

Committee(s): Policy & Resources Committee	Date: 23 March 2023
Subject: Light Touch Governance Review – Initial Proposals	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	3,4,8,9,10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
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: The Town Clerk & Chief Executive	For Decision
Report author: Polly Dunn, Principal Governance and Member Services Manager, Town Clerk’s Department	

Summary

Following implementation of recommendations arising from the Lord Lisvane’s Governance Review in 2022, the Light Touch Governance Review (LTGR) was commissioned by Members to provide an opportunity to address any significant concerns arising out of the various new structures and processes. Officers have been tasked to bring back recommendations in areas that Members feel are clearly not working, where improvements could be made quickly, or where immediate intervention is required.

This report presents options for matters considered a priority ahead of the April Court meeting, at which Members will consider their annual appointments to Committees. It includes realistic options and proposals made directly in response to feedback and comment considered by the Policy & Resources Committee in February of this year. Changes to Terms of Reference are set out in Appendices A-F.

Due to the nature of what is being discussed, there are a number of variables for Members’ consideration. As such, Officers have drawn together their recommendations, but made clear where other options are available, should Members wish to consider an alternative direction of travel. It is also usual practice to grant delegated authority (in accordance with Standing Order 41b) in respect of any changes to terms of reference, to ensure that any matters discussed at Committee can be appropriately re-drafted ahead of Court’s consideration.

In addition to the various Terms of Reference up for review, the Standing Orders have also been revised and presented for consideration. Amendments have been made in line with proposals agreed in principle by Court in March 2022. Further changes also include those made in response to the LTGR and other changes that have been generated as part of the ‘business as usual’ annual review of committee terms of reference. A summary of changes can be found in Appendix G, with a detailed work up of proposed changes found in Appendix H.

Recommendation(s)

Members are invited to:

- i) Agree to merge the **Property Investment Board and Financial Investment Board** into a new Investment Committee, answerable directly to the Court of Common Council, and agree the revised Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A on this basis, including:-
 - a) To recommend that the existing FIB and PIB membership be directly appointed to the Investment Committee, with names to be drawn by ballot to determine how the term lengths will be staggered to ensure the usual gradual turnover in vacancies.
 - b) To note that the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegations are to be reviewed with the intention of revising the financial thresholds for reporting to Finance Committee on certain property related matters (SOs 55-59).
- ii) Support a change to the (currently joint) reporting lines of **Equality Diversity and Inclusion Sub**, such that it becomes a sub-committee of Policy & Resources Committee only, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Corporate Services Committee; and agree the revised terms of reference as set out in Appendix B to reflect this change.
- iii) Provide feedback on the **Civic Affairs Sub-Committee** terms of reference as set out at Appendix C and task Officers to bring back revised proposals in agreed terms to the next Policy & Resources Committee meeting.
- iv) Retain current arrangements for **Capital Buildings Board** (Appendix D) with no further action at this time
- v) Support a change to the (currently joint) reporting lines of **Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee**, such that it becomes a sub-committee of Finance, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Policy & Resources Committee; and agree the revised terms of reference as set out in Appendix E to reflect this change.
- vi) Task officers to explore suitable alternative arrangements for a **Culture Forum and Masterplan** and present back to the Committee within six to twelve months.
- vii) Support that no changes be made to the **Education Board and Independent School Boards'** terms of reference at this time, but commission officers to work on greater guidance for Members and Officers on the governance arrangements surrounding the City Corporation's Family of Schools.
- viii) Refer concerns relating to the reporting of benefits in kind, and on the constitution of the Efficiency and Performance Working Party, to the **Finance Committee** for initial consideration.
- ix) To update the **Policy & Resources Committee** Terms of Reference (Appendix F) in line with other decisions taken in response to this report.

