



**OFFICIAL REPORT**  
AITHISG OIFIGEIL

# **Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee**

**Wednesday 21 May 2025**

**Session 6**



**The Scottish Parliament**  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba



---

**Wednesday 21 May 2025**

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Col.</b>
<b>DECISION ON TAKING BUSINESS IN PRIVATE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CONTINUED PETITIONS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Fertility Treatment (Single Women) (PE2020) .....	2
Victims of Domestic Violence (PE2025) .....	3
Cervical Cancer (Testing) (PE2088) .....	5
Scottish Ministerial Code (PE2093).....	6
Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003 (PE2108).....	8
Early Learning and Childcare (Funding) (PE2111) .....	9
<b>NEW PETITIONS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Psychoeducation for the Neurodiverse Community (PE2141) .....	10
Artificial Sweeteners (Ban) (PE2144).....	11
Compulsory Microchipping for Cats (PE2145) .....	13
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (Transition) (PE2148).....	14

---

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> Meeting 2025, Session 6**

**CONVENER**

\*Jackson Carlaw (Eastwood) (Con)

**DEPUTY CONVENER**

\*David Torrance (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

\*Foyso Choudhury (Lothian) (Lab)

\*Fergus Ewing (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)

\*Maurice Golden (North East Scotland) (Con)

\*attended

**CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE**

Jyoti Chandola

**LOCATION**

The Adam Smith Room (CR5)



## Scottish Parliament

### Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee

Wednesday 21 May 2025

*[The Convener opened the meeting at 09:30]*

### Decision on Taking Business in Private

**The Convener (Jackson Carlaw):** Good morning, and welcome to the ninth meeting in 2025 of the Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee.

Our first agenda item is the usual dry business of agreeing whether to take in private agenda items 4, 5 and 6, which are on consideration of a draft report on the participation blueprint, our approach to the end of the parliamentary session, and our annual report. Do we agree to take those items in private?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

## Continued Petitions

### Fertility Treatment (Single Women) (PE2020)

09:30

**The Convener:** Agenda item 2 is consideration of continued petitions. With just less than a year of the parliamentary session left, the committee's ability to extend its work on petitions is now slightly more circumscribed, because, by the time we get responses, we could be short of time to fully consider them. We are considering petitions as sensibly as we can so that we can advance their aims as best we can. I hope that those who have lodged petitions will understand that.

Our first petition is PE2020, lodged by Anne-Marie Morrison, which calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to provide the same fertility treatment to single women as is offered to couples on the national health service for the chance to have a family. We last considered the petition on 1 May 2024, when we agreed to write to Public Health Scotland and the national fertility group.

The national fertility group's response highlighted that access to NHS in vitro fertilisation treatment in Scotland is the most generous in the United Kingdom and it noted that, in 2021, Scotland had the highest rate of NHS-funded IVF cycles in the UK at 58 per cent, compared to 30 per cent in Wales and just 24 per cent in England.

Last April, Public Health Scotland presented its modelling work, which aimed to increase understanding of the eligibility, demand and cost implications for changes to national access criteria for NHS fertility treatment, including IVF treatment and intrauterine insemination for single people.

The national fertility group's submission stated that further work is still to be done in order to understand capacity implications. The group will then discuss the modelling implications and consider whether a change recommendation could be supported in the medium to long term.

There is quite a lot of work going on. In light of that, do colleagues have any suggestions for action?

**Fergus Ewing (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP):** I note that our two responses are from the national fertility group, dated 4 July 2024; and from Public Health Scotland, dated 8 May, which was barely two weeks ago. I also understand that we have not heard from the petitioner and I am keen that she should have a proper opportunity to respond to the latest comment from Public Health Scotland.

As you alluded to, Scotland has a better record on IVF than elsewhere in the UK, which is commendable and a matter of some satisfaction. However, according to the petitioner, the elapse of time makes the whole objective of achieving and giving life much more challenging, particularly for single women. Time has passed—a couple of years—since the petition was submitted.

Last week, we spent a lot of time talking about the ending of life. The gift of life is the biggest gift that there can possibly be. Therefore, I think that, first, the petitioner should have an opportunity to comment, if she wishes to do so. Secondly, the replies from the national fertility group and particularly from Public Health Scotland were somewhat vague and talked solely about process. They gave no idea of when the various items of work that they alluded to were to begin or finish, and that is surely not satisfactory.

