



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Published 9 March 2021
SP Paper 974
7th Report 2021 (Session 5)

Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee

Comataidh Inbhean, Dòighean-obrach is Cur-an-dreuchd Poblach

Standing Order Rule changes - Public Petitions System



Published in Scotland by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body.

All documents are available on the Scottish Parliament website at:
<http://www.parliament.scot/abouttheparliament/91279.aspx>

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact Public Information on:
Telephone: 0131 348 5000
Textphone: 0800 092 7100
Email: sp.info@parliament.scot

Contents

Introduction	1
Background	2
SPPA Committee Consideration	3
Proposed changes	4
Consultation	7
Recommendation	8
Annexe A: Proposed Standing Order rule changes	9
Annexe B – Correspondence between the Conveners of the Public Petitions Committee and the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committees	10
Annexe C: written submissions	16
Annexe D: Extract from minutes	18

Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee

The remit of the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee is to consider and report on—

- (a) the practice and procedures of the Parliament in relation to its business;
- (ab) a proposal for a Bill relating to the arrangements for financial assistance to non-Government political parties represented in the Parliament;
- (b) whether a member's conduct is in accordance with these Rules and any Code of Conduct for members, matters relating to members interests, and any other matters relating to the conduct of members in carrying out their Parliamentary duties;
- (c) the adoption, amendment and application of any Code of Conduct for members; and
- (d) matters relating to public appointments in Scotland;
- (e) matters relating to the regulation of lobbying; and
- (f) matters relating to Scottish general elections falling within the responsibility of the Cabinet Secretary for Government Business and Constitutional Relations.



SPPA.Committee@parliament.scot



0131 348 6924

Committee Membership



Convener
Bill Kidd
Scottish National Party



Deputy Convener
Patrick Harvie
Scottish Green Party



Neil Findlay
Scottish Labour



Oliver Mundell
Scottish Conservative
and Unionist Party



Gil Paterson
Scottish National Party



John Scott
Scottish Conservative
and Unionist Party



Maureen Watt
Scottish National Party

Introduction

1. Standing Order rules about bringing petitions and their admissibility are contained in Chapter 15 of Standing Orders.

Background

2. The Public Petitions Committee (PPC) reviewed the Public Petitions system and invited the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments (SPPA) Committee to consider a number of Rule changes to give effect to the following:
 - A petition that is substantially the same as a petition already under consideration by the Parliament is inadmissible;
 - A petitioner can only have one current petition under consideration by the Parliament at any one time;
 - A petition relating to a Bill currently under consideration by the Parliament or to primary legislation passed by the Parliament within the period of twelve months preceding the lodging of the petition is inadmissible.
3. A letter ¹ from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee sets out the rationale for these changes. All of the relevant correspondence is set out in Annexe B of this report.

SPPA Committee Consideration

4. The SPPA Committee first considered the letter from Johann Lamont MSP, as Convener of the PPC, at its meeting on 1 October 2020. The Committee invited Johann Lamont to the Committee on 3 December to explain the proposed changes in more detail.
5. Following consideration of its consultation on the proposals (at its meeting on 11 February) the SPPA wrote ² to the PPC to highlight concerns raised about its proposal that a petitioner should only have one current petition under consideration at any one time. The response ³ from the PPC was considered by the Committee at its meeting on 4 March 2021.

Proposed changes

6. The Public Petitions Committee undertook a review of the petitions system "to ensure that the rules and guidance adequately and consistently reflect practice and legislative requirements." The objective of the proposed changes is to assist the Public Petitions Committee in responding to increasing demand for petitioning the Scottish Parliament.
7. The Convener of the Public Petitions Committee indicated that the proposed changes would "assist the Committee in responding to this increasing demand by focussing on those petitions it believes merit more detailed consideration and scrutiny." She further explained that the proposed changes were also aligned to the Public Petitions Committee's [Vision Statement](#) which aims to:
 - ” ensure the petitions process is open and accessible, avoids the duplication of parliamentary scrutiny and focuses on issues—
 - which may not otherwise receive attention
 - are not being considered elsewhere in the Scottish Parliament; and
 - where the Committee believes its involvement can make the most difference.
8. In a letter to the SPPA Committee ⁴, the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee set out the three changes that it wished to make to the petitions system:
 - A petition that is substantially the same as a petition already under consideration by the Parliament is inadmissible;
 - A petitioner can only have one current petition under consideration by the Parliament at any one time;
 - A petition relating to a Bill currently under consideration by the Parliament or to primary legislation passed by the Parliament within the period of twelve months preceding the lodging of the petition is inadmissible.
9. The arguments presented by the Public Petitions Committee for these changes are set out in the box below:

