



Glasgow City Council

Operational Performance and Delivery Scrutiny Committee

Report by Director of Communication and Corporate Governance

Contact: Gary Hurr - Ext: 20960

COMPLAINTS HANDLING PERFORMANCE 2023 - 24

Purpose of Report:

To advise elected members of the council family's performance in complaints handling for the year April 1 2023 – 31 March 2024 with the exception of Social Work complaints, which were covered in a separate report to this committee in November.

Recommendations:

The Operational Performance and Delivery Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the content of this report.

Ward No(s):

Citywide: ✓

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐

consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

1. Executive Summary

- a. This report covers the Glasgow family of organisations' complaints handling performance for the period 1 April 2023 – 31 March 2024. Since April 2013 all Scottish councils have been required to monitor and report their performance on handling complaints under their Complaints Handling Procedure (CHP) against a suite of high level performance indicators to meet the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) statutory requirements.
- b. All core GCC service departments and ALEOs use the model Complaints Handling Procedure, introduced in the Glasgow family of organisations in June 2013. This consists of three stages: frontline resolution (stage 1); investigation stage (stage 2) and external review (stage 3), where a referral is made to the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO), either by the complainant or the authority.
- c. Compliance with the model CHP is a statutory requirement. The relevant legislation is contained in the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman Act 2002.
- d. There are a number of different outcomes to formal complaints: upheld; partially upheld; not upheld; withdrawn, transferred to another process and resolved. The majority of complaints received by the Glasgow family continue to be upheld or partially upheld, either at Stage 1 or 2.
- e. Complaints can be dealt with either at the frontline resolution stage, or the investigation stage. Most complaints are dealt with at the frontline stage.
- f. Frontline stage resolution is generally applied where the complaint is reasonably straightforward and involves a one-off or limited service failure. The Service Level Agreement for a frontline complaint resolution is five working days.
- g. Staff are encouraged to try to resolve a customer complaint at the time it is made. Training is provided to assist staff in customer-facing roles, who may take a customer complaint, via courses on GOLD.
- h. Where a complaint is upheld in whole or part, a suitable apology can be made to the customer and actions taken, wherever possible, to address their concerns and/or improve service provision.
- i. Where complaints identify issues of persistent service failure, these should be addressed by managers in the relevant Service. Analysis of complaints data should be carried out regularly by Service senior managers and embedded in change and improvement processes.
- j. Investigation stage complaints are more complex and can generally be categorised as maladministration, or persistent service failure. Complaints handlers can immediately move a complaint received to the investigation stage where they consider it will not be possible to investigate or resolve within five working days (due to its complexity). Customers who have had their complaint dealt with at the frontline stage are offered the option to have it considered at stage 2, if they are dissatisfied with the frontline response. Complaints considered at stage 2 (after a referral from stage 1) should be investigated by more senior staff not connected to the initial complaint to ensure objectivity. The SLA for investigation stage is 20 working days and will always be concluded with a formal, written response to the complainant, advising of the outcome and signposting the complainant to the SPSO. At that point the council's investigation

is considered to be concluded and further correspondence with the customer is not necessary.

- k. Extensions to the above timescales for responses may be granted – for example, where the case has a degree of complexity or seriousness that does not allow for a response within SLA, or where staff absence will impact on response times. We always try to agree extensions with the customer. Requests by complainants to move a complaint immediately to stage 2 are at the discretion of the council. This is to help avoid relatively trivial matters being considered at Stage 2 and to give the relevant Service the opportunity to respond at Stage 1.
- l. At the conclusion of stage 2, customers are referred to the SPSO, should they remain unhappy. The SPSO may decide to investigate the complaint and this is considered the third, and final, stage of the complaint's journey. Once a complaint has exhausted the council's CHP, dialogue with the complainant should cease pending the SPSO investigation to avoid prejudicing the outcome. Where the SPSO makes a decision on a complaint, it cannot be investigated again by the council.
- m. Complaints can be made in a variety of ways: in person, by telephone, using a paper form or increasingly, online using a bespoke complaints form. More than 80 per cent of complaints are now made online, via the council's website. Making a complaint online has advantages both for the customer and the council: for the customer it means the complaint is expressed in their own words and can be entered on a 24/7 basis and for the council it saves time processing the complaint. While complaints made via social media channels are noted by the digital teams, customers are always signposted to the online complaints procedure, should they wish their complaint to be progressed formally. This process is embedded in the CHP. Complaints made on social media are not recorded in council systems due to the difficulties of establishing complainants' identities and tracking such complaints.
- n. Complaints are recorded, tracked and managed in an IT system called Lagan. This system will be retired during 2025, assuming budgetary approval, and replaced by a solution called Granicus which will offer significantly improved case management facilities and self-service options, leading to a reduction in manual interventions during the process of managing a complaint. More detail on the new system is included at Section 5 of this report.
- o. The present system of how complaints are categorised has been recognised as unsatisfactory and lacking qualitative management information to help generate service improvements. A new, streamlined system of categorisation was due to be introduced during 2022 to allow for improved reporting, consistency, benchmarking and better management information. This is being done in conjunction with the Local Authority Complaint Handlers Network, of which GCC is a member, and the SPSO. This work stream is currently in progress and was intended to be introduced during 2022 but has been postponed, pending the implementation of the new case handling system.
- p. There is occasional variance in the way complaints are recorded across the council family. Where this is persistent, matters will be addressed via the council's complaint handler's network which meets regularly. Better categorisation of complaints will assist with this process, leading to improved management information on which to base decision making.

