# 7 **Committees**

# The system isn't working

- 232. Throughout my Review, the Corporation's Committee system has been a consistent target of strong and widespread criticism so much so, in fact, that I was surprised that it has survived in its present form. It has become a means in itself rather than a means to an end.
- 233. In Part 4 I identified three particular problems of the Committee system: the number of Committees; the engagement of multiple committees with a single issue; and the sequencing of meetings of Committees involved, meaning that the convoy moves at the speed of the slowest ship. In this Part of my Report I identify some general issues relating to Committees, and then move on to propose a way in which the talent and expertise of Members could be put to better use, followed by proposals for a radical restructuring.

## General issues

#### Are Members non-executives?

- 234. In the course of my Review I was often told that Members, especially in their Committee work, should be regarded as non-execs. I do not agree. In a normal corporate environment, non-executive members sit with executive members, sharing corporate responsibility. But (except in a few cases governed by local rules) the non-execs as a group do not take decisions on their own. In Corporation Committees, on the other hand, the Members do have to take decisions. The key issue is the level at which they engage.
- 235. There is a temptation to micro-manage; a temptation, moreover, which is too often not resisted. Committees should set policy in their areas; agree (or secure) overall resources; review delivery and risk; and hold Officers to account but for overall delivery, not for day-to-day activities. This, combined with the review of delegations which I recommend later in this Report, should rebalance the Member/Officer relationship to the general benefit (and should also allow Committees to do their work with significantly fewer meetings).

## Committee staffs

- 236. Earlier I identified the quality of staff as a Corporation strength. <sup>61</sup> The Corporation's Committees are served by highly competent Officers, but I think that **the work of Committees might be better enabled if Committee staff felt empowered to be more pro-active,** guiding Committees to a greater degree, perhaps commissioning papers (with Chair approval) when necessary. If my recommendations on restructuring the system are accepted, they will also have a role in diplomatically assisting Committees to keep to their terms of reference.
- 237. I am encouraged in this view by having been at one stage responsible for the staffing of House of Commons Select Committees. In that system Clerks, while of course not supplanting the primary role of Members, feel that they have an important complementary (and self-starting) role in contributing to a Committee's effectiveness and success.

## Committee reports

238. I have been impressed by the quality of the reports submitted to Committees. They are authoritative, comprehensive and well – even stylishly – written. But they are often discursive, no doubt with the best of intentions, and this can encourage Committees to lose focus on matters for decision, or indeed to request further reports. There should be a move to much shorter reports, focused on the single issue at hand, with the matters for decision clearly identified. If my recommendation that the Corporation should go paperless is accepted, then there will be much less need to provide background; live links to the portal will access the necessary papers, and the concept of a free-standing "for information" paper, of which – as I noted earlier – there were more than 2,000 on agendas in 2018/19, should disappear.

## Committee and Court minutes

239. There is also scope for streamlining minutes throughout the organisation. If my recommendation for webcasting all meetings<sup>62</sup> is accepted, there will be a permanent record. Minutes can then adopt the style of the Cabinet Office, focusing on *decisions*, and recording discussion as economically as possible: "in discussion the following main points were made…"

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> See paragraph 84.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> Paragraph 174.

## Cancel when necessary

- 240. I have been struck by the number of very lightly loaded Committee and Sub-Committee meetings. When there is little substantive business, Chairs should cancel meetings (and Committee Clerks should feel free to suggest it).
- 241. A subset might be a planned reduction in the frequency of meetings, with the use of urgency/Chairman's decision when necessary.<sup>63</sup>

## Keep to Terms of Reference

242. This should be obvious. However, terms of reference of committees have developed over time; they show some signs of political compromise; they are sometimes loosely phrased; and there are some overlaps. If my recommendations on restructuring are accepted, there will need to be a careful revisiting of Committee terms of reference to improve clarity and minimise overlap.

## Limit Sub-Committees

- 243. Setting up a Sub-Committee has almost become a default setting. But if there is real discipline in Committee business, and a raising of the Member/Officer threshold, then **setting up a Sub-Committee should be very much the exception**, and the system should be greatly simplified thereby.
- 244. In order to achieve this, I recommend that there should be no general Committee power to establish Sub-Committees, and that SO 27.1.a should be repealed. Any genuinely necessary Sub-Committee should be provided for in the terms of reference of the parent Committee (as the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee is to the Policy and Resources Committee). And there would be merit in sunsetting Sub-Committees so that explicit revival would be required if the Sub-Committee concerned were still needed. I make further recommendations about terms of reference and Sub-Committees in paragraphs 281 and 282 below.

.

<sup>63</sup> Under SO 41.

## Joint meetings

245. I am told that joint meetings of Committees have proved very useful on occasion, and such meetings may have merit in the restructured system.<sup>64</sup>

# Member briefing

- 246. If the leaner Committee structure which I propose is to realise its full potential, Members will need to have a really good understanding of their own Committee's business. I do not say that this does not happen already; but there are undoubted benefits to be had if all the Members of a Committee have a shared understanding of current developments in their area, and also an insight into the challenges with which Officers are dealing. So regular briefings, in informal surroundings, not part of a Committee meeting, have a part to play. This has occasionally happened with existing Committees, but should become a general practice.
- 247. My proposals will greatly reduce the number of Committee places available; but there will be merit in involving the wider membership of the Court nevertheless. One possibility might be occasional briefings by individual Committees and their supporting Officers, whereby any Member of the Court can keep up with other Committees' current work and challenges. This might also encourage the sense of collective effort which is lacking at the moment.

# Chair training and appraisal

- 248. Some may see it as unnecessary or even demeaning, but a professional system requires the best possible approach to chairing, and periodic training (even if only in the form of a mentoring discussion) should be routine.
- 249. For the same reasons, there should be a light-touch 360-degree appraisal of Chairs; and Chairs should be involved in the appraisal of senior Officers.

At the moment vacancies on Committees are re-advertised,

# Handling vacancies 250. At the

sometimes more than once. Vacant Committee places may be much rarer under my proposals, but in any event I recommend that **there should be no re-advertising of Committee vacancies**. A

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> See SO 28, and my comments on the drafting of that SO in paragraph 158.

Committee should run with a vacant place which can be filled on a casual basis later if necessary. A Member can easily find out at any time which Committees have vacancies.

# Green impact assessments

- 251. I recommend that a "green impact assessment" should accompany every policy or project proposal submitted to Committee. Other impact assessments are already used (and have been used for Brexit implications) but, given the headline commitment to environmental sustainability in the Corporation's Corporate Plan, green impact assessments seem to me to be essential.
- 252. Even though environmental awareness should pervade the organisation, there is much to be said for assigning climate issues, and the Corporation's response, to a lead Committee.<sup>65</sup>

#### Committee not Ward

253. It is important that Members sitting on Committees should remember that as Committee Members their role is not to represent their Wards but to contribute in a dispassionate way to the Committee's deliberations and decisions. I deal with Ward Committees in paragraphs 270 to 272 below.

# Making best use of the talent

# The challenge

- 254. There is a great deal of talent, skill and relevant experience among the Members of the Court of Common Council, but it is not effectively deployed on Committees.
- 255. This is partly because of the somewhat opaque method of appointment, and partly because of a culture that feels that new Members must serve an extended apprenticeship before getting Committee places that they may particularly want, or for which they are especially fitted or qualified.<sup>66</sup> This may also act as a deterrent to new Members who may have a lot to contribute to the Corporation.

<sup>65</sup> The Policy and Resources Committee has (Order of Appointment, paragraph 4(o)) sustainability issues as part of its portfolio, but this needs to be framed in rather more prescriptive terms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> I acknowledge that the orders of appointment of certain committees provide that the membership should include a small number of Members with shorter periods of service on the Court; but these provisions as drafted have no link to skills and experience.

## A Governance and Nominations Committee

- 256. I think the time has come for a wholly new approach. I recommend the establishment of a Governance and Nominations Committee (G&NC), whose task would be to recommend Members for appointment to Committees on the basis of what they could contribute.
- 257. As a first step in an appointment round, Members could put in for Committee places, setting out how they were qualified and what they could contribute.<sup>67</sup> The Committee would no doubt also take into account their attendance records at the Committees of which they had been members.
- 258. The Committee would make recommendations in respect of each Committee, to be decided upon by the Court. To provide a discretionary element, the Committee could recommend as appointable a number larger (by say 20%) than the number of places to be filled.
- 259. The same procedure could be followed with casual vacancies, or the Committee might be empowered to appoint in such cases without a Court decision.
- 260. As I observed in respect of the Competitiveness Committee, I am loath to recommend a new Committee while trying to simplify the structure but, as will be clear from later proposals, I have in mind that the Governance and Nominations Committee will absorb functions from elsewhere, so contributing to the overall reduction.
- 261. I do not make detailed recommendations about the membership of this Committee (although I think the Chief Commoner might be an appropriate *ex officio* member); but to give the Committee's nomination functions authority and credibility, the membership should reflect the make-up of the Court of Common Council as a whole, rather than being limited to the "usual suspects". This does not mean, of course, that a modest number of "usual suspects" will not have a role to play in a total membership of about 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> This principle is recognised to a very limited extent in the current arrangements, as for example in the membership of the Capital Buildings Committee of two Court of Common Council Members "with appropriate experience, skills or knowledge", but the principle should operate across the whole system.

- 262. It may be thought that a Committee of this sort could become unduly influential; but, if applications were open, so also would be the degree to which the Committee discharged its functions objectively and impartially.
- 263. In paragraph 377 I list responsibilities which should go to the G&NC from Committees which I recommend should be re-organised or abolished.

# Restructuring

# **Principles**

- 264. I have proceeded on the basis that Committees need to align fairly closely to the activities needed to deliver the Corporate Plan. However, I do not think it wise to allow the elements of the Corporate Plan to dictate the Committee structure. Changes in the Plan should not then require changes in Committees.
- 265. I have rejected the possibility of each Committee having "its own" Chief Officer. Although individual Chief Officers will naturally work more closely with one Committee than with others, to formalise that relationship would be a recipe for creating silos at a time when the priority must be to break down silos and foster a corporate approach.

# "Grand" and "Service" Committees

266. I do not see much point in the distinction between Grand Committees and Service Committees, and I recommend that it is discontinued. Committees should be simply Committees.

# Size of Committees

267. Almost all Committees are much too big. The Committees/Boards listed below are in the order in which they appear in the *Appointment of Committees* document. The numbers of Members of some Committees cannot be definitive, as the orders of appointment contain provisions such "at least" and "not fewer than".

•	Policy and Resources	38
•	Finance	39
•	Capital Buildings	18

•	Investment	27
•	Audit and Risk Management	16
•	Planning and Transportation	35
•	Port Health and Environmental Services	33
•	Markets	33
•	Police Authority Board	13
•	Crime and Disorder Scrutiny	8
•	Culture, Heritage and Libraries	35
•	Governing Bodies: City of London School	21
	City of London Girls' School	21
	City of London Freemen's School	22
•	Guildhall School of Music and Drama	21
•	Education Board	18
•	Community and Children's Services	37
•	Gresham (City Side)	12
•	Establishment	17
•	Open Spaces and City Gardens	12
•	West Ham Park	15
•	Epping Forest and Commons	16
•	Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and	
	Queen's Park	18
•	Freedom Applications	10
•	Barbican Residential	21
•	Barbican Centre Board	20
•	City Bridge Trust	17
•	Standards	19
•	Standards Appeals	12
•	Licensing	15
•	Health and Wellbeing Board	13
•	Health and Social Care Scrutiny	7
•	Local Government Pensions Roard	7

268. Committees of 30 Members or more are not really Committees; they are in effect sub-plenaries: debating bodies, not fora for taking decisions. Even the smaller Committees in the list above are unwieldy; and the three Boards of Governors, together with the Boards of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and of the Barbican Centre, are well above the recommended size for such bodies. I return to this latter point in Part 9 of this Report.

269. I recommend that Committees should have no more than 15 Members, with an optimum size of between 12 and 15. It may be that Planning and Transportation may need to be slightly larger in order to cope with the need to provide non-overlapping panels to consider applications.

#### Ward Committees

- 270. I can see no argument for the retention of Ward Committees. I have been told that they are desirable because they give new Members a chance to serve on Committees. I suggest that that clearly indicates that Ward Committees are there to provide a role, not to do a job, and I am not convinced.
- 271. I therefore recommend the abolition of all the Ward Committees as Ward Committees: Finance; Planning and Transportation; Port Health and Environmental Services; Markets; Culture, Heritage and Libraries; and Community and Children's Services; Where their role survives into the new structure, they should be reconstituted as subject Committees of between 12 and 15 Members.
- 272. This means that SO 23 should be repealed and SO 24 amended.

# Multiple membership

- 273. SO 22 sets a maximum number of Committees on which Member may serve at eight. Moreover, the limit does not apply to additional, *ex officio*, membership of Committees; and it also allows membership of a Committee on which a Member is filling a twice-advertised vacancy to be added above the limit. I find this extraordinary. It also suggests that a Committee's work is not sufficiently valued. Full participation in a Committee's work, taking into account time needed for preparation and for events outside a Committee's formal sittings, should be demanding and will be time-consuming.
- 274. Setting *ex officio* memberships outside the limit is illogical. Such memberships will usually be because the Member concerned chairs another, relevant, Committee. That should mean more work, not less, if the liaison role is to be carried out effectively.

#### 275. I recommend that

- no Member should be a member of more than two Committees;
- that membership of one of the governing bodies of the independent schools and of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama; of the Barbican Centre Board; and of the Police Authority Board should not count against this limit (I later recommend that these Boards should be taken out of the committee structure);
- ex officio membership of a Committee or Committees should raise the limit to four. It may occasionally be that a single Chair carries with it more than four ex officio memberships. In such cases the limit should not apply; and
- SO 22 is amended accordingly.

# Service on outside bodies

276. SO 43 provides that a Member may not serve as a representative of the City Corporation on more than six outside bodies at a time. This does not include *ex officio* appointments. This limit seems high, but on the basis that such membership may not be unduly demanding **I do not recommend a change.** 

#### Chair terms

277. SO 29 specifies the terms<sup>68</sup> for which a Chair may be held: Policy and Resources, five years; Finance, five years; the Police Authority Board, four years; and other Committees, three years. These seem reasonable, but for consistency **there is a case for making all Chair terms four years.** 

# **Deputy Chairs**

278. Under SO 30.3.a, an immediate past Chair becomes Deputy Chair for the first year of the new Chair. I do not think that this is a good idea, and is certainly not in accordance with current best practice. The new occupant of the Chair needs to start a term afresh

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> Expressed in years consecutively.

without the possibly brooding presence of his or her predecessor. Any guidance from experience that may be needed can be drawn upon informally. I therefore recommend that a Chair ending a term of office should not be eligible to rejoin that Committee during the successor's term of office. The SO will need amendment accordingly.

## Chairs-in-waiting

279. There is a current practice whereby the Member who is to take the Chair is identified and becomes a Chair-in-waiting for two years. This seems an unnecessarily long time. A year should be long enough.

## Member terms

280. There will be a degree of "institutional churn" as a result of elections, personal preferences and other factors. However, there are examples of Members remaining on Committees for a very long time. I therefore recommend that the maximum period of service on a Committee should be eight years, with four years to pass before rejoining. Ex officio memberships should be excluded from this rule. SO 24 will need to be amended accordingly.

## Committee terms of reference

281. Under SO 21 Committees are "reconstituted" each year at the first regular meeting of the Court in April. The terms of reference of each Committee are included in the *Appointment of Committees* document. The opportunity is frequently taken by individual Committees to seek amendment of their terms of reference, and such requests are routinely approved. This seems to me to be a recipe for mission creep and overlap.

#### 282. I therefore recommend that:

- following the restructuring of the Committee system, the terms of reference of each Committee should be in its own Standing Order;<sup>69</sup> and that
- amendment of any set of terms of reference (including a request to establish a Sub-Committee) should be considered by the Court only following a recommendation by the Governance and Nominations Committee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> And so not combined with the Order of Appointment.

#### Aldermanic seats

- 283. Even though they have their own Court of Aldermen, Aldermen sit as Members of the Court of Common Council, and, depending upon the terms of reference of individual Committees, have seats reserved for them.
- 284. In order to draw fully upon the resource represented by the Aldermen, I recommend that there should be no bar, formal or by convention, to an Alderman being Chair of any Committee.
- 285. If Aldermen were to be represented *pro rata* in the new Committee structure, they would account for one seat in every five. However, I do not recommend reserved places, which may well vary from Committee to Committee; this will be something for the new Governance and Nominations Committee to consider in making their recommendations.

# "Rapporteurs"

286. In the leaner Committee structure, taking into account the considerable workload that will continue to fall upon Chairs of Committees, there may be a role for *rapporteurs*, in the Continental usage: Members taking the lead on particular subjects within a Committee's area. This happens to some extent already, but in the context of smaller Committees it may be worth using more extensively.