



Public Relations and Economic Development Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee

Date: TUESDAY, 5 FEBRUARY 2019

Time: 3.00 pm

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS

Members: Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)
Sir Mark Boleat
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
The Rt. Hon the Lord Mayor, Alderman Peter Estlin
Anne Fairweather
Sophie Anne Fernandes
Christopher Hayward
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Edward Lord
Andrew Mayer
Jeremy Mayhew
Alderman William Russell
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Sir Michael Snyder
James Tumbridge
Alderman Sir David Wootton

Enquiries: Emma Cunnington
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To agree the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 8 January 2019.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 8)
4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 9 - 10)
5. **VOTING SYSTEM FOR CO-OPTED MEMBERS ON PRED**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 11 - 20)
6. **EDO MONTHLY UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.

For Information
(Pages 21 - 22)
7. **CORPORATE AFFAIRS UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Communications.

For Information
(Pages 23 - 28)
8. **PARLIAMENTARY TEAM'S UPDATE**
Report of the Remembrancer.

For Information
(Pages 29 - 32)

9. **REFOCUSING ELEMENTS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE'S RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS ACTIVITY USING AN ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE (ESG) APPROACH**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.

For Decision
(Pages 33 - 38)

10. **UPDATE ON NEW WEBSITE**
Report of the Director of Communications.

For Information
(Pages 39 - 40)

11. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

13. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

14. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUB (POLICY & RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 8 January 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 3.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Edward Lord
Sir Mark Boleat	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Jeremy Mayhew
Tijs Broeke	Alderman William Russell
Anne Fairweather	Sir Michael Snyder
Sophie Anne Fernandes	James Tumbridge
Christopher Hayward	Alderman Sir David Wootton

In Attendance:

Deputy John Tomlinson

Officers:

John Barradell	- Chief Executive & Town Clerk
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Economic Development
Eugenie de Naurois	- Communications Team
Sanjay Odedra	- Communications Team
Peter Cannon	- Communications Team
Nigel Lefton	- Remembrancer's
Jeremy Blackburn	- Mansion House
Tim Wainwright	- Mansion House
Mary Kyle	- Economic Development Office
Callum Anderson	- Economic Development Office
Sufina Ahmad	- Town Clerk's
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's
Devika Persaud	- Town Clerk's
Rofikul Islam	- Town Clerk's
Emma Cunnington	- Town Clerk's

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor, Alderman Peter Estlin and Deputy Tom Sleigh.

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Tijs Broeke declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 11 by virtue of his role as a school governor of the City of London Academy Hackney.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 December 2018 be approved as a correct record.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Members received an outstanding actions report of the Town Clerk.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

5. **PRESENTATION FROM CEO OF LONDON & PARTNERS**

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of London & Partners, Laura Citron, delivered a presentation on the work of the organisation. The CEO outlined the key messages that told London's story, which were relevant to different audiences. Members heard how London & Partners view that London's reputation was currently at risk and so London & Partners were responding quickly to secure London's global reputation.

The CEO presented some of the findings of the messaging research carried out with the City Corporation which found that the best received message was "London is a city of creative energy". Members also heard how London & Partners were trying new methods of communication to coordinate networks of businesses such as WhatsApp.

The Policy Chair, the Director of Economic Development and Head of Media all expressed the close, positive working they had encountered with London & Partners.

The following discussion points were then raised:

- London & Partners worked very closely with the Department for International Trade (DIT) and are in contact on a daily basis.
- Whilst it was important that messaging included London's current strengths, it should be borne in mind that there could be some uncertainty on whether these strengths are long-term.
- Whilst it was important that security and safety were conveyed as key messages for London, this was best undertaken through images of people looking safe rather than specific reference to security.
- One Member felt that London did have competitive advantages and some of the threats around companies leaving were counteracted by the thought of living and working in other cities within the EU.
- London & Partners had innovative ways of measuring outputs and outcomes, and Members were particularly interested in social media activation.

- Whilst there was reluctance to say much publicly on immigration, London & Partners were in a position to talk privately with Government, promoting the business view.

6. **GENERAL UPDATE FROM THE POLICY CHAIR**

The Chair of Policy & Resources updated Members on her recent and upcoming activity, including with parliamentary, business and London stakeholders. Members heard about her recent meeting with Transport for London on Crossrail, and also on upcoming international visits to India and to Davos with the Lord Mayor.

A Member commended the idea of seeing London borough leaders in their own council offices and thought that consideration should go into including this within the Lord Mayor's speech at the London Government Dinner.

7. **EDO UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Economic Development providing highlights of the key activity undertaken by the Economic Development Office (EDO) in December 2018.

A Member requested that, in future, reports specify the city of a visit rather than just a country. For example, the Lord Mayor visited Vancouver in Canada and San Francisco in the US.

A Member also impressed the importance of asking the International Regulatory Strategy Group (IRSG) to focus on engaging on the e-Privacy Regulation.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

8. **CORPORATE AFFAIRS UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications updating Members on key elements of the Corporate Affairs team's activity in support of the City Corporation's external political engagement and corporate communications.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

9. **PARLIAMENTARY TEAM UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Remembrancer updating Members on the main elements of the Parliamentary Team's activity in support of the City Corporation's political and parliamentary engagement.

The Remembrancer reported that Commander Karen Baxter of the City of London Police had given oral evidence to the Treasury Select Committee earlier that day, which had been well received by MPs.

The Remembrancer also updated Members on the Clean Air Bill and that it would be discussed at a meeting of the Greater London Assembly (GLA) later in January. The City Corporation had been engaging with particular MPs on the matter.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

10. DRESS CODES AT EVENTS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Mansion House concerning a trial introduction of Lounge Suit as the dress code for the Business and Industry Dinner in March 2019.

Members noted that the recommendation was to trial a change in dress code for one dinner.

One Member requested that the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen consider any further application of dress codes to Aldermanic dress. The Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen responded that it was important that dress code was always fit for circumstance and occasion.

It was also discussed that for many people at the Dragon Awards Dinner, wearing black tie was an important part and people wanted to dress up for the event. There was also comment that the report should have included a box which recommend lounge suit for general business engagement dinners.

One Member suggested that an acceptable compromise would be to label dress codes as “White Tie preferred”, so that guests knew what the standard would be but that those who could only wear black tie would not be deterred. Another Member felt that a mix of dress codes would look dishevelled.

There was some debate around whether Members should wear robes at dinners, and one Member did feel it was useful for guests to differentiate between hosts and other guests.