Submitting multiple petitions on the same topic

The current standing order rules state that a petition is inadmissible if it is 'is the same as, or in substantially similar terms to, a petition brought during the same session of the Parliament and which was closed less than a year earlier'. There is currently nothing in the rules preventing any member of the public submitting a new petition on a topic which is substantially similar to one already under consideration by Parliament.

There have been instances where the Public Petitions Committee has been required to consider a number of very similar petitions in parallel, leading to a duplication of effort and placing additional pressure on Members and the clerking team.

The view of the Committee is that to avoid this happening in the future, it would be beneficial to amend the standing order rules so that the Committee could deem inadmissible any petition raising substantially the same issues as a petition already under consideration by the Committee.

To ensure this does not disadvantage anyone from making their views known, anyone unable to advance a petition would have the option of commenting on the existing petition.

Multiple Petitions by the Same Petitioner

At present, there is nothing to stop a petitioner having multiple petitions under consideration by the Parliament at the same time. Whilst the Scottish Parliament's petitions system has deliberately been designed to be open and accessible, this can sometimes lead to the Committee devoting extensive resources and time to pursuing several issues on behalf of one individual.

In order to ensure equity of access to the petitions process, the Committee is of the view that any petitioner with a current petition under consideration by the Parliament should be prevented from pursuing a further petition until such time as their initial petition has been closed.

Petitions Relating to Current or Recent Legislation

Currently there is no restriction on a petitioner bringing forward a petition on a topic which the Scottish Government has recently legislated. The Committee is of the view that there is a significant risk that considering such a petition is likely to lead to it carrying out post-legislative scrutiny when the new legislation may not even have been commenced.

Considering issues that have recently been legislated on also runs contrary to the aims of the petitions process, which seeks to raise awareness of issues where there is scope to bring about positive policy change. Given that new legislation is unlikely to be subject to review for some time, the chances of influencing change are therefore minimal.

Petitioners are also currently able to bring forward a petition which relates to legislation being considered by the Scottish Parliament. In this scenario, the petitioner's aims may be better served by contributing to the legislative process by, for example, responding to a committee's call for views on a Bill.

10. The Convener of the Public Petitions Committee subsequently provided further clarification on the proposals in a second letter to the SPPA Committee.⁵ These are contained in the box below:

Submitting multiple petitions on the same topic

The Public Petitions Committee is regularly petitioned on the same issue. While members of the public can be signposted to engage in a petition that is already published and seeks the same objective, there is currently nothing to stop multiple petitions being received and published on the same topic. This results in the duplication of effort for the Committee as well as staff involved in supporting the petitions process.

This suggested change is consistent with the admissibility criteria for petitions in the UK and Welsh Parliaments.

Multiple petitions by the same petitioner

This change is intended to avoid any one member of the public monopolising the petitions process or the Committee's agenda and putting pressure on available resources to the detriment of others wishing to engage in the process.

While this rule would also apply to organisations, guidance will always be provided on alternative ways that issues can be raised to Parliament, if a petition is already under consideration by that organisation.

I also wish to highlight that the number of petitions received from organisations is very low. I therefore do not anticipate this rule change preventing or restricting organisations from engaging in the petitions process.

Petitions relating to current or recent legislation

One aspect of this proposed change seeks to avoid the Public Petitions Committee scrutinising a Bill at the same time as a subject Committee or the whole Parliament, depending on what stage it is at in the parliamentary process. Should a proposed petition be received that relates to legislation being considered by the Scottish Parliament, the clerks would provide clear advice on how a member of the public could engage with the legislative scrutiny process and have their views taken into account.

The second aspect seeks to avoid petitions being submitted on a topic on which the Parliament has recently legislated. In the event that recently passed legislation is found to be defective, I am confident that existing parliamentary processes are in place to highlight any concerns of this nature, rather than this being addressed through the Public Petitions Committee.