I suggest that we also write to the minister, simply to ask whether clarity can be provided as to when all that work will come to an end. While congratulating the NHS and all who are involved in the good things that are being achieved, we should also urge that much more be done to help women, particularly single women, who the petitioner believes and perceives are not able to access services as they should—although that point is contested. That would be a full response to the petition, which is a very important one.

**The Convener:** We could do two tightly focused pieces of work with a view to bringing the petition back sooner rather than later. We could ask the petitioner for their response and write a straightforward letter to the minister to draw their attention to the work that we have done and ask for an urgent ministerial response so that we can determine what more we can do with the petition. Are colleagues content with that?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

### **Victims of Domestic Violence (PE2025)**

**The Convener:** PE2025, which was lodged by Bernadette Foley, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to improve the support that is available to victims of domestic violence who have been forced to flee the marital home by ensuring access to legal aid for divorce proceedings where domestic violence is a contributing factor; ensuring that victims are financially compensated for loss of the marital home, including loss of possessions and furniture left in the property; and ensuring that victims are consulted before any changes are made to non-harassment orders.

When we previously considered the petition at our meeting on 26 June 2024, we agreed to write

to the Minister for Victims and Community Safety. The minister's response states:

“where a Non-Harassment Order ... is made by a civil court following an application by the person at risk, they will ... be notified of any application to revoke or vary the NHO and will be entitled to oppose the application in court.”

The response notes that, when an NHO has been made against an offender as part of their sentencing and they then apply to vary or revoke the order, they are required to serve a copy of the application upon anyone who is named in the NHO, including the victim. In such cases, it is up to the prosecutor to decide whether to oppose the application.

The minister's letter also informs us that, although the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service proactively seeks the views of the person at risk, it does not expressly impart those in open court in order to minimise safety risks to the victim. The minister states that a move from that approach might

“create opportunities for perpetrators to use the court process to further abuse the victim.”

In relation to progress on the implementation of part 1 of the Domestic Abuse (Protection) (Scotland) Act 2021, the minister highlights that work on that

“continues to take some time”

and that it has brought up new challenges but is on-going. The minister stated that she would look to provide a detailed update to the committee in the coming months but, in fact, no update has been provided since July last year.

On legal aid reform, the minister pointed to “The Vision for Justice in Scotland: Three Year Delivery Plan 2023/24 to 2025/26”, which provides for stakeholder engagement on future legislative proposals to reform the legal aid system. At the time when the minister wrote to the committee, it was intended that that work would commence “in early course”, but it is worth noting that the Scottish Government's recently published legislative programme for 2025-26 does not include a proposed bill on legal aid reform and that stakeholder engagement is on-going.

In the light of all of that, do colleagues have any suggestions for action?

**Fergus Ewing:** This is the other petition that has received my detailed attention. The minister's response was fairly positive, but it is now almost a year old. It stated that work was to commence in early course, but the programme for government contains no reference to that legislation, as the convener said, and it is not clear whether the work has commenced or is to be commenced.

I therefore suggest that we do two things. First, we should write to the minister to seek an update

on the submission of 29 July 2024 and, in particular, clarity on whether the work that is referred to in the last paragraph of the letter has commenced. It stated that the Government intended

“to commence this engagement in early course.”

Secondly, the petitioner’s response of 30 July 2024 recognised the minister’s concern and thanked her for her helpfulness to the committee, but it raised a very interesting point about whether victims are able to apply for an extension of a non-harassment order.

I gather that non-harassment orders are normally granted for a specific period in time. It therefore seems to be an extension of natural justice that, if the victim feels that there is a reason why that time period should be extended, they should have the opportunity to apply to court for an extension thereof. I would therefore be grateful if, in writing to the minister, we could inquire of him whether it is the case that the current law—which I think is, from memory, the Act of Adjournal (Criminal Procedure Rules Amendment No 2) (Non-harassment order) 1997—allows the victim to make such an application, and, if not, whether that would be part of the legislation that the minister is considering bringing in and considering in early course.

**The Convener:** Are colleagues content to pursue the petition on that basis?

**Members indicated agreement.**

### **Cervical Cancer (Testing) (PE2088)**

**The Convener:** PE2088, lodged by Emma Keyes, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to help to eliminate cervical cancer in Scotland for women and those with a cervix by introducing at-home human papillomavirus self-sampling to enhance the smear testing programme, helping to increase the uptake and accessibility of smear testing.