- q. There is a considerable onus on a complaints handler to recognise at which stage the complaint should be handled. Some complaints are categorised as being fit for stage 1 when they should immediately be moved to stage 2 as it is apparent a resolution/response cannot be provided within the stage 1 SLA due to the complexities of the case. This has an adverse effect on the overall SLA response rate at stage 1.
- r. At the present time, it is not generally possible to quantify the amount of time spent by officers on dealing with complaints. Some complaints are straightforward and will involve little resource to resolve, while others will take much longer to resolve and potentially involve a larger group of officers. A small number of complainants can take up a disproportionate amount of officer resource, potentially to the disadvantage of the broader customer base. Where complainants persistently refuse to accept the council's explanation or decision on a matter, this may be managed via its Unacceptable Actions Policy (UAP) which aims to effectively manage the contact of vexatious customers, or those whose actions we consider unacceptable. Customers placed under some form of UAP restriction will always be given at least one point of contact within the council for the period of the restriction.
- s. Responsibility for complaints handling is operationally managed by the corporate Customer Care Team (within CBS) for the core council and by complaints handlers/managers within the specific ALEOs. Strategic responsibility for complaints reporting, compliance and governance resides with the Chief Executive's Department.

2. The general trends and issues in 2023 – 24 for complaints handling can be summarised as follows:

- a. The overall number of complaints received has increased . There were 1840 more complaints in 2023 – 24 than in the preceding period (2022 – 23).
- b. Some 92 per cent of complaints received during 2023 – 24 were closed in the same period. This compares to 95 per cent during 2022 – 23.
- c. There is a significant shortfall in performance in terms of meeting timescales for responses, at stage 1. The average time to resolve a Stage 1 complaint during 2023 – 2024 was 20 days (the SLA is five working days). It should be noted, however, that complaints not recorded as closed within five working days may well have been dealt with operationally even though they have not been formally closed in the IT system. The onus to formally close complaints can often be on officers performing frontline service delivery, who may have competing priorities. This is being addressed with further training for complaints handlers to make sure a complaint is closed in the system at the time of redress or resolution. The new IT system for recording complaints will also be more closely integrated into existing GCC line of business systems providing alerts and reminders to close off resolved complaints. This should see an improvement in the Stage 1 performance recorded during 2024 – 25.
- d. Performance at Stage 2 is 18 working days on average for complaints to be closed. This is within the national performance target of 20 days and represents a further improvement from 2022 – 23.
- e. A number of Service Improvements were identified as a result of complaints received. The majority of these were by Glasgow Life. GL publicises the outcomes of complaints in the venue where they were received using a 'you said, we did' method of presentation on reception area notice boards. This is in line with good practice standards.
- f. Complaints performance is reported to Service/ALEO senior management teams on a regular basis. Cases investigated by the SPSO are brought to the attention of senior officials in the relevant service and to the Chief Executive.

3. Complaints statistical data 2023 - 24

This period has seen an increase in the number of complaints received about services provided by the Glasgow family of organisations.

Complaints received

Period	Total complaints received	Stage 1 (frontline) Complaints	Stage 2 (investigation) Complaints	Change from previous year
2023 - 24	7,694	7,333	361	+1840
2022 - 23	5,854	5,621	233	-899
2021 - 22	6,753	6,517	236	+665
2020 - 21	6,097	5,929	168	-3,753
2019 - 20	9,850	9,437	413	+570
2018 - 19	9,280	8,840	479	-1,808
2017 - 18	11,088	10,057	1,031	-2,044
2016 - 17	13,092	11,737	1,355	-4,220
2015 - 16	17,312	15,764	1,544	+3,662
2014 - 15	13,650	12,139	1,511	+3,526
2013 - 14	10,124*	9,452	672	N/A

(Note: * only partial data available for year 2013 – 14 due to introduction of new Complaints Handling Procedure during that period.)

(Note: some complaints considered at Stage 2 will have been escalated at the complainant's request after a Stage1 outcome. Council officers may also decide to refer a complaint to the Stage 2 process immediately, depending on the nature of the complaint.)

Outcomes of complaints closed at all stages	
Upheld complaints	40%
Partially upheld complaints	40%
Not Upheld complaints	17%
Withdrawn or transferred to another process	3%

Average time taken to resolve complaints	Glasgow family	National performance target
Stage 1 (frontline)	20 days (20 days in 2022 – 23)	5 days
Stage 2 (investigation)	18 days (23 days in 2022 -23)	20 days

Service Improvements made as a result of complaints	
Glasgow Life	34

4. Complaints recorded against each Service or ALEO 2023 –24 and comparative figures for 2022 - 23.

Stage 1

Organisation	2023/4	2022/3
Chief Executive	41	61
City Building	0	6
Education Services	341	295
Financial Services	582	784
Glasgow Life	651	741
Jobs and Business Glasgow	2	4
Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability	5268	3730
Total	7333	5621

Stage 2 - Direct to Stage 2

Organisation	2023/24	2022/23
Chief Executive	1	3
Education Services	98	79
Financial Services	20	16
Glasgow Life	18	10
Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability	176	68
Total	313	176

Stage 2 - Escalated from Stage 1

Organisation	2023/24	2022/23
Education Services	1	12
Financial Services	9	5
Glasgow Life	35	32
Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability	3	8
Total	48	57

- Please note that any complaints escalated from Stage 1 to Stage 2 are only counted at the final stage of their journey to prevent them being counted at both Stage 1 and Stage 2.

5. Systems update

The Granicus system will be used for all 'Contact Us' processes, to receive, record and manage comments, compliments, complaints and for Glasgow Life enquiries. Data will be extracted and put into a reporting solution. The solution will:

- Aligns with Digital Glasgow Strategy and Customer Strategy
- Expands the use of existing customer contact platform called Granicus, which is already in use for a range of GCC services, including reporting a missed bin collection and garden waste permit requests
- Integrates with myAccount, providing benefits such as:
 - Authenticated customer account

- Customer can access a copy of the case they submit
- Ability to exchange information and requests relating to the contact us case between the customer and the case handler
- Customer can withdraw their case
- Case Handler can issue correspondence to the customer that is held on record
- Provides a new reporting system for operational management and SPSO KPI compliance reports
- Combines the existing comment and compliment form and complaint form into one contact us process
- Provides a single contact us case handling solution for GCC, HSCP-SWS and Glasgow Life, replacing existing systems
- Compliant with:
 - SPSO case handling procedure for complaints
 - Operational KPIs for Case Management for comments, compliments
 - Operational KPIs for Case Management for MLU and Enquiries (Glasgow Life)
- Provides a Case Management system processes to align with business operating models across the Glasgow Family
 - Provides access to teams that handle cases providing permission group access
 - Improved user features such as
 - Searching, filtering for cases
 - Assigning cases to case handling teams
 - Improved data accuracy / quality, due to the ability to record key dates retrospectively
- Will be implemented by representatives from GCC, HSCP-SWS and Glasgow Life
 - To date the group has
 - Defined system requirements
 - Agreed the system specification
 - Online Form, fields
 - Permissions and Roles
 - Case Forms and fields
 - Correspondence
 - Data and Workflow
 - System Rules e.g. SLA

6. Cases referred to the SPSO and their outcomes

During the period the undernoted cases were referred by customers to the SPSO at the conclusion of the council's Stage 2 investigation. In all 27 customers exercised their right to have their case considered by the Ombudsman.

Of those 27 cases, none were taken forward for investigation by the SPSO for one of the following reasons:

- The SPSO was satisfied the council had acted in a reasonable manner in dealing with the complaint
- The SPSO noted the council's response to the complainant and did not consider it could achieve anything further for the customer by investigating
- The complaint was outwith the SPSO's jurisdiction and remit
- The complaint was time barred or premature

Complaint reference	SPSO response
202208682 Complaint regarding missed bin collections	SPSO considered actions taken by the council to resolve were reasonable and did not investigate the complaint further.
202205006 Complaint about Glasgow City Council Planning Local Review Committee's (LRC's) decision to grant planning permission in relation to a local business' application for seating and storage outside of the complainant's flat. Concerns about the council's handling of this matter: The LRC did not have the required quorum to make a valid decision; Residents' objections did not get a fair and equitable hearing; The LRC's decision to allow the storage unit was unreasonable and incompetent; The council's Planning department did not notify objectors rendering the process incompetent; and Incorrect and misleading information was given to the public denying them a civil right to legal recourse and causing financial loss and distress.	SPSO decided not to investigate further as having tested the council's position by obtaining independent advice, the SPSO are satisfied that the council's position is reasonable and is supported by the relevant records. SPSO also noted that the council have apologised for any failings identified and that the apology, and the learning and improvement the council agreed to progress were actions the SPSO would have expected had they carried out a full investigation
202210299 Customer complained that a friend had a piece of street art commissioned only for this to then be wrongly painted over by the council's graffiti team. Customer asked that the council pay appropriate compensation in order that she can re-commission a further piece of wall art.	SPSO did not investigate the customer's complaint. They considered the council's response to be reasonable. The SPSO cannot recommend awards of compensation and acknowledged that the council correctly directed the customer to the claims process. GCC have never received a claim in relation to this incident.
202207862 Customer complained that NRS had failed to exercise their legal powers in relation to the regulation of landlords and that NRS also failed to investigate the complaint made by his tenant about repairing standard in a fair and balanced manner.	SPSO did not investigate the customer's complaint. The SPSO was satisfied the council's response to the complaint was reasonable, that it demonstrated the Repair and Tolerable Standard Process was followed and that NRS acted in accordance with their regulatory powers.
202300783	SPSO did not investigate the complaint. SPSO are satisfied that whilst the council

<p>Complaint that the council unreasonably failed to respond to reports of an abandoned vehicle on the complainant's street.</p>	<p>do have a duty to remove an abandoned vehicle, it is for them to determine what they consider to be an abandoned vehicle. They noted that GCC set out on their website and in response to the complaint what they constitute to be an abandoned vehicle and why they do not consider the vehicle reported met the criteria.</p>
<p>202209393 Complaint that the council failed to reasonably communicate with the customer regarding the action they were taking after the developer of his estate failed to provide EV chargers as set out in the conditions of the planning approval. Also, the council refused to explain or provide details on why it is impractical for the developer to provide the EV chargers as set out in one of the conditions for the development.</p>	<p>SPSO did not investigate complaint further. They were satisfied that the Council reasonably responded to the complaint as it was raised with them. They noted the council accurately referred the customer to the enforcement process as the complaint solely referenced the customers disagreement with the council's actions or lack of action to enforce the condition. Therefore, this response was reasonable.</p>
<p>202301891 The council did not reasonably advise customer of decisions or outcomes regarding his report of alleged breaches of planning control. The council did not provide the Planning Committee with reasonable information regarding planning application. The council's responses to the customer's complaints did not address some of the issues and discrepancies raised by the customer.</p>	<p>The SPSO did not take the complaint further as they did not see any evidence to lead them to doubt the council's ultimate positions on the matters raised. The SPSO were satisfied that the council's position was reasonable. The SPSO provided feedback to the council and the asked that council issue an apology to the complainant, noted below: The council should reflect on the Adviser's view that the wording of condition 13 of the 2018 approval meant that it did not, in fact, achieve what was intended. Provide an apology to the customer that they did not: Issue him with a Planning Impact Report (PIR) detailing the assessment of the complaint and the next steps required within two calendar months of the formal acknowledgement of the case, communicate the decision to mark the report as "withdrawn", the reasons or practical meaning of this to him or communicate the decision to close the "main report" of the case to him.</p>
<p>202303529 Complaint about a vehicle which has been parked in a council controlled space for more than eight years. The vehicle is covered by a tarpaulin, has four flat tyres and as well as being unsightly, customer feels it could potentially pose a health risk to the public. Vehicle has SORN status but also has a valid parking permit. Customer</p>	<p>SPSO are not considering the customer's complaint as it's outwith their jurisdiction. The customer's concerns are about issues which he is unhappy about, but which do not appear to amount to injustice or hardship for him personally, as is required by the SPSO Act 2002. Section 5.</p>