Consultation

11. The Committee agreed to consult on the proposed changes with all MSPs and wrote to them on 22 December 2020. The Committee received six responses in total, three of which made substantive comments (these are included in Annexe B). While three of the six responses were supportive of all of the proposed changes, John Mason MSP, Elaine Smith MSP and Neil Findlay MSP disagreed with the proposal that a petition is inadmissible if it has been brought by or on behalf of a petitioner who, at the same time, has a current petition under consideration by the Parliament.
12. The Committee recognised these concerns and wrote ⁶ to the PPC inviting it to consider an adjustment that would afford petitioners some leeway in being able to submit more than one petition while also ensuring that an individual petitioner could not dominate the petitions system at the expense of others by submitting multiple petitions.
13. The PPC responded ⁷, accepting the concerns raised by those responding to the SPPA's consultation. The PPC proposed the application of a cap of two on the number of petitions allowed per petitioner and this is set out for Parliament's agreement with the other proposed changes at Annexe A.

Recommendation

14. The Committee recommends to the Parliament the changes to Standing Orders set out at Annexe A of this report.

Annexe A: Proposed Standing Order rule changes

The red text shows the proposed changes to Rule 15.5.

Rule 15.5 Admissibility of petitions

1. A petition is admissible unless it—

(a) does not comply with Rule 15.4.2 or is otherwise not in proper form;

(aa) is frivolous;

(ab) breaches any enactment or rule of law;

(ac) refers to any matter in relation to which legal proceedings are active;

(b) contains language which is offensive;

(ba) fails to raise issues of national policy or practice;

(c) requests the Parliament to do anything which the Parliament clearly has no power to do; ~~or~~

(d) is the same as, or in substantially similar terms to, a petition brought during the same session of the Parliament and which was closed less than a year earlier.

(e) is the same as, or in substantially similar terms to, any other petition which is currently being considered by the Parliament;

(f) has been brought by or on behalf of a petitioner who, at the same time, has two current petitions under consideration by the Parliament; or

(g) relates to a Bill which is currently being considered by the Parliament, or to primary legislation passed by the Parliament within the period of twelve months preceding the lodging of the petition.

1A. For the purposes of paragraph 1(ac), legal proceedings are active in relation to a matter if they are active for the purposes of section 2 of the Contempt of Court Act 1981 (c.49).

2. The Committee shall consider and decide in a case of dispute whether a petition is admissible and shall notify the petitioner of its decision and of the reasons for that decision.

Annexe B – Correspondence between the Conveners of the Public Petitions Committee and the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committees

LETTER FROM PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE TO STANDARDS, PROCEDURES AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE 23 June 2020

Dear Bill,

The Public Petitions Committee's remit includes a requirement to keep under review the operation of the petitions system. The Committee has recently undertaken such a review to ensure that the rules and guidance adequately and consistently reflect practice and legislative requirements.

Standing order rules about bringing petitions and their admissibility are contained in Chapter 15. In addition to the rules, the Committee publishes guidance providing more detail on its practices in a determination on proper form as provided for in rule 15.4.3.

At its meeting on 20 February 2020, the Committee considered a paper on a review of the Public Petitions system. At this meeting, it was agreed that I should write to you to invite the Standards, Procedures and Appointments Committee to consider the need for a small number of rule changes in relation to the admissibility of petitions to provide for the following:

- A petition that is substantially the same as a petition already under consideration by the Parliament is inadmissible;
- A petitioner can only have one current petition under consideration by the Parliament at any one time;
- A petition relating to a Bill currently under consideration by the Parliament or to primary legislation passed by the Parliament within the period of twelve months preceding the lodging of the petition is inadmissible.

Suggested wording to reflect these proposed rule changes has been provided by legal services and can be found at Appendix A.

I outline the rationale for these rule changes below.

Submitting multiple petitions on the same topic

The current standing order rules state that a petition is inadmissible if it is 'is the same as, or in substantially similar terms to, a petition brought during the same session of the Parliament and which was closed less than a year earlier'. There is currently nothing in the rules preventing any member of the public submitting a new petition on a topic which is substantially similar to one already under consideration by Parliament.

There have been instances where the Public Petitions Committee has been required to consider a number of very similar petitions in parallel, leading to a duplication of effort and placing additional pressure on Members and the clerking team.

The view of the Committee is that to avoid this happening in the future, it would be beneficial to amend the standing order rules so that the Committee could deem inadmissible any petition raising substantially the same issues as a petition already under consideration by the Committee.

To ensure this does not disadvantage anyone from making their views known, anyone unable to advance a petition would have the option of commenting on the existing petition.

Multiple Petitions by the Same Petitioner

At present, there is nothing to stop a petitioner having multiple petitions under consideration by the Parliament at the same time. Whilst the Scottish Parliament's petitions system has deliberately been designed to be open and accessible, this can sometimes lead to the Committee devoting extensive resources and time to pursuing several issues on behalf of one individual.

In order to ensure equity of access to the petitions process, the Committee is of the view that any petitioner with a current petition under consideration by the Parliament should be prevented from pursuing a further petition until such time as their initial petition has been closed.

Petitions Relating to Current or Recent Legislation

Currently there is no restriction on a petitioner bringing forward a petition on a topic which the Scottish Government has recently legislated. The Committee is of the view that there is a significant risk that considering such a petition is likely to lead to it carrying out post-legislative scrutiny when the new legislation may not even have been commenced.

Considering issues that have recently been legislated on also runs contrary to the aims of the petitions process, which seeks to raise awareness of issues where there is scope to bring about positive policy change. Given that new legislation is unlikely to be subject to review for some time, the chances of influencing change are therefore minimal.

Petitioners are also currently able to bring forward a petition which relates to legislation being considered by the Scottish Parliament. In this scenario, the petitioner's aims may be better served by contributing to the legislative process by, for example, responding to a committee's call for views on a Bill.

Amending the standing order rules in this area would allow the Committee to focus its efforts on where there was the potential to make the most difference.

I hope this letter is helpful in setting out the Committee's thinking.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Johann Lamont MSP

Convener, Public Petitions Committee

Appendix A

Suggested wording for proposed standing order rule changes

The drafting proceeds on the basis that the changes sought are best addressed by means of additions to the existing list of 'inadmissibility' grounds, at Rule 15.5.1.

The overall approach has been to keep the drafting fairly brief and straightforward, consistent with the approach taken in setting out the existing grounds on which a petition may be inadmissible.

That approach also takes into account that, in relation to 'difficult' cases, the committee, per 15.5.2, is to consider and decide in a case of dispute whether a petition is admissible.

The proposed drafting amendments are outlined as follows—

Rule 15.5 Admissibility of petitions

In Rule 15.5:

At the end of paragraph 1(c), omit 'or'.

At the end of paragraph 1(d), insert:

'(e) is the same as, or in substantially similar terms to, any other petition which is currently being considered by the Parliament;

(f) has been brought by or on behalf of a petitioner who, at the same time, has a current petition under consideration by the Parliament; or

(g) relates to a Bill which is currently being considered by the Parliament, or to primary legislation passed by the Parliament within the period of twelve months preceding the lodging of the petition.'

LETTER FROM PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE TO STANDARDS, PROCEDURES AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE 16 December 2020

Dear Bill,

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee on 3 December 2020 to discuss the proposed changes the Public Petitions Committee is seeking to make to Standing Orders.

As I explained during the meeting, demand for petitioning the Scottish Parliament continues to grow. The proposed changes would assist the Committee in responding to this increasing demand by focussing on those petitions it believes merit more detailed consideration and scrutiny.

The changes are also aligned to the Public Petitions Committee's [Vision Statement](#) which aims to ensure the petitions process is open and accessible, avoids the duplication of parliamentary scrutiny and focuses on issues—

- which may not otherwise receive attention
- are not being considered elsewhere in the Scottish Parliament; and
- where the Committee believes its involvement can make the most difference.

During the meeting, the Committee sought clarification on the proposals set out in my previous letter of 23 June. I seek to address these points below.

Submitting multiple petitions on the same topic

The Public Petitions Committee is regularly petitioned on the same issue. While members of the public can be signposted to engage in a petition that is already published and seeks the same objective, there is currently nothing to stop multiple petitions being received and published on the same topic. This results in the duplication of effort for the Committee as well as staff involved in supporting the petitions process.

This suggested change is consistent with the admissibility criteria for petitions in the UK and Welsh Parliaments.

Multiple petitions by the same petitioner

This change is intended to avoid any one member of the public monopolising the petitions process or the Committee's agenda and putting pressure on available resources to the detriment of others wishing to engage in the process.

While this rule would also apply to organisations, guidance will always be provided on alternative ways that issues can be raised to Parliament, if a petition is already under consideration by that organisation.

I also wish to highlight that the number of petitions received from organisations is very low. I therefore do not anticipate this rule change preventing or restricting organisations from engaging in the petitions process.

Petitions relating to current or recent legislation

One aspect of this proposed change seeks to avoid the Public Petitions Committee scrutinising a Bill at the same time as a subject Committee or the whole Parliament, depending on what stage it is at in the parliamentary process. Should a proposed petition be received that relates to legislation being considered by the Scottish Parliament, the clerks would provide clear advice on how a member of the public could engage with the legislative scrutiny process and have their views taken into account.

The second aspect seeks to avoid petitions being submitted on a topic on which the Parliament has recently legislated. In the event that recently passed legislation is found to be defective, I am confident that existing parliamentary processes are in place to highlight any concerns of this nature, rather than this being addressed through the Public Petitions Committee.

I hope this information is helpful and look forward to hearing the outcome of the consultation in due course.

Your sincerely,

Johann Lamont MSP

Convener, Public Petitions Committee

**LETTER FROM STANDARDS, PROCEDURES AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS
COMMITTEE TO PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE 12 February 2021**

Dear Johann,

Standing Order Rule Changes – Public Petitions

I last wrote to you in December to let you know that the Committee would be consulting on the set of changes your Committee proposed to the Standing Orders Rules on Public Petitions.

At our meeting yesterday, the Committee discussed the responses to its consultation. While most responses were broadly supportive of the changes, there were some concerns about the Rule which would limit petitions to one per petitioner—

(f) has been brought by or on behalf of a petitioner who, at the same time, has a current petition under consideration by the Parliament;

The responses to our consultation are set out in the Annexe below. During the Committee's discussion yesterday, Neil Findlay drew attention to the current petition by Scottish Mesh Survivors, noting that a tension arose between wishing to encourage the lodging of a new petition by the same petitioners in order to bring new issues to the fore while keeping the existing petition in the system. It is for cases such as these that we feel there should be some flexibility.

The Committee discussed the possibility of a cap of two or three petitions per petitioner. Rather than impose our own solution however, the Committee would like to invite you and your Committee to make an adjustment that would afford petitioners some leeway. Your Committee is best placed to decide the scope and parameters of such a compromise.

The SPPA Committee will then consider your proposal before recommending the changes in a report to the Parliament. There is still time to secure the agreement of the Parliament and have the Rules in place for the beginning of the new session.

Yours sincerely

Bill Kidd MSP

Convener

Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee

LETTER FROM PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE TO STANDARDS, PROCEDURES AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE 26 February 2021

Dear Bill,

Thank you for your letter of 12 February 2021 highlighting that the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments (SPPA) Committee had discussed the responses to its consultation on the proposed changes to Standing Orders Rules proposed by the Public Petitions Committee.

The Public Petitions Committee welcomes this feedback which was discussed at its meeting on 24 February 2021. At this meeting, the Committee was encouraged by the broad support for the changes being sought, while noting the concerns raised during the consultation, and by your Committee, on the Rule which would limit petitions to one per petitioner—

(f) has been brought by or on behalf of a petitioner who, at the same time, has a current petition under consideration by the Parliament;

The Committee believes the Scottish Parliament's public petitions system should continue to be open and accessible, and that this should be balanced to ensure equity of access to the petitions process. As such, the Committee remains of the view that petitioners should be limited in the number of petitions they can bring forward at any one time.

The Committee recognises the concerns raised and is therefore agreeable to your Committee's suggestion to apply a cap on the number of petitions per petitioner. The Committee considers that a cap of 2 would be an appropriate solution to address the concerns raised, while seeking to ensure there is fair access to the process for all who would wish to have a petition considered by the Scottish Parliament.

I trust that this response is helpful to the Committee in considering its next steps.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Johann Lamont MSP Convener

Public Petitions Committee

Annexe C: written submissions

Neil Findlay MSP

I do not support the proposal for a petitioner to only have one petition underway at any one time. Some petitions take a long time to go through the system, this would see someone left for that period only able to take one issue forward. Also some orgs may have several issues they want to take forward and would be prevented from doing so.

John Mason MSP

The proposed changes to the above severely impact upon the Parliament's ability to be open and accessible. Openness and accessibility must be given both priority and protected status to ensure the active engagement of the citizenry in democratic processes, and to ensure those processes remain as democratic as possible.

The tests for the admissibility of a petition are sufficiently robust without the inclusion of a restriction on the number of petitions that can be brought by a single petitioner. The admissibility tests; that the petition cannot be frivolous; that the petition must relate to national policy, and if passed, that the petition cannot be on a topic which is substantially similar to one already under consideration by Parliament, strike a good balance between keeping the system open and accessible and protecting parliamentary resources as well as limiting the ability of individuals and/or groups to monopolise the system.

I believe it would be problematic to limit participation in the petition process, for instance it would be both desirable and sensible that a medical professional could submit a petition on abortion at the same time as submitting one on assisted dying.

Therefore, I support the inclusion of the admissibility test that the petition cannot be on a topic which is substantially similar to one already under consideration by Parliament, however, do not support the rule change which would prohibit more than one simultaneous petition by the same individual.

There may be room for further exploration of a maximum number of petitions an individual may have at any one time, however, I would certainly support a generous approach, for example an individual can have no more than five live petitions.

Elaine Smith MSP

I wholeheartedly agree that the consideration of Petitions is one of the most important parts of our Parliament's work and has been invaluable in giving members of the public direct access to our democratic process.

I recall that previously a petition at Westminster had to be physically presented in the House of Commons and put into a petition bag behind the Speaker's Chair which contrasted with the modern approach of our new parliament when it was set up. Westminster now has e-petitions but they must gain 100,000 signatures to be considered. Therefore, I am glad that we introduced a much more accessible system and have worked to streamline that process and importantly to make it accessible to all.

I understand that older, middle-class men are over-represented amongst those lodging petitions with women and young people being under-represented. I appreciate, and

support, the ongoing work of the committee to move out of Holyrood and engage with the community; which should also assist with the profile of those who petition the parliament.

I have given careful consideration to the proposed rule changes and, specifically, whether they could have negative consequences impacting on the inclusive and accessible nature of the petitions process.

I appreciate that multiple petitions on the same topic need to be avoided. However, I wonder if there could be a simple procedural way of making sure that the views expressed in the petition are still passed into the Bills process, without comment, but allowing them to formally still be considered. The petitioner could be advised of the evidence gathering process, or the Lead committee, for particular legislation under consideration.

With regards to multiple petitions by the same petitioner I appreciate the concerns. However, I am concerned that since the completion of the handling of a petition is not time limited, through no fault of their own, a petitioner could unintentionally be barred from lodging anything for two to three years having only lodged one previous petition on an issue they felt very strongly about. In that regard, I believe that some further qualifier needs to be considered.

Since these proposed changes have been prompted by an increased demand for petitioning, I do feel that a greater degree of secretariat support is needed. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to avoid frequent changes in secretariat staff and committee members. Since the subjects of many petitions are quite detailed change of staff and committee members can cause delays as time is needed to become familiar with the issues.

I hope these observations are of some assistance to your deliberations.

Annexe D: Extract from minutes

23rd Meeting, 2020 (Session 5) Thursday 3 December 2020

Standing Order Rule changes (in private): The Committee considered a note by the clerk.

3rd Meeting, 2021 (Session 5) Thursday 11 February 2021

Standing Order Rule Changes (in private): The Committee considered a draft report and draft Standing Order Rule Changes in relation to the Petitions system. The Committee agreed to write to the Public Petitions Committee.

6th Meeting 2021 (Session 5), Thursday 4 March 2021

Standing Order Rule Changes (in private): The Committee agreed a draft report and draft Standing Order Rule Changes in relation to the Public Petitions system.

Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee

Standing Order Rule changes - Public Petitions System, 7th Report 2021 (Session 5)

- 1 Letter from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee to the Convener of the SPPA Committee. 23 June 2020
- 2 Letter from the Convener of the SPPA Committee to the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee. 12 February 2021
- 3 Letter from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee to the Convener of the SPPA Committee. 26 February 2021
- 4 Letter from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee to the Convener of the SPPA Committee. 23 June 2020.
- 5 Letter from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee to the Convener of the SPPA Committee. 16 December 2020.
- 6 Letter from the Convener of the SPPA Committee to the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee. 12 February 2021
- 7 Letter from the Convener of the Public Petitions Committee to the Convener of the SPPA Committee. 26 February 2021