RESOLVED, that:

- It be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee to support the trial introduction of Lounge Suit as the dress code for the Business and Industry Dinner in March 2019.

11. THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION'S SOCIAL MOBILITY STRATEGY FOR 2018-28 - PROGRESS UPDATE

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust updating Members on progress of the City Corporation's work on social mobility.

Following a question, Members heard how the majority of the activities in the academies benefit pupils from City of London academies rather than independent schools.

The Chair of the Establishment Committee also requested for this paper to be submitted to the Establishment Committee.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

12. SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMME

Members considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services concerning a proposal of a summer enrichment pilot tackling summer learning loss and summer hunger for pupils and young people during August 2019.

The Sub-Committee was very supportive of the proposal but agreed that the Policy Initiatives Fund was not the correct source of funding and it should be recommended to Policy & Resources that this should be funded from a contingency budget.

There was some general feedback that the activities should be age appropriate and what was interesting to a 10 year old, for example, would be different for an 18 year old. It was confirmed to Members that officers were liaising with the provider and being guided by them on the appropriate age range, looking at gaps in current provision.

The Policy Chair informed Members that the Sutton Trust's report, Chain Effects 2018, ranked the City Corporation's sponsored academies as the top performing schools in the country in terms of Attainment 8 and Progress 8 at GCSE level, which track pupil achievement and progress. Members asked the Media Team to undertake a proactive communications approach on this news.

Another Member asked whether the budget, as suggested in the report, could allow for other schools to take part such as the City of London Academy Hackney and asked for more transparency on reasons behind the choosing of City of London Academy Highbury Grove. Members heard how it was envisaged that focusing the pilot in Islington would contribute evidence to existing research in this borough.

Members requested for a report back to this Sub-Committee on the pilot, acknowledging that this work was accountable to the Education Board.

RESOLVED, that:

- It be recommended to the Policy & Resources Committee that the proposal outlined in this report be approved, subject to finding a suitable budget for this pilot, such as a contingency budget.

13. CITY CORPORATION'S LEGAL INITIATIVES

Members received a joint report of the City Remembrancer and the Director of Economic Development concerning an overview of the City Corporation's legal services work.

Members were pleased on receiving such a report, however one Member noted that there were a few activities missing from the report, such as an annual reception for the Central London Bench and activity of the Courts Sub Committee of the Policy & Resources Committee. It was also noted that engagement with the Central London Bench could be increased.

Discussion followed about the importance of legal services as part of the wider professional and business services sector. A Member underlined the need for the City Corporation to be engaging in all areas of this wider sector too. Other Members agreed but also felt that as there was such a depth of understanding of legal services within the City Corporation, and that a future Lord Mayor might potentially use legal services as their mayoral theme, it made sense for this to be focused on.

One Member felt it would be helpful to understand a breakdown of the legal services sector based on Ministry for Justice reports, and specifically referenced intellectual property lawyers as London was a centre of expertise in this area.

There was also discussion on how to involve Members better in these areas and it was suggested that the Town Clerk looked again at how to collate Members' interests in a certain area. One Member reported that the majority of Members were also members of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW).

The Director of Economic Development confirmed that two reports would be submitted to this Sub-Committee in due course, concerning, firstly, the City Corporation's involvement with the Professional and Business Services Council and, secondly, research on the overall ecosystem of the City.

RESOLVED, that:

- The work currently being undertaken be noted and the outlined direction of travel be endorsed;
- The Town Clerk review how Members interests be collected and whether this should be updated; and
- The Director of Economic Development to report back on the City Corporation's involvement with the Professional and Business Services Council and its research on the overall ecosystem of the City.

14. POLICY CHAIR'S VISIT TO WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Economic Development outlining the key messages and activities from the Policy Chair's visit to New York and Washington DC in November 2018.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

15. SIX MONTH MEDIA UPDATE

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications summarising media output over the past six months from the City Corporation's Media Team.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

16. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no urgent items.

18. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

19. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

20. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 4.15 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Emma Cunnington
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee

Outstanding Actions Sheet - February 2019

No.	Date	Action	Officer responsible	Progress Update
1	26.02.18	Members of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub Committee receive regular emails outlining the Policy Chairman's political and business engagements.	Emma Cunnington	On-going.
2	29.05.18	Further consideration to be given to the voting system for electing co-opted Members to the Sub-Committee.	Emma Cunnington	Due February 2019. <i>On today's agenda.</i>
3	25.07.18	Further information be provided to the Sub Committee regarding the budget for the City Dynamics programme.	Damian Nussbaum, Sean Green	Due December 2018.
4	12.12.18	The Town Clerk to consider where the sports engagement role should sit and if extra funding might be needed.	John Barradell, Bob Roberts	Due March 2019.
5	12.12.18	An update on the new City Corporation's corporate website be submitted to the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee in due course.	Bob Roberts	Due March 2019. <i>On today's agenda.</i>
6	08.01.19	The Town Clerk review how Members interests be collected and whether this should be updated	Angela Roach, Emma Cunnington	Due July 2019.
7	08.01.19	An update on the City Corporation's involvement with the Professional and Business Services Council and its research on the overall ecosystem of the City.	Damian Nussbaum	Due July 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Public Relations and Economic Development Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee – For decision	Date: 5 February 2019
Subject: Voting System for Co-opted Members on PRED	Public
Report of: The Town Clerk & Chief Executive	For Decision
Report author: Emma Cunnington, Town Clerk's	

Summary

At a meeting of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee in May 2018, a Member requested for consideration to be given to alternative voting systems in the election of co-opted Members for the Sub-Committee.

This report sets out the current voting system used (First Past the Post), as well as information, advantages and disadvantages of two alternative options: Alternative Voting (AV) and Single Transferrable Vote (STV).

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Consider alternative voting systems such as Alternative Voting (AV) or Single Transferrable Vote (STV) as well as the existing system of First Past the Post (FPTP) for the election of co-opted Members to the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee, and make recommendations to the Policy and Resources Committee.

Main Report

Background

1. At the Public Relations and Economic Development (PRED) Sub Committee on 29 May 2018, a Member requested consideration to be given to the voting system for co-opted Members.
2. Such appointments are currently decided through the use of the First Past the Post (FPTP) voting system, whereby the successful candidate is the one who receives the largest number of votes. FPTP is what is known as a plurality system, i.e. the winning candidate needs win only the largest number of votes cast but does not require an absolute majority.
3. It was suggested by some Members that this voting method was, perhaps, not the ideal means by which to elect co-optees, and with it proposed that a preferential voting system might be more suitable. As a consequence, the Town Clerk was

asked to examine potential alternative systems for Members' consideration ahead of the next election of co-opted Members in May 2019.