- x) Consider the proposed changes set out in summary form at **appendix G**, and detailed within **appendix H**, provide comment and agree those for onward submission to the Court of Common Council in April 2023.
- xi) Delegate Authority to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of this committee, to revise the Terms of Reference of all the appended Committees and Sub-Committees, for consideration by the Court of Common Council and/or the relevant Grant Committee.
- xii) Authorise the Town Clerk to make amendments to the Standing Orders and Committee Terms of Reference that arise directly from decisions taken today (e.g., the renaming of committee(s) and reflecting that in all governance documents) including the introduction of any explanatory footnotes.

Main Report

Background

1. In September 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. Proposals were ultimately considered and agreed by the Court of Common Council in December 2021, for implementation from April 2022.
2. The Court acknowledged that the governance changes would require some time to bed in, possibly years. However, given the significant volume of changes, it was difficult for Members and Officers alike to predict just how the dust would settle. With this in mind, Members of the Court agreed to conduct a short-term, 'light-touch' review to provide an opportunity to amend elements that they believe required more immediate attention.
3. The focus of the Governance Review had, understandably, been centred around the overall reduction in number of committees. This LTGR provides an opportunity to reconsider what the 'function' and 'performance' should be.
4. Having sought Members' initial views on which elements should be brought forward as a priority, which actions should be pursued thereafter and, if relevant, which require no further action, this report brings forward the matters deemed a priority in the P&R Committees February meeting and which were the subject of subsequent discussion at the Informal Court meeting in late February.

Property Investment Board and Financial Investment Board (PIB and FIB)

Background

5. At the February Policy & Resources meeting, there was broad support for a merger of the Property Investment Board and the Financial Investment Board. This proposal would assist in the streamlining of investment activities and reporting, more intelligent formulation of recommendations around investment strategy and

asset proportion considerations, and benefit from pooling of the skills of Members and Officers in an appropriate forum.

6. In addition to the merger, there was an overall request to abolish 'joint' sub-committees. PIB, FIB, Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee and Equality Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee are jointly constituted by two Grand Committees of the Court. The reason they are constituted as such, is because the Sub-Committees are currently each responsible for work areas from two 'parent' grand committees.
7. This framework has led to confusion of overall responsibility (i.e. what matters need to be referred to which grand committee) and reporting fatigue (including double reporting of minutes, etc.).
8. Currently PIB and FIB report into both Finance Committee and Policy & Resources Committee. As per the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegations to Officers, Finance is the conduit for Property matters (e.g. the disposal or purchase of property). Policy and Resources Committee is responsible for approving overall strategy and policy in respect of the City Corporation's assets. The Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, is responsible for the determination of the appropriate investment proportions between property and non-property assets.
9. Should it be the preference of Members, it would be possible to use this opportunity to re-establish a Grand Committee, as it existed pre-Governance Review. Given that both PIB and FIB currently have arrangements within their terms of reference that allow the Chairman and Boards to report directly to the Court of Common Council, they are de-facto grand committees in all but name would reduce the reporting lines making it accountable directly to Court, except in instances reserved for other committees (i.e. RASC would remain responsible for the proportion of investments between investment and non-property assets). Accountability to both Policy & Resource and Finance Committee could also be retained by virtue of direct appointment rights, as outlined in draft Terms of Reference in **Appendix A**.
10. Should Members agree to merge PIB/FIB, and convert it into a Grand Committee, or a sub-committee answerable to Policy & Resources, the Committee may wish to consider removing reference to Finance Committee from within Standing Orders 55 to 59 and empowering the new Investment (sub) Committee to take decisions up to the same thresholds (see revised SOs, attached at appendix G). This would remove barriers and streamline reporting, particularly given the 'rubber stamp', or passporting service Finance provides in this respect. Alternatively, the threshold of reporting to Finance could be amended but options for this have yet to be explored with appropriate officers.
11. It has also been suggested that it would make sense to increase these financial limits to avoid unnecessary extra work and/or to allow such matters to be ratified by Finance Committee and/or Court under appropriate information papers. The result would produce a slicker process and achieve exactly the same result without impacting disclosure. Work is currently underway to consult with officers on potential changes to the Scheme of Delegations but this would result in later

changes to the relevant standing orders. This would reduce the volume of property reporting and urgencies through the Finance Committee.

12. This proposal reduces the overall number of committees within the COL's Governance Structure, in line with the original Governance Review ambitions. In doing so it streamlines and clarifies reporting arrangements to other Committees and the Court of Common Council.
13. It allows Members to be appointed for four-year terms, on a staggered basis, therefore improving the retention of skills and corporate knowledge in a way that is manageable and democratic.

Options:

- i) To leave the sub-committees as two distinct bodies, jointly reporting to two grand committees.
- ii) To merge PIB and FIB into a Sub-Committee that reports into either Policy & Resources Committee or Finance Committee
- iii) **To merge PIB and FIB into a Grand Committee, answerable directly to the Court of Common Council, consider revised thresholds for reporting to the Court of Common Council and/or the Finance Committee and agree the revised Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A (Recommended).**

Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Sub-Committee

Background

14. Much like PIB/FIB, the primary concern with EDI lay with its 'joint' sub-committee status.
15. In terms of which responsibilities of the EDI Sub Terms of Reference fall under the purview of Corporate Services, and which to Policy & Resources, it is a indistinct picture. Whilst arguably all elements will apply to City Corporation staff, the cross-cutting nature of EDI and the Corporations broader obligations in this area, would fall to the Policy & Resources Committee. For this reason it is presently recommended that the sub-committee report into Policy.
16. To assist, the current terms of reference are set out at **Appendix B**. We have highlighted and marked with a + , all matters which pertain exclusively to staff and therefore is specifically limited the remit of Corporate Services Committee. On this basis, proposed wording has been added to ensure that proposals on these matters get reported up to Corporate Services in an appropriate fashion.
17. As with PIB/FIB and OPPSC, the committee-reserved appointments within the composition (which remains unchanged) will provide continued representation.
18. This arrangement will ensure that both grand Committees retain oversight of relevant issues, whilst providing clarification on overall responsibility and reporting lines.

19. This suggestion is, somewhat complicated by proposals within the general Committee Terms of Reference report on the agenda, which suggest that EDI (in broad terms) be added to the Corporate Services Committee Terms of Reference. If this is supported by Members, then the natural home for EDI would then be Corporate Services Committee.
20. Beyond the complexities of joint reporting, where the Court has appointment rights to sub-committees (like EDI) it is proposed that these be appointed for terms of up to four years. The reasoning behind this is because the process of re-appointment procedures every Spring, which mean that the Sub-Committee Court vacancies cannot be advertised and appointed to until the relevant Grand Committee has constituted the sub each year. The full membership is consequently not in place until June or possibly July of each year, resulting in three lost months of Member input at that particular sub.
21. Members may wish to consider this as a blanket rule across all sub-committees with direct appointment rights across the Court of Common Council. A draft change to the Standing Orders on this basis has been added to **Appendix G**.

Options

- i) Retain joint sub-committee status but clarify what aspects of its responsibilities are to be referred to which of its parent grand committees.
- ii) Establish as a sub-committee of Corporate Services Committee, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Policy & Resources Committee.
- iii) **Establish as a sub-committee of Policy & Resources Committee, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Corporate Services Committee. and agree the terms of reference as set out in Appendix B. (Recommended)**
- iv) Provide feedback and task Officers to bring back revised proposals in agreed terms to the next Policy & Resources Committee meeting.

Civic Affairs Sub-Committee

22. Along with feedback received from Members, it is evident from the frequency and length of these meetings that there are too many responsibilities sitting under this particular Committee.
23. It is currently responsible for: Standards, Benefices, Member Privileges, Member Financial Assistance, Member Learning & Development, Outside Bodies, Ceremonials and Hospitality.
24. Policy & Resources Committee seemed supportive that some form of bifurcation may be valuable, however, how to split the responsibilities it remains to be established.
25. There are, broadly speaking, three groupings that officers determine as 'natural' pairings. There is a relationship between ceremonials and hospitality. Then,

separately, between Standards, Member Privileges, Member Financial Assistance and Member Learning and Development. Finally, there is some synergy between Outside Bodies and Benefices.

26. If split into three parts, Members would be creating three groups, where had been one. This goes against the principles of the original Governance Review and arguably leaves one (OSB and Benefices) without sufficient business to warrant a distinct sub-committee or working party.
27. In addition to the volume of responsibilities, the question has been raised as to the unintentional diminishing of the role of the Chief Commoner in relation to many of these areas. According to the current published Chief Commoner Job Description, the Chief Commoner is responsible for the chairmanship of sub-committees and working parties responsible for the provision of City Corporation hospitality and consideration of the Commoners' privileges and related issues, and continues to be the foremost representative and proponent of Commoners in respect of their privileges and support (including acting as a key figure in matters of conduct). It has been suggested that the current arrangements for Civic Affairs Sub, for which the Chief Commoner is the Deputy Chair, arguably diminish the role of the Chief Commoner and prohibits their ability to lead on championing matters relating to Member issues.
28. The current Terms of Reference are set out at **Appendix C**, but the responsibilities therein have simply been re-arranged into the groupings outlined above. The highlighted text indicates areas which have, until 2022, fallen to working parties chaired by the Chief Commoner, in line with the published job description.

Options

- i) Make no changes to existing arrangements.
- ii) To bifurcate the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee in the terms set out in **Appendix C**, taking into consideration:
 - a) A fair and logical arrangement of matters and responsibilities.
 - b) Chairing arrangements of each body (with specific consideration as to the role of the Chief Commoner)
 - c) Whether these bodies should be Sub-Committees (with decision making responsibilities) or Working Parties (with more informal arrangements).
- iii) To bifurcate the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee in a manner different to that set out in Appendix C, as preferred by Members, taking into considerations points a-c set out above.
- iv) **Provide feedback on the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee terms of reference as set out at Appendix C and task Officers to bring back revised proposals in agreed terms to the next Policy & Resources Committee meeting. (Recommended)**

Capital Buildings Board (CBB)

29. An array of feedback was submitted in regard to the CBB. This varied from specific views that the Markets Co-Location Programme (MCP) should move to the oversight of another body, through to more general reflections on the increased capital and major projects programme, all the way through to the establishment of a Development Company.
30. As reported at your last Policy & Resources Committee, the establishment a new informal group 'Barking Reach Group – BRG' was to be considered (and has since been agreed) at a meeting of the CBB on 15 March. The Membership of this Group includes the representation from P&R, CBB, Markets and Finance, and will allow the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) to take decisions within agreed thresholds in a way that ensures continued strategic oversight from Members whilst providing greater pace and flexibility in respect of project decisions.
31. Separately, there have been separate discussions at the Markets Board on the MCP; these are contained within the report on the Annual Review of Terms of Reference found elsewhere on the agenda.
32. Given the recent decision to establish the BRG, Members may feel it would be precipitous to further change arrangements at this time, before the efficacy of this new group in addressing some of the previous concerns raised has been assessed. Furthermore, to press ahead with more governance arrangements around major projects without appropriate consultation with both officers and Members, could have a significant negative impact to the Corporation in relation to the financial and reputational risks presented by these programmes.
33. It is therefore recommended that no further action be taken at this time to allow for recent changes to bed in. The current terms of reference have been provided at **Appendix D**, for information.

Options

- i) **Retain current arrangements for CBB (Appendix D) with no further action at this time. (Recommended)**
- ii) Provide feedback and task Officers to bring back revised proposals in agreed terms to future Policy & Resources Committee meeting.

Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee

34. As with PIB, FIB and EDI, there were concerns about the joint-reporting nature of OPPSC. In simple terms, the Sub-Committee currently feeds into Finance in respect of Operational Property and Procurement matters and reports into Policy & Resources Committee for Projects (although Policy & Resources also retains responsibility for the use of Guildhall as noted under the Investment Committee proposals).
35. Beyond this, and the Projects Governance review (ongoing), and a review of thresholds under the Scheme of Delegations (due to be reported in April 2023), there were no further concerns to this new sub-committee.

36. Given the majority of the sub-committee's business currently lies with Finance, on balance it seems sensible to make Finance the 'parent' committee. However, it is possible to do so whilst ensuring that Policy & Resources Committee retains responsibility for the approval of the projects procedure and other project-related matters, and the referral of any projects matters considered necessary. Revised terms of reference have been drafted at **Appendix E** on this basis.

Options

- i) Retain joint sub-committee status but clarify what aspects of its responsibilities are to be referred to which of its parent grand committees.
- ii) **Establish as a sub-committee of Finance Committee, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Policy & Resources Committee. (Recommended).**
- iii) Establish as a sub-committee of Policy & Resources Committee, with clearer direction within its terms of reference on what matters are to be agreed in consultation with the Finance Committee.
- iv) Provide feedback and task Officers to bring back revised proposals in agreed terms to the next Policy & Resources Committee meeting.

Housing

37. This is subject to a separate and distinct review, proposals for which are presented separately.

Culture Heritage and Libraries Committee (CHL)

38. Feedback on CHL was wide-ranging in nature. It included the creation of a new masterplan/strategy for cultural assets; the creation of a culture forum, featuring representatives from key stakeholders across the Corporation; the introduction of sports oversight (currently under the purview of Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee); and the streamlining of Governance around Destination City.

39. At the December 2022 informal Court meeting, there was a warm reception for proposals on the development of a masterplan, with cross-Corporation engagement, possibly in the shape of a forum, rather than a traditional committee. If this proposal has wider Member support, officers would need to consider how to deliver a masterplan, what vehicle would be most appropriate to create and then oversee delivery against the strategy, and what implications that may or may not have in relation to the CHL.

40. If this is an area the Committee wishes to have explored, it is proposed that officers be tasked to bring back proposals around the establishment of a culture masterplan, potential delivery mechanisms, and potential impact on existing structures.

41. In the meantime, as this work is underway, more immediate steps could be taken to address concerns of reporting on Destination City, where greater clarity has been sought by Members around CHL's remit. This is something that can be addressed by working closely with report authors, to ensure that recommendations for each committee are defined on each report. This type of confusion surrounding matters that require input from multiple committees, is not unique to Destination City. As such, the Governance and Member Services Team wishes to work with Officers to encourage 'split' recommendations, so it is very clear what each committee is being asked to consider and approve. It does not require any changes to the current CHL Terms of Reference.
42. There are some 'business as usual' changes to the CHL terms of reference included within the separate report elsewhere on your agenda.

Recommendations:

- i) No changes to CHL and no further action.
- ii) **No immediate changes to CHL but agree to consider suitable arrangements for a Culture Forum and Masterplan within six to twelve months. (Recommended).**

Education

43. Proposals around the restructuring and reporting arrangements of the various governing bodies of our Family of Schools would carry considerations and implications of significant constitutional complexity that they cannot be assessed as "light touch." There are primary legislation implications and statutory obligations that must be considered in detail before any changes are instructed.
44. Furthermore, as articulated by the Chair of the Education Board at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting in February, there may well be an unprecedented amount of change experienced by our independent schools in the coming year for various reasons. Whilst generally supportive of more autonomy in the longer term, Members agreed that now was not the time to be pursuing constitutional change.
45. That being said, given the volume of submissions in this area, it is clear that some steps do need to be taken more urgently.
46. The nature of the relationship between the Education Board, Community and Children's Services Committee, City of London Academies Trust, and the Boards of Governors of the Independent Schools, is particularly complex. An understanding of the differing arrangements around the Academies Trust, in particular, needs to be cultivated and activity underway through an ongoing review in this area will lend itself towards this. General submissions to the LTGR have demonstrated the need for improved understanding of the remit of each body within the Family of Schools, and how they work together in the oversight of our Family of Schools.

47. In this vein, the Governance and Member Services Team wish to develop an 'at a glance' guidance note which sets this out for all Members and Officers. Other forms of training (e.g. a video) can also be explored.

48. For completeness, delegated authority is being sought within a separate report, to consider minor amends to the City Independent Schools' Boards of Governors, to bring them in line with one another.

Recommendations:

- i) **No change at this time, with work on greater guidance for Members and Officers to be commissioned.**

Finance Committee

49. Concerns raised at a recent OPPSC meeting relating to the reporting of benefits in-kind (following the abolition of the Finance Grants Sub-Committee) were raised through the LGTR. These should be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration and, in time, recommendations as to how these might be addressed.

50. Equally, suggestions concerning a review of the Terms of Reference for the Efficiency and Performance Working Party are relatively minor and should also be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration at its first meeting of the civic year.

Recommendations:

- i) **Concerns relating to the reporting of benefits in kind, and on the constitution of the Efficiency and Performance Working Party, be referred to the Finance Committee for initial consideration. (Recommended)**
- ii) No further action be taken.

Bridge House Estates Board

51. Various changes to thresholds for officer approvals have been advanced in respect of this Board's remit; it is suggested that these be captured within the related Scheme of Delegations Review.

52. Bridge House Estates Board has also advised that an options paper about the Monument (which was a secondary issue raised through the LGTR process) is due to be presented to its Board meeting later in March; therefore, no further proposals are presented on this matter at this time.

53. It should be noted that the Board is also advancing some proposed minor changes to its Terms of Reference, which are set out elsewhere on the agenda.

54. There are no options for recommendation at this time.

Various Open Spaces Committees

55. As agreed within the recommendations at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting in February, the Open Spaces Department is still undergoing TOM

processes and has requested that changes to terms of reference should be visited after this has been implemented.

56. There is, however, a proposal to change the name of the Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee to “the Natural Environment Board” under separate cover, to reflect the change of nomenclature within the department generally.

57. No further options are to be considered at this time.

Policy & Resources Committee

58. Most recommendations on the Policy & Resources Committee centred on its various sub-committees and these have been captured and addressed within the report already.

59. At **Appendix F**, changes to the Terms of Reference are proposed in line with the recommended options put forward by Officers within this report; however, should Members agree different options, this document would need to be revised under the requested Delegated Authority procedures.

60. Some changes within Appendix F have been suggested on the basis that they give the Committee more flexibility in how it chooses to discharge functions through its various sub-committees. This is not to suggest that (for example) Standards will not fall under Civic Affairs Sub-Committee; rather, the deletion of specific reference allows the Policy Committee to consider how best to delegate this function, whether this be to the Civic Affairs Committee or otherwise.

61. Beyond the Sub-Committees, there were also comments on the Committee’s composition. This was an area discussed within the original Governance Review and it was not considered useful to revisit at this time given the consideration already afforded. Furthermore, whilst some Members suggested a reduction in size, others suggested an increase (e.g. by adding ex-officio membership of all Committee Chairmen) in the absence of a clear consensus of approach, no recommendation has been made at this point in time.

Options

- i) **To update the Policy & Resources Committee Terms of Reference (Appendix F) to accommodate and reflect decisions taken this day.**
- ii) To update the Policy & Resources Committee Terms of Reference to allow for decisions taken this day and to instruct Officers to commence a review of the Committee’s composition.

Standing Orders

62. The City Corporation’s functions are governed by a suite of various governance documents including the Standing Orders, Officer Scheme of Delegations, Terms of Reference, Procurement Code, Financial Regulations, Projects Procedure, and so on. This list is not exhaustive but indicates the complexities that arise from continued significant changes to the framework, as officers work to bring all documents in line with one another, ensuring the relevant Member approvals at each stage. It is for this reason that Standing Orders and the Scheme of

Delegations are now updated annually, with exceptions made outside of this cycle on very few urgent and specific occasions.

63. Within **appendix G** is a summary of proposed changes to the Standing Orders of the Court of Common Council being brought forward this year. These have been separated into two tables. The first includes changes agreed in principle by the Court at its meeting in March 2022. These are now being brought forward following a suitable period of bedding in of the other significant changes made to the document in that year.
64. The second table summarises proposes changes that were identified through the original Governance Review (such as the introduction of a limit of committees that a report can be considered at); matters which are arising from the Light Touch Governance Review; and finally, changes which may be necessary as a consequence of the general annual review of terms of reference.
65. It is recommended that Members consider the proposed changes set out in summary form at appendix G, and detailed within appendix H, provide comment, and agree those for onward submission to the Court of Common Council in April 2023.
66. In addition, within the LTGR, it was proposed that explanatory footnotes be added for the benefit of Members (for instance, clarity on what a valid point of order or explanation is defined as, etc.) It is suggested that the Committee authorise the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Comptroller and City Solicitor, to produce these explanatory notes on the basis that these are solely factual guidance notes, rather than representing any alterations that would require further Member consideration and approval.
67. Members should note that a report on a review of the Officer Scheme of Delegations will be brought forward at the April meeting of this Committee (and May Court meeting). Other governance documents will then be brought forward to the relevant bodies for updating, as required.

Proposals

68. It is for Members to decide what areas they wish to change in response to the LTGR. Members may also wish to visit new issues, or revisit old ones, as part of a longer-term piece of work, particularly in the context of a refreshed Court membership after the March 2022 elections.
69. It is also for Members to decide what updates to the Standing Orders they wish to recommend to the Court at this time.
70. Once considered by Policy & Resources in March, all matters requiring the Court's approval will be submitted for consideration in April. Any recommended changes relating to sub-committees will ultimately be referred to the relevant parent Committees for actioning at their first meetings of the Civic Year (April-June 2023).

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

71. The whole purpose of the Governance Review and subsequently the Light Touch Governance Review, is to help ensure that the City Corporation has in place the best governance structures to deliver against our Corporate Plan. To ensure this, continued cross-departmental consultation needs to be undertaken, particularly ahead of the report proposed for March 2023.

Financial implications

72. See Resource Implications.

Resource implications –

73. Unlike the recent Governance Review, which saw a reduction in the number of bodies incorporated within the Court of Common Council's formal decision-making structure, these proposals are unlikely to see any significant overall increase or decrease in committee volume. Nevertheless, in contrast, the continued move towards more efficient processes will inevitably lead towards reduced costs of bureaucracy. 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 Governance & Member Services team to realign service output and requirements.

Legal implications

74. There are none.

Risk implications

75. As with any process of significant change, there are risks associated with implementation and unforeseen challenges as the new system embeds. Whilst a new system was brought into effect last year, significant organisational turnover across departments, including the Town Clerk's department, inhibited the ability to communicate and embed organisational understanding of some of these changes. This risk is therefore mitigated with the request that matters be staggered and brought to Members on a priority basis, so that communications and training piece can assist with Corporation-wide implementation.

Equalities implications

76. 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

77. The proposals included in this paper do not carry any significant implications for the Climate Action programme.

Security implications

78. There are none.

Conclusion

79. The City Corporation's governance spans multiple regulatory and legal areas, including (but not limited to) requirements stipulated by local and police authority, charitable, higher education, and specific aspects of primary legislation. It is, therefore, an inherently complex system. The proposals set out for consideration above emerge from feedback received in relation to the LTGR process and your initial decisions at your February meeting; Members are now asked to consider the various proposals and determine which they wish to progress to the Court of Common Council.

Appendices

- A. Draft Investment Committee Terms of Reference
- B. Revised Equality Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee Terms of Reference
- C. Current (re-ordered) Civic Affairs Sub-Committee Terms of Reference
- D. Current Capital Buildings Board Terms of Reference
- E. Revised Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee Terms of Reference
- F. Revised **Policy & Resources Committee** Terms of Reference
- G. Summary of changes to the Standing Orders
- H. Detail of changes to the Standing Orders

Background Papers

[Policy & Resources Committee: Governance Review – November 2021](#)

[Court of Common Council: Governance Review – December 2021](#)

[Court of Common Council: Review of Standing Orders – March 2022](#)

[Policy & Resources Committee: Light Touch Governance Review – February 2023](#)

Polly Dunn

Principal Governance and Member Services Manager

E: polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk