

Committee:	Date:
Policy & Resources Committee	17 February 2022
Subject: Review of Standing Orders	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1-12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

In December 2021, the Court of Common Council determined new governance arrangements, arising from a comprehensive Governance Review undertaken by Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, and following extensive Member consultation as to the implementation of his various recommendations.

Arising from the changes approved, a series of consequential amendments to Standing Orders are required, so as to give effect to the decisions made by the Court. Similarly, amendments have also been required due to changes relating to the introduction of the Bridge House Estates Board, as approved by the Court earlier in the Governance Review process. This report details these consequential amendments required.

The Governance Review process also highlighted a number of other areas where further consideration of specific Standing Orders would be beneficial. Whilst these are less time-critical (i.e., changes are not required immediately to give effect to the implementation of the new post-Governance Review arrangements), it is considered both timely and appropriate to provide an initial opportunity to consider all items in the round. The various items are, therefore, also presented for Members' consideration.

Finally, it should be noted that the ongoing reviews of the Project Procedure, Procurement Strategy and other documents in keeping with the outcomes of the Governance Review may lead to further consequential changes being required in due course. It is intended that the incorporation of these amendments would also provide an opportunity for a further housekeeping exercise to improve the presentational arrangements of the document.

Recommendations

That Members:

- consider the proposed amendments to Standing Orders set out in this report, for onwards submission to the Court of Common Council; and

- delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to make any such changes as are required following the Committee's consideration to facilitate onward submission to the Court of Common Council.

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 came to conclusions in respect of the Competitiveness agenda (Section 5) and, separately, Bridge House Estates, earlier in the process, before considering the wider committee structure and general principles for the operation of processes in December 2021.
4. As a consequence of those decisions, various amendments are required to be made to Standing Orders, in order to give effect to the decisions reached by the Court and to allow for their implementation in the new municipal year. These are set out in this report.
5. In addition, a series of separate observations were made both by Lord Lisvane and by various Members throughout the Review process in respect of Standing Orders. In the interests of completeness, they are also set out in this report for Members' consideration.
6. Subject to Members' views, the Standing Orders will be updated for implementation in the new municipal year. Further adjustments are likely to be required as a consequence of related reviews in due course concerning certain thresholds and it is considered that this will also provide a helpful opportunity to take additional time to modernise the presentational aspects of Standing Orders.

7. Moving forwards, Standing Orders shall also be the subject (together with the Scheme of Delegations) of more regular, annual review, as it is important for the Corporation to take a more agile and responsive approach to its governance arrangements (as opposed to waiting for larger, set-piece periodic reviews).

Summary of Changes

8. While the amendments are marked in the appended Standing Orders document (Appendix 1), for ease of reference and comprehension the table below provides a list summarising all changes made. This list also provides the accompanying rationale for any change, or highlights where specific consideration on an option is required.
9. As Members will note, some changes simply give effect to the decisions already taken by the Court in establishing the Bridge House Estates Board and through the Governance Review, while others are points of clarification or corrections of typographical and formatting errors.
10. In addition, there are a number of areas which were raised through debate over the period and which require specific consideration; for instance, whether Members would wish to pursue changes to various thresholds or time limits concerning the conduct of debate at Court meetings. As these particular areas have yet to be discussed by Members, they have not yet been incorporated into appendix 1. Instead, Members' views are sought, together with delegated authority to allow for your Committee's determinations to be reflected in the Standing Orders document, ahead of consideration by the Court of Common Council. For the sake of ease of reference, these are highlighted in the table below using *italic*

Standing Order No.	Summary of Change / Rationale	Reason for Revision / Consideration
1(3)(e) (Application and Interpretation)	Following recent changes in the Town Clerk's Departmental structure: where there are references to the "Town Clerk", the <i>Deputy Town Clerk</i> and only <i>one</i> Assistant Town Clerk will be authorised to act in the absence of the Town Clerk, or where there is a vacancy in the office of Town Clerk.	Clarification / correction
<i>2 (Suspension of SOs)</i>	<i>A question has been raised as to whether a higher threshold than a simple majority should be required to suspend specific Standing Orders. Members' views are sought.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
3(2)(a) (Adjustments – Financial Limits)	The SO currently empowers the Town Clerk and Chamberlain to make changes in keeping with changes to the value of money. In practice, this has not been done in some time; therefore, mandating it as part of the annual review process will mitigate against the risk of thresholds falling out of kilter as years pass and is recommended.	Governance Review outcome
4 (Access to Meetings – non-Local/Police Authority Business)	An adjustment to reflect the Court's decision to disapply the practice of inappropriately treating its non-local authority business under the provisions of local government legislation.	Governance Review outcome
9(4)(a) (Referral of Reports - threshold)	<p><i>This point of consideration reflects P&R's recent concerns over the referral of a planning application. Whilst the referral mechanism is a useful one and the Court must retain the ability to exercise sovereignty on issues Members consider of importance, you may wish to consider a modest increase in the number of signatories required to, say, 1/5 (20%) of the membership of the Court, so that there is a greater confidence anything escalated is of significance to a substantial proportion of the Court.</i></p> <p><i>Wording is also proposed to reflect the fact that it is not permissible to refer Licensing determinations to the Court (due to the parameters of separate legislation which supersede Standing Orders). Given the recent discussion concerning Planning applications, Members may also wish to consider whether they wish to specify that it should not be in order to refer Planning applications under this mechanism.</i></p>	<i>For consideration</i>

9(4)(b) (Referral of Reports – urgency referrals)	<i>Members have expressed disquiet at the late circulation of information prior to meetings, particularly where there is insufficient time to digest documents. Members may wish to consider changing the deadline for urgent referrals to 12noon the day before the Court, as 12noon on the day renders it impractical to print and/or publish electronically and circulate the report in time, let alone allow Members to read and consider what could be a significant volume of information.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
10 (Ballots – open and recorded)	Lord Lisvane proposed that provision should be made for ballots for appointments to committees, outside bodies, etc. to be undertaken in an open and recorded manner, rather than by secret ballot (as is currently the case). P&R was not minded to support this change when considering it in June 2021 and so an amendment is not included in the revised Standing Orders (and the Governance Review outcome would be to make no change); however, the observation is listed here for completeness and in case Members wish to revisit the consideration.	Governance Review outcome
10(3) (Ballots – physical or digital)	<p><i>Your Committee may wish to consider whether the Court should continue with paper ballots in Court itself, or instead undertake ballots in advance of meetings (where able).</i></p> <p><i>During the Covid period, ballots for appointments to committees / outside bodies were undertaken electronically prior to Court meetings, with ballot papers issued shortly after the Summons allowing several days to complete and submit them. The results were announced prior and the Court then appointments made at the meeting on the basis of the outcomes. This had the advantage of meaning that the will of the whole Court was known (rather than just those able to be present on the day), whilst also saving time taken up by balloting at Court meetings themselves. However, it is recognised that this might constitute an additional administrative burden for Members in advance of Court meetings and ballot emails may be missed (especially in the event of technical difficulties), whereas a hard copy on the day obviates that risk.</i></p>	<i>For consideration</i>
10(4) (Ballots – different voting arrangements)	<i>A preferential voting system is currently used where there are multiple candidates for a single vacancy. All other contests are managed on a first-past-the-post basis. Members may wish to consider whether this divergent approach should be continued, or whether a uniform approach would be preferable.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>

	<i>In case of benefit in coming to a determination, there have been no “preferential” votes undertaken since March 2017 where there has been no change between the Member who gets the most votes in the first round of voting and the Member who is ultimately appointed following all vote reallocations.</i>	
<i>10(5) (Ballots – Term Allocation)</i>	<i>Members may wish to consider whether, in circumstances where varying terms are being allocated on the basis of seniority / votes received, discretion should be provided to allow for the allocations to be re-arranged if all successful candidates are in agreement. This could be beneficial in situations where someone anticipating standing down from the Court in the next year or two would otherwise be awarded the longer term.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
<i>11(3) (Motions – time limits)</i>	<i>The Mover of a Motion is currently afforded 10 minutes to open and close debate, which some Members have reflected feels excessive. Given the overall time allocation for Motions is 60 minutes, this would potentially account for 1/3 of all available time; therefore, a reduction to, say, a maximum of 7 minutes each to open and close would provide greater opportunity for wider debate by the Court whilst still representing a sufficiently lengthy period for the Mover to make their points.</i> <i>Members’ views are sought.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
<i>11(4) (Motions - Amendments)</i>	<i>Members may wish to consider whether to insert a subsection to provide for notice of any amendments intended to be moved, so as to allow for wording to be made available in advance and inform debate (other than those which are consequential upon matters arising from the debate and so flow naturally from it / could not have been pre-empted).</i> <i>Alternatively (or additionally), there may be some merit in proposing that amendments made during the meeting be handed to the Town Clerk in writing, so they can be shown on a screen or otherwise made clear in order that Members are certain what they’re voting on.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
<i>11(11) (Adjournment)</i>	<i>Members may wish to consider whether to include provision for the Lord Mayor to adjourn the Court immediately, for a specified period, so as to avoid unnecessary delay (for instance, where the Fire Alarm is sounded and a swift evacuation is necessary, such as in March 2016).</i>	<i>For consideration</i>

12(3) (Motions - threshold)	<p><i>As with referrals, it has been suggested that the current number of signatories required (10) is a relatively low proportion of the Court.</i></p> <p><i>Members may, therefore, wish to consider whether a slight increase would be desired, to ensure Motions for debate are on matters which reflect the views of a sufficient number of the Court.</i></p>	For consideration
12(4) (Motions – urgency)	<p><i>As with urgent referrals, an earlier deadline would be beneficial in ensuring that there is time for the Lord Mayor to consider properly the grounds for urgency and the Motion's validity, as well as to ensure the Motion can be circulated and made known to Members and members of the public in advance of the meeting. Bringing the deadline forward to 9am on the day of Court, for instance, would provide an additional window within which to facilitate this greater transparency of process.</i></p> <p><i>Members' views are sought.</i></p>	For consideration
12(5) (Motions – withdrawal)	<p><i>Lord Lisvane proposed that the ability of the Mover and Seconder to withdraw a Motion should be removed. Another suggestion that arose through the Governance Review process was that the Mover and Seconder should have the ability to make amendments to the Motion at the outset, with the Court's consent.</i></p> <p><i>Members' views are sought.</i></p>	For consideration
12(6) (Motions – expiring time)	<p><i>At present, a warning that the time limit for the consideration of Motions is being neared is only provided when moving to another Motion.</i></p> <p><i>In practice, Members have found it helpful to be informed of remaining time limits as a matter of course and so it is suggested that altering the Standing Order, such that notice is provided of remaining time automatically would be beneficial in helping to manage debate.</i></p>	For consideration
12(7)(c) (Motions – Rescind / Revisit)	Formatting / numbering change for purposes of clarification and ease of reference	Formatting

13(4) (Questions – Addressing the Court)	An amendment to provide for the Chairs of all sub-committees empowered to report directly to the Court (under SO9) to speak (for instance, the Property Investment Board, Capital Buildings Board, etc.).	Clarification, Governance Review outcome
13(5) (Questions – number))	<i>Lord Lisvane suggested that the current facility for a Member to submit up to three questions is unduly generous and should be reduced to one per Member.</i> <i>Members' views are sought accordingly.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
13(13) (Questions – Policy Statement)	<i>Lord Lisvane proposed that a greater number of questions should be permitted here.</i> <i>Separately, it has been suggested may be advisable to move this subsection to sit under SO6 as a general provision, as it relates to a separate type of item than questions.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
13 (Questions – Written submissions)	Lord Lisvane proposed the requirement for the wording of questions to be circulated, so as to avoid lengthy preambles or a situation where the question asked on the day varies from the original posed. He also proposed changes in respect of the facilitation of written questions and responses in between meetings, and Members views are sought thereon.	For consideration
13 (Questions – Public Questions)	<i>Through discussion at the Court of Common Council in December 2021, it was asked that consideration be given to facilitating public questions.</i> <i>Such provisions are common elsewhere and normally require questions to be submitted in advance, with the questioner invited to have their question read or to ask it in person. It is normal for either a specific number or a particular time limit to be applied to help manage proceedings.</i> <i>Should Members wish to adopt this approach, a proposed protocol would be brought to your March meeting for consideration and adoption in the new municipal year.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
14 (Divisions)	<i>A suggestion has been made that the current Standing Order is, perhaps, overly prescriptive and would benefit from re-drafting to future-proof for the possibility of</i>	<i>For consideration</i>

	<i>electronic divisions and so on. Should Members so wish, a truncated SO will be inserted, linking separately to notes on different procedures for physical / hybrid / virtual meetings.</i>	
17(2) (Minutes)	This responds to a recent incident of confusion concerning the ability to raise points of discussion under the Minutes. It is not generally permissible under Local Government arrangements for Matters Arising to be raised under the Minutes in full Council meetings, neither is it in keeping with the traditional Local Government Standing Order for Minutes (nor the longstanding practice and intention of the Court's existing Standing Order). A revision to incorporate the wording of the traditional local government standing order would be "No discussion shall take place upon the minutes, except upon their accuracy and any question of their accuracy shall be raised by motion". This does not constitute a change in position, rather, simply a matter of clarification.	Clarification / correction
18(1) (Chief Commoner)	Clarification to make clear that Aldermen are not eligible to stand as Chief Commoner.	Clarification / correction
18(6)(b) (Chief Commoner – Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)	This reflects the creation of the new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee, approved through the Governance Review.	Governance Review outcome
18(6)(c) (Chief Commoner – Civic Affairs Sub-Committee)	<i>In view of the above, an amendment or deletion of (c) is also required depending on whether Members feel the Chief Commoner should be eligible to Chair committees.</i>	<i>Clarification / correction, For consideration</i>
18 (Chief Commoner – casual vacancy)	<i>Members might wish to consider whether a new sub-section is required to reflect arrangements for any vacancy which might arise, for instance through a resignation from the Court or death in service. In such circumstances, it has been the convention that the Immediate Past Chief steps into the role for the interim period, until such time as a new Chief Commoner (or Chief Commoner designate) is elected by the Court.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
20 (Petitions)	<i>The current wording is unhelpfully ambiguous and would benefit from a summary of the process being set out (i.e., that petitions are referred by the Court on to the relevant Committee(s) for further consideration).</i>	<i>For consideration</i>

	<i>As a longer-term consideration, Members may also wish to consider whether a process for electronic petitions, with a considered threshold to require a debate, might be explored (similar to what is in place for the House of Commons).</i>	
21 (Appointment)	A tweak to the wording is suggested to help prevent issue where (as has happened previously) the particular timing of Easter has caused this meeting to fall at the beginning of May.	Clarification / correction
22(1) (Committee Appointments – Limit)	A decrease from eight to six, as determined by the Court in December 2021.	Governance Review outcome
22(3) (Committee Appointments – Exemptions)	Amendments are required as a consequence of the change at 22(1) and due to the changes / abolition of the Capital Buildings and Standards Appeal Committees respectively.	Governance Review outcome, Formatting
25(2) (Vacancies – Process)	<i>Changes to formalise the process of notification and appointment would be beneficial, to provide clarity around process as well as to facilitate the Court's recommendations around "making best use of talent" agreed in December 2021.</i> <i>If Members are supportive, an amendment will be inserted to regularise the time periods for notice and nominations.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
26 (Terms of Reference)	<i>Lord Lisvane identified this Standing Order as unnecessary / superfluous and recommended its removal.</i> <i>Subject to Members' consent, it will, therefore, be deleted.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
New Standing Order	The insertion of a new Standing Order, which reflects the protocol approved by the Court concerning the limit on the numbers of committees considering items, would be beneficial. Draft wording is set out below for review. <i>1. Other than in exceptional circumstances, all reports shall be subject to approval by a maximum of three Committees or Sub-Committees.</i>	Governance Review

	<p>2. <i>The most appropriate Committee(s) in each instance shall be identified by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chief Officer in whose name the report is submitted.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Where the report in question affects the terms of reference of other committees (beyond the three identified as most appropriate), the Chairs/Chairmen of those committees to which the report is not submitted shall be notified and an opportunity provided to submit comments on behalf of their committee (to which the report shall also be circulated for information). The Chairs of those committees shall also be entitled to attend the decision-making meeting(s) to represent their committee's views.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Should any Chair/Chairman object to the decision taken in respect of (2) above, the final judgment of the Lord Mayor and Chief Commoner shall be sought.</i></p>	
27(1) (Sub-Committees)	Amendments are required to give effect to the decisions of the Court in December 2021 to provide greater control over the proliferation of sub-committees.	Governance Review outcome
27(2) (Sub-Committees – quorum)	Clarification to provide for local variations as required by specific circumstances	Clarification / correction
28 (Joint Committees)	<p><i>As identified by Lord Lisvane, the current SO is confused and refers to Joint Meetings of Committees rather than Joint Committees in the more generally understood local authority sense.</i></p> <p><i>As suggested by Lord Lisvane, given the intent of the SO is almost certainly to refer to Joint Meetings (as are used from time-to-time at the Corporation), it is proposed that this be re-worded to reflect an accurate position.</i></p> <p><i>Subject to Members' confirmation that they are happy for a revised SO to reflect this position, the wording will be clarified accordingly.</i></p>	<i>For consideration</i>

29(1)(e) (Chairs – meeting cancellation / rescheduling)	<i>Throughout the Governance Review process, several Members reflected on the need to move away from cancelling or changing the date / time of scheduled meetings due to the Chair's availability. The addition of some advisory wording to help emphasise this point may, therefore, be something Members wish to consider.</i>	<i>For Consideration</i>
29(2) (Chairs – Term Limits)	A correction of “Police Committee” to the CoL Police Authority Board.	Clarification / correction
29(3)(a) (Chairs – Exemptions)	An update to the listed committees to reflect changes made through the Governance Review.	Governance Review outcome
29(7) (Chairs)	An update to the listed committees to reflect changes made through the Governance Review.	Governance Review outcome
30(various) (Deputy/Vice Chairs, Policy & Resources)	Various amendments to reflect the decision by the Court in December 2021 to revert to a single P&R Deputy Chair.	Governance Review outcome
30(3)(a) (Deputy Chair – outgoing Chair eligibility)	An amendment to give effect to the Court's decision to remove the automatic right to serve; instead, the outgoing Chair shall be eligible for election as Deputy Chair in same way as other eligible Members.	Governance Review outcome
30(9) (Deputy Chair – ex-officios)	An update to the listed committees to reflect changes made through the Governance Review.	Governance Review outcome
29 & 30 (Chairs / Deputy Chairs – Election / Open Ballots)	As with SO10, Lord Lisvane proposed that the process for elections to these posts should cease to be by secret ballot. Members were not previously minded to support this change when considering it and so an amendment is not included here, but the consideration is listed here for completeness.	Governance Review outcome
31 (Ward Reception Committees)	A wording clarification to make clear the Court's practice of referring state hospitality to WRCs, i.e., hospitality relating to a visiting Head of Government or State, or another senior guest of sovereign / dignitary.	Clarification / correction
31(6) (Ward Reception Committees)	This relates to a practice which is now defunct, so can be deleted.	Clarification / correction

31(8) (Ward Reception Committees)	<i>Members may wish to consider a minor adjustment to provide for the possibility for an exception, where there is a specific reason (for instance, a Member with exceedingly close connections with the country or Head of State in question).</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
32 (Access to Meetings)	An alteration consistent with that made in respect of SO4, to reflect the decision around the inappropriate application of local authority legislation.	Governance Review outcome
35(3) (Attendance)	Updated to reflect changes to the Standards regime / the abolition of the committee.	Governance Review outcome
35(3) (Attendance)	<i>Following some recent discussions around certain items, Members may wish to consider whether attendance should be limited and at the Chair's discretion in certain instances, such as where the committee is considering staffing matters concerning named or identifiable members of staff, or where information has been provided in confidence by the Royal Household or Her Majesty's government. Clarification should also be provided in respect of inability to attend the private deliberations of Licensing Sub-Committees when they are coming to their determinations.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
36(1) (Quorum)	<i>Lord Lisvane proposed that a general quorum provision be inserted (for instance, 33% or similar). Members may wish to consider whether this should be mandated, rather than the individual arrangements agreed by the Court as at present. It should be noted, however, that there will be specific considerations that may need to be borne in mind which may cause challenges with a uniform application and would require further exploration (for instance, where there need to be specific representatives beyond a simple number of people present, e.g., the Local Govt Pensions Board, which requires at least one Employee Representative and Scheme Manager Representative).</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
37(1) (Conduct of Debate)	A small clarification to make clear that the reference includes reports.	Clarification / correction
37 (Conduct of Debate)	<i>A suggestion was made in the Governance Review process that Members may wish to consider whether there should be a limit on number of occasions on which an individual can speak to any one item, akin to the arrangements for the conduct of debate at Court (where each Member is permitted to speak twice on any motion). Members' views are sought.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
38 (Decisions)	<i>Lord Lisvane proposed providing the option for Members to call for a recorded vote on decision items (akin to a Division at the Court). Should this be something Members wish</i>	<i>For consideration</i>

	<i>to pursue, it may also be worth considering whether it should be for an individual to be able to demand this, or whether it should require a certain proportion of the Committee (for instance, 20%) to do so.</i>	
40 (Duration)	<i>Through the Governance Review process, several Members expressed dissatisfaction with the duration of some meetings. The suggestion has, therefore, been made that Members may wish to consider limiting the time by which a meeting may be extended (for instance, by a maximum of 30 minutes).</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
41(b) (Delegated Authority)	An adjustment to reflect the Governance Review outcome that, other than where circumstances make it impracticable, the wider views of the committee membership shall be sought in seeking to progress delegated authority decisions.	Governance Review outcome
42 (Conferences)	<i>This reference is somewhat outdated and the requirements are all captured within the Business Travel Scheme and Financial Regulations, so is superfluous.</i> <i>It is, therefore, suggested to Members that this either be deleted or, alternatively, a revision to refer directly to those documents.</i>	<i>For consideration</i>
43(1) (Outside Bodies)	A typographical correction (replacing the word “shall” with “may”).	Clarification / correction
45 (various) (Access to documents)	Typographical updates (references to City of London Corporation)	Clarification / correction
48 (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Reference to Budgets within the Standing Order title	Clarification / correction
48(2) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Distinction on the budget approval process for BHE being within the gift of the BHE Board	BHE Review
48(3) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Distinctions drawn between the responsible Committee/Board for revenue estimates and capital budgets for City’s Fund, City’s Cash and Bridge House Estates	BHE Review

48(4) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Distinctions drawn between the necessary regulatory compliance of City Fund/City's Cash and with the Bridge House Estates (and any other charity for which the City Corporation is the Trustee)	BHE Review
48(5) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Specifies the responsibility of the Chamberlain in respect of monitoring the City Fund and City's Cash only, against the approved Prudential Indicators and reporting (via the Finance Committee) to the Court if they are to be breached.	BHE Review
48(6) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Full reference to the City of London Corporation	Clarification / Correction
48(7) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Specifies and distinguishes the reporting lines for detailed revenue estimates of City Fund and City's Cash (via the Spending Committee and Policy & Resources Committee) and for Bridge House Estates, the relevant budgets, analysis of projected movements and proposed allocation of funding to the charity's primary and ancillary object (via the Bridge House Estates Board).	BHE Review
48(8) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Articulates the required reporting from the Finance Committee and Bridge House Estates Board to the Court of Common Council in March of each year for the City Fund, City's Cash and Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review
48(9) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Full reference to the City of London Corporation	Clarification / Correction
48(9) and 48(10) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	A new paragraph inserted relating to the commitment to income without the approval of the Court of Common Council unless otherwise provided for in the Standing Orders, with detail distinguishing the process for City Fund/City's Cash and the Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review

48(10) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Clarification that similar principles to those outlined in 48(9), shall operate for income items. Where income is received outside the City Fund and City's Cash budget set for the relevant year, or outside the annual budget for a charity for which the City Corporation is charity trustee, the relevant Service Committee (for Bridge House Estates this is the Bridge House Estates Board) shall be required to authorize acceptance of those funds which must be in accordance with the strategies and plans set for each fund.	BHE Review
48(11) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Distinction drawn between process for City Fund/City's Cash and Bridge House Estates, requiring estimated financial estimates to be considered by the Finance Committee and Bridge House Estates Board (respectively) before proposals are submitted to the Court of Common Council.	BHE Review
48(11) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Additional reference to authorisation under existing officer delegated authority added.	Clarification / correction
48(12) (Resource Allocation, Revenue Estimates, Capital Budgets)	Full reference to the City of London Corporation	Clarification / correction
49(1) (Financial Regulations)	Full reference to the City of London Corporation	Clarification / Correction
50(1) (Project Management)	Provides exemption of the Standing Order for Bridge House Estates projects, where the relevant responsibilities lie with the Bridge House Estates Board unless otherwise reserved to the Court of Common Council	BHE Review
50(1)(a) (Project Management)*	Responsibility for the City Corporation's programme of projects has been transferred to the Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee, who will have oversight of Project Management. Correction has also been made to reflect that this Sub Committee will be a joint Sub Committee of Finance and Policy & Resources Committee.	Governance Review outcome
50(1)(b) (Project Management)*	Responsibility for the decisions surrounding projects has been updated to capture that the authority will lie with the new Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee and the Spending Committee. Correction has also been made to reflect that this Sub Committee will be a joint Sub Committee of Finance and Policy & Resources Committee	Governance Review outcome

50(3) (Project Management)*	The new Operational Property and Project Sub-Committee will have responsibility for the review of the City Corporation's Project Procedure.	Governance Review outcome
50(4) (Project Management)*	<p>Addition of express provision for the Town Clerk to vary the Project Procedure for both City Fund/City's Cash and Bridge House Estates.</p> <p>Updated reference to the Operational Property and Project Sub-Committee (in place of Projects Sub-Committee) as the relevant body for the Town Clerk to consult with when considering varying the Projects Procedure in relation to individual projects.</p>	Clarification / Correction, Governance Review Outcome
51(2) (Procurement and Contract Letting)	Adds provision for the consultation of the Bridge House Estates Board in advance of any changes to the Procurement Regulations that have an impact upon the charity.	BHE Review
51(2) (Procurement and Contract Letting)*	Updated reference to the body responsible for the review of Procurement Regulations from the Finance Committee to the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee, as per the approved Governance Review Court recommendations.	Governance Review outcome
52(1) (Writing-Off Debts)	Tidying up of wording / Full reference to the Court of Common Council	Clarification / Correction
52(1)(c) (Writing-Off Debts)	Specifies provision for the writing off of debts in excess of £10,000 for City Fund and City's Cash (via the Finance Committee) and for Bridge House Estates (via the Bridge House Estates Board)	BHE Review
53(Various) Corporate Plans and Strategies	Deletion of "corporate" from "corporate plans" reference.	Clarification / Correction
53(1)(a) Corporate Plans and Strategies	Provision made to ensure that City Fund/City's Cash Corporate Asset Management Plans be subject to annual review by the relevant Committee of Court, whilst the Bridge House Estates Board will perform this role for Bridge House Estates	BHE Review
53(1)(a) Corporate Plans and Strategies*	Change in the regularity of the Corporate Asset Management Strategy review from annual to not less than every five years as per current practice. No longer to be reported to the Corporate Asset Sub-Committee (which ceases to exist) but to the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee	Clarification / Correction, Governance Review outcome

	Distinctions articulated between reporting arrangements for operational and investment properties in respect of any proposed property transactions that are not in accordance with the strategies referred to in SO 53(1)	
53(1)(b) Corporate Plans and Strategies	Provision made to ensure that City Fund/City's Cash Investment Property Strategies be subject to annual review by the relevant Committee of Court, whilst the Bridge House Estates Board will perform this role for Bridge House Estates	BHE Review
53(4)(a) Corporate Plans and Strategies*	Change in approvals required for property transactions not in accordance with plans and strategies referred to in SO53(1) for investment and non-investment property to reflect the committees that will have oversight of those two portfolios (Property Investment Board and the Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee). Additional clarification about the Bridge House Estate Board's involvement for property within Bridge House Estates	Governance Review, BHE Review
54 (Capital Buildings)	Amendment to reflect new name and arrangements of the Capital Buildings Board	Governance Review
55(1) Acquisitions	Additional definitions added under acquisitions for Bridge House Estates "investment property assets" and "operational property assets"	BHE Review
55(2) Acquisitions	Full reference to the City of London Corporation	Clarification / Correction
55(2) Acquisitions	For Investment Property Assets - distinctions made for possible Total Acquisition Costs and the corresponding required approvals for the three separate funds: City Fund, City's Cash, and Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review
55(3) Acquisitions	For Operational Property Assets - distinctions made for possible Total Acquisition Costs and the corresponding required approvals for the three funds: City Fund, City's Cash, and Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review
55(3) Acquisitions*	Acquisitions of interest in operational property assets will need to be reported to the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Finance Committee.	Governance Review outcome
56 (Identification of Surplus Property)	Clarification in Standing Order title now includes reference to Operational requirements as Property Assets that are considered surplus may be for both departmental or operational requirement.	Clarification / correction

56 (Identification of Surplus Property)*	As per the Governance Review outcome, the introduction of a mechanism to allow for the new Projects & Operational Sub-Committee to raise and progress discussion on assets which it believes are surplus.	Governance Review outcome
56(1) (Identification of Surplus Property)	Clarification that Committees are required to consider the effective and efficient use of operational property assets within their management and control.	Clarification / correction
56(1) (Identification of Surplus Property)	The effective and efficient use of operational property assets for Bridge House Estates property will be monitored by the Bridge House Estates Board.	BHE Review
56(1) (Identification of Surplus Property)*	As committees consider the effective and efficient use of an operational property asset within their management/control (for City's Cash), this will be monitored by the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Corporate Asset Sub-Committee, which will no longer exist.	Governance Review
56(2)(a) (Identification of Surplus Property)	If a Bridge House Estates operational property is no longer required for use by the charity, a report must be made to the Bridge House Estates Board.	BHE Review
56.2.a (Identification of Surplus Property)	As committees consider whether an operational property asset within their management/control (for City Fund or City's Cash) is no longer required, a report on the circumstances will be made to the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Corporate Asset Sub-Committee, which will no longer exist.	Governance Review
57(1) (Freehold disposals)	Disposals of freeholds subject to 2000 year leases and of former freehold highway land shall be approved by the Finance Committee if part of City Fund/City's Cash. For Bridge House Estates, this will be subject to the approval of the Bridge House Estates Board.	BHE Review
57(1) (Freehold disposals)*	Disposals of non-investment property freeholds subject to 2000 year leases (for City Fund and City's Cash) will be subject to approval by the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Finance Committee.	Governance Review
57(2) (Freehold disposals)	For freehold disposals - distinctions made for anticipated receipt and the corresponding required approvals for the three funds: City Fund, City's Cash, and Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review
57(2) (Freehold disposals)	Updating the thresholds for committee approvals for the freehold disposals of City Fund/City's Cash non-investment property to reflect the changes to the Officer Scheme of Delegation (approved by Court in December 2021)	Scheme of Delegation alignment

57(2) (Freehold disposals)	Updating the reporting requirements for approval of the freehold disposals with an anticipated receipt of £5mil or above (for non-investment property) to the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Finance Committee	Governance Review
58(1) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)	Thresholds dictating approval required by Committee of leasehold disposals/surrenders (City Fund and City's Cash) revised in line with the Scheme of Delegation as approved by Court in December 2021	Scheme of Delegation alignment
58(1) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)*	The Committees that have the responsibility for approving the disposals/surrender of leaseholds corrected in line with the new Governance Structure	Governance Review
58(1)(a) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)	Increase on the threshold for lettings periods to 30 years or less for officer delegation, as agreed through the Scheme of Delegation review.	Scheme of Delegation alignment
58(1)(b) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)	For lettings - distinctions made for anticipated premium receipt and the corresponding required approvals for the three funds: City Fund and City's Cash.	BHE Review
58(1)(b) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)*	Authority to approve the grant any lease at less than full rack rental value for a period of 175 years or less shall, for City Fund and City's Cash non-investment property, lie with the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee in place of the Finance Committee.	Governance Review
58(1)(c) (Leasehold Disposals / Surrender)	For lettings - distinctions made for anticipated premium receipt and the corresponding required approvals for Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review
59(1) (Variations)	In the context of seeking minor variations to the terms of ground lease restructurings, disposals, acquisitions and other transactions, or to leases being taken by the City Corporation as tenant, specific reference has been added to confirm that this be the position whether acting as a trustee of Bridge House Estates or otherwise.	BHE Review
59(2) (Variations)	Revisions have been made to the threshold for approval (for variations to the terms of an existing lease, tenancy, licence or other agreement) revised in line with the Scheme of Delegation changes, as approved by Court in December 2021.	Scheme of Delegations alignment
59(2) (Variations)	This change relates to the distinct paths of approval for variations to the terms of an existing lease, tenancy, licence or other agreement relating to a property, stipulated for City Fund/City's Cash and for Bridge House Estates.	BHE Review

60 (Disposals subject to planning agreements)	In the context of land held by the City of London Corporation as freeholder approved for redevelopment, specific reference has been added to confirm that this be the position whether acting as a trustee of Bridge House Estates or otherwise added.	BHE Review
61 (Employee Handbook)	An amendment has been made to reflect change of name of the Establishment Committee to the Corporate Services Committee.	Clarification / correction
62(2) (Officers)	A clarification has been made to ensure it is understood the provision extends to Aldermen as well as Common Councillors.	Clarification / correction
62(3) (Officers)	An amendment has been made to reflect change of name of the Establishment Committee to the Corporate Services Committee.	Clarification / correction
63(1) (Appointments)	A minor amendment has been made to refer more clearly to the City Corporation.	Clarification / correction
63(2) (Appointments – Deputy Chief Officers)	Although no change is proposed here, it should be highlighted that this may need re-examination and amendment in due course following the completion of the Target Operating Model changes.	N/A (highlighted for completeness)
64(1)(c) (Disciplinary Action)	An amendment has been made to reflect the change of name of the Establishment Committee to the Corporate Services Committee.	Governance Review
64(6) (Disciplinary Action)	A change has been made to reflect that the "relevant independent person" appointed to the Statutory Officer Review Panel will be from the Independent Appeals Committee, following the abolition of the Standards Committee.	Governance Review
64(7) (Disciplinary Action)	Updated reference from the Police Committee to the City of London Police Authority Board, as it is now known.	Clarification / correction
64(7) (Disciplinary Action)	This wording has been altered to reflect the changes to the Standards regime.	Governance Review
64(9) (Disciplinary Action)	This simply reflects updated referencing within the Standing Orders	Clarification / correction

**Standing Orders marked with an asterisk have been drafted pursuant to the decisions taken by the Court in December 2021 to set up a new Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee and consistent with the direction to streamline and delegate relevant decisions making powers to said sub-committee.*

11. Corporate & Strategic Implications

- **Strategic implications** – These changes will facilitate efficiencies in the delivery of the City of London Corporation Strategy.
- **Financial and Resource implications** – 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
- **Legal implications** – the changes proposed in this report, if agreed by the Court of Common Council, will legally change internal organisational administrative procedures and regulate the conduct of meetings at the City of London Corporation.
- **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.
- **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.
- **Climate implications** - The proposals included in this paper do not carry any significant implications for the Climate Action programme.
- **Security implications** – None

Conclusion

12. It is recommended that the proposed changes be approved so that a substantial part of the Governance Review recommendations can be progressed and delivered.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Standing Orders with tracked changes

Background Papers

[Governance Review](#) (Report to the Court of Common Council – December 2021)

[Scheme of Delegations](#) (Report to the Court of Common Council – December 2021)