We last considered the petition at our meeting on 12 June 2024, when we agreed to write to the UK National Screening Committee and the Scottish Government. The response from the NSC highlights evidence on the use of HPV self-sampling within the NHS cervical screening programme, which it reviewed in 2019. Back then, the NSC recognised the value of self-sampling, but it indicated that further work was required to ensure its feasibility in the existing screening programme. Such work is under way, and the NSC has pointed to a variety of projects in the area which, once completed, will inform future recommendations to ministers across the UK.

The Scottish Government’s response states that, beyond engagement with the NSC on self-

sampling, it continues to explore alternatives to increase the uptake of the cervical screening programme, including the improved use of digital technology, as well as more personalised communications with eligible participants. In light of that, do members have any comments or suggestions for action?

**David Torrance (Kirkcaldy) (SNP):** In light of that evidence, I wonder whether the committee would consider closing the petition under rule 15.7 of standing orders, on the basis that the NSC, on which the Scottish Government relies for advice, has considered that further work is required to ensure the feasibility of self-sampling in the current screening programme, and has indicated that various projects that will inform future recommendations are under way.

In closing the petition, the committee might wish to draw the petitioner’s attention to the response from the Minister for Public Health and Women’s Health to a recent written question on a similar topic.

**The Convener:** Are colleagues content with that?

**Members indicated agreement.**

**The Convener:** We thank the petitioner, but in light of the information that we have, we will close the petition at this time and hope that the work progresses.

### **Scottish Ministerial Code (PE2093)**

**The Convener:** PE2093, lodged by Benjamin Harrop, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to review and update the Scottish ministerial code to: put the code under statute; enable independent advisers to initiate investigations, and if the First Minister decides to go against the independent adviser’s advice, they should make a statement to Parliament; set out the sanctions for breaches other than misleading Parliament; allow independent advisers to make recommendations for changes to the code; rename the independent adviser position to make it clear that there is no judicial involvement; and require ministers to make a public oath or commitment to abide by the code.

We last considered the petition at our meeting on 26 June 2024, when we agreed to write to the First Minister. The committee’s letter particularly sought clarification on what consideration the First Minister had given to updating the ministerial code since taking office, and it asked him to set out the process for appointing independent advisers on the ministerial code, including whether any consideration was given to how long they should remain in post.

The First Minister's initial response confirmed his intention to publish an updated edition of the ministerial code, and it indicated that the length of service of independent advisers on the code was a matter that is agreed between the First Minister and the individual advisers.

The most recent correspondence from the First Minister confirms the publication of an updated ministerial code, following the appointment of three new independent advisers. The First Minister's response states that, as per the updated code, those advisers can begin investigations into alleged breaches of the code without a referral from him, and that when a breach is established, the advisers can recommend appropriate sanctions.

09:45

The petitioner's response welcomes the changes that enable independent advisers to initiate investigations and to recommend sanctions and changes to the code, but highlights concerns that the code has not been put under statute and that there is no requirement on ministers to make a public commitment to abide by it. The petitioner also raises concerns that the designation of advisers as independent may cause confusion, with people believing that "independent" suggests a judicial role. However, I feel that a certain amount of progress—some might say that it is unexpected—has been made on the substance of the petition.

Do colleagues have any suggestions for action?

**David Torrance:** Considering that a lot of the petitioner's asks have been met, I wonder whether the committee would consider closing the petition under rule 15.7 of standing orders, on the basis that the Scottish ministerial code has been reviewed and updated, taking into account the main asks of the petition.

**Fergus Ewing:** I do not oppose that, because a lot of progress has been made and a lot of the points that the petitioner raised have been answered. However, I note the fact that, in the petitioner's response of 5 May, which is hot off the press, he sets out very clearly his response on each point. Some of the points that he makes certainly have substance, and others may do. I do not think that we can do much more with the petition in the remaining time that is available to us this session.

I commend the petitioner for his forensic focus on the defects in the code. To be fair, the responses have been relevant, but the petitioner may wish to come back to the Parliament in the next session, after he has reflected further on the changes.

**The Convener:** I have the petitioner's response before me, and he has indeed come back on each individual point. From our perspective—the code having just been reviewed by the First Minister and republished—it is not likely that there will be a further review at this time, but it may well be that, next session, circumstances could be different and that the issues could once again be worth considering by whoever holds the office at that point.

**Fergus Ewing:** I do not think that the issues will ever go away.

**The Convener:** No. Are we agreed at this stage?

*Members indicated agreement.*

### **Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003 (PE2108)**

**The Convener:** PE2108, lodged by Andrew Muir, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to require medical professionals to obtain a second medical opinion before a person is detained under the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003. The petition was last considered on 9 October 2024.

In its response to the committee, the Scottish Government states that it is confident that one medical opinion is sufficient for the granting of a short-term detention certificate, because of the additional safeguards and patients' rights that are provided for in the 2003 act.

The petitioner and his wife, Clair Muir, have provided a joint written submission, which details Mrs Muir's personal experience of being under a short-term detention certificate. The petitioner explains that, during Mrs Muir's treatment, further investigation by a new responsible medical officer resulted in that treatment being brought to a conclusion. He believes that their experience would have been better had a second medical opinion been available before detention started.

The issues in the petition are familiar to many of us, and the petitioners have drawn our attention to them on a number of occasions. Given the Scottish Government's response, what might we do now?

**David Torrance:** In light of the Scottish Government's response—and the fact that it will not, I think, be changing its mind on this—I suggest that we close the petition under rule 15.7 of standing orders, on the basis that the Scottish Government is confident that one medical opinion is sufficient to grant a short-term detention certificate, because of the additional safeguards and patients' rights that are provided for in the 2003 act.



**The Convener:** I read again the response from the petitioner and Mrs Muir—it was not a happy experience. However, the Scottish Government seems resolute in its view. Do colleagues accept Mr Torrance’s recommendation at this point?

**Members indicated agreement.**

**The Convener:** With some regret, we feel that we can do nothing further, in the face of the Government’s response.

### **Early Learning and Childcare (Funding) (PE2111)**

**The Convener:** PE2111, lodged by Julie Fraser, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to provide families with financial support for early learning and childcare when their children reach nine months. The petition was last considered on 30 October 2024.

In its response, the Scottish Government highlights its work with local authorities on a national improvement project that will not only take focused action in five local authorities but seek out and promote good practice to increase uptake of such care for eligible two-year-olds.

The Scottish Government’s work on early adopter community projects has continued, too, with the aim of tackling poverty and helping families give their children the best start in life by expanding access to childcare services. The response confirms that some projects will directly support children from the age of nine months, but firm data will be available only through future grant reporting and evaluation activity.

In light of that response, do members have any suggestions for action?

**David Torrance:** I wonder whether the committee would consider closing the petition, under rule 15.7 of standing orders, on the basis that the Scottish Government is working to expand early years and childcare through early adopter community projects in six local authorities, some of which directly support children aged nine months. It is also working on a national improvement project that aims to seek out and promote good practice to increase uptake for eligible two-year-olds.

**The Convener:** Is the committee minded to accept Mr Torrance’s proposal?

**Members indicated agreement.**

**The Convener:** We thank the petitioner for raising the petition with us. I hope that the response is validated by experience, and that the petitioner keeps a note of whether all of that transpires. If not, she could bring the issue back in a future session of Parliament.

## **New Petitions**

09:52

**The Convener:** That brings us to item 3, which is consideration of new petitions. To those tuning in to see what is happening with a petition that they have lodged, I can confirm that we always seek two opinions. The first is from the Scottish Parliament information centre—the Scottish Parliament’s independent research body—which gives us formal briefings on the issues raised by petitions, and the second is a preliminary view from the Scottish Government. As always, we seek that information from those two bodies in advance, because, historically, that has been the first thing that we have done as a committee. Doing so helps expedite our in-depth consideration of the petition before us.

### **Psychoeducation for the Neurodiverse Community (PE2141)**

**The Convener:** The first of our new petitions is PE2141, lodged by Luis Robertson, which calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to improve the support available to the neurodiverse community by providing fully-funded psychoeducation and sensory aids, which allow for greater community integration pre and post diagnosis.

In the petitioner’s view, psychoeducation is crucial for autistic individuals, as it equips them with the knowledge and tools to better understand themselves and their experiences. That knowledge could lead to self-acceptance and enable them to connect with others more effectively.

As noted in the SPICe briefing, psychoeducation interventions are typically structured, fixed-term, condition-specific sessions for neurodiverse people, delivered by a qualified professional. Depending on individual needs, some neurodiverse persons also find use for sensory aids, such as fidget toys, weighted blankets, therapy balls or visual timers. The SPICe briefing also highlights that the evidence base for psychoeducation is still somewhat small, given that it is an emerging field. However, it points to some research that suggests that psychoeducation could play a positive role in post-diagnostic support, particularly if it is co-produced by neurodiverse people.

