

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Policy & Resources Committee	18 November 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Governance Review: Committee Structure Considerations	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1-12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Town Clerk	<b>For Decision</b>

### Summary

In late 2019, the City Corporation commissioned a comprehensive Governance Review. This was to be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Livsane, was appointed to conduct the Review. The Review's findings indicated that the Corporation's structures were too complex, with its decision-making too slow; questions of corporate endeavour were also raised.

In response to the Review, an informal engagement process has been undertaken through which Members have been consulted extensively in relation to all the recommendations therein. Through the debate and consideration emerging, a number of immediate changes have already been made, such as the introduction of a new Standards Regime. This report now presents proposals emerging on the overall structure and business cycle for the committees of the Court of Common Council, for Members' consideration.

Should all the proposals within the report be adopted, the overall number of bodies within the formal committee structure would be decreased from the 135 identified by the initial Governance Review down to 78. Further efficiencies are also intended thereafter, as annual review processes (coupled with limitations on the establishment of new bodies) lead to continuous options for greater rationalisation; equally, a number of the existing bodies are time-limited or proposed for review at future points.

The proposed changes to the committee processes and structure are anticipated to result in significant organisational efficiencies, not least due to the removal of duplication of process and the realigned focus of committee decisions. However, this needs to be accompanied by appropriate delegations, to ensure that the balance of reporting to committees is correct and allows for the optimal level of Member scrutiny and decision-making. A separate report proposing amendments to the Scheme of Delegations has been prepared as a consequence, and further reviews of the Projects Procedure and Procurement thresholds are also underway.

In keeping with good practice, it is also strongly recommended that a Post-Implementation Review take place at a suitable point after any new arrangements are implemented. Inevitably, there will be changes which work well and which Members may wish to extend, or changes which have not worked as intended and need to be revisited or amended. Consequently, an opportunity to revisit the arrangements in a relatively light-touch yet methodical fashion will provide an important step in ensuring any arrangements are right for the longer-term.

## **Recommendations**

That Members:-

1. Note the proposals made in relation to the Committee structure through the initial Review of the City Corporation's Governance (Appendix 4).
2. Consider the proposed responses to the initial Governance review recommendations as summarised in Appendix 2 and detailed within the body of this report.
3. Consider the proposed Committee Structure and amendments to governance processes as set out in this report.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. In September 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review.
2. The Committee received the Review in September 2020 and determined that the many proposals should be considered in a structured way in the coming period, with Members afforded sufficient time to read and consider the content and implications. It was noted that the recommendations were far-reaching and wide-ranging and it would be for Members to consider how far they were appropriate and which should be taken forward. It was also agreed that it would be of the utmost importance to ensure that the process provided for all Members of the Court to continue to have the opportunity to input and comment on the Review. To that end, a series of informal Member engagement sessions were arranged to afford all Members opportunities to express their views on the various aspects of the Review.
3. Members considered the section of the Review concerning the Standards Regime (Section 8) first, resulting in the Court ultimately agreeing to a new set of arrangements in January 2021 and an Independent Panel being appointed. Similarly, the Court has already come to conclusions in respect of the Competitiveness agenda (Section 5) and, separately, Bridge House Estates. Planning arrangements are also under discussion elsewhere, and are due to come back to Planning & Transportation Committee in the first instance in the coming weeks.
4. Whilst the various areas of the Committee Structure were also broken down into more manageable sections for the purposes of consultation and engagement,

Members were mindful that consideration of the whole should be taken together, given the interdependencies and interconnected nature. To that end, the Policy & Resources Committee considered first a number of overarching principles (as recommended in the Review) and has now asked for the outcomes of the various engagement sessions on the wider committee structure piece to be drawn together, for consideration in the round. In the interests of digestibility, the breakdowns used during the Member Engagement process are replicated in the format below:-

- General Principles
  - Corporate Committees
  - Service Committees
  - Statutory Committees
  - Educational and Cultural Institutions
  - Open Spaces
5. Given the volume of recommendations made, this paper does not address each in turn directly in the interests of readability. However, two summary tables are set out at Appendix 2 for the sake of completeness, clarity, and reference. The first collates the individual recommendations for consideration set out in this report, whilst the second lists each of the recommendations made by Lord Lisvane in his initial Review (in summary form), with corresponding paragraph reference, and a summary of the emerging response to each (or alternative arrangements put forward).

### **General Principles**

6. Throughout his submission, Lord Lisvane set out his view that the current committee system is not fit for purpose, having noted a significant amount of criticism relating to this during his review. He cites, in particular, three previously identified issues, the addressing of which will be vital in any new approach:
- the number of committees
  - the practice of multiple committees' involvement in a single issue, and
  - the sequencing of these meetings, resulting in unnecessary delays.
7. Through Members' discussions and submissions, the following proposals have emerged by way of addressing these issues:-
- **Number of Committees:** Whilst the Review will bring overall numbers down, the function and performance of the various bodies should be more the focus than the number thereof. Notwithstanding this, once restructured, robust mechanisms are required to prevent the future proliferation of new bodies.

It is proposed, therefore, that the creation of any sub-committee or working party shall, in future, be subject to the submission of a business case to the Policy & Resources Committee, outlining the justification, resourcing

requirements, life expectancy / sunseting arrangements, and clear terms of reference.

- **Multiple involvement of Committees:** A consistent cause for concern has been the number of bodies from which approval must be sought for some items, particularly where they are cross-cutting or new areas of work. This can add considerable confusion, delay, and contradiction in approvals, as Members strive to offer comment from different perspectives / areas of responsibility and officers seek to serve several masters. It is a significant contributor to the assessment of the Corporation's decision-making processes as slow or sclerotic, whilst also meaning accountability becomes diffuse and workstreams are not grasped firmly on occasion.

Members' observations have identified that there are several actions needed in concert to address this problem, viz.:-

- **Greater control over Terms of Reference:** Greater control and oversight is needed in respect of committee and sub-committee terms of reference, as changes can often be subject to political compromise, or arise through discussion without sufficient thought able to be given as to implications. The current cycle and process by which changes are proposed and submitted means Policy & Resources either receives very little time to consider them, or takes them in isolation and is unable to assess contextual implications of proposed changes. Similarly, changes to sub-committee ToRs are often undertaken in isolation and this can lead to a lack of corporate awareness and unexpected implications for the sequencing of business. It is, therefore, proposed that revising the annual cycle of the review of Terms of Reference to provide more time will go some distance towards addressing this, as will requiring written submissions making the case for the change. This will be vital to improving clarity and minimising overlap of responsibility – the latter being one reason why papers often go to so many bodies and decision-making can be slowed. The process will also allow for existing areas of overlap to be addressed as they become apparent, providing for an annual process of review and improvement as the new structure embeds.
- **Limits on numbers of Committees considering items:** Even with greater control of Terms of Reference, there will undoubtedly continue to be many cases where items cut across many areas of responsibility. One example is the Sport Engagement Strategy, which went to some eleven committees in sequence: this cannot be conducive to either good or efficient governance.

Several Members have proposed a hard limit on the number of Committees which might consider an item, as a way to obviate this difficulty. However, it is clear that an alternative mechanism of wider Member engagement would be fundamental to any such approach being effective and facilitating sufficient scrutiny.

One proven approach could be that adopted by the European Parliament whereby a specific committee(s) is identified as holding primary responsibility for decision-making and then other committees with interest are circulated the paper and asked to submit their opinion ahead of the

primary committee considering the matter. This would need some tweaking to fit the Corporation's arrangements – one committee would be inappropriate in many cases, given the need to take on board both service and corporate committee views – but the principle of having a designated approving committee, whilst others with a lesser stake play a key role in scrutinising and offering opinion in advance (albeit on a more informal basis) is sound.

It is, therefore, proposed that – other than in exceptional circumstances – all reports be subject to approval by a maximum of one 'corporate' committee, one 'service' or 'institutional' committee, and one relevant sub-committee (together with the Court of Common Council if the matter is of significance enough to breach the thresholds specified by Standing Orders). For instance, a project seeking to take a loan to extend the Freeman's School Main House would go to that Board as the service committee, the Projects Sub-Committee to consider the project mechanics, and Policy & Resources to approve the loan.

The most appropriate committee in each instance shall be identified by the Town Clerk and the Chairs of the relevant committees notified to provide an opportunity for any objection and reappraisal, in which case the final judgment of the Lord Mayor and Chief Commoner shall be sought. The relevant report shall then be circulated to those affected committees where opinion is sought, with a period provided for responses. These will then be collated and submitted to the decision-making committees, to inform their ultimate deliberations. The Chairs of those committees would also be invited to attend the decision-making meeting(s) to represent their committee's views.

This will both require and foster greater discipline in the planning and preparation of cross-cutting reports, which provides a further benefit in raising corporate awareness of emerging strategies and initiatives.

The provisions of Standing Order No.9(4) will also remain as a safeguard, thereby providing an opportunity for Members to bring the relevant item before the Court for consideration, should it be felt that the process is insufficient on any occasion.

- **Sub-Committees:** one potentially complicating factor in both sequencing and the multiplicity of committees involved in decision-making is the role played by sub-committees. In many cases, Grand Committees have created dedicated subs to facilitate greater and more focused consideration of particular items, which is to be welcomed. However, it is also true that, in many cases, these sub-committees are then provided with limited (if any) power to act and so represent an additional stage in the approvals process; the sub-committee having been established to consider in detail, recommendations are normally then simply "rubber-stamped" in practice by the Grand Committee, resulting in unnecessary delay in approvals. Notwithstanding this, though, there is a welcome opportunity for additional scrutiny and sense-check provided, so some sort of similar arrangement would remain welcome. If committees were encouraged to delegate power to act to their sub-committees in certain areas, this could speed up the decision-making process significantly,

whilst providing a call-in facility within Standing Orders for the grand committee to revisit decisions within a specified timeframe would also provide a safeguard. An additional benefit is that, as the grand committee can make decisions on behalf of the sub-committee (as the parent body), it provides a secondary opportunity for formal Member decision-making in the event of sequencing issues. (By way of example, RASC items which miss deadlines often go direct to P&R, rather than urgency).

- **Sequencing:** A related problem in decision-making pace is the sequencing of meetings, whereby the timing of meetings falls such that there can be several weeks between a service committee, corporate committee, or a relevant sub-committee, thereby adding a significant window to approval periods. Having every committee meet more frequently to provide greater opportunities cannot be the answer; therefore, alternatives must be explored.

Part of the problem with current sequencing arrangements is that they are predicated on long-standing arrangements or precedence, or have had changes to cycles made at particular points in time which mean they are obliged to “fit in” with other arrangements, rather than a fresh view being taken of the overall arrangements and adjustments made accordingly.

A more fixed committee cycle, set several years ahead and with firmer rules on meeting dates, would allow for a clearer flightpath on submission dates. By way of example, it is almost always the case under the current system that Policy & Resources meets on a date that facilitates the latest possible submission of reports on to the Court, so as to allow for any delay in approval of major items to be minimised. Sequencing other corporate committees in the same window, with service committees in the window immediately prior, would allow for a natural progression of items; equally, officers looking ahead at submission timescales would have absolute clarity on process and find it exceedingly difficult to justify operating outside of those arrangements.

The downside of this arrangement would be that it would provide decreased latitude for Chairs to change meeting dates to accommodate their schedules (although that is not to say there would be no flexibility within available windows, of course). However, the greater advance notice of dates would, it is hoped, off-set this to a large degree.

- **Delegated Authority arrangements:** Where sequencing issues cannot be avoided, there is greater scope for the use of the delegated authority mechanisms in a more inclusive and transparent fashion. If the Committee is aware of an imminent report which cannot await the next meeting, there should be a greater use of e-mail to provide sight of such items to Committee Members and seek comments, so as to inform the Chair and Deputy Chair’s final view via the consultation arrangements (and the subsequent decision). The comments received, where a public report, can be collated and fed into the usual public report of action taken, so as to provide as much transparency as possible.

8. The above proposals aside, emerging from Members’ views on other recommendations on general restructuring principles are the following key proposals:-

- **Agendas and “information” items** – On almost every agenda there are, at present, large numbers of “for information” items. This is particularly acute for Grand Committees such as Policy & Resources, where the minutes of multiple sub-committees are received for information alongside reports for information, resulting in an accumulation a significant volume of additional pages and items for Members to process but where no decision or discussion, is required.

At the same time, many of the “for information” items are matters where strategic input or guidance is sought but, due to the labelling system for reports, can be missed or it is not immediately apparent where this is the case. During the Governance Review engagement process, it was oft observed that this resulted in a lack of focus on relevant items and means that Members are not provided with sufficient aid to help identify quickly where the Committee’s time should be focused.

To that end, and in-line with Members’ suggestions emerging through the engagement process, it is proposed that committees move to a three-tiered arrangement for reports: *For Decision*, *For Discussion* (i.e. those information items where debate should be focused), and *For Information* (i.e. those which are simply to be noted or received in accordance with requirements and where there is to be no discussion at the meeting unless prior notice is provided or the leave of the committee is sought).

Allied to this, all strictly “for information” items should be removed from the primary agenda pack and created as a supplementary agenda. This pack would continue to be published online and received by the committee, but could be considered “*en bloc*” by the committee in session, without discussion. This builds on the good practice adopted at various points by the Barbican Centre and Guildhall School Boards, where information items are so marked. There may, of course, be occasions where a specific information item merits further discussion due to emerging or unforeseen issues, so there will be the provision Members to provide prior notice to open an item for wider discussion within the meeting, or to seek the leave of the Committee at the meeting itself should something occur at a late stage.

- **Workplans** - It is also suggested that workplans (i.e., forward agenda plans) should be implemented as a matter of course for every Grand Committee, so as to provide greater visibility not just to the Committee but also to other Members and officers across the organisation as to what issues are anticipated to be under consideration in the coming period. This will allow for improved awareness and co-ordination across the organisation as to emerging issues and considerations, which will go towards addressing issues of silo working and corporate endeavour identified in the Review.
- **Minutes and reports** - Whilst a suggestion that committee minutes should become more condensed or streamlined (compared to current arrangements) received general support, it was felt there still needed to be a reflection of the broad differences of opinion expressed, representing the balance of views sensibly (rather than simply recording decisions). For certain areas, minutes would also need to remain fuller to comply with various inspection regimes. Court minutes should continue in their current format. Similarly, renewed efforts should be made to improve the quality of

report writing, making them more concise and with clearly identified decisions and options for Members.

- **Scheme of Delegations** – There was widespread support for a review of the Scheme of Delegations and the thresholds therein, as the balance was not optimal in many cases. This resulted either in issues of minor import taking up significant officer and committee time and routine business being delayed, or, conversely, major items not being afforded sufficient scope for review and discussion at committee. In view of the scale of activity required to present proposals on recalibration of the Scheme, all Chief Officers are currently contributing to revised proposals to be brought forward for Member engagement and consideration. Dependent on the decisions taken, these may well allow for further efficiencies within the committee structure as the business presented to existing sub-committees can be re-absorbed by grand committees, when pitched at a more appropriate level. A suitable mechanism to ensure reporting to committees on actions taken under these increased delegations should also be introduced, to ensure Member oversight. Such mechanisms already exist in some committees, so could be replicated.

One of the key elements of this is likely to be the thresholds set in the separate but related Projects Procedure and Procurement Strategy. In several cases, thresholds have not been adjusted for several years and so do not reflect changes in the value of money, nor constitute an appropriate setting of thresholds, given the usual costs of regular low-level projects. Work is underway to present more appropriate arrangements, including the removal of routine procurement from the Gateway Process.

- **Standing Orders** – Equally, it was recognised that Standing Orders in their current format have suffered from accretion and piecemeal review over the years, with inconsistencies or areas where clarity is lacking. Self-evidently, many of the changes required will be dependent on decisions made around the committee structure and the scheme of delegations; therefore, it is proposed that a thorough review be undertaken to present a new and refreshed document. This process will also consider the various recommendations set out in paragraphs 147 to 174 of the Review.
- **Term Limits** - On the question of term limits, there were a range of views, with it ultimately felt that they were clearly essential in those areas where there was a statutory or regulatory expectation to have them, or where there was a lack of obvious turnover in membership; however, they were not necessarily always appropriate for all committees.

Nevertheless, through subsequent discussion at the informal Court meeting on 11 November, a majority of those present indicated a desire to revisit this issue and supported the imposition of term limits across the board (with terms frozen during service as Chair). Members may, therefore, wish to consider this once again in the light of that discussion.

- **Multiple Memberships** - Similarly, whilst there was in-principle support for reducing the numbers of committees one might serve on, this would need to be handled carefully so as not result in an abundance of vacancies, as well as facilitating the clear benefits of cross-pollination of service on various committees.



Continued use of the ability to waive service limitations once a vacancy has been open for a certain period was suggested as being prudent. To that end, it is proposed that the limit on memberships be decreased from 8 to 6; however, the existing practice whereby this limit be waived when a vacancy is advertised more than twice should continue.

Whilst some consideration was given to whether service on some committees should automatically disqualify a Member from service on another, it was felt on balance that the benefits of cross-pollination, together with the clear responsibilities on Members around the disclosure of interests and managements of conflicts, meant that this was neither necessary nor appropriate.

- **Chair and Deputy Chair arrangements** – Regarding the automatic right for outgoing Chairs to take up the Deputy Chair role, Members felt on balance that this should be a matter for the committee to determine in each instance. In some cases there was a clear value to this handover process and continuity, whereas in others, it could be seen differently; ultimately, Members felt that the democratic approach would be preferable and the outgoing Chair should be eligible to stand as Deputy Chair, but be required to be elected. There was no support for making all Chair's terms a consistent length, as there were logical reasons for differences in particular cases.

## COMMITTEE STRUCTURE: SUMMARY

9. The sections below outline the emerging views or consideration in relation to the various proposals advanced by the initial Governance Review. However, by way of summary, an overarching analysis of the proposals and implications on the various current committees is as follows:-

- *Audit and Risk Management Committee*: No change.
- *Barbican Centre Board*: No change.
- *Barbican Residential Committee*: Abolition, with creation of new Housing Committee, with dedicated regular meetings for BRC matters. (This would also be supplemented by the establishment of a Barbican Consultation Group for enhanced and dedicated consultation.
- *Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School*: Review of composition with reduction in the number of Common Council representatives (with suitable financial control / veto powers worked into the terms of reference).
- *Board of Governors of the City of London School*: Review of composition with reduction in the number of Common Council representatives (with suitable financial control / veto powers worked into the terms of reference).
- *Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls*: Review of composition with reduction in the number of Common Council representatives

(with suitable financial control / veto powers worked into the terms of reference).

- *Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama:* Review of composition with reduction in the number of Common Council representatives (with suitable financial control / veto powers worked into the terms of reference).
- *Bridge House Estates Board:* This was established as part of a parallel piece of work and follows the abolition of the City Bridge Trust Committee.
- *Capital Buildings Committee:* To cease being a Grand Committee and become a sub-committee of Policy & Resources, with delegated powers to act.
- *City of London Police Authority Board:* No change.
- *Community & Children's Services Committee:* Removal of Housing function to create new Housing Committee.
- *Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee:* No change, although a review of composition and commencement of annual meeting cycle required.
- *Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee:* To absorb responsibility for sport (minus the strategic engagement aspect, which remains with Policy & Resources); Benefices Sub to form part of new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee; responsibility for London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) to be transferred to new body.
- *Education Board:* No change to main Board, although Charity Sub-Committee to be abolished (pending formal submission of proposals).
- *Epping Forest & Commons Committee:* No change bar arrangements for local administration of consultative committees.
- *Establishment Committee:* Prospective name change to "Corporate Services Committee"; proposed joint new Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Sub-Committee (with P&R).
- *Finance Committee:* Transfer of Digital Services to new Grand Committee; merger of Corporate Asset Sub-Committee (and potentially Procurement Sub-Committee) with Projects Sub-Committee to create a new joint Sub-Committee for Operational Property, Projects, and Procurement; abolition of Finance Grants Oversight and Performance Sub-Committee.
- *Freedom Applications Committee:* Consideration to be given to abolition, with functions transferred to new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee of Policy & Resources.
- *Gresham (City Side) Committee:* No change.