Current Position

First Past the Post (current system)

4. This system is that which is currently employed by the sub-committee to elect co-optees and is what is known as a "plurality" or "first-past-the-post" system. The main advantages of such a voting system are that the voting process is straightforward and there is a high degree of familiarity with it, and that the count is straightforward and is undertaken relatively swiftly after the vote, requiring no specialist equipment.
5. However, a disadvantage is that where there are multiple candidates standing for a single vacancy and the vote is split, a winner can be returned who is not necessarily the preferred option of the full sub-committee. For example:

There are four candidates, persons A, B, C, and D competing for one vacancy on a Committee. Persons A and B are both popular and effective individuals who are well-regarded by the full sub-committee. Meanwhile, candidate C enjoys strong support from a proportion of the sub-committee – around 40% - but is viewed as divisive or unsuitable by the remaining 60%. Person D does not enjoy significant support and is likely to receive few votes.

The majority of the sub-committee, who are not supportive of Person C, have their vote split by A and B, whilst all of C's supporters back him. As a result, C is returned to the dissatisfaction of the majority, despite the fact that both A and B are widely popular and the full sub-committee would have been content with either of them being appointed.

Options

6. The Policy and Resources Committee gave consideration to altering voting methods for elections to Grand Committees and Outside Bodies during 2015, focusing on Alternative Vote (AV) systems and the Single Transferable Vote system. Ultimately, it was decided to adopt AV for elections where there were multiple candidates standing for a single vacancy, but retain First Past The Post where there were multiple vacancies. The Court adopted this position in early 2016 and voting arrangements have worked well since that time. Below is a summary of the two systems explored:

Alternative Vote (or Instant Run-off Voting)

7. The Alternative Vote system (or Instant Run-off Voting) is a method which allows for ranked or preferential voting, whereby Members rank the candidates in the order in which they would like to see them returned. The voter puts a '1' by their first choice, a '2' by their second choice, and so on, until they no longer wish to express any further preferences or run out of candidates. This process is currently

employed by the Court of Common Council (see Standing Order No.10) for electing to single vacancies on committees or outside bodies. *(N.B. – where there are multiple vacancies, the Court retains the use of an FPTP system).*

8. Candidates are elected outright if they gain the support of half of those voting. However, under AV, if no candidate reaches the 50% threshold, then the candidate who received the fewest first preference votes is eliminated from the contest and their votes are redistributed according to the second (or next available) preference marked on the ballot paper. This process continues until one candidate receives 50% of the vote. The obvious advantage of this process is that the winning candidate is the consensus choice and will be the preference of the majority of those voting.
9. The AV system is widely used, including in the House of Lords (for electing Hereditary Peers), the House of Commons (for electing Select Committee Chairmen), for Australian State Government and House of Representative elections, and for the Presidential elections in Ireland and India.
10. However, it is primarily employed where there are multiple candidates for single vacancies. When there are multiple vacancies, the method becomes slightly more complicated, which is why the Policy and Resources Committee opted against its implementation in 2015. A breakdown of the process for multiple vacancies, including an example, is attached at Appendix A.

Single Transferable Vote (STV)

11. Single Transferrable Vote (STV) is a widely implemented electoral system currently used for national and local elections in the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Australia and Malta, as well as for local elections in Scotland and New Zealand.
12. Under STV, the voting process is the same as for the AV system. The method allows for ranked or preferential voting, whereby Members number against the candidates the order in which would like to see them returned. The voters put a '1' by their first choice, a '2' by their second choice, and so on, until they no longer wish to express any further preferences or run out of candidates.
13. An example ballot paper for an STV election to fill three vacancies on a Committee is shown below:

Appointment of 3 Members to the XX Committee

Instead of using a cross, number the candidates in the order of your preference.

Put the number 1 next to the name of the candidate who is your first preference, 2 next to your second preference, 3 next to your third preference, 4 next to your fourth preference, and so on.

You can mark as many or as few preferences as you like.

CANDIDATE A	4
CANDIDATE B	2
CANDIDATE C	1
CANDIDATE D	
CANDIDATE E	3
CANDIDATE F	5

14. Under both AV and STV, only one round of voting is usually required. Voters rank candidates in order of preference and those candidates returned are the preferred option of the majority. Under AV, if the number of candidates to reach the majority threshold does not equal the number of vacancies then the candidate who received the fewest first preference votes is eliminated from the contest and their votes are redistributed according to the second (or next available) preference marked on the ballot paper.
15. However, under an STV system, candidates do not necessarily require a majority of votes to be elected. Elected candidates must achieve a known share of first preference votes, or 'quota' which is determined by the size of the electorate and the number of vacancies to be filled. Surplus votes for popular candidates who have achieved over and beyond the required quota are transferred in accordance with the voter's second preference and not "wasted" – i.e. votes on certain preferred or less-preferred candidates are transferred to other candidates, which is helpful where there are multiple vacancies in ensuring that candidates favoured by the majority are returned.

16. The quota is set by a formula based on the number of votes cast and the number of vacancies. Different formulae can be used but the most common is:

$$\text{votes needed to win} = \left(\frac{\text{valid votes cast}}{\text{seats to fill} + 1} \right) + 1$$

17. The counting process under STV differs to that of the Alternative Vote system. Votes are counted as follows:

- Only first preference votes are tallied in the first instance and a candidate who has reached or exceeded the quota via first preference votes is declared elected.
- If a candidate has more first preference votes than the quota, their surplus first preference votes are transferred to other candidates, i.e. votes that would have gone to the preferred candidate go to the next preference.
- If no other candidate still meets the quota, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated and their votes are transferred, again according to the preference indicated.
- If the next available preference is for a candidate that has already been eliminated, then the vote is awarded to the next preference after that (i.e. third or fourth preference, and so on).
- This process repeats until either a preferred candidate is found for every vacancy or there are as many vacancies as remaining candidates.

18. The most commonly used method of transferring surplus first preference votes is by random transfer, where a number of votes corresponding to the candidate's surplus are transferred to their next choices. Counters redistribute the last ballots the elected candidate received, the first ballots the candidate received, or choose another method such as a fully random draw. Variations of the random transfer or surplus votes are currently used for some elections in Australia and the Republic of Ireland.

19. It is important to note that changing the order of the ballot papers could change the outcome of the election.

Proposal

20. It is proposed that for the purpose of electing four co-opted Members onto the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub Committee, the voting system should remain as FPTP to enable the votes to be counted simply and the results to be announced quickly. This would also be in line with the Court of Common Council's position adopted in early 2016 to use AV for elections where there were multiple candidates standing for a single vacancy, but retain First Past The Post where there were multiple vacancies.

Conclusion

21. This report explains the current system for the election of the Members to Committees and sets out some alternatives for your consideration.

Appendices

- Appendix A: The use of AV for elections to multiple vacancies

Emma Cunnington

Head of Chairmen's Support Services, Town Clerk's

T: 020 7332 1413

E: emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

The use of AV for elections to multiple vacancies

1. The same process as electing to single vacancies is applied to voting for multiple vacancies. Members vote according to their preference, just as with voting for a single vacancy. If there are three vacancies, then just as with the present system you vote for three candidates – marking them 1, 2 and 3 as appropriate.
2. The only difference is that Members have the option to express a preference for candidates beyond the three they choose to vote for: the voter is simply expressing a preference for their “next choice” in the event that one of their preferred three candidates is unsuccessful.
3. The example below demonstrates the system in practice, using an election to a Grand Committee at the annual April meeting of the Court as an example.
4. In this example, there are 3 vacancies on a particular Committee and 7 Members standing. 101 Members are in attendance at the vote, all casting valid ballots. Candidates are elected if they receive the backing of 50% of voters, so in this case a candidate needs 51 votes to be returned.
5. Members vote according to their preference, just as with voting for a single vacancy, as shown in the example below. The 1, 2 and 3 are – to all intents and purposes – the same as marking an “X” if the vote was run under the current system. However, marking a “4” means here that if one of your favoured three candidates gets eliminated early on, this vote will transfer to your next preferred candidate and therefore can still influence the result.

Committee – 3 vacancies

Adams, T.	3
Bastin, C.	2
Campbell, K.	4
Drake, T.	-
Eastham, G.	5
Furnell, J.	-
George, C.	1

6. In this instance, the voter’s favoured candidate is George. However, the voter realises that George is unpopular and is unlikely to be elected. Under the current system, this vote would effectively be “wasted” and the voter may opt to vote for somebody they prefer less but who is more likely to be returned. However, under AV, the voter knows that - if George is as unpopular as expected and is eliminated in the first round - then their vote will effectively be transferred to their fourth-choice

candidate. This, therefore, removes the present inclination to vote for just one candidate, so as to avoid potentially diluting the value of your votes.

7. Accordingly, the voter decides that, should George or one of his other two preferred candidates fail to be returned, he would favour Campbell above all other candidates. He therefore marks a “4” next to her name, to indicate she is his next choice.
8. In assessing the final three candidates, the voter decides they do not wish for Drake or Furnell to be returned in any circumstance; however, all things being equal, they feel that Eastham could do a good job so make him their fifth preference, whilst declining to indicate a preference for the other two candidates. This means that, no matter what, his ballot paper will not contribute any votes to either Drake or Furnell’s candidatures.
9. The papers are collected up in the normal fashion and first, second and third preference votes for each candidate counted. As shown below, Bastin and Campbell have gained the support of half of voters from first, second and third preferences and are duly elected.
10. One vacancy therefore remains. The candidate with the fewest votes (George) is eliminated accordingly; the ballot papers where George received a first, second or third preference vote are consulted, and his 12 “votes” reallocated according to who was indicated as the voters’ fourth preference.

Candidate	VOTES AFTER:			
	1 st Round	2 nd Round	3 rd Round	4 th Round
<i>Adams</i>	19	19	■	■
<i>Bastin</i>	80	■	■	■
<i>Campbell</i>	75	■	■	■
<i>Drake</i>	41	43	48	62
<i>Eastham</i>	32	35	39	■
<i>Furnell</i>	36	38	40	49
<i>George</i>	12	■	■	■

■ = Candidate Eliminated
 ■ = Candidate Elected

11. We can see that a number of voters have declined to express a preference for more than three candidates. The seven voters who did express a fourth choice now have their vote reallocated (as shown in the table). In the case of our voter, he named Campbell as his fourth choice – but Campbell has already been elected. Accordingly, the voter’s vote for George is now transferred to his next available preference – Eastham.
12. The second round of counting now over, and with no other candidate having received the support of half of the Court, again the candidate with the fewest votes (Adams) is eliminated and their votes reallocated according to the preferences indicated.

13. Following the reallocation of votes, again no candidate has reached the threshold to be returned, so the candidate with the fewest votes (Eastham) is eliminated and their votes reallocated according to the next preference indicated.
14. Drake consequently reaches the required number of votes and is elected to the third vacancy.

What if there is a tie?

15. AV does not entirely remove the possibility of re-balloting being required where multiple vacancies are being contested. It is possible - as with the current system - that two Members might receive an equality of votes for a vacancy after all other candidates have been eliminated and there are no further votes to reallocate. In this instance, the candidate with the highest number of first preference votes is declared the winner, providing a natural "tie-breaker." Should this still present a tie, then a straightforward run-off would be required at the next meeting, as is currently the case. However, with up to 125 Members voting and expressing various preferences, it is unlikely that this would be a common occurrence (indeed, AV renders a draw less likely than under the current system).
16. It is important to note that there would be far fewer Members voting at a sub-committee election, however.
17. It is also possible (although highly unlikely) that more candidates reach the required threshold than there are vacancies for. Consider the table at paragraph 10: imagine in the final round of counting, both candidates pass the 51 votes mark. In this instance, the candidate with the highest total would still be returned. Another unlikely possibility is that, after the first round of counting, five of the candidates receive 51 votes, with the remaining 48 votes split between the other two candidates. In this instance, we would again deem those with the highest number of votes to be returned, with first preference votes used as a tie-breaker if required.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee	Dated:
Public Relations & Economic Development Sub-Committee	5 February 2019
Subject: EDO monthly update – January	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Information
Report author: Emily Howell	

Summary

The following report provides Members with highlights of the key activity undertaken by the Economic Development Office (EDO) in January. This month has marked a busy start to 2019. There have been several international visits, the planning of many more and plenty of high level meetings.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the progress of EDO workstreams.