In its initial submission, the Scottish Government explains how organisations funded through the autistic adult support fund provide support that achieves similar aims to those of psychoeducation. It also explains how existing providers of psychoeducation and sensory aids

can apply for funding. The Government further stresses that it supports several alternative initiatives that achieve the aims sought in the petition, while indicating that it is open to exploring the integration of psychoeducational approaches and the use of sensory aids into existing frameworks.

If members are content, I suggest that we write to the Scottish Government to ask for a breakdown of the funding that is due to be made available to the providers of psychoeducation and sensory aids in 2025-26 and beyond and to ask whether that will be made available through the autistic adult Scotland fund. We should also ask for an update on whether the Scottish Government intends to subsidise or distribute sensory aids through the existing frameworks and to integrate that provision with the psychoeducational programmes that are led by neurodivergent individuals. Are members content?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

**The Convener:** We will keep the petition open and seek to make inquiries along the lines that have been suggested.

### **Artificial Sweeteners (Ban) (PE2144)**

**The Convener:** PE2144, lodged by Ben Ronnie Lang, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to ban the sale and use of artificial sweeteners, such as sucralose, in food and drink products in Scotland.

This is a much-explored field of public health. The petitioner believes that artificial sweeteners that are found in foods and beverages pose a serious public health concern and should therefore be banned, based on their potential to increase the risk of developing conditions such as type 2 diabetes.

The SPICe briefing highlights that many organisations, such as the NHS, the British Heart Foundation and Diabetes UK advocate the use of sweeteners as a replacement for sugar, because of the impact of sugar on tooth decay, obesity and type 2 diabetes. On the other hand, the World Health Organization has made a conditional recommendation that non-sugar sweeteners are not used as a means of achieving weight control, due to a lack of evidence about the long-term benefits for body weight and concerns about potential long-term impacts.

In its initial review of the petition, the Scottish Government notes the conclusions of a recent statement from the UK Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition on the lack of data on the volume of NSS used in food products and on advice to younger consumers. The Government has also indicated that it will engage with Food

Standards Scotland and the UK Government to discuss the implications of the recommendations in the SACN's statement.

However, the Scottish Government also notes the SACN's view that all NSS in the UK are safe for human consumption, having undergone a rigorous assessment by either the European Food Safety Authority or the UK Food Standards Agency. The Scottish Government says that, although it will continue to monitor the evidence, its view is that there is currently insufficient evidence to consider banning non-sugar sweeteners.

I do not know, Mr Ewing—were there non-sugar sweeteners when we were young? I cannot remember. Did we just put sugar in everything?

**Fergus Ewing:** I think that I ate the sweets so quickly that I probably did not notice.

**The Convener:** I sometimes wonder about the implications of the use of artificial sweeteners for people who use them from birth. Nonetheless, the research does not, at the moment, appear to validate demands for the complete exclusion of artificial sweeteners.

In that light, I wonder what Mr Torrance has to say about it.

**David Torrance:** There were probably no artificial sweeteners in my day either.

In light of the research, I wonder whether the committee will consider closing the petition under rule 15.7 of standing orders, on the basis that the Scottish Government will not consider taking steps to ban the sale of non-sugar sweeteners, given the views expressed by the UK Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition that NSS are safe for human consumption, having undergone safety assessments by the European Food Safety Authority or by the UK Food Standards Agency, and that the Government will continue to monitor the evidence on NSS and to work with Food Standards Scotland, which is reviewing the SACN recommendations and assessing what they could mean for Scotland.

**The Convener:** That is probably the position that we have to adopt, although do colleagues, like me, sometimes wonder what the safety assessments actually are or amount to? What do they do to establish that an issue is not one of concern? Is it some form of monitoring?

Unfortunately from the petitioner's perspective, if the Scottish Government's view is that that is the course of action that it is going to follow, there is really nothing that the committee can do but accept that it is an issue that will continue to command a degree of public attention and which will remain the subject of further discussion. For

the moment, are colleagues content to follow Mr Torrance's recommendation?

**Members indicated agreement.**

### **Compulsory Microchipping for Cats (PE2145)**

10:00

**The Convener:** PE2145, lodged by Jillian Brown, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to make it compulsory for cats and kittens to be microchipped. The Scottish Government's "Code of Practice for the Welfare of Cats" recommends that all responsible cat owners consider microchipping their pets as the best way of ensuring that they can be reunited with their rightful owners.

The Scottish Animal Welfare Commission has published a report on responsible ownership and care of cats, recommending that Scottish ministers

"introduce legislation to require the compulsory microchipping and registration of owned cats".

The Scottish Government's response to the petition states that it is carefully considering the recommendations in that report and will engage with stakeholders ahead of any decision being made on what future direction the Government might recommend.

The committee has received a written submission from Cats Protection, highlighting the public support for compulsory microchipping in England, which is now in force, and calling for its introduction in Scotland.

**Foyso Choudhury (Lothian) (Lab):** Before Mr Torrance jumps in, I want to say that I totally agree with everything that the petitioner has said. Microchipping should be compulsory, because a cat is not only a cat—it is part of a family, too. If the proposal means that cats that are lost are brought back home, we should all support it.

We should write to the Scottish Government to ask whether, in light of the Scottish Animal Welfare Commission's report and the new requirement in England, it will introduce legislation to mandate the microchipping and registration of cats in this parliamentary session.

**The Convener:** Do we have any idea of how many cats there are? I doubt it. My goodness, it could be quite a commitment.

Does anybody else have any observations or reflections?

**Foyso Choudhury:** Why do we not find out how many there are?

**The Convener:** I do not even know whom I would ask to find out how many cats there are that

would require to be microchipped. Would the measure be retrospective, or applied to each new cat that is to be launched into the domestic environment?

In any event, the Government is considering the issues, and it is perfectly reasonable to try to establish when those considerations might lead to a recommendation. Are colleagues content to support Mr Choudhury's recommendation?

**Members indicated agreement.**

### **Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (Transition) (PE2148)**

**The Convener:** PE2148 is on improving the transition from child and adolescent mental health services to adult mental health services. Colleagues will be aware that we are already considering a petition asking for a complete review of mental health services, but this petition is quite a focused ask in that wider field. Lodged by Heather Stitt, it calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to improve the transition from CAMHS to adult mental health services by ensuring that national referral guidelines and criteria are adhered to.

The SPICe briefing provides an overview of the work that the Scottish Government has undertaken on transitions. Research in 2016-17 highlighted the need for improvements to training resources, service co-ordination, information access and proactive outreach to vulnerable individuals with additional support needs.

The Minister for Social Care, Mental Wellbeing and Sport's submission states that the Scottish Government expects health boards to consider and plan for transitions in services and care. The submission also highlights the 2020 service specification, which sets out an expectation that the transition care planning guidance will be implemented and that CAMHS will have protocols in place to ensure robust transitions. Moreover, the minister's response highlights the transition care plan guidance and template, which were developed with the Scottish Youth Parliament.

Our colleague Sarah Boyack MSP wished to join us this morning, but she is unable to do so. Instead, we have received a written submission from her, which questions how the Scottish Government monitors adherence to the guidelines and service standards. Ms Boyack states that, without appropriate support or treatment, there is a risk that some young people will be unable to work or contribute to their communities, and she concludes by saying that young people and their families should not feel that they have been abandoned or left in limbo.

Do colleagues have any suggestions?

**Foyso Choudhury:** We should keep the petition open and write to the Minister for Social Care, Mental Wellbeing and Sport to ask, in light of the expectations that the Scottish Government has set, how it monitors implementation of the transition care planning guidance, CAMHS transition protocols and the transition care plan template, and whether the Scottish Government has gathered feedback from young people and their families following transition between child and adult mental health services.

**The Convener:** There is a recommendation from Mr Choudhury to keep the petition open and to explore two specific lines of inquiry. Are colleagues content with Mr Choudhury's suggestions?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

**The Convener:** We will keep the petition open and seek to advance our consideration by obtaining that information.

That brings us to the end of the public part of our meeting. We will next meet on 4 June, and we will now move into private session for the subsequent agenda items.

10:05

*Meeting continued in private until 10:24.*

This is the final edition of the *Official Report* of this meeting. It is part of the Scottish Parliament *Official Report* archive and has been sent for legal deposit.

---

Published in Edinburgh by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, the Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh, EH99 1SP

---

All documents are available on  
the Scottish Parliament website at:

[www.parliament.scot](http://www.parliament.scot)

Information on non-endorsed print suppliers  
is available here:

[www.parliament.scot/documents](http://www.parliament.scot/documents)

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact  
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000

Textphone: 0800 092 7100

Email: [sp.info@parliament.scot](mailto:sp.info@parliament.scot)

---



The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba