

1. In response to Part D, Question 5.10, you provided us with a list of claims which had been made:

At question 5.10(a), you note that 15 claims were brought, but you list 21 claims in total. Are we to assume that the reference to 15 is a typographical error?

In relation to question 5.10(b), "Who brought the action?", you provided the names of legal representatives of the Pursuers. It would be helpful if you could provide the names of the Pursuers as opposed to their legal representatives.

In response to your recent follow-up queries around questions 5.10(a) and 5.10(b), our 2020 response has been reviewed and we ask that you accept the amended 5.10 annex to supersede the previously submitted annex. All civil litigation claims received (to date) are included and the name of the pursuer is now included.

We can confirm that there have been 21 claims, two of which may be duplicates and that, with apologies, the reference to 15 was a typographical error.

**From this list, we note that you include claims against Grampian Regional Council. Does Aberdeen City take responsibility for carers who were approved by Grampian Regional Council whether they were within the now boundaries of Aberdeen City or is this shared with Aberdeenshire and Moray according to geographical location?**

Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council and the Moray Council have reached agreement that liability for personal injury claims (including those relating to historic abuse) arising from the former GRC (which would include responsibility for carers approved by GRC) should be apportioned between authorities according to a formula in the Local Government (Transitional Financial Provisions) (Scotland) Order 1996 (1996 Order). From a practical perspective the effect of the 1996 Order is that Aberdeen City Council assumes responsibility for claims against the former GRC and recoups costs and expenditure from Aberdeenshire Council and Moray Council according to the statutory formula in the 1996 Order.