Main Report

1. The team supported the annual visit to India by the Policy Chair, Catherine McGuinness. The three day and two city trip, to Delhi and Mumbai, included meetings with regulators and the private sector, and charring our India Advisory Council. Pre-briefing meetings were held to prepare her for the visit and included the Indian High Commission, the Association of Indian Banks and other key private sector experts as well as members.
2. The team has also supported a visit by the Lord Mayor to the Gulf (Kuwait, Dubai and Abu Dhabi). Accompanied by a senior delegation. The themes of the visit included Sovereign Wealth investment, capital markers, Green Finance and Tomorrow's Cities. The Lord Mayor also addressed key Gulf partners' concerns about the City's confidence through and beyond Brexit.
3. The Innovation, Inclusion and Growth team formally commenced the partnership with Capital Enterprise to deliver CAP Talent. The programme will match computer science university students from across London with tech start-ups for paid summer internships at the London Living Wage. They are currently establishing a measurement framework and roll-out plan with Capital Enterprise.
4. Following a number of years of formal sponsorship of Tech London Advocates, we concluded that arrangement when the current term expired at the end of 2018, moving instead to a more informal relationship with ad hoc engagement as required which could involve e.g. stakeholder engagement in the tech space.

5. The Asia Policy Team ran another meeting of the Green Belt and Road Investor Alliance, which received the Green Investment Principles and agreed next steps for promoting their uptake. The special Advisor for Asia also met with the China Advisory Council (CAC) in Beijing which is made up of a collection of Chinese banking executives. The CAC agreed to continue pursuing priorities in Green Finance, Belt and Road and Renminbi internationalisation.
6. The Brussels office organised a highly successful panel event on contract continuity on 8 January which had 98 people in attendance. The attendees included industry representatives from across the EU27 as well as the UK, the EU Institutions, the Permanent Representations of various Members States as well as a number of persons from third country Missions to the EU. The Brussels office have already received very good feedback on the event from the European Investment Bank, Barclays, JP Morgan, the Federation Bancaire Francaise, the Swiss Mission and Kreab as well as The City UK and UK Finance.
7. The Regulatory Affairs Team organised, throughout January, the Policy Chair and Lord Mayor's trip to Davos (Switzerland); there will be a full report written following this trip. They have also been working on a trip to Berlin and Frankfurt for IRSG Chair Mark Hoban, as well as IRSG members Nick Collier (Refinitiv) and Rachel Kent (Hogan Lovells). This will involve bilateral meetings with government officials, regulators and industry experts to discuss cliff-edge scenarios, EU market access and future relationship after Brexit.

Emily Howell | Executive Office
Economic Development Office
emily.howell@cityoflondon.gov.uk | 020 7332 3600

Committee(s)	Dated:
Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee	5 February 2019
Subject: Corporate Affairs Update	Public
Report of: Bob Roberts, Director of Communications	For Information
Report author: Jan Gokcen, Corporate Affairs Officer	

Summary

This report provides a monthly update of the Corporate Affairs team's activities, supporting the City Corporation's strategic political engagement.

The Corporate Affairs team coordinates and organises the City Corporation's political engagement and seeks to support both Members and Officers in its delivery, with a particular focus on the activity undertaken by the Policy Chair and Lord Mayor.

The activities documented in this report focus largely on those lead by the Corporate Affairs team. Activities undertaken in partnership with other teams and departments are also included and have been appropriately termed.

The timeframe of this report spans the period lapsed between the previous and current meetings of this Sub Committee.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note this report.

Main Report

Strategic Objectives/engagement

1. Based on developments in the domestic political and economic landscape and in line with the City Corporation's corporate priorities, the Corporate Affairs team has focused its activity in the following areas:

Brexit

2. Following the Meaning Vote in Parliament on the Government's Withdrawal Agreement and Political Declaration on the future relationship between the United Kingdom (UK) and the European Union (EU), the Corporate Affairs team:
 - a. Continued to monitor latest political developments in the UK and EU;
 - b. Evaluated the various possible outcomes following the Withdrawal Agreement's rejection by Members of Parliament;

- c. Contributed to Brexit updates for the Policy Chair and attended the Remembrancer's Offices' briefing of Parliamentarians on the cliff-edge risks of a no deal Brexit;
- d. Worked across the City Corporation's various departments to ensure all Brexit-related engagement with the Government is coherently organised and strategically conducted;
- e. Alongside the Media Team, reviewed the Brexit contingency plans of other City Corporation departments.

London – Local engagement and London promotion

3. The Corporate Affairs team seeks to develop and encourage City Corporation engagement with the rest of London beyond the Square Mile. To this end, the Corporate Affairs team:
 - a. Contributed to the preparations and organisation of the London Government Dinner, including the preparation of a gift to all attendees, reviewing the Lord Mayor's speech, reviewing the table plan and briefing the Policy Chair and other Members and Officers on issues related to local government and industry in London;
 - b. Continued to develop work on a London Borough engagement programme for the Policy Chair;
 - c. Organised and briefed the Policy Chairman and Town Clerk for a meeting with Cllr Clare Coghill, Leader of Waltham Forest, and Martin Esom, Chief Executive of Waltham Forest Council, concerning Waltham Forest's status as the London Borough of Culture in 2019, New Spitalfields Market and Whipps Cross Hospital;
 - d. Attended a meeting between the Policy Chair and the Chairman of Port Health and Environmental Services with Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor of London for Environment and Energy;
 - e. Attended and briefed the Policy Chair ahead of the Wider South East Summit. This was held at City Hall and is an annual gathering of local authority representatives across South-East England. Issues such as achieving sustainable growth and speaking with one voice as a region were discussed;
 - f. Created and maintained a document covering the position of London Boroughs on a second referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, ahead of Court of Common Council on 10th January 2018;
 - g. Organised and briefed the Policy Chairman for a meeting with Cllr Jas Athwal, Leader of Redbridge Council;
 - h. Briefed the Policy Chair ahead of and drafted the speech for the Policy Chair's remarks at the launch of the Centre for London think tank's report on 'London and the UK'.

Domestic Political Engagement

4. A key aim of the political engagement organised and undertaken by the Corporate Affairs team is to foster productive dialogue between the City Corporation and key decision-makers in government – at local, regional and national levels. To this end, the City Corporation:

- a. Drafted the Policy Chair's remarks at the Freedom ceremony of Business and Industry Minister Richard Harrington MP;
- b. Organised a meeting between, and drafted the briefing for, the Policy Chair and Housing Minister Kit Malthouse MP;
- c. Drafted the Policy Chair's remarks for the Belfast City Council reception;
- d. Held internal discussions on, and began preparations for, the Policy Chair's visit to Cardiff, as part of the Corporation's regional strategy;
- e. In conjunction with colleagues in the Department for Built Environment, begun preparations for a roundtable discussion on improving the efficiency of freight movement across London.

International Engagement

5. Where relevant, the Corporate Affairs team assists the City Corporation's overseas engagements, such as those undertaken by the Policy Chair and Lord Mayor. To this end, the Corporate Affairs team:
 - a. Drafted the Policy Chair's speaking remarks given at fringe events and private gatherings at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland;
 - b. Drafted the Policy Chair's speaking remarks given various engagements during the visit to India.

Think Tanks

6. As part of the City Corporation's engagement with think tanks, the City Corporation:
 - a. Met with the Social Market Foundation and the Institute for Government to discuss possible partnership opportunities in the year ahead;
 - b. Met with Chatham House to discuss the City Corporation's corporate membership;
 - c. Met with the Vice-Chancellor of the London Metropolitan University to discuss possible partnership opportunities.

Party Conference

7. In preparation of the City Corporation's attendance at the 2019 party conferences, the Corporate Affairs team:
 - a. Visited event venues in Brighton, where the Labour party conference will take place this autumn;
 - b. Visited event venues in Manchester, where the Conservative party conference will take place this autumn;
 - c. Held internal discussions as to possible topics for City Corporation events party conferences.

Overall Activities

8. The Corporate Affairs team's core activities in delivering the City Corporation's strategic political engagement include:
 - a) Ensuring senior City Corporation representatives are meeting with relevant lawmakers and policymakers on issues of pertinence to the organisation;

- b) Coordinating high-level engagement between senior City Corporation representatives and senior political figures at a national, regional and local level;
- c) Maintaining and developing partnerships with think-tanks from across the political spectrum;
- d) Organising the City Corporation's annual Party Conference activity;
- e) Organising bilateral and multilateral engagements between senior City Corporation representatives and Government Ministers;
- f) Participating in and contributing to all briefings for senior Members and Officers in their external engagements;
- g) Drafting speeches for the Policy Chair, Deputy Chair, and Vice Chairs;
- h) Reviewing and signing off speeches for the Lord Mayor;
- i) Collating and reviewing notes from meetings and engagements held by senior Members and Officers with external figures.

Jan Gokcen

Corporate Affairs Officer, Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1426

E: Jan.Gokcen@cityoflondon.gov.uk

APPENDIX

ENGAGEMENTS

Category	Type	Attendee(s)	Date	Contribution
Local Government	<i>London Government Dinner</i>	Sadiq Khan , Mayor of London; Cllr Peter John , Leader, Southwark Council & Chair of London Councils. <i>Senior representatives from London's local authorities also in attendance.</i>	10/01/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair
Parliament	Call	Chi Onwurah MP , Shadow Minister for Industrial Strategy	11/01/2019	Attended Call: Policy Chair
Corporation Event	Freedom of the City – Ceremony and Dinner	Richard Harrington MP , Minister for Business and Industry. In attendance – Greg Clark MP , Secretary of State for Business, Energy, Industrial Strategy	17/01/2019	Speech: Policy Chair
Local Government	Meeting	Shirley Rodrigues , Deputy Mayor of London for Environment and Energy	17/01/2019	Note of and attendance at meeting
Local Government	Meeting	Cllr Claire Coghill , Leader of Waltham Forest Council & Martin Epsom , Chief Executive, Waltham Forest Council Vice	18/01/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair and Town Clerk
Corporation Event	Sheriff's Lunch	David Gauke MP , Secretary of State for Justice	21/01/2019	Briefing: Sheriff Elizabeth Green
Parliament	Briefing Circle Roundtable – <i>'Focus on the UK's Domestic Policy Agenda'</i>	Nicky Morgan MP , Chair, Treasury Select Committee	23/01/2019	Briefing: Deputy Chair
International	Panel Event	UK Fintech Mission to Switzerland	24/01/2019	Speech: Policy Chair
Corporation Event	Sheriff's Lunch	Dame Eleanor Laing MP , Deputy Speaker of the House	28/01/2019	Briefing: Sheriff Elizabeth Green
International	<i>Financial Services Roundtable – Mumbai</i>	Representatives from Barclays, HSBC, Deloitte, EY, JP Morgan, and others.	29/01/2019	Speech: Policy Chair

International	<i>Launch of City of London & PwC Regtech report.</i>	Governor of the Reserve Bank of India – TBC	29/01/2019	Speech: Policy Chair
Parliament	TheCityUK Senior Members Roundtable	Sir Graham Brady MP , Chairman, Conservative 1922 Committee	29/01/2019	Briefing: Deputy Chair
Think-Tank	<i>Whitehall and Industry Group CEO Roundtable</i>	Sir Mark Sedwill , Cabinet Secretary & John Manzoni , Chief Executive of the Civil Service and Permanent Secretary of the Cabinet Office	30/01/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair
Local Government	Meeting	Cllr Jas Athwal , Leader, Redbridge Council	04/02/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair
Government	Meeting	Kit Malthouse MP , Housing Minister	04/02/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair
Local Government	<i>Launch of Centre for London report: 'Capital to country: London's relationship with the United Kingdom'</i>	Caroline Flint MP; Henri Murison , Director, The Northern Powerhouse Partnership; Jackie Sadek , Chief Executive, UK Regeneration	05/02/2019	Speech: Policy Chair
Local Government	<i>London Councils Leaders' Committee</i>	Various leaders of London Councils	05/02/2019	Briefing: Deputy Chair
Regional Government	<i>Belfast City Council Reception</i>	Suzanne Wylie , Chief Executive, Belfast City Council	05/02/2019	Speech & Briefing: Policy Chair
Government	<i>TheCityUK's Chairman's Dinner</i>	Jeremy Hunt MP , Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs	05/02/2019	Briefing: Policy Chair

Committee(s)	Dated:
Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee	5 February 2019
Subject: Parliamentary Team update	Public
Report of: Paul Double, City Remembrancer	For Information
Report author: Emma Wade, Parliamentary Engagement Officer	

Summary

This report has been prepared to update Members on the main elements of the Parliamentary Team's activity in support of the City of London Corporation's political and parliamentary engagement. An oral update will be provided at the meeting on the parliamentary next steps in the Brexit process.

This report spans the period since the last meeting of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub Committee on 8 January.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

1. At the time of writing, further Commons debate and a vote on the Government's 'Plan B' for the Brexit negotiations is due to take place on Tuesday 29 January. The House of Commons motion is not a re-run of the 'meaningful vote' on a deal. In order to ratify the Withdrawal Agreement, the Government must return to the Commons and comply with the full requirements of the EU (Withdrawal) Act 2018 Section 13(1). No official indication of timing has been given on this yet. An oral update will be provided on the outcome of the vote (and corresponding amendments) at the meeting of the Committee.

Legislation

2. Work on a private Bill relating to the relocation of City's markets and a separate private member's Bill on air quality in Greater London is being undertaken by the Office. The Office continues to work with London Councils on the Bill relating to air quality. The Chair of Policy and Resources recently met with Shirley Rodrigues (Deputy Mayor for the Environment) to discuss the Corporation's proposals.
3. The Financial Services (Implementation of Legislation) Bill completed its committee stage in the House of Lords without amendment. Lord Bates explained the purpose of the Bill as being to provide "a temporary solution, specifically in a no-deal scenario, to deal with the dynamic regulatory landscape for the financial services industry after the UK has left the EU negotiating table and taken its own

path.” Responding to the subsequent debate, Bates said that the Government were “alert to concerns... and the need to maintain the competitiveness of the UK financial services industry and to ensure that any regulatory burdens are applied to small and medium-sized enterprises in a proportionate way.” The Bill will have its Report Stage on 29 January. There are some technical aspects of the Bill which may need to be addressed. These are currently being examined and, if necessary, can be the subject of amendments tabled in the Commons. Further information will be circulated in this eventuality.

Debates and Briefings

4. An updated briefing note on the ‘cliff edge’ risks for the financial services sector, focusing on contract continuity and data flows, was circulated to targeted MPs and Peers ahead of the meaningful vote and debate on 15 January.
5. The Office, working with the Port Health team, drafted a letter sent jointly by the Policy Chair and Port Health & Environmental Services Committee Chair Jeremy Simons to relevant Select Committee Chairs and constituency MPs. The letters outlined the City Corporation’s concerns with regards to port health and animal health and a ‘no deal’ Brexit.
6. The Office briefed and supported a phone call between the Policy Chair and Labour’s Shadow Industrial Strategy Minister, Chi Onwurah, MP for Newcastle upon Tyne Central. The call focused on financial and professional services ‘no deal’ contingency planning.
7. The Office briefed for and accompanied the Policy Chair to a meeting with Helen Whately MP, the Conservative Party’s vice-chair for Women, to discuss representation of women in politics and in business.

Select Committees

8. Commander Karen Baxter and Detective Chief Superintendent Peter O’Doherty of the City of London Police gave oral evidence to the Treasury Select Committee’s inquiry into economic crime. They were briefed ahead of the session by members of the Office, and a member of the Office accompanied them to Parliament.
9. A submission was made to the International Trade Select Committee inquiry into ‘UK Trade in Services’, working in conjunction with both the Regulatory Affairs and Exports and Investment EDO teams. The submission highlighted the importance of exploring opportunities for boosting further trade in services post-Brexit, and suggested ways in which this could be achieved.

GLA and the Regions

10. Members and officers of the GLA were sent a briefing note on the cliff-edge risks facing the financial services sector in the event of a ‘no deal’ Brexit, ahead of the first Mayor’s Question Time of the year, which featured several Brexit-related questions.
11. A press release concerning the concept designs for the Centre for Music and the project’s next steps was circulated to Members of the London Assembly.

Other

12. The Government confirmed in a written statement that a reciprocal agreement had been reached with Spain on the voting rights of UK and Spanish citizens “to stand and vote in local elections now and in the future”, with DExEU Minister Robin Walker adding his hope this “will be the first of many similar bilateral agreements with other Member States.” He also confirmed that whilst agreements were being negotiated with Member States the Government “do not anticipate any changes to the current primary legislative framework for candidacy and voting rights being made before the May 2019 English and Northern Ireland local elections” and added that “it is the policy intent of the UK Government that candidates who are validly nominated and elected at the May 2019 local elections in England and Northern Ireland should be able to serve that term of office in full.”

28 January 2019

Emma Wade

Parliamentary Engagement Officer, Office of the City Remembrancer

T: 020 7332 3901

E: emma.wade@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Public Relations & Economic Development Sub-Committee – For decision Policy & Resources Committee – For decision	Date(s): 5 February 2019 21 February 2019
Subject: Refocusing elements of Economic Development Office’s Responsible Business activity using an Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) approach	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Decision
Report author: Giles French, Economic Development Office	

Summary

Financial and Professional Services (FPS) competitiveness is a central pillar of the Economic Development Office (EDO) strategy. A key part of that competitiveness is that FPS must not only finance growth, but growth that is responsible, sustainable and inclusive, in line with our corporate strategy.

This paper proposes that EDO change the approach it takes to achieving these specific outcomes by evolving the work of the Innovation, Inclusion and Growth (IIG) team from corporate social responsibility, a corporate reputation metric, to an Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) approach, an investment metric that channels finance to more sustainable businesses. This would lead to the work of IIG having greater impact, more closely aligning with the rest of EDO’s work supporting FPS and be of greater relevance to our business stakeholders. Crucially it would strengthen our contribution to the Corporate Plan aim to ‘Support a thriving economy’, specifically the outcome ‘Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible’.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve the proposed change in approach within EDO to ‘Support a thriving economy’ by encouraging growth that is responsible, sustainable and inclusive. This would be via a new programme of work based on an Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) methodology, building on our Green Finance work and achieved by reprioritising current resource.
- Note that any staffing or HR implications of the proposed change in approach would be brought to the Establishment Committee as soon as possible.

Main Report

Background

1. The past three years have seen a major transformation in the focus, scale and reach of work across EDO, coalescing coherently on the central priority of competitiveness of financial and professional services (FPS). The impact of our work on trade policy, promotion, international engagement, supporting innovation and research has improved and increased demonstrably since recommendations of a major review were implemented in 2016.
2. However, while there have been some changes to other elements of EDO's work in the responsible business space, that workstream has not transformed in a similar way and is now notably less aligned with EDO's central focus on FPS competitiveness.

Current Position

3. In line with EDO's enhanced focus on areas with the greatest impact to support the Corporate Plan, elements of its work in the responsible business space have ceased in the past couple of years as we sought to move away from an activity-based approach to one that is more strategic and policy focused.
4. Some activity such as the Lord Mayor's Dragon Awards continue as discrete activities. And the Corporation as a whole has never been doing more in CSR, be it through Heart of the City, CBT or its own CSR work. This provides an opportunity to review how EDO supports growth which is responsible, sustainable and inclusive in the most impactful way, both by clearly supporting of FPS success and mirroring the lessons learned in transforming EDO's other workstreams.
5. This paper proposes that such a change should involve a clear pivot from an approach based on championing corporate social responsibility (CSR) - with its inherent focus on individual corporate reputation as a driver for change, and which continues to be championed by Heart of the City - towards one based on Environment, Social, Governance (ESG), a set of metrics targeting positive impacts in the investment chain with increased potential for systemic change across FPS in the way that it channels finance to foster more sustainable, responsible business outcomes.

Proposals

6. Adoption of an ESG approach for EDO's work in the responsible business space would refocus activity away from discrete programmes which target the outcomes of individual corporates based on reputation (the CSR approach) and towards wider system change based on standards for a company's operation used by socially conscious investors to screen potential investments. This would eliminate any duplication with the activities of Heart of the City and CBT.

7. This would involve taking the broad model of successful work already undertaken in the environmental space through the development of and support for the Green Finance Initiative (GFI) and using that to develop similar approaches – likely involving key players in FPS and government – to the social and governance elements.
8. The strengths of the GFI work have been in bringing both the public and private sector together. In particular, we have used public policy and regulation to drive more commercial investment opportunities. We have therefore avoided simply urging private investors to commit more capital to green opportunities because it is the right thing to do, but rather enabled them to deliver both sustainable outcomes and commercial returns. The same approach can and should be deployed for other social and governance outcomes.
9. There is considerable evidence to support the case for an ESG methodology leading to both greater impact and wider systemic change compared to approaches driven primarily by reputation. For example, a recent study from asset manager Amundi identified ESG investing as a source of outperformance in the US and Europe from 2014-17.
10. But the context is one where there is a huge amount of work to be done to ensure that we create a positive feedback loop, where better corporate behaviour leads to more investment at lower cost, and which in turn drives better – and more sustainable - corporate outcomes. For example, a recent PWC study found that 9 out of 10 investors are not being given corporate information that helps them compare one with another on ESG factors.
11. This is the central challenge but also the opportunity for further engagement. We know that companies taking an ESG approach can perform better but are currently not rewarded financially. Recalibrating incentives and behaviour has proved effective in green finance and can be effective across all of the ESG measures.
12. An illustration of the benefits of adopting a change in approach to focus on ESG as compared to CSR are outlined at Appendix One.
13. It should be noted that much of the skills activity led by EDO, notably activity to support a skilled FPS workforce – including work to flow from the Financial Services Skills Taskforce, chaired by Mark Hoban, once it reports in the summer - and elements of work promoting inclusion and diversity within FPS, maps well to the proposed ESG approach.
14. A shift in approach along the lines proposed would involve some changes to staffing structures within EDO. Subject to your Committee's approval of the proposed change, a report detailing changes to the team structure would be brought to the Establishment Committee as soon as possible.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. While a shift to the proposed ESG focus would alter the nature of work undertaken in EDO to support the responsible business agenda, it would also strengthen our contribution to the Corporate Plan aim to 'Support a thriving economy', specifically the outcome 'Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible'.

Implications

16. Subject to your Committee's approval of a shift to the broad ESG approach, a report setting out any proposed restructure and staffing implications will be brought to the Establishment Committee as soon as possible.

Conclusion

17. The proposal outlined above to adopt a new approach to achieving lasting, system wide change in FPS would achieve a coherence of purpose across EDO's activities to support FPS competitiveness. It would also enhance the City Corporation's impact in the responsible business space in the widest sense.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Benefits of changing from a CSR to an ESG approach

Giles French

Regulatory Strategy & Trade Director, Economic Development Office

T: 020 7332 3644

E: giles.french@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix One – Benefits of changing from a CSR to an ESG approach



change

WHY?

Reputation is weak lever

Financial Incentives affect bottom line

Greater responsiveness

WHAT?

Campaigns, events, PR

Policy, strategy, alignment

Approach aligns with broader EDO priorities

WHO?

Individual Corporates

FPS ecosystem

Core constituents for EDO, wider reach

OUTCOMES

Some behaviour change at individual corporates

New approach embedded for investors and corporates

Permanent, system wide change

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Digital Services Sub Committee Public Relations and Economic Development Committee	4 February 2019 5 February 2019
Subject: Update on new website	Public
Report of: Director of Communications	For Information
Report author: Melissa Richardson, Digital Publishing and Content Strategy Lead, Communications, Town Clerks	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to keep Members updated on the progress of the website project, specifically to establish progress to date.

The current website does not meet our needs and does not reflect well on the City of London Corporation. The content management system of the current website will also be redundant after Summer 2020.

Therefore, we wish to replace the current website with one with the ability to display well on mobile devices, to provide comprehensive search results and to provide information in a task-based and user-focused manner.

The project went out to tender in summer 2018 and the results were verified at the IT Category Board on 9 October 2018. The suppliers, Zengenti, were appointed in November 2018.

The project has been approved at Gateway 5 enabling funding to be released which has allowed recruitment for a Project Manager to begin.

Main Report

Background

1. The current website was launched in 2012 and, inevitably, is showing its age and no longer reflects well on the City of London Corporation.
2. All support for SharePoint 2010 [the current website platform] will cease in Summer 2020 (regular support stopped in 2015). SharePoint will not be providing a platform for external sites in future, so it cannot simply be updated. Leaving our website an unsupported platform poses a major risk.
3. Our current website does not display well on mobile devices, is not task structured (ie lacking user focus) and the out of the box search engine cannot provide the results from across the full range of corporate information (ie

Member, Jobs and Media sites are separate) that users would expect.

Current Position

4. The project went out to tender in August with evaluations in September 2018. The results of these evaluations went to the IT Category Board on 9 October. The award was made to the supplier following the Gateway 5 report. This has let the project commence and has released the funding.
5. The contract has been let under the Crown Commercial Services framework, G-Cloud 10. The call off contract has been agreed with the successful supplier following the approval of the Gateway 5 report. The new supplier, Zengenti, will commence the initial phases of the project during January 2019 in line with the outline project plan.
6. The discovery phase next steps are
 - a. talk to internal and external stakeholders
 - b. establish user needs
 - c. establish business requirements.
7. Members will be asked to participate in the discovery phase and in user testing. This will contribute to how the site is designed and the testing of its functionality.
8. A dedicated Project Manager is currently being recruited now that funding has been released.
9. This allows an early discovery phase (suppliers liaising in order to make informed recommendations about how to meet required outcomes), enabling work to start properly in early 2019. Based on previous experience, this will allow a realistic amount of time for building, consultation and testing to ensure the new site is ready before Summer 2020.

Conclusion

10. Members are asked to note the report.

Melissa Richardson

Digital Publishing and Content Strategy Lead

T: 020 7332 3449

E: melissa.richardson@cityoflondon.gov.uk