does not believe a permit should have been issued.	
202303025 Complaint about the upkeep of open spaces in parks and areas which look onto houses. Customer feels that GCC are using Biodiversity as an excuse for not maintaining the areas and that improvements should be made so that people can enjoy the parks.	SPSO not investigating further as they are satisfied GCC have provided a reasonable response to the complaint. They have acknowledged the concerns and explained the procedures they follow in regard to grounds maintenance. SPSO note that this is a discretionary decision for GCC to take and they cannot instruct the council otherwise.
2023054826 Complaint that bin has been persistently missed because access to the lane the bins are normally collected from has been blocked off by a local nursery. The nursery use the lane as a play area at a time which coincides with bin collections. Customer was looking for a long-term solution and compensation	SPSO not investigating further as they are satisfied GCC have provided a reasonable response to the complaint and have already implemented measures to resolve the collection issues. SPSO also noted that they cannot recommend awards of compensation for time and trouble.
202303947 Complaint about water from a defective drain which is causing ponding outside the front of customer's property. Customer stated flood prevention work had been programmed to take place but was cancelled due to Covid 19. Yet, this work has still not been progressed	SPSO satisfied that the council have provided reasonable explanations, in line with relevant repairs policy, for their position in respect of the issues raised. As such they are not investigating the complaint. SPSO also noted GCC had advised that COVID restrictions had a serious impact on their work programmes which resulted in delays, and which caused a large backlog of works. During this time all works had to be reprioritised which meant that previously highlighted defects were moved within their list of works to be considered for further works programmes.
202303037 Complaint about a lack of provision of safe routes in Pollok Country Park	SPSO did not investigate the customer's complaint. SPSO asked the council to contact the customer directly to provide a more comprehensive response to the issues raised. GCC contacted the customer and provided a further response as requested by SPSO
202306011 Complaint about lack of maintenance of local area such as reduced grass cutting	SPSO did not investigate further. They noted that they considered the council's response to be reasonable and that the SPSO cannot become involved in the day to day running of the council and could not direct GCC to increase their resources in respect of their Parks service.
202301714 Complaint about lack of proper signage or notice of newly introduced charges at EV charging points	SPSO did not investigate the complaint as they were not satisfied that GCC had responded to the customer in line with the CHP. SPSO asked the council to contact

	<p>the customer directly and arrange a full response.</p> <p>GCC contacted the customer and provided a final CHP response as requested by SPSO</p>
<p>202306898</p> <p>Complaints noted below following the council's advice that the customer should leave their property due to a report of loose render on the gable of the tenement which was considered a danger to the public:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A failure by the Council to provide adequate advice and support. 2. The failure of the Council to cite accurately the legal source from where their powers and duties came from. 3. The delay in serving the Dangerous Buildings Notice on the residents of 15 Cordiner Street. 4. The treatment you received from a council Building Control officer. 	<p>SPSO did not consider the complaint as it was time barred. They do not consider that there was a significant level of inaction by the council which prevented the customer from making the complaint to them within the relevant timescales.</p>
<p>202306176</p> <p>Complaint about lack of action by GCC in relation to reports made by the customer of anti-social behaviour by neighbouring residents</p>	<p>SPSO did not consider the complaint as they were satisfied that the council's response was reasonable. They noted that can be difficult for an organisation to progress matters through an ASB process if there is little or no independent evidence about what is happening, and that the council appears to have taken the customer's concerns seriously and explained why they have been unable to take the matter further.</p>
<p>202303291</p> <p>Complaint about lack of action by GCC Environmental Health, Noise and Building Standards teams in relation to her complaint about renovation works in a neighbouring property</p>	<p>SPSO noted that the council did respond when the customer contacted them and whilst the customer does not accept actions by the council's officers were appropriate, SPSO do not consider there is clear evidence to support this. As the SPSO could not achieve the resolution the customer was looking for they decided not to investigate the complaint.</p>
<p>202307712</p> <p>Complaint about the council's decision to impose road restrictions on Everard Drive and concerns about the process by which this decision was reached and overall road safety.</p>	<p>SPSO had no reason to doubt the council's position, which appears reasonable in line with the relevant statutory process. In these circumstances, SPSO confirmed they would not investigate the complaint further.</p>
<p>202307665</p> <p>Complaint about the handling of a bus lane fine</p>	<p>SPSO did not investigate. They noted that the model complaints handling procedure for council's makes clear that a complaint is not a disagreement with a decision where</p>