- *Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee*: No change bar arrangements for local administration of consultative committees.
  - *Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee*: No change.
  - *Health and Wellbeing Board*: No change at this stage, although the White Paper currently progressing through Parliament is likely to require further consideration in due course.
  - *Investment Committee*: Abolished, with joint meetings of relevant committees to replace and enhance investment strategy development and monitoring process. PIB and FIB to become joint sub-committees of P&R, Finance, and BHE Board, allowing for greater co-ordination and transparency across the three funds and a more coherent overall approach.
  - *Licensing Committee*: No change.
  - *Local Government Pensions Board*: No change.
  - *Markets Committee*: To cease being a Ward Committee, with commensurate reduction in size to 12-15 Members. Review of continued operation to take place once new consolidated Markets Site delivered.
  - *Open Spaces and City Gardens / West Ham Park Committees*: No change to Grand Committees; local consultative bodies to be removed from formal centrally-administered structures and granted greater autonomy to be run locally.
  - *Planning and Transportation Committee*: Subject to separate consideration.
  - *Policy and Resources Committee*: No change to the Grand Committee, but various mergers or reallocations of sub-committee activities to provide a reduction in sub-committees, and review of ex-officio membership.
  - *Port Health & Environmental Services Committee*: No change.
  - *Standards Committee*: Already abolished (replaced with Independent Appeals Panel, outside of the normal Committee structure).
  - *Standards Appeals Committee*: Already abolished (replaced with Independent Appeals Panel, outside of the normal Committee structure).
10. Specific proposals relating to Sub-Committees and Working Parties are set out in this report; however, it should be noted that efforts have been made throughout the lifetime of the Review process to identify and remove Working Parties which are either dormant / being held in abeyance, are outside of the formal committee structure and so incorrectly listed, or have been determined by the parent committee as no longer being required. In each of these cases, permanent abolition (or removal from the listings where incorrectly identified) is proposed;

should they be required again in future, the parent committee in each instance would be required to make an application to re-establish it.

11. In producing his Review, Lord Lisvane identified some 32 Grand Committees, 63 Sub-Committees, 16 overview and scrutiny or consultative committees, and 24 Working Parties or “other” similar bodies – i.e., a total of 135 bodies. Through a combination of the internal review process mentioned above and the proposals outlined here, the new structure (if approved in its entirety) would result a decrease to 78 Committees, Sub-Committees, and working parties within the formal committee structure of the Court of Common Council.
12. It should be noted that the proposed adjustments do not necessarily result in the removal of the relevant bodies altogether. Rather, a number of bodies were incorporated within the Review’s accounting which are not City Corporation functions (for instance, the City of London Academies Trust, which is an external body to which the City Corporation provides clerking support and is not answerable to the Court of Common Council) and so should be removed from such accounting, as they add to misunderstandings around process and lines of accountability. Similarly, some proposals posit the removal of bodies from the formal committee process (thereby reducing central administrative burdens or bureaucracy) but do not abolish the bodies themselves, which would be administered in a different fashion (and distinct from the formal decision-making process).
13. In reading the various proposals which emerge from Members’ discussions, please note the following:-
  - A recommendation to abolish all standing **Reference Sub-Committees** as a matter of course was supported by the majority of Members in the engagement process. They have, therefore, been removed from the committee structure and to avoid duplication this is not mentioned further under each committee below.
  - Whilst Members were not supportive of the move to abolish **consultative committees** in general, there was support for the management of many of them being devolved to local areas and removing them from the central bureaucracy. This is outlined further in the “Open Spaces” section later in this report.
  - Members were, in general, supportive of the recommendation **to reduce all (non-Ward) Committees in size**, noting the recommendation that they be 12-15. However, it was agreed that a “one size fits all” approach would not be appropriate and each case would need to be assessed on its merits. Consequently, it is proposed that each affected committee be asked to consider its composition with a view to reducing numbers. Such reductions could be arranged such that they achieved through natural wastage as vacancies occur each year, minimising disruption.
  - Members have already expressed their strong support for the retention of **Ward Committees**; with the exception of the Markets Committee, this continuation is assumed within the below proposals and previous recommendations to change the status of such committees is discounted.

### **Governance & Nominations (Making best use of talent)**

14. In considering the Committee Structure initially proposed through the externally-conducted Review, it was noted that an integral constituent element was the Governance & Nominations Committee, the establishment of which would have significant implications for all other committees (together with the appointments processes and related matters).
15. Members were near-unanimous in their opposition to the creation of such a body; consequently, the proposals around the Committee Structure are set out in that context and the associated recommendations (when cross-referenced) should be read accordingly.
16. With reference to the question of making greater use of talent on the Court, instead of this new committee being established, Members were supportive of a greater use of skills matrices, together with more intelligent advertising and use of data, to help inform Members' voting when appointing to committees. Such arrangements are, in part, already employed to good effect by a small number of the Court's committees.
17. To that end, it is proposed that a central skills and experience register be created, which would be available for Members to review in advance of any committee election; further, each committee shall be asked to provide the Court with an indication of any particular skills, expertise, or background where expressions of interest from applicants would be particularly welcome, informed by such skills audits as deemed appropriate by the relevant committee.

### **CORPORATE COMMITTEES**

#### **Policy & Resources (paragraphs 288-297 of the Lisvane report)**

18. Although the subject of much discussion, there was no significant sentiment supporting radical changes to the Policy & Resources Committee, which plays a vital role as a 'co-ordinating committee' pursuing the Corporation's corporate aims, as the Governance Review report notes.
19. Equally, whilst a review of ex-officio Members of the Committee would be welcome (and the Committee should be encouraged to undertake such a review), there was minimal appetite for substantial composition changes, particularly where this would reduce the number of Members elected directly by the Court.
20. There was broad consensus that the current arrangement, whereby there are three Deputy Chairs, should be dispensed with and the Committee should revert to having one designated Deputy Chair, and this is recommended accordingly (although the election of the Deputy Chair should not be seen as confirmation of successor until the final year of that term, when confirmed by P&R as at present). Notwithstanding this, there should be a greater use of Lead Members (or 'rapporteurs') to help spread the burden of office amongst the wider committee whilst also making best use of talent. This would also give a wide array of Members the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge of certain areas

and prepare them for potentially standing as Chair. Other Committees should also be encouraged to adopt the “lead Member” approach as fits their needs.

21. The Committee currently has the following sub-committees and working parties:-

- Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (RASC)
- Public Relations Sub-Committee
- Projects Sub-Committee
- Outside Bodies Sub-Committee
- Members’ Privileges Sub-Committee;
- Hospitality Working Party (HWP)
- Ceremonial Working Party (CWP)
- Culture Mile Working Party (CMWP)
- Members’ Diversity Working Party (MDWP)
- Members’ Financial Assistance Working Party (MFAWP)
- Tackling Racism Task Force (TRT)
- Competitiveness Advisory Board (CAB)

22. A rationalisation, therefore, of the various bodies (many of which meet intermittently, or which have very limited remits) was widely felt to be sensible. Within this, there may also be scope to absorb sensibly some other areas of committee activities, thereby reducing the number of committees or areas of overlap across the board. Finally, the sub-committees often have limited (if any) power to act and so represent an additional stage in the approvals process; delegating power to act would speed up the decision-making process significantly, whilst providing a call-in facility within Standing Orders for the Grand Committee to revisit decisions within a specified timeframe will provide a safeguard. A proposed re-structured arrangement might be as follows:-

- **Resource Allocation Sub-Committee:** Retain as is, but with greater power to act (currently, many items go to RASC and are then simply rubber-stamped by P&R, thereby slowing approval processes without adding greatly to scrutiny).
- **Capital Buildings Board (replacing Capital Buildings Committee):** Given the strategic importance of the work of Capital Buildings, together with the significant resource allocation matters, there is an argument for bringing it closer to Policy & Resources to ensure greater alignment and shared understanding of ongoing activity. By granting it delegated power to act, Capital Buildings can also continue to act decisively and utilising streamlined governance arrangements, thereby ensuring these major projects can continue to be delivered at pace but with greater corporate visibility. The existing composition could also be continued.

As the breadth of activity overseen by this Sub-Committee grows, given various new major projects potentially coming on-stream, it would also have the ability to establish small dedicated task and finish groups, as it deems appropriate, to

allow for more detailed and responsive consideration relating to individual projects, and acting as a rapid-response reference group for project officers to consult with lead Members, providing greater Member involvement and oversight at crucial moments in the project delivery.

- **Competitiveness Advisory Board:** No change.
- **Public Relations Sub-Committee:** Members may wish to consider a change of name to Communications Sub-Committee. Whilst it is logical for responsibility for sport engagement itself to remain with this sub-committee, it is also suggested that wider responsibility for co-ordinating the delivery and commercial aspects of the sport agenda be moved to the Culture Committee, to provide more dedicated focus and recognise the inherent link between sport and culture.
- **Civic Affairs Sub-Committee:** This could be, in effect, a merger of HWP, Members' Privileges Sub, Outside Bodies Sub, CWP, and the MFAWP. Each of these have fairly limited yet related remits and could be accommodated within the existing HWP meeting cycle, thereby reducing the overall number of meetings and sub-committees with no detriment to the consideration of business. Members may also wish to consider whether the Freedom Applications Committee should be brought within this, given the relatively niche remit of that Committee and the link with hospitality. Similarly, the Benefices Sub-Committee's remit could potentially be absorbed within this new body's activity, given its very specific role and the link to the Corporation's ceremonial roles and activities.
- **Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee:** Whilst operational property previously fell under the remit of Policy & Resources, it currently sits with Finance. However, the bulk of items constitute project reports and, given the use of corporate assets, often have a corporate angle which merits a view from a Policy perspective. There may, therefore, be merit in combining the two sub-committees as a joint sub-committee of Finance and Policy & Resources, so that items can avoid going to both the Projects and Corporate Asset Sub Committees (CASC) for duplicate consideration.

Equally, the arrangements around the corporate control of operational property need to be strengthened, to encourage greater corporate endeavour and collaboration in the use of corporate assets for opportunities (and discourage perceived reluctance across service areas in relinquishing under-used resources for the corporate benefit). Whilst this will be achieved through changes to Standing Orders, this joint sub-committee would give greater weight to corporate control and oversights of projects and assets, whilst also minimising duplication.

Several suggestions were also made that the remit of the Procurement Sub-Committee could be absorbed into this joint body; given the possible changes to approval thresholds through the Scheme of Delegations review and related Projects and Procurement thresholds reviews, it is likely that the workload of the existing Sub-Committee would be reduced and so could be absorbed within this new body; however, there are questions of appropriateness of fit which Members may wish to consider.

- **Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Sub-Committee:** This new formal Sub-Committee would replace both the MDWP and TRT. At present, the former is being held in abeyance; the latter has a relatively limited scope and the informal nature of the group means it has limited teeth, and there might be benefit in drawing together associated strands of activity to provide a more dedicated focus. In view of the close relationship with the staff remit of the Establishment Committee, a joint sub-committee might also be considered beneficial.
  - **Culture Mile Working Party:** No specific proposal was made in relation to this body, although the continued need for it was queried. Given the synergies and potential for overlap with the wider Culture Committee, as well as its non-decision making status, it is recommended that this Working Party be dissolved, with the Culture Committee taking on its areas of focus.
23. In total, these changes (if accepted) would result in a decrease of up to two grand committees (Capital Buildings and Freedom Applications) and the removal of P&R sub-committees, plus up to a further three non P&R sub-committees through mergers (Benefices Sub, Corporate Asset Sub, Procurement Sub).
24. In the interests of clarity and greater co-ordination, it is also proposed that each sub-committee shall be chaired either by the Policy Chair directly, or by their nominee, subject to the Committee's endorsement in the usual way. This will replace the highly-varied arrangements currently in place across the different bodies, which can lead to some confusion and mean that the Policy Chair does not necessarily enjoy appropriate co-ordination or oversight of important areas under their remit.

### **Finance Committee**

25. The continuation of the Finance Committee in its current form was supported across the board, including remaining as a Ward Committee. Of its five sub-committees,
- **Corporate Asset Sub-Committee** – As set out above, a merger is proposed with the Projects Sub-Committee. This could also potentially include Procurement Sub.
  - **Digital Services Sub-Committee** – Whilst Members were broadly supportive of this area of activity no longer resting with the Finance Committee, there was a lack of consensus as to whether it should be moved to the remit of another Committee or, instead, be established as its own Grand Committee, given the ever-increasing reliance on IT and various changes expected to come through the Target Operating Model (TOM), which were anticipated to remove the IT function from the Chamberlain's department (although it should be noted that future arrangements are currently under review through the TOM process and no firm decision has yet been taken as to the shape of such future arrangements). A number of Members also proposed it be moved to sit with the Establishment Committee (with the new body potentially renamed "Corporate Services Committee"), given the significant and integral impact of IT services on staff.



Ultimately, the prevailing view is felt to have been for it to become a standalone service committee, given the fundamental significance and impact of digital services on the organisation (the role of which will only grow over time), and the need to have the capacity to engage effectively with the various stakeholders across the organisation and beyond, providing the requisite coordination in approach and purpose. The Committee would also take on board responsibility for information governance, giving it a more robust and cohesive remit.

- **Efficiency and Performance** – Whilst a proposal had been mooted for this Sub-Committee to be moved to the Audit & Risk Management Committee, Members were minded that the role of this Sub-Committee was sufficiently distinct from that of Audit & Risk Management that a merger would be unwelcome. No change is, therefore, proposed.
- **Finance Grants Oversight and Performance** – Noting the distinction between BHE and non-BHE grant-making, Members were opposed to a proposal this be moved to the BHE Board. However, Members of the Sub-Committee in particular have articulated their concerns as to the unclear and limited purpose of the Sub-Committee, and the value added as a consequence. Members will be aware that a separate comprehensive review of the various charities operated by the City Corporation is currently underway and being taken through committee processes. It may well be that, following this period of rationalisation, a discrete working party or similar is necessary to provide some sort of review or co-ordinating function; however, at this point in time, the existing Sub-Committee is no longer required and should be abolished. In the event that any new body with a specific purpose is required after the charities review is concluded, it would be subject to a bid via the new processes established for the creation of new sub-committees.

In the interim period annual reporting on Benefits-in-Kind and the Central Grant Programme will be taken directly to the Finance Committee. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund will continue to be overseen by RA Sub-Committee.

- **Procurement** – The aforementioned merger with Projects Sub and Corporate Asset Sub has been suggested by several Members, although there is less natural synergy with this area of work and the other two existing sub-committees. Members may wish to consider accordingly.

### **Investment (paragraphs 298-299 and 304)**

26. The Investment Committee currently sits, in practice, as a vehicle by which the Property and Financial Investment Boards are appointed (together with the former Social Investment Board, which has been dissolved). The investment strategy itself is set by the Policy & Resources Committee, with the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee determining the recommended proportions between property and non-property assets on Investment Committee's advice. The creation of the Bridge House Estate Board also means that responsibility for BHE Investments now rests with that Board. In view of this limited function and

infrequency of meetings (just twice a year), the Governance Review's recommendation was that the Investment Committee was not necessary as a separate Committee and that it should be folded into the Finance Committee (with the Property Investment functions moved separately to a new Property Committee).

27. During discussions, Members expressed a range of opinions as to whether or not a dedicated Investment Committee should exist or not, and whether or not it should have a greater or altered remit. However, the consistent and fundamental theme that emerged was the feeling that the current arrangements provided an insufficiently joined-up approach to the oversight of the Corporation's investment activities generally and that, whatever the outcome of the Review process in terms of committees, the key to success would be in addressing the structures and outputs of investment strategy setting and monitoring.
28. Given the BHE Board's separate responsibilities over investments, the challenge becomes to achieve a joined-up approach which respects the individual responsibilities around the funds, whilst also providing for a co-ordinated and complementary approach. The use, then, of joint meetings and joint committees becomes a logical option in order to address this and ensure a coherent and co-ordinated approach.
29. In the first instance, a co-ordinating body is required to replace the nominal role of the Investment Committee in monitoring overall performance but, more importantly, to provide a significantly enhanced role in the joint development of investment strategies for consideration by P&R/RASC and BHEB. This requirement shall be met through joint meetings of RASC (as the designated P&R Sub-Committee with responsibility for such activity) and BHEB, together with the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of the Finance Committee and the refreshed **Property Investment and Financial Investment Boards** (see below). It may also be beneficial to invite Chairs of other Grand Committees not already included to attend such meetings, in order to facilitate a more collectively understood and supported investment strategy. This would have the benefit of improving upon existing co-ordination without the requirement to establish a separate committee. Investment strategy and asset allocation decisions would continue to be taken by RASC for City Fund and City's Cash by the BHE Board for BHE. (The question of pension fund investments is addressed later in this report).
30. For the Financial Investment Board, Members were broadly minded that it would not be appropriate to move its activities to the Finance Committee, given the substantially differing natures of the two areas of focus and the need for dedicated oversight of investment across asset classes. Equally, whilst noting proposals for a separate Property Committee, Members were minded that property investment in general was significantly different from questions of the maintenance of operational property and were reticent to support such a merger. For both, the same questions around ensuring coherent approaches across the various funds also arose.
31. It is, therefore, proposed that both PIB and FIB become joint sub-committees of

P&R, Finance, and the BHEB, with each nominating representatives and a number of places also reserved for direct election by the Court. Both would retain the power to co-opt external expertise as they see fit, as well as to report directly to the Court.

32. It should be noted that BHE Board reserves the right to make all decisions in respect of Bridge House Estates; therefore, that Board's views would need to be sought as to whether it would be willing to participate in this arrangement and continue with the process of having FIB and PIB act in what is technically an "advisory" capacity and reserve final decision-making for relevant items to itself.

### **Pensions Committee**

33. Although not mentioned within the Review, Members are also asked to consider the creation of a new body to have responsibility for the management, administration, and investments of the City's Pension Fund, a subject which arose during the Member engagement process.
34. The Corporation has a distinct and separate role from its other functions as an administering authority of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). As an administering authority the Corporation is responsible for operating the Pension Fund, establishing investment arrangements and employer contribution rates that safeguard the payment of benefits to scheme members as and when they fall due. The administering authority must also safeguard the solvency of the Fund through periodic actuarial valuations, actively manage risks around potential employer default and monitor all aspects of the Fund's performance.
35. The Pension Fund has investment assets valued at £1.3bn and estimated liabilities of £1.4bn (as at 31 March 2021), making this a key area of risk for the organisation. At present responsibility for discharging this role resides variously with the Investment Committee (via Financial Investment Board), the Establishment Committee, and the Finance Committee. Whilst these arrangements have enabled the Corporation to fulfil its statutory responsibilities satisfactorily to date, regulatory guidance is that governance should be improved further via the establishment of a dedicated Pensions Committee with decision-making powers (it should be noted that the role of the existing non-executive Local Government Pension Board is to scrutinise decision making, so it cannot absorb this function).
36. Although not a mandatory requirement, Pension Committees are the overwhelmingly dominant mode of governance across the LGPS and the City Corporation is increasingly out of alignment in failing to manage its arrangements in this way (it is believed that we may be the only body operating under differing arrangements). A separate Pensions Committee ensures that all key strategic decisions are taken by one body, supporting streamlined, consistent and aligned decision-making across the function. It also cultivates, in one place, the specific knowledge and understanding needed to effectively oversee the Pension Fund in its entirety. Finally, it allows the administering authority to manage potential conflicts of interest and to demonstrate to external

stakeholders, in a transparent and straightforward manner, that decisions are taken in the interests of scheme members and employers without privileging the host authority. If agreed, the first activity for this new Committee would be to carry out the next triennial actuarial valuation and resultant investment strategy review.

