

APPENDIX A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES - MEMBER AND OFFICERS

| Serial | Response |
|--------|--|
| 1 | Establishing the scope of the policy: It may be useful to provide a statement to stipulate which meetings the policy applies to, drawing on the language of the Act. From looking at both the Act and Guidance, I appreciate that this may not be straight forward. Simply put however, it would be useful to clarify which type of meetings are within scope and which are out of scope. For example, does the policy need to make clear that it does not apply to Governors meetings? |
| 2 | Distinguishing between Council responsibility & the responsibility of another body: Following on from the above point, we may want to clarify where the Council has direct responsibility for ensuring Multi Location Provision, and where it must ensure that another body discharges the duty on its behalf, e.g. Corporate Joint Committees or other regional bodies corporate who conduct business where the Council is involved but is not directly/immediately responsible. To put this another way, if the Corporate Joint Committee does not discharge their responsibility in relation to this policy, the non-compliance must sit with them. |
| 3 | Need to make clear which meetings this refers to i.e. meetings involving elected Members |
| 4 | It would be helpful to define which type of meetings this refers to e.g. |
| 5 | Need to clarify what the legislation requires and which type of meetings it applies to. E.g. need to be clear doesn't apply to governors meetings |
| 6 | We need to ensure that the policy can be applied to all current and future meetings which Cardiff Council may be responsible for (eg City Deal, CJC's etc) Currently policy is very focused on committees run by Democratic Services |
| 7 | "Decisions" This perhaps needs redrafting as Scrutiny Committees don't make decisions |
| 8 | Consider quoting the Act and offering an explanation (part 3, chp4, s47(6)) |
| 9 | What is the process for review and alteration once it is in place? Would it be reviewed say quarterly in its first year so that changes could be made and problems rectified – would the Constitution Cttee look at it? |
| 10 | Reliance on the internet - This is a key point given digital exclusion issues in Cardiff, particularly in lower socio-economic areas – whilst the policy rightly highlights physical meetings are not accessible to some, perhaps need to emphasise a bit more that remote meetings are not accessible to digitally excluded ... which helps explain why multi-location mtgs are preferred... |
| 11 | Does this need to be more generic |

| Serial | Response |
|--------|--|
| 12 | Line 19 deals with physical attendees needing IT equipment to be able to follow contributions from those attending remotely. This will need to be arranged in such a manner so as to not cause "feedback", which disrupts the broadcast for remote attendees |
| 13 | No mention was made regarding the software install for independent members that sit on committees. How will that be addressed? |
| 14 | We welcome the fact that the committees have been assigned a likely type of meeting (mostly virtual, mostly physical etc). Understood that have to offer a virtual option by law. |
| 15 | So this will mean balancing needs of those who can't access physical mtgs with needs of those who can't access remote mtgs. |
| 16 | As can remote mtgs to digitally excluded |
| 17 | Glamorgan Archives Joint Committee has been meeting remotely since the start of the pandemic and it's generally worked really well, so I have no issue with the idea of continuing that on a permanent basis. |
| 18 | From a PG perspective, Andrew has contacted the officer representatives from other Authorities and I understand they are broadly/generally in agreement about the approach ie primarily Joint Committee (JC) meetings will be remote but with the option of physical JC meetings (if it is felt beneficial). |
| 19 | JP and I have discussed this and we would be in favour of all Prosiect Gwyrdd meetings being remote .As you suggested in the presentation , travelling to Cardiff or even Barry for a 10-15 minute meeting is not an option these days. |
| 20 | In light of the Prosiect Gwyrdd Joint Committee, I see no reason due to distance, that these could not be totally remote. |
| 21 | I understand from the draft policy that if the JC meeting is physical it can be held from a variety of different locations eg some members at one location and others at another location. I presume that if the meeting was not fully remote, it could be a mixture of both physical and remote ie some members/officers could be in physical attendance (at different locations if necessary) with others accessing the JC remotely. I am not sure if needed but would it be useful to specifically include this later point in para 25? |
| 22 | I did confirm via the Labour Whip my view that the governors panel (LAPG)meeting worked well virtually as previously member would spend longer travelling than they did in meetings. I think it would be really sad if meetings like that went back to being an inface meeting unless the members of the committee actually wanted to change again as it seems such a chunk of people's time if they are not already in County Hall |
| 23 | We don't currently do this. |
| 24 | Point 30 on the first line is "to use of" I think should be "to make use of" or "to use" |
| 25 | Attendance at multi-location meetings may require participants and observers to use display screen equipment or to be seated for extended periods of time. |
| 26 | Is this all participants or just those who are going to be in the whole meeting? I think it might be excessive to ask witnesses to complete DSE, especially as they are not usually in the meeting for longer than 1-2 hours. Does this need changing to say 'participants who are expected to be in the meeting for more than 2 hours' |

| Serial | Response |
|--------|---|
| 27 | Will it also avoid mtgs being held one after the other when participants are on both committees e.g., planning committee and E&C – participant could end up in front of screen for 6 hrs – with short comfort breaks only – not ideal |
| 28 | I think for scrutiny it has been the Chairs views that have taken precedence albeit that some chairs have checked with cttee members as well |
| 29 | All committee members are encouraged to physically attend at least one meeting every 6 months of each committee or decision-making body to which they are appointed during each municipal year where it is possible and practicable to do so. I just wonder why this is required and what purpose it will serve? Some Committees might only sit a few times a year and even if they are more regularly, I am not sure what would be achieved. |
| 30 | You mentioned that you are recommending physical presence at a meeting every 6 months. As the Standards and Ethics meetings are held quarterly that would mean that you are suggesting attendance at every other meeting. Is that correct |
| 31 | Why? |
| 31a | Whether a member can elect to attend in-person? Given the ongoing pandemic and uncertainties that is not an option at present, however can this be considered for the post-pandemic position? |
| 32 | I understand and can see the benefits of increased use of technology, but I would be grateful for assurances that the inherent associated risks in respect of access, participation, ensuring committee consensus, cohesion and inclusion, and the effectiveness of the democratic process have been assessed with relevant risks mitigated. |
| 33 | I don't like Zoom meetings, I like real meetings with real people. The sooner we return to our wonderful City Hall Chamber designed for such meetings the better. Politics is about people and meeting people and talking to them. I did not become a councillor to become a face on tv channel. |
| 34 | They (GAJC Committee Members) have previously expressed a vague desire to meet face-to-face again. The issue I can see with that is that we normally meet at the Glamorgan Archives building, but we wouldn't have the technical infrastructure to be able to deliver a multi-location meeting with some in the building and some at home and it's not worth us having that technical equipment for 4 meetings a year. I don't know if you've had any comments/thoughts from any of our Joint Committee, but this might be something that I will need to discuss with them as to whether they would want the potential for a face-to-face meeting occasionally, say once a year for example. Would it be possible to borrow the technical equipment for such a meeting or would we need to think about holding the meeting in one of the existing rooms set-up for the purpose? |
| 35 | Duplication of words - the number |
| 36 | Point 40 on the second line "the number" is repeated |
| 37 | This doesn't really work for Cabinet so we need to be clear that it is for non executive meetings |
| 38 | I feel Scrutiny Committees will need to meet physically once each year to establish, build and maintain the team working relationship, to secure the Chair's position. This could be the initial meeting after election/appointment at Full Council. Could Cardiff's policy recommend this even though it can't mandate? |

| Serial | Response |
|--------|--|
| 39 | Which role do you see the PSO performing – Organiser? Or simply officer support. |
| 40 | We should probably reference point (bii) of this procedure rule which states that notice must be given on the agenda! |
| 41 | Again this is not how we record Cabinet attendance |
| 42 | Might be better to refer to 'Scrutiny Committee' rather than name them, as they may well change |
| 43 | Will there be restrictions on the number of hours of webcasting time allocated to each Committee? |
| 44 | Just to follow up from the discussion around minutes vs webcast recordings – we have previously said that we don't think we would permanently preserve video recordings of meetings as they are not the official record and are not legally admissible (as far as we understand it). The signed minutes currently remain the officially accepted record and so that has to be the accepted format for preservation. However, the discussion today has backed up the thoughts that have been running through my mind recently that it might be feasible in the future for the video recording to become a more official record and we might need to consider the long-term preservation of this as a distinct record-set. This requires a bit more thought and planning as the expense of preserving video files on a permanent basis could be significant. I'll give it a bit more thought and see if I can put some more factual info behind the pros and cons of keeping them. This doesn't really impact on the policy but is something that requires a bit more thought and discussion as we move permanently into the online meeting world. |
| 45 | Should really refer to Decision registers here in terms of Cabinet (and Council?!) |
| 46 | Does this need a 'subject to covid restrictions' caveat – just in case fully remote because of covid and therefore County Hall not open to public? |
| 47 | This should be 2 working days – otherwise a request could be made at 5pm on a Friday for a 5pm meeting on a Monday! |
| 48 | Line 55 refers to MS Teams, yet Line 56 refers to translations being provided by Zoom. How will this work in practice? |
| 49 | Again Cabinet office? |
| 50 | We've suggested changes to the terminology. For example, Cabinet publishes a decision register, rather than minutes etc. If, however, this is now a legislative requirement, we'll review. |
| 51 | "clear" |
| 52 | Cabinet? |
| 53 | For consistency, should this spell out that physical attendance cannot be mandated – so clear that same rules apply to officers as to members. |
| 54 | Does this apply to all participants, even those who are in physical meeting with the Chair? |

| Serial | Response |
|--------|--|
| 55 | Should this be all participants, not just remote participants, as all participants will be logged into teams to be able to vote/ seek consensus – see point 75. |
| 56 | On the instructions – “the Chair will join the meeting 5 minutes the start” I think “before” is missing |
| 57 | Should there also be a section of leaving a meeting early – e.g. put message in Chat function? |
| 58 | On the Prior to Meetings section, I feel, a lot of the points are not applicable to most committees and the last point in that section does not make sense. Possibly some typos there. I don't like the wording of the other two Chair sections and feel they could be a lot simpler if needed at all. Most Chairs, I'm sure, discuss the plan for the meeting with their relevant officers beforehand and have the relevant paperwork to assist them. I don't feel there is a need to over complicate it. |
| 59 | We need to be careful re: pre emption or decisions here |
| 60 | Missing the word 'to' |
| 61 | Should this point be in next section? |
| 62 | Missing the word 'of' |
| 63 | Missing the word 'of' |
| 64 | Sorry, not clear if they should avoid asking members in turn or whether they should do this |
| 65 | Futureproofing: Some aspects of the policy may become dated very quickly. For that reason, you may want to refer to “suitably qualified staff” supporting hybrid meetings, rather than specific teams. Equally, rather than name specific meeting as being within scope, you may be better served by tightly defining the type of meetings that are within scope of the policy. |
| 66 | The document is very wordy and difficult to follow but after the support worker explained the reasoning then it makes sense for it to be written out like this. However, will there be a young person friendly version of the document produced where things like legal requirements could be removed? We are happy to help you produce a young person friendly version. |
| 67 | Is there any reason why children and young people are not specifically mentioned in the document? We feel that as some of us are involved in these types of meeting that maybe there should be a mention, especially around time constraints of children and young people attending school and therefore would find it almost impossible to attend meetings before 4:30 |
| 68 | Due to the length of the document we don't feel we have had enough time to fully go through the document but we can't see anything that is obvious we would change other than what we have already said but we think if a child friendly version was made it would make it easier for us. |
| 69 | From a HR perspective we have no comments on the policy – it seems consistent with the hybrid working for staff. |