	there is a statutory procedure for challenging that decision. However, they considered that customer was not complaining about the decision to issue the Bus Lane Charge Notice, rather, they were unhappy about the handling of the issue of the Notice. They stated that the Notice issue does not fall outwith the scope of the complaints procedure and therefore, the Council should consider the complaint in line with stage 2 of their complaints handling procedure. A stage 2 response was then issued by GCC
202306589 Complaint about the uplift of blue bins	SPSO decided the complaint is not one they investigate further for now, as the best course of action is to send the complaint back to the organisation. NRS and neighbourhood liaison engaged with customer and a further response was issued.
202308890 Complaint about lack of action by GCC in relation to the customer's complaint about fly tipping and anti-social behaviour by a neighbour.	SPSO did not investigate. They considered that the council's response and actions were reasonable and in line with policies and procedures
202307352 Complaint about a potential data breach and the council's refusal to respond appropriately to your complaints.	SPSO did not investigate as in their view, the complaint to the council was primarily about data breaches and the council's response to this. SPSO were satisfied that the council's response to refer the customer to the ICO was reasonable and appropriate.
202310001 Complaint about missed bin collections	SPSO were satisfied that the action taken by the council achieved the outcomes the customer was looking for and is a reasonable resolution to the complaint. They noted that further investigation by their office would not achieve anything further which would be of practical value to the customer
202307928 Complaint that the council would not remove leaf fall from a nearby tree, from his garden	SPSO did not investigate as they were satisfied the council's response was reasonable
202310448 Complaint in relation to school policy of pupils going to the toilet in pairs.	SPSO are not progressing the complaint. They consider (the daughter's) consent is required under existing Scottish age of legal capacity legislation for them investigate.
202303913 Complaint about handling and lack of communication about a council tax matter	SPSO considered the complaint to be premature and referred the customer back to GCC complaints process
202306105 Complaint about hazardous tactile paving on Sauchiehall Street Avenue. Customer believes the council are not being	SPSO are satisfied that the council's response to the complaint is reasonable as they have explained the steps they have taken to investigate the complaint, have

consistent in the design of the footway, which is required by Department for Transport Guidance.	provided a clear response to the issues raised and have explained why they have taken a different position to the customer.
202311954 Complaint about refuse collection arrangements and removal of the kerbside brown bin service	SPSO decided the complaint is not one they investigate further for now, as the best course of action is to send the complaint back to the organisation for a more comprehensive response. This has since been issued.

Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

<i>Financial:</i>	None
<i>Legal:</i>	Compliance with the Complaints Handling Procedure is a statutory requirement. The relevant legislation is contained in the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman Act 2002.
<i>Personnel:</i>	None
<i>Procurement:</i>	None

Council Strategic Plan:

Good complaint management, clear and detailed reporting and service improvements learned as a result of complaints within the council generally support its core values of transparency, upholding citizen's rights and partnership working with citizens by allowing contributions to be made from any source on the subject of how service delivery might be improved.

The complaints handling process supports the following specific themes:

Resilient and Empowered Neighbourhoods, with specific outcomes:

- Citizens and neighbourhoods can influence how services are developed and budgets spent

Priorities: 77, 83

A well-governed city that listens and responds, with specific outcomes:

- Improve the council's communication with residents, including through updating our website, facilitating engagement on social media and by webcasting council committee meetings.

Priority: 105

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2017-22

This process supports Equality Outcome 8 - Service users with protected characteristics are provided with targeted, improved and more accessible information about the services provided by the Council Family.

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?

Not required as this is not a new/updated strategy, policy or service and has no significant equality impact. However, the overarching complaints process commits to making reasonable adjustments to support individuals with protected characteristics ensuring that it is accessible for all.

Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio economic disadvantage.

Not required as this is not a new/updated strategy, policy or service and has no significant equality impact

Climate Impacts:

*Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions?
Please specify:*

None.

What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?

None.

Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?

No.

Privacy and Data Protection impacts:

Customer complaints' data is stored in a secure case management system, Lagan.

3 Recommendations

The Operational Performance and Delivery Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the content of this report.