. I think of I'm reaching the limits of my to what they allow me on Team sessions, so I'm glad I'm gonna let you go, but thank thank you so much. I just didn't want they can catch you mid, mid sentence here and get cut off by the uni

INTERVIEWEE 2: send your final copy the interested and just particularly, if it's anything that kind of relates to what ive said.

BMC: Yes, I will do. I'll highlight the bits and being confident someone shared with anybody and, oh, I know it's all good enough. I mean, I hopefully I do get it finished the next the next, month or so, because it's been dragging on a hell of a long time, doing this part time, you know, it's been quite a, it's been quite a process. But there you go, been good though. Och aye. I mean, it's, it's been much cheaper than buying a Harley Davidson. Is that, you know, as my midlife crisis goes, you know, I mean, I'll do a master's, you know, I mean,

INTERVIEWEE 2:Harley Davidson for the mind!!.

BMC: hahahhh, thanks very much, lovely to speak to you be to wait. Bye,. Thank you. Cheers man, bye.
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