37. If Members endorse this proposed new body, a report will be brought back specifying terms of reference and membership arrangements (modelled on best practice elsewhere across the sector).

### **Capital Buildings Committee (and Proposed Property Committee) (paragraphs 300-303)**

38. As mentioned above, whilst there was some agreement with the suggestion that there was insufficient total oversight of the City's property functions, Members were generally opposed to a merger of various property-related committees in the manner he suggested. It was felt that there was too much of a difference between, for instance, the skills and focus required to manage property investment compared to the project management expertise required on Projects Sub or Capital Buildings. The proposal for a combined Property Committee was, therefore, not supported.
39. On the specific question of the Capital Buildings Committee, several Members observed the strategic importance of the work of Capital Buildings, together with significant resource allocation implications, and the occasions where there might be a delay in approvals due to the need for dual sign-off. Given the importance of pace in these major projects, this was posited as an argument for bringing it closer to Policy & Resources, so as to ensure greater alignment and pace in decision-making; it was also observed that the remit of the Committee was such that it could function equally effectively as a sub-committee, provided its terms of reference were framed appropriately.
40. Whilst the proposed Property Committee was not supported directly, there was nevertheless some support expressed for a different mechanism by which this overall overview might be provided. To that end, it is suggested that a small number of joint meetings of (or briefings to) the Policy & Resources Committee, Capital Buildings Sub-Committee, Projects & Operational Property Sub-Committee, Bridge House Estates Board, and Property Investment Board be held (with Chairs of other Committees invited as relevant or appropriate), at which the City Surveyor and Chamberlain shall be asked to present overarching analyses of the City Corporation's activities across all property-related workstreams.

### **Audit & Risk Management (paragraph 305)**

41. There was a unanimous sentiment that this Committee should remain as-is (and not take on the additional responsibilities of the Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee, as advocated by in the initial Review).

### **Establishment (paragraphs 334-340)**

42. There was broad opposition to the proposal to abolish the Establishment Committee, with various arguments made for its continued retention.

43. Some Members suggested that the name be changed to reflect its function in relation to Corporate Services (for instance, the Corporate Services Committee), on which Members' views are sought.
44. In addition (and as referenced earlier within this report), there were several suggestions that the Committee should take on the Digital Services Sub-Committee's functions, in view of the inextricable link between staff, IT systems, and the delivery of services; however, this is not proposed, in view of the desire to ensure Digital Services has sufficient prominence and focus under the new arrangements.
45. The Committee's existing sub-committee (the Joint Consultative Committee) needs to continue to exist to undertake its role in negotiating with the City Corporation's recognised trade unions. It is also noted that a new sub-committee, covering Diversity & Inclusion, is proposed under Policy & Resources: consideration as to whether this sub-committee should be under the joint auspices of P&R and Establishment is invited.

#### **Planning & Transportation Committee**

46. Members will be aware that this is the subject of separate consideration and reporting in terms of its future operation and the potential adoption of a Panel-based system for the consideration of applications. However, for the purposes of this report and the sake of completeness, it should be stated that the Committee will continue to exist within the new structure regardless of any ultimate decision in relation to Panels, and as a Ward Committee.

### **SERVICE COMMITTEES**

#### **Port Health & Environmental Services (paragraph 318)**

47. No change was recommended through the initial review, nor did any material changes emerge through the Member consultation process. The Committee should, therefore, remain as-is.

#### **Markets (paragraph 319)**

48. Due to what he describes as its "light load", the findings of the initial Governance Review recommended that the Markets Committee be abolished and for its business to be delegated to officers.
49. Members expressed a range of opinions on this proposal. Whilst there was some support for immediate abolition, others expressed hesitancy given the ongoing markets consolidation programme and the potential implications thereof, suggesting that it should be retained until the new markets site opens and then subject to a further review at that time. However, it was widely accepted that there was no need for this to continue to be a Ward Committee, given the very few Wards currently affected directly by the existing markets.

50. It is, therefore, proposed that the Markets Committee be changed from a Ward to a non-Ward Committee, and re-designated the Markets Board. There would be a commensurate reduction in membership, down to a maximum of 15 Members, all to be elected directly from the Court (with staggered terms to provide for continuity), although any Members who held tenancies at any of the markets should be ineligible from serving. The future of the Committee shall then be the subject of review upon delivery of the new Markets Site.

#### **Culture, Heritage & Libraries (paragraphs 324-328)**

51. Initial proposals around this Committee ceasing to be a Ward Committee were not supported in general; neither was the proposal to remove the Keats House Consultative Committee, which should be retained.
52. Through the Member engagement process, some suggestions were made that the Benefices Sub could be absorbed within an agglomerated sub-committee of Policy & Resources which takes on responsibility for ceremonial and civic matters (the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee). Members views are sought thereon.
53. Other suggestions were made in respect of a merger of the Committee with the Barbican Centre Board to create a composite Culture Committee; however, these were not widely supported.
54. At the RA Sub Away Day on 30 September 2021, Members supported the LMA becoming a small institutional department for the purposes of the Target Operating Model arrangements. In keeping with this decision, the LMA will now need its own Board to be constituted and established within the committee structure, with the relevant responsibilities removed from the Culture Heritage & Libraries Committee as a consequence.

#### **Community & Children's Services (paragraphs 331-332)**

55. Whilst the Governance Review proposed no amendments to this Committee, there were some suggestions made during the engagement stage around the abolition of this committee and the reallocation of its functions elsewhere. There was limited support for this option in general; however, there was, a greater degree of support for moving the housing function into a standalone committee, incorporating both the housing-related responsibilities of this Committee (including those of the grand committee and those overseen by the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee) together with those of the Barbican Residential Committee.

#### **Barbican Residential Committee (paragraph 353-356)**

56. Lord Lisvane recommended the abolition of this Committee, for the reasons articulated in paragraphs 353-356 of his Review. Further, while making no recommendation in respect of the Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee, as it is not a Committee of the Court, he suggested that the Corporation may wish to review the way in which it engaged with all residents (not just those of the Barbican Estate) upon abolition of the Barbican Residential Committee.

57. During the engagement process, Members noted a submission from the Barbican Association outlining its thoughts on the future of the area, and also noted called for the adoption of a replacement for the BRC that would involve both lessees and officers in undertaking the obligations of City Corporation as landlord of the Barbican residential estate. Subsequent further engagement highlighted profound disappointment as to the current relations between the Corporation and Barbican residents as a collective.
58. Irrespective of any view one might hold as to the governance structures relating to the Barbican Estate (and the significant efforts of the immediate past Chairman in improving matters should be noted), it is widely felt that consultation with residents (and, indeed, other partners and stakeholders across the Estate) has been sub-optimal for some time. Consultation is currently disparate and disconnected; different departments will lead consultation on different issues, often not joining up with other ongoing activities or, on some occasions, with any awareness of them. Residents and other stakeholders can, understandably, be left unsure as to whom concerns or comments should be addressed, or whom they should expect to receive feedback or communications from. This has contributed to growing concerns that the resident voice is not being heard, or that the Corporation is not communicating its plans in an effective manner.
59. In addition, there are concerns that the disaggregated way in which the Estate is managed (with different departments or committees responsible for walkways, street scene, signage, repairs and maintenance, and so on) means that there is a shortfall in the overall vision and management of the Estate. This causes concern not only in respect of the management of an iconic City asset, but also in terms of its future-proofing.
60. All this exacerbates grievances expressed concerning the outcomes of the 2003 referendum around the Estate's management, where undertakings made by the Corporation around resident engagement and involvement are believed to have not been delivered on to the level that might have been expected.
61. A crucial component of any solution, then, is to address the questions of collaboration, communication, and consultation, providing clear lines of engagement and giving an improved and effective method of interaction for the City, residents, and other Estate stakeholders.
62. In the first instance, establishing a wider dedicated Consultative Group would provide this improved mechanism, where representatives of all key stakeholders (not just residents) can meet regularly to discuss and help monitor ongoing and emerging developments across the Estate. Not only would this be a logical "one-stop shop" for all consultation activities to be announced, but a specific consultation and action tracker can provide direct visibility and confidence to resident stakeholders that their concerns are being heard and addressed, and that nothing falls between the cracks. The engagement of Estate users in a single forum would also provide for an opportunity a more cohesive overview of the Estate's management, potentially leading to the development of an Area Plan in

due course and allowing concerns about the cohesive oversight of the Estate as a whole to be addressed.

63. It must be emphasised that this improved engagement cannot not be limited to the Barbican Estate. There are, of course, particular circumstances around the Barbican which justify more atypical arrangements: for instance, no other City estate houses a School, arts centre, conservatoire, and so on, so the establishment of a particular User Group for engagement across this disparate stakeholder groups makes sense. However, it would be entirely inequitable to not establish analogous arrangement around improved engagement across other estates, and indeed, across the wider City (noting that a significant proportion of City residents do not live on Estates), as appropriate.
64. Inevitably, there will be cost implications associated with any such approach (likely to consist primarily of a small number of dedicated officers, some of which might be met through the reallocation of existing resources). Should Members support this proposed approach, costings can be brought back to provide an opportunity to consider the extent of arrangements it is willing to support.
65. In terms of the formal remit of the BRC, this would be relocated to a new Housing Committee, with meetings arranged such as to provide dedicated scrutiny for Barbican matters (please see below).
66. One particular area where residents were keen to see additional involvement was enhanced input into how their management fee is spent (in relation to the upkeep of the Estate). If Members would support an increased level of participation, then it must be ensured that expenditure reflects accurately the income obtained from fee-payers (i.e. there must be transparency around existing elements of cross-subsidy across the Estate) so that decisions are taken properly in relation to the designated funds; equally, any say into decisions on expenditure must be fully democratic, transparent and reflective of the will of all residents (not simply a small number of delegates of representative associations).
67. To that end, it is suggested that existing residential representation bodies be approached to discuss how potential plebiscites or surveys might be undertaken to ensure proposals align with residents' wishes, with the newly constituted Committee asked to present formal proposals on their behalf to the Court once discussions and options have been advanced sufficiently.

### **Housing Committee**

68. Arising from the above, one of the proposals advanced by several Members was the creation of a new Housing Committee, absorbing both the housing responsibilities of Community & Children's Services Committee (and its Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee) and the remit of the Barbican Residential Committee, giving greater prominence and co-ordinated consideration to the increasingly important area of housing.



69. However, in establishing any such arrangement, Members have made explicit the importance that due consideration be given to managing the business of both “areas” of housing business separately, so as not to allow for one aspect of its responsibility to dominate consideration. It is vital that consideration of the City Corporation’s social housing and almshouses responsibilities not be coloured unduly by the weighty separate considerations around the Barbican Estate, and vice-versa.
70. To that end, it is proposed that the new Committee be structured such that it meets on a monthly basis, with agendas arranged such as to allow for consideration of Barbican Residential business and current Housing Management business on an alternate meeting basis. Bringing together a single membership to consider all housing issues will allow for greater cross-pollination of ideas and awareness of common themes across the housing portfolio, as well as allowing for learning around engagement practices with residents to be shared more effectively and rapidly.
71. The new Committee should be established consistent with the Governance Review’s proposals in relation to size (i.e., 12-15), whilst also taking into account sufficient representation at meetings by Members of Wards within which relevant housing estates are located.
72. Should the principle of a new Housing Committee be approved, a detailed proposal would be brought back for consideration consistent with the above principles.

**Police Authority Board (paragraph 499-521, 527, 529 and 534-537)**

73. Whilst noting the various recommendations made through the initial review, Members were cognisant of the significant recent and ongoing efforts made by the Police Authority Board in respect of revised governance arrangements, many of which addressed those proposals to various degrees. In view of this, no changes are proposed.
74. However, it should be noted that the initial Governance Review recommendations did propose various degrees of greater autonomy for the Police Authority Board and the City of London Police (in keeping with the general proposals for the City’s various institutional departments, referenced later within this report). In particular, this relates to matters associated with human resources, financial management, procurement, and so on, where current governance arrangements could be streamlined more effectively. Whilst these were not debated at any length during the engagement process, Members may nevertheless wish, therefore, to encourage the Board to bring forward such proposals as it sees fit which might assist with increasing efficiency and providing greater clarity / streamlining in respect of lines of accountability in such cases.

**STATUTORY BODIES AND OTHERS**

75. The Governance Review also identified the following committees which have a purpose fixed by statute or other legal arrangement and which are required to continue, or which currently perform niche or specialist roles. For the vast

majority, Members supported his recommendation of no change; where change is proposed, this is outlined below.

#### **Licensing Committee (paragraph 374)**

76. No changes were advanced to the role of this Committee, given its statutory functions and its effective manner of operation.

#### **Local Government Pensions Board (paragraph 376)**

77. Given its very particular statutory role, no changes were proposed. Whilst there was some consideration given to combining this Board with the new (separate) Pensions Committee, legal advice has demonstrated that this would be inadvisable and highly challenging to achieve in a compliant fashion.

#### **Health & Wellbeing Board (paragraph 375)**

78. Together with the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee (below), the Governance Review commented on the relatively narrow statutory functions and proposed no change. No substantive calls for change came through the engagement process, although a small number of Members (in proposing the abolition of the Community & Children's Services Committee) suggested that adult social services and homelessness be transferred to this body. It is worth noting that the unique composition of this Board is fixed by the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

79. However, Members will wish to note that a new Health & Social Care White Paper is currently progressing through Parliamentary processes, which is likely to have a significant impact on the role and remit of Health & Wellbeing Boards. At this point in time it would be precipitate to presume the outcome of Parliamentary debate; however, it is inevitable that this will require some level of further consideration once outcomes are known. The Health & Wellbeing Board is monitoring the position and considering what changes may be necessary to increase the efficacy of the Board in line with this.

#### **Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee (paragraph 375)**

80. As above, no firm changes were proposed. Whilst there were one or two suggestions that this might revert to being a sub-committee (as it was prior to 2015), it was noted that the change had been made in response to clear Government guidance which recommended a separate overview and scrutiny committee to avoid any potential conflicts of interest (e.g., for Members also sitting on Community & Children's Services or the Health & Wellbeing Board). It is also not permissible for it to be merged with the Health & Wellbeing Board. As the work of this body is fairly discrete, and there would be no meaningful implication for a change on overall number of bodies, nor on workload for Members or officers, it is recommended that this body be left as-is with no change. This is also consistent with the initial Governance Review proposal.

#### **Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee (paragraphs 321-323)**

81. This Committee should be required to resume activity and meet on at least an annual basis. Whilst there was some suggestion that this could become a sub-committee of the Audit & Risk Management Committee, the way in which the Police and Justice Act 2006 is framed renders this challenging to deliver in a

legally compliant fashion; further, it is a particularly niche function which does not mesh comfortably with A&RM's oversight of general Corporation matters.

82. Following a recent review of the Safer City Partnership (a body outside the committee structure in which Members have traditionally played some role), it has also been determined that a review of the operation of both bodies is necessary, so as to ensure that they comply more effectively with both legal requirements and national best practice in this area. Consequently, it is proposed that this Committee be retained and that a report proposing refreshed arrangements – both in respect of the Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee and the Safer City Partnership Strategy Group - be submitted in the Autumn.

### **Gresham (City Side) Committee (paragraph 333)**

83. No changes were proposed, both in view of the specific requirements imposed by the obligations of Sir Thomas Gresham's Will and subsequent legislative items, and the effective work of the Committee to-date in discharging its functions with minimal administrative requirement.

### **Freedom Applications Committee (paragraph 352)**

84. Whilst the initial Review proposed no change, a suggestion has been made through the engagement process that this Committee's role – being very specific, and yet linked inextricably to questions of wider policy, public relations, and hospitality – might not merit continued status as a standalone body. It has, instead, been suggested that this could be absorbed within the new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee of Policy & Resources.

### **Fraud and Cyber Crime Reporting and Analysis Service Procurement Committee**

85. Members will recall that this new Committee was established in March 2021 to meet with specific Home Office requirements associated with the governance of a major procurement exercise. It is time-limited and expires in April 2024.

## **EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS**

86. Commentary around the institutional departments in the initial Review outlines various management processes and problems identified across all the institutions which, it argues, its recommendations would resolve. These include greater responsibility for:
  - a. Overseeing their own Audit & Risk management regimes / arrangements
  - b. De-centralised Human Resources arrangements
  - c. Greater Financial Control and Management
  - d. Devolved responsibility for obtaining Legal advice
  - e. Control over Procurement functions
87. A report on the agenda for the 14 October 2021 meeting of the Policy & Resources Committee referred to separate considerations taken in respect of the level of autonomy to be granted to the various institutions around these functions. A pilot scheme (previously approved by this Committee) is also currently underway at the City of London School which seeks to model increased

autonomy in relation to procurement arrangements (albeit in a way that is consistent with wider City Corporation strategies, such as climate action). Should this be successful, it is likely that this would be replicated across the various institutions, in ways appropriate to their specific arrangements. For that reason, this report does not address this issue further at this stage, but focuses more on the structure of the Boards themselves.

88. This separate report also addresses considerations relating to the question of reporting lines and day-to-day interactions between the institutions, their Boards, and the corporate centre.
89. In summary, throughout the Member engagement process, there emerged a conflicting tension between the general desire to grant the institutions more independence whilst also protecting the City Corporation's brand and position given its status as funder of last resort.
90. On balance, in respect of governance arrangements Members were supportive of a move towards greater autonomy, as well as a rebalancing of the various Boards away from an outright Common Council majority; however, they were not prepared to go so far as to grant full practical independence and, further, stipulations would be required within the terms of reference to provide the Corporation Members with a veto or other such control mechanism in relation to financial matters, such as to protect the Corporation's financial interests.

#### **Independent Schools - City of London School, City of London School for Girls and City of London Freeman's School (paragraphs 459 - 472)**

91. The proposals of the initial Governance Review for the three School Boards were similar and, essentially, proposed the creation of a governance scheme which would allow them to remain in City ownership whilst, in practice, enjoying near-total independence in their management and operation.
92. For the reasons set out above, there is a reticence to grant full autonomy at this stage; however, general support for significant changes to the composition and mechanism of appointment to the Boards was expressed. The current sizes of the three Boards were felt to be too large (although the Freeman's School's recent reduction in size is noted) and their balance weighted too heavily towards appointing Common Councillors, irrespective of skills or expertise.
93. Whilst some suggestions around a joint Board for the Boys' and Girls' Schools were made, these did not garner significant levels of support and were also opposed by the Schools themselves. Although it was noted that such arrangements had been employed previously, there was a feeling that the two schools were significantly divergent and required specific strategic oversight from a dedicated Board.
94. It is, therefore, proposed that the School Boards be asked to review and propose revised Board composition and appointment arrangements which they feel would best meet with their requirements in providing strategic oversight moving forwards. In doing so, they should be mindful of best practice in the independent schools sector, as well as the need to ensure adequate (albeit minority)

representation from the Common Council, with voting rights sufficient to protect the City Corporation's financial interests.

95. It should be noted that it is likely that the Boards will propose a joint sub-committee to oversee the new Junior School, which has been established as a joint venture, in due course. Given the likelihood that a new committee or sub-committee of some sort is likely to be necessary, the numbers and lists set out in this report incorporate provision for such, for the sake of completeness.
96. On the administrative side, several Members advocated the merits of moving clerking responsibility for the School Boards away from the Corporate Centre and devolving this to the Schools (should they so wish). For the Boys' and Girls' Schools in particular, the appointment of an internal Clerk to the Governors working across both Schools would be consistent with other operational synergies that are currently being pursued and would deliver more bespoke support; understandably, clerks within the Town Clerk's department are generalists, having to service various committees across different disciplines, whereas this would provide for enhanced specialist support within the independent schools' governance context. There would also be potential cost savings to the corporate centre arising from not needing to provide the same degree of support, although some allocation will still be necessary to manage the interface with the corporate centre when reporting centrally (the clerk to the Education Board being the most obvious source of support, given the added benefit of direct information-sharing across the educational areas).
97. The method of operation of the Boards, insofar as their replication of the voluntary application of rules based upon Local Government regulations (as required for all current Grand Committees) should also be dispensed with, as the need to run meetings partially in public does not support effective school governance and creates bureaucratic challenge around meeting structure and committee report content which could cause potential concerns from the Independent Schools' Inspectorate regarding the quality of the Schools' governance arrangements.

#### **Guildhall School of Music & Drama (paragraphs 473 - 486)**

98. As with the independent Schools, the initial proposals also recommended that the Corporation should abolish the Board of Governors for the Guildhall School of Music & Drama as it currently operates, and instead establish an independent governing Board. However, as mentioned previously and akin to other institutions, there were very real concerns about the Corporation's financial position being protected, particularly given the ongoing uncertainties relative to the higher education sector and its funding arrangements.
99. Nevertheless and, as with the Schools, there remained some support for a greater degree of autonomy in respect of procurement and other arrangements, as well as for a re-balancing of the Board's composition to meet its needs in obtaining sufficient external expertise, whilst protecting the Corporation's financial position.

100. It is, therefore, proposed that the Board of Governors be asked to review and propose a revised Board composition which it feels would best meet with the conservatoire's requirements. This may well include the disapplication of Local Government-based regulations around access to meetings. In doing so, they should be mindful of best practice in the higher education sector, as well as the need to ensure adequate (albeit minority) representation from the Common Council, with voting rights sufficient to protect the City Corporation's financial interests.

### **Education Board (paragraph 330)**

101. The initial Governance Review recommended no change to the Education Board, a proposition which obtained broad support from Members during the engagement process.
102. However, through the engagement process there were several comments that the precise nature of the Board's role in relation to the City of London Academies Trust will require some further clarification following a review of the sponsorship agreement in due course. This will require a review of the Terms of Reference once the outcomes of that process are known.
103. One of the Education Board's two sub-committees, the Education Charity Sub-Committee, has not met since July 2019. Officers in the Central Grants Unit are proposing to bring a report to the Board in December for a final decision on the Education Charities but, in short, will be proposing that the Education Charity Sub-Committee is wound down and that the Education Board become the sole Committee acting as Trustee for these Charities going forward. This will streamline the decision-making process and support governance efficiencies. The report will also recommend that the consultation function with Community and Children's Services (CCS) Committee will no longer be required. Amendments will therefore also need to be made to CCS Committee Terms of Reference going forward, if this is approved.

### **Barbican Centre Board (paragraphs 487 – 494)**

104. As with the other institutions, there was support for a degree of greater autonomy for the Board in relation to procurement processes and so on, as well as in terms of reporting and interaction with the corporate centre (as set out in the aforementioned report (considered by Policy & Resources on 14 October).
105. The recent changes that the Court had previously approved in adjusting the Board's composition were noted as having already gone some way towards addressing issues of balance and composition.
106. Members were mindful that, unlike the other educational or cultural institutions, a significant proportion of the Barbican was funded via City Fund and, consequently, its business must be treated under local authority regulations.
107. As a result, there are no firm proposals relating to the Barbican Centre Board emerging from the Review at this stage; however, in keeping with the best practice with which the Board has already been operating, it is encouraged to keep its current composition and arrangements under review and bring forward

proposals as it sees fit. Similarly, questions of interaction with the corporate centre and requirement to comply with certain corporate processes will continue to be explored through the related institutional review activity being undertaken.

### **London Metropolitan Archives**

108. Under the Target Operating Model, it was originally envisaged that the London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) could be treated, operationally, as an institution. As with all other defined institutions, this would mean that the LMA would require its own Board and to be more autonomous from the City of London Corporation.
109. Responsibility for the governance of the London Metropolitan Archives currently lies with the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee. This is specifically referenced in their terms of reference, as follows: “...*to be responsible for...the management of the City’s libraries and archives, including its functions as a library authority in accordance with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 and all other powers and provisions relating thereto by providing an effective and efficient library service...*”.
110. The London Metropolitan Archives, in addition to its public archival functions, also provides corporate services across the City Corporation’s departments and institutions in that it holds and archives, and provides access to, the City Corporation’s own internal corporate records. London Metropolitan Archives also has the Guildhall Library and the Small Business Research and Enterprise Centre (SBREC, formerly known as the City Business Library) within its management group: the day-to-day administration of these two Guildhall based services is the responsibility of their own managers.
111. At the meeting of Policy & Resources Committee on 14 October, Members confirmed that the London Metropolitan Archives, due to its national importance, should be treated as an ‘institution’ (and have its own Board, separate to Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee), and thus a paper will be forthcoming in December, setting out the proposed composition and terms of reference for a London Metropolitan Archives Board. It is critical that governance arrangements need to be commensurate with other national archives and the wider galleries, libraries, archives, and museums (GLAM) sector to ensure appropriate standing.
112. At present, there is less clarity on what should happen with the Guildhall Library and the SBREC. For Guildhall Library, there are plans to run a consultation to gather the views on future options which can then be presented to Members for decision. This follows a report taken to Culture Committee in September 2020, when a consolidation of LMA and Guildhall Library was proposed; Members decided not to go ahead with the proposal and asked for further consultation. The SBREC, given the differences in function, outlook and concentration on SMEs, would not fit naturally within the wider LMA, so consideration will need to be given as to where this would sit going forwards.

### **OPEN SPACES**

113. In summary, the initial Governance Review proposed an agglomeration of all existing open spaces committees under a single body, to be known as “The Open Spaces Committee.” This single body, he suggests, would allow the Corporation

to continue to discharge its various related requirements by having the new Committee being constituted as ‘the Committee acting on behalf of the Corporation in respect of *[insert relevant statutory/testamentary requirement]*’ or similar, with a suitably worded Resolution from the Court to confirm this. Under the same principle, this would also allow the new body to fulfil any and all charitable responsibilities. The agendas for the new body could also be arranged to reflect the mode in which the Committee was operating.

114. The engagement process highlighted robust opposition to this proposal, both across the Court and amongst stakeholders involved with the various Open Spaces Committees. Doubts as to both the practicalities of such a proposal were advanced, not least given the legal requirements around memberships which would need to be met.
115. Further, it was noted that the management structures associated with several open spaces were currently undergoing significant changes through the TOM process and that any changes made precipitately at this point in time could lead to future arrangements not being aligned sensibly.
116. Given this, together with the local sensitivities for important open spaces based outside the City and the need to pay mind to the views of local stakeholders, the broad consensus was that it would be unwise to pursue any governance changes to the grand committees at this point in time.
117. There was similar reticence to the suggestion of abolishing the various existing consultative committees, which were widely felt to be of significant utility and benefit. However, it was observed that the current practice of treating them as part of the formal committee structure was, perhaps, unnecessarily burdensome. Not only did the associated administrative and bureaucratic requirements add unnecessary cost, but the removal of consultative processes from local areas contributed to a sense of disassociation from processes amongst local communities, with people potentially discouraged from interaction with a formal committee process operated from many miles away in Guildhall.
118. Instead, it was suggested that retaining these bodies, yet moving them outside of the formal committee structure and transferring administration to the local departments and areas, would not only minimise costs but would also provide the benefit of greater local autonomy and engagement in the consultative processes.
119. There was, however, a sentiment that this might not be possible with respect to Hampstead Heath, given the particular requirements of legislation associated with that open space.
120. Consequently, it is proposed that the existing bodies continue to operate but cease to be maintained by the Committee & Member Services Section; instead, they be operated on a more informal basis administered by the local service area.
121. Regarding the Wanstead Park Working Party, there was no opposition to a specific recommendation that this should be abolished due to its inactivity since



2016; equally, the Epping Forest Management Plan Steering Group should be dissolved for the time-being (noting it may be re-established on request if and when it is required).

### **Transitional Arrangements and Implementation Timescales**

122. Subject to Members' views as to the various proposals, there is self-evidently a large degree of activity which will need to take place in the coming months to allow for timely implementation. This includes items such as the presentation of various adjustments to terms of reference, revisions to standing orders to frame the implementation of new procedures, and so on. The ex-officio memberships across committees will also need to be realigned, given the potential deletion of certain existing committees. A schedule with requisite activities and timelines will be confirmed pending Members' decisions in respect of proposals in this paper.
123. Following consideration by Members of your Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, these proposals were presented to the informal Court meeting on 11 November. Pending consideration by the Policy & Resources Committee this day, it is intended they would then be submitted to the Court of Common Council for formal consideration in December. This would then provide a full quarter for implementation of such consequential changes as are required to give effect to the decisions taken as to structures, as well as for appropriate communications to officers concerning future reporting arrangements, such that they can take effect following the 21 April 2022 Court meeting,
124. It is also strongly recommended that a Post-Implementation Review take place, at a suitable period following the implementation of new arrangements. This process could be relatively light-touch and methodical, but as a matter of best practice is essential in ensuring things can be amended, improved upon, or removed as appropriate, ensuring any arrangements are right for the longer-term.

### **Implications**

125. **Financial and Resource implications** – Whilst the proposals within this report amount to a significant reduction in the number of bodies incorporated within the Court of Common Council's formal decision-making structure, it should be noted that this does not constitute the full array of committees / related bodies serviced by the Town Clerk's department (and City Corporation officers more widely). As can be seen within the list at Appendix 1, support is also provided to a number of the bodies identified in the initial external Review (such as the City of London Academies Trust, the Livery Committee, and so on) which are not bodies of the Common Council. Similarly, support is also provided for other outside bodies, such as the Museum of London, which were not identified in the external Governance Review document and do not form part of the Corporation's Committee structure but which, nevertheless, the organisation has a responsibility to service.

126. Nevertheless, the move towards more efficient processes will inevitably lead towards reduced costs of bureaucracy and facilitate associated contributions to Target Operating Model and Fundamental Review savings. For instance, expedited processes will lead to a reduction in costs associated with delays to approvals; a lesser volume of time spent by officers in producing reports for low-level items and presenting them to multiple committees will also release capacity within the workforce. A reduced central administration burden (through devolving support responsibilities in certain areas) will also provide for flexibility within the Committee & Member Services team to realign service output and requirements.
127. **Climate Implications** – The proposals included in this paper do not carry any significant implications for the Climate Action programme.
128. **Equalities implications** – Under the Equality Act 2010, all public bodies have a duty to ensure that when exercising their functions they have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and to take steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people and encourage people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low. The proposals contained in this report do not have any potential negative impact on a particular group of people based on their protected characteristics.
129. **Risk implications** – as with any process of significant change, there are risks associated with implementation and unforeseen challenges as the new system embeds. The approval of a post-implementation review, to identify and address any such issues, will be an important mitigating factor.
130. **Security implications** – none.

## **Conclusion**

131. The proposals outlined within this report represent a range of proposals to increase the efficiency of business and improve the efficacy of the City Corporation's governance arrangements. Members' views are sought as to the proposals herein, to inform the proposals to be submitted formally.

## **Appendices:**

- **Appendix 1:** List of committees (with proposed changes marked)
- **Appendix 2:** Committee Structure Charts – Current and Proposed
- **Appendix 3:** Recommendations Summary Table (and Responses to original proposals) ([available electronically](#))
- **Appendix 4:** Review into the City Corporation's Governance arrangements ([available electronically](#) or on request)

**Amended - List of Committees (with changes marked)**

**Committees**

- Audit and Risk Management Committee
- Barbican Centre Board
- ~~Barbican Residential Committee~~ (replaced with new Housing Committee)
- Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School
- Board of Governors of the City of London School
- Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls
- Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama
- **Bridge House Estates Board** (replaced City Bridge Trust)
- ~~Capital Buildings Committee~~ (becomes sub-committee of P&R, with power to act)
- City of London Police Authority Board
- Community & Children's Services Committee
- Culture, Heritage and Sport Committee
- **Digital Services Committee**
- Education Board
- Epping Forest & Commons Committee
- Establishment Committee
- Finance Committee
- Fraud and Cyber Crime Reporting and Analysis Service Procurement Committee
- ~~Freedom Applications Committee~~ (remit transfers to new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)
- Gresham (City Side) Committee
- Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee
- Health and Wellbeing Board
- **Housing Committee**
- ~~Investment Committee~~ (replaced with joint meetings and enhanced FIB/PIB)
- Licensing Committee
- Local Government Pensions Board
- **London Metropolitan Archives Board**
- Markets Committee
- Open Spaces and City Gardens
- **Pensions Committee**
- Planning and Transportation Committee
- Policy and Resources Committee
- Port Health & Environmental Services Committee
- ~~Standards Committee~~ (replaced with Independent Panel, outside of this structure)
- ~~Standards Appeals Committee~~ (replaced with Independent Panel, outside of this structure)
- ~~The City Bridge Trust~~ (remit transferred to new Bridge House Estates Board)
- West Ham Park Committee

## Sub Committees

- Academic & Education Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School
- Academic and Personnel Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School
- ~~Assessment Sub (Standards) Committee~~
- Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- ~~Benefices Sub (Culture, Heritage & Libraries) Committee~~
- Bursary Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School
- Bursary Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School
- Bursary Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls
- City of London Police Pensions Board
- City Junior School Joint Sub-Committee
- Civic Affairs Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee
- Communications Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee
- ~~Corporate Asset Sub (Finance) Committee~~
- ~~Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee (expired during Review process)~~
- ~~Digital Services Sub (Finance) Committee~~
- Economic and Cyber Crime Committee of the City of London Police Authority Board
- ~~Education Charity Sub (Education Board) Committee (subject to confirmation through Charities review)~~
- Efficiency and Performance Sub (Finance) Committee
- Finance & Estates Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School
- Finance and Estates Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls
- Finance and Resources Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board
- ~~Finance Grants Oversight and Performance Sub Committee~~
- Finance, General Purposes and Estates Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School
- Financial Investment Board
- ~~General Purposes Committee of Aldermen (not a part of the Common Council's committee structure)~~
- Governance and Effectiveness Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Governance Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School
- Governance Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls
- Grants Committee of the Bridge House Estates Board
- ~~Hearing Sub (Standards) Committee (abolished as part of changes to Standards arrangements)~~
- Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee

- ~~Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee~~
- Equity Diversity & Inclusion Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee
- Integrated Commissioning Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee
- Licensing (Hearing) Sub-Committee
- ~~Lighting Up Deputation Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee~~ (this is not actually a sub-committee and is incorrectly listed as such)
- Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee
- ~~Magistracy and Livery Sub-Committee (General Purposes Committee of Aldermen)~~
- ~~Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee~~
- Nominations Committee of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freemen's School
- ~~Nominations Committee of the Court of Aldermen~~
- Nominations Sub-Committee of the Audit and Risk Management Committee
- Nominations Sub (Education Board) Committee
- Nominations, Effectiveness & Inclusion Committee of the Barbican Centre Board
- Operational Property, Projects, & Procurement Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee
- ~~Outside Bodies Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee~~ (absorbed within new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)
- ~~Procurement Sub (Finance) Committee~~ (merger with Projects Sub / Procurement Sub)
- Professional Standards and Integrity Committee of the City of London Police Authority Board
- ~~Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee~~ (merger with CASC / Procurement Sub)
- Property Investment Board
- ~~Reference Sub (Barbican Residential) Committee~~ (blanket deletion of Reference Sub-Committees)
- ~~Reference Sub (Committee of Aldermanic Almoners, Common Council Governors and Donation Governors of Christ's Hospital) Committee~~
- ~~Reference Sub (Licensing) Committee~~
- ~~Reference Sub (Markets) Committee~~
- ~~Reference Sub (Port Health and Environmental Services) Committee~~
- ~~Reference Sub Committee of the Barbican Centre Board~~
- Remuneration and Nominations Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama
- Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee
- Resource, Risk & Estates (Police) Committee
- Safeguarding Sub (Community & Children's Services) Committee
- Senior Remuneration Sub (Establishment) Committee
- ~~Social Investment Board~~
- Staff Appeal Committee
- Strategic Planning & Performance (Police) Committee
- ~~Street Trading Appeal Hearing~~ (these are ad hoc panels established in the event of an appeal, so should not be listed as a standing sub-committee. It has been many years since any hearing took place).
- Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee

## Overview and Scrutiny

- Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee
- Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee
- Inner North East London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

## Consultative Committees

- ~~Ashted Common Consultative Group~~
- ~~Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee~~
- ~~Billingsgate Market Consultative Advisory Committee~~
- ~~Burnham Beeches and Stoke Common Consultation Group~~
- ~~Epping Forest Consultative Committee~~
- ~~Epping Forest Joint Consultative Committee~~
- Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee
- ~~Highgate Wood Consultative Group~~
- Keats House Consultative Committee
- ~~Queen's Park Consultative Group~~
- ~~West Wickham, Spring Park and Coulsdon Commons Consultation Group~~
- ~~Joint Consultative Committee~~
- ~~Independent Custody Visitors Panel (this is not part of the committee structure and so should not be listed here)~~
- Barbican Consultative User Group

## Working Parties

- ~~Ceremonial Protocols Working Party of the Policy and Resources Committee (now Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)~~
- ~~City of London School for Girls 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Working Party (the anniversary having passed, this was abolished during the Review process)~~
- ~~Cultural Strategy Working Group (this Group has not met for several years and is therefore proposed for deletion)~~
- ~~Culture Mile Working Party~~
- ~~Dispensations (Standards) Working Party (abolished during the Review process as a consequence of Standards-related changes)~~
- ~~Education Strategy Working Party (this Group has not met for several years and is therefore proposed for deletion)~~
- ~~Epping Forest Management Plan Steering Group (this Group has not met for several years and is therefore proposed for deletion)~~
- Gresham Working Party
- Competitiveness Advisory Board
- ~~Hospitality Working Party of the Policy & Resources Committee (now Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)~~
- ~~Housing Development Programme Working Party (abolished during the Review process)~~
- ~~Members Financial Assistance Working Party (has concluded the bulk of its work during the Review process; remaining functions transfer to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)~~
- ~~Members Diversity Working Party (merged with Tackling Racism Taskforce to become Inclusion Sub-Committee)~~

- ~~Relocation of the Markets Working Party~~ (this was incorrectly listed and was not constituted as a formal Working Party, so should not appear here)
- ~~Secure City Programme Oversight Group~~ (this was incorrectly listed and was not constituted as a formal Working Party, so should not appear here)
- ~~Statues Working Group (expired October 2021)~~
- ~~Tackling Racism Taskforce~~ (becomes new Inclusion & Diversity Sub)
- ~~Wanstead Park Working Party~~ (has not met since 2016, proposed for abolition as per Lord Lisvane's recommendation)

**Other bodies (NB – whilst these were listed by Lord Lisvane within his Review, they are not part of the Common Council's formal committee structure)**

- Livery Committee (a body of Common Hall)
- House Committee of the Guildhall Club (an independent committee)
- City of London Academies Trust and its sub-committees (an external body)
- Christ's Hospital (treated as an outside body)
- Safer City Partnership (a statutory body not under the Common Council)
- Member Development Steering Group (an informal reference body)
- Museum of London and its sub-committees (not referenced by Lord Lisvane but listed here for completeness)

***Committees of the Court of Aldermen (which are outside of the Common Council's purview)***

- *General Purposes Committee*
- *Nominations Committee*
- *Mayoral Visits Advisory Committee*
- *Magistracy & Livery Sub-Committee*
- *Emanuel Hospital Charitable Trust*
- *The Management Committee of Aldermen to Administer the Sir William Coxen Trust*