

**From:**

**To:** Stokley, Gemma

**Subject:** Re: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 15 January 2024 18:28:20

Thanks Gemma, with reference to anti semitic, can we not generalise and provide to include all faiths and religious backgrounds?

**From:**

**To:** Stokley, Gemma

**Subject:** Re: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 16 January 2024 12:41:36

Dear Gemma,

Thank you. I have read the draft code of conduct - and read it alongside the LGA version. It was good to see that it is an almost perfect mirror of the LGA, except in two places:

In para 14. there is no mention that the MO has a statutory responsibility for the implementation of the Code of Conduct - the LGA version makes mention of this. In C.10.2 on the registration of gifts, LGA sets a value of £50, but the corporation sets £100, or £200 for multiple gifts. For good measure I checked some other councils, including GLA, which must closely mirror the Corporation in this area, and they all set £50. While I am not in the least surprised that the Corporation should view itself as exceptional in this area, I would have thought it wiser to apply the same standard as everyone else.

No other comments!

**From:**

**To:** Stokley, Gemma

**Subject:** RE: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 21 January 2024 17:21:34

Thanks, Gemma

A few suggestions:

1. Set out the Nolan principles in full before moving on to our own – e.g. add a statement in 6 “Members will be expected to comply with these”. Add an extra paragraph after 6 with the Nolan headings. Both to ensure that nothing is missed in our own interpretation, and because there is so much guidance on the Nolan principles and what they mean.
2. When saying that members acting as charity trustees or on behalf of companies should act in the best interests of the charity/company, consider adding “and in accordance with charity/company law”
3. Add something similar about those acting as governors of educational establishments as there again is law and guidance which should be observed?
4. On use of resources and facilities I think it would be genuinely helpful for members to know when they can use Guildhall and in particular Guildhall computers for their own work functions; what the rules are around use of computers which members are issued for home use (for example I have BBC Sounds running on my CoLC computer as I type this; I assume that’s OK?); and similarly for CoLC phones. Maybe in separate guidance.
5. As there are so many members would it be appropriate to include guidance on when members can contact officers – especially junior officers – direct, to avoid officers feeling pressured or having too much time taken up?

**From:**  
**To:** Stokley, Gemma  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Draft Code of Conduct  
**Date:** 23 January 2024 09:37:09

Dear Gemma

I am not happy that we single out Antisemitism. Muslims on the Court could well argue that similar attention should be paid to Islamophobia.

I therefore propose that we drop the final sentence of 23 and excise Appendix C, thus removing all specific references to Antisemitism.

An alternative would be to give equal weight to Islamophobia. Unfortunately there is no internationally accepted and concise definition of Islamophobia.

I think the code is sufficiently robust to cover anti-racist behaviour without further spelling it out, especially in light of reference to the Equality Act 2010 in 22. However, if a specific reference to anti-racist behaviour is deemed necessary, then it can be added at the end of 23 in lieu of the sentence that I propose we drop; viz: the Corporation condemns all anti-racist behaviour.

One of the primary objections to retaining and including Appendix C is that the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of Antisemitism enters into foreign affairs, a field into which we strongly urge members **not** to stray.

I would be most grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this. Many thanks.

Best Wishes

**From:**

**To:** Pinto, Raquel

**Cc:** Stokley, Gemma; Haynes, June

**Subject:** RE: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 02 February 2024 13:27:13

Dear Raquel,

Thank you for including me in this consultation.

This all seems perfectly sensible and well set out. However I have two observations:

1) It seems odd to me to only cite Antisemitism in the appendix and not all other forms of prejudice and intolerance – this section seems extremely incomplete to me. I suggest it should include, at the very least, the Government definitions of discrimination:

[Discrimination: your rights: Types of discrimination \('protected characteristics'\) - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/discrimination-your-rights-types-of-discrimination-protected-characteristics)

2) Section 10-14 - In light of recent experiences I'm also wondering about section 11 and that, in fact, members, whether they like it or not, are subject to scrutiny, in the public eye at all times and in a digitally connected age, can easily be identified. This included in their privately lives. We have had a recent incidence where a member, who had made no reference to their connection with the City, had attracted attention to themselves by their behaviour and a member of the public looked them up and sent a complaint against them to us. So I wonder whether it should expressly say that a member always represents the CoL regardless of whether the setting is public or within their private lives.

Best

**From:**

**To:** Stokley, Gemma

**Cc:** Haynes, June

**Subject:** Re: REMINDER: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 07 February 2024 13:46:15

Hello Gemma,

I think C8.2 which makes non cooperation a breach of the code is not appropriate and I think that should be removed.

Best wishes,

**From:**

**To:** Stokley, Gemma

**Subject:** Re: DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT - CONSULTATION

**Date:** 09 February 2024 15:46:45

Dear Gemma,

Many thanks for forwarding the document for comment.

My views are restricted to C2.

Under C2.3, I quite understand that some groups have protected characteristics and that those are under written by the respective laws. But I think that in our Code of Conduct, we should aspire to "I promote equalities and do not discriminate against any person, including those with Protected Characteristics". That would have the advantage of promoting equality of course because it would not imply that those without protected characteristics have less protection than those that do. I accept that this goes further than current legislation, but it is certainly good practice.

Under C2.1 and C2.2, I wonder if we can be more proactive in promoting what we want as opposed to only saying what we don't want (as indeed we do under C2.3) - e.g. "I promote respect and will not bully/harass any person". This has the advantage of drawing on C1 too, in essence binding the provisions of both articles together.

Lawyers may have views, but I see no harm in tightening up the provision under C2.3 so that everyone benefits, including those with protected characteristics because that terminology does not cut across the provisions in law.

Thanks again for sharing.

Best wishes.

**From:**  
**To:** Stokley, Gemma; Haynes, June  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Draft Code of Conduct  
**Date:** 19 February 2024 17:06:36

Dear Gemma /June

I am a little constrained in my comments on the draft code of conduct as I have been unable to access all the papers. I have used the links to download all the papers but one document that I was able to access when in Guildhall last week is not available to me at home as the link to it produces a paper which contains a part which says non public, restricted etc. This is not very helpful to elected Members.

The wording which concerns me, and I believe other Members, was drawn to my attention by another lawyer. There were, in the document I was able to access in Guildhall (but not at home), an additional four parts of C8, C8-5 to C8-8. One of these referred, as a stand alone item, to Members cooperating with officers. This is standing the relationship between officers and Members on its head. It is officers who are, ultimately, answerable to elected Members, the elected Members are not answerable to officers, whose job it is to carry out (in so far as lawful) the decisions and wishes of the elected Members. The elected Members are answerable to their electors, not officers.

If these additional items appear in the final version produced for approval at Court then I, and I suspect other Members, will have to object to them at the Court meeting. If there is, as I believe to be the case, a different version to that accessible outside Guildhall, then I will have to oppose its adoption at that point. If I am right on this then I suggest the full version is circulated to all Members, in a manner accessible both within and outside Guildhall, and the consultation period extended as otherwise the current consultation will not fully serve its purpose.

Regards



Comments from the informal Court of Common Council meeting on 15 February 2024 were as follows:

- Some felt that Anti-Semitism should not be singled out within this document and its appendices and that it should simply read that all forms of discrimination around protected characteristics were condemned. They warned of the danger of seemingly straying into the realm of foreign policy were it to be retained here in the absence of reference to other forms of discrimination on the basis of religion such as Islamophobia;
- It was noted that the IHRA definition of Anti-Semitism had been widely adopted, this document may therefore benefit from explaining this and the reasoning behind it. But using in the Code of Conduct was queried;
- Others expressed concern around removing the reference to Anti-Semitism given that this had now featured within this document for a number of years;
- It was felt that renewed focus was needed on how confidential and non-public information was to be filtered and handled by Members.
- Members sought confirmation on the version that was being consulted upon, with greater clarity regarding the differences between the two versions.

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 5, 2024 5:29 AM  
**To:** Dunphy, Peter  
**Cc:** Fentimen, Helen  
**Subject:** Code of Conduct

Dear Peter,

In your role as Chair of the Member Development and Standards sub, I seek your support in updating the Code of Conduct.

The Code is due for review at your next meeting in July.

There has been widespread concern about the opaque nature of the registering of masonic interests.

Lord Lisvane ( Para 438) stated that the current arrangements failed to provide adequate transparency.

The current, widely used, test of relevance is whether those interests might reasonably be thought by others to influence actions or words of a member.

There is a clear case that failure to declare individual Lodge membership is no longer acceptable.

This is most apparent in relation to the Guildhall Lodge where seniority and progression between members ( and officers) gives rise to a perception of conflict.

Our EDI policy is fatally flawed if we fail to take clear and decisive action.

Best regards,