

**Canterbury City Council
Short Topic Scrutiny Review**

Appointments to Outside Bodies

October 2009

Canterbury City Council Short Topic Scrutiny Review

Appointments to Outside Bodies

1. Introduction

The Scrutiny Sub-Committee approved a short topic review into Appointments to Outside Bodies in June 2009. The panel consisted of:

- Councillor Ron Flaherty – Chairman
- Councillor Reuby
- Councillor Steed
- Councillor Windsor

A small team of officers supported the review and other council officers gave their time as witnesses and provided data.

The panel’s task was to hold a series of meetings to consider how the appointments of councillors and the Lord Mayor are made to outside bodies in the district and make recommendations for improving the process. A summary of the Panel’s recommendations is set out at Appendix A.

The review involved identifying the councillor and Lord Mayor’s responsibilities, how appointments are made and what information is provided to councillors prior to their appointment. A copy of the scope for the review is attached at Appendix B.

The Panel reviewed information and gathered evidence throughout their meetings and information was provided by a wide variety of sources including many of the outside bodies, who gave their views on this aspect of their involvement with the council.

1.1 Witnesses

The Panel interviewed the following witnesses:

Council officers	Group Leader	Former Lord Mayors
Colin Carmichael Mark Ellender Marsha Whiteway	Councillor Gilbey Councillor Alex Perkins Councillor Seath	Councillor Eden-Green Denis Linfoot Councillor Samper Fred Whitemore

In addition, the panel wrote to outside bodies to seek further information on funding, legal status, values and expectations of the council representative. It also took guidance from sources such as the Charity Commission and Local Government Ombudsman.

The panel would like to thank the witnesses for their co-operation and insight, which has ensured the review, has been constructive and informative.

1.2 2003 Scrutiny Review

Councillor representation on Outside Bodies has previously been subject to a scrutiny review. In 2003, a Scrutiny Review Panel produced a report, which examined the value to the council of being represented on outside bodies and the value to the bodies of having council representatives serve in them.

The review concluded that the number of outside bodies and councillors serving on them should be reduced, and as a result the list of official outside bodies was amended accordingly. The Panel also made recommendations for improving communications so that the General Purposes Committee who is responsible for making the appointments was better informed of the activities of the body and the councillor's role within it. Finally, the Panel highlighted that councillor representation on outside bodies should be reviewed regularly and that "*scrutiny in the future will be essential*" with the development of partnership working.¹

2. Background

2.1 General Outside Bodies

The council appoints members to around 50 outside bodies across the district and nationally. These appointments are formally decided by the General Purposes Committee and confirmed by Full Council at the beginning of each council year. The appointments are based on nominations by each of the political parties represented on the council. The Executive also has the ability to make appointments if it is a matter of urgency and there is not time to convene a meeting of the General Purposes Committee.

Legal and Democratic Services produce guidance for elected Members and officers who sit on outside bodies. They also provide advice and support to councillors on the various types of body and the implications for sitting on them.

The appointments are generally deemed to be of value to both the organisations and councillor. However, the large number of groups and limited number of councillors means it is not always possible to find an appointment to an organisation in any given year. Therefore, as part of its remit, this review considered the suitability of all the current appointments to outside bodies to ensure the best use of the councillors' limited resources and address the review concerns.

2.2 New appointments

When a request is initially made for councillor representation on an outside body, Legal and Democratic Services issue a form to the organisation to gather relevant

¹ Representation on Outside Bodies Scrutiny Review 2003, 24 April 2003 Overview agenda, p18.

information about the appointment. For example, the nature and size of the organisation, the role the councillor would take within the organisation and the number of meetings they would be required to attend. The completed form is then presented to the General Purposes Committee to help them consider the suitability of the request and which councillor would make the most appropriate appointment. A copy of this form is set out at Appendix C.

The information gathered by Legal and Democratic Services at the outset ensures that new appointments are appropriate at the time they are made.

2.3 Outside Bodies Feedback

Each year, the council's Legal and Democratic Services Division writes to both the organisations and councillors, requesting feedback on the preceding year's term of office, details of attendance and the activities of the organisation and the council representatives. This information is then presented as a report to the General Purposes Committee to help inform the appointments process for the coming Council year.

Comments from Members and other council representatives about their involvement on Outside Bodies for 2008/09 where given, were mainly positive. Many of the representatives wrote favourably of their work with the outside body, whilst the organisations comments' were similarly positive. Some outside bodies did not reply, although these were in the minority. Similarly, a number of councillors did not reply (ten).

The Panel also wrote to the organisations with councillor representation to gather information for the review and gain their perspective on the appointments process. Again some did not reply although many of those who did reported favourably of councillor involvement.

The information provided by the organisations and councillors is important in ensuring the General Purposes Committee understands all the issues and makes the right appointments to the right bodies. Although the absence of information is not always the result of a lack of commitment by the Outside Body, a repeated lack of information suggests that council involvement with the outside body is not as strong as at the time of the original appointment. The panel felt that after two years this would be a point at which the council's involvement should be re-considered.

Recommendation 1: If an organisation does not provide a report to the council for two consecutive years, the necessity of the appointment should be reviewed.

3 General Outside Bodies

3.1 Current position

Some councillors are appointed to more than one organisation and up to nine representatives are elected to each body. The role of the councillor can be either; Representative, Trustee or Director as the table below demonstrates²:

Title	Brief description of role	Number of organisations
Representative	Represents the council’s interests and provides advice, guidance and contributes at meetings of the organisation.	34
Trustee	To act in accordance with the trust deed and to protect the trust’s assets. They must comply with the Trustee Act 2000.	15
Director	Has a duty of care towards the company, to act in the best interests of the company as a whole. Directors therefore have a “quasi-trustee” role taking proper care of the assets of the company.	3

3.2 Trusteeships

Councillors and the Lord Mayor are appointed as trustees to some of the outside bodies. As a trustee has a specific set of responsibilities that are different to those of a representative, the Panel decided to consider the capacity and suitability of the councillor and Lord Mayor trusteeships. In particular, they sought guidance from the Charity Commission's “Essential Trustee” which states that unlike representatives on outside bodies, trustees:

“Have and must accept ultimate responsibility for directing the affairs of a charity and ensuring that it is solvent and well-run.”³ The Guidance also highlights the implications of serving as a trustee on an organisation: “Trustees may also be personally liable for any debts or losses that the charity faces as a result. This will depend on the circumstances and the type of governing document for the charity.”⁴

² In some cases several councillors may have different roles (Trustee, Director, Representative) on the same organisation.

³ Charity Commission: The Essential Trustee, p 6.

⁴ Charity Commission: The Essential Trustee, p6.

The Panel took into consideration the responsibilities of a trustee when considering the appointments made to outside bodies. As the issues for councillors and the Lord Mayor are potentially different, they are dealt with separately later in this report.

3.3 The number of appointments

Councillor representation on organisations can often require a significant time commitment and the Panel considered it might be appropriate to reduce the number of appointments made. Any reduction in the number of appointments would require clear and logical reasons for doing so. Therefore, the Panel established a criterion set to assess each of the appointments against. They considered that any appointment should meet one or more of the following:

- A statutory appointment
- The outside body is a strategic organisation
- A Service Level Agreement exists between the council and the organisation
- The appointment is required to oversee funding
- The appointment has value to the organisation and council

The Panel used all the information gathered during the review together with the criterion to assess the suitability of the current appointments. The Panel's assessment is set out in a matrix at Appendix D.

The Panel considered that in future, their criterion could be used together with the form issued by Legal and Democratic Services to assess the suitability of requests for new councillor appointments.

3.4 Liaison role

If the number of appointments were reduced it would still be possible for organisations to approach individual councillors to provide advice and guidance. However, this would be at the discretion of the councillor rather than the council. A recognised liaison role could be introduced to ensure that links between the council and organisations were maintained without being an addition to the list of official outside bodies. The liaison role could be defined as; *“provides advice, guidance and contributes at meetings of the organisation”*. However, unlike a representative, the councillor would not serve on the body as a representative of the council. A register could be maintained of councillors involved in organisations in this liaison capacity.

The Panel used their criterion to establish if any of the current appointments would be better suited to the liaison role. They assessed each of the appointments and considered there were several appointments that in consultation with the organisation and appointed councillor could be transferred to the liaison role.

Recommendation 2: That the councillor representatives on the following organisations be transferred to a newly recognised liaison role:

- ***The cross Channel Arts Association***

- ***The Canterbury and District Voluntary Action and Support***
- ***The Canterbury and Herne Bay Volunteer Centre***

3.5 The number of council representatives

Twenty organisations have more than one councillor appointed to them. In some instances, this is a requirement of the organisations charter or governing documents. For example, the charter of the University of Kent Court requires 9 councillor appointments. However, the Panel considered there were also examples where more than one representative was unnecessary. In some instances, the number of representatives on a body may have arisen out of a desire to ensure political balance in appointments to the outside body. However, the outcome is that some outside bodies have more representatives than they would otherwise need when compared to others.

Whilst a benefit of several councillor appointments to one body was to help ensure the council was always fully represented on an organisation, the Panel felt this could also be addressed if the representative was supported by a substitute in the event they were unable to attend a meeting of the body. The Panel considered a way for new councillors to gain experience of the outside bodies' process was through the substitute role. Members are able to substitute for representatives on outside bodies, although it is not possible to substitute for directors or trustees. The role of the substitute is also addressed later in this report.

Recommendation 3: That councillor representation on the following organisations be reduced to one⁵:

- ***Age Concern (Herne Bay)***
- ***Canterbury District Citizens Advice Bureau***
- ***Canterbury Housing Advice Centre***
- ***Canterbury-Reims Twinning Association***
- ***Canterbury Relief in Need Charity***

3.6 Council Funding of outside bodies

At the same time, it may be necessary to increase the number of appointments. During the review, the Single Grants Gateway Panel, which allocates grants and concessions to the voluntary sector of behalf of the council, asked this Panel to review the councillor representation on organisations that receive funding from the council.

The Panel considered that a fundamental reason for councillor appointments was to oversee the finances of organisations funded by the council. This was particularly important when the level of funding was significant. However, the Panel heard evidence that whilst this occurred in most cases, there were some organisations,

⁵ The current number of councillor representatives are set out in Appendix D of this report.

which the council funded that currently had no councillor representation to oversee finances.

The Panel discussed the issue of outside bodies who receive large amounts of funding from the council in discretionary grants (rather than any rate relief or other mandatory grant). Currently there are 29 bodies that receive grants through the council's Single Grants Gateway process⁶. The majority receive grants of £20,000 or less, three receive grants of £20,000 to £30,000 and two bodies receive grants of above £30,000 with the highest grant in 2009/10 to a single organisation being £127,084.⁷

Despite the presence of Service Level Agreements on some of the larger grant receiving bodies, members of the Panel felt that there would be some benefit in terms of accountability from having a councillor representative appointed to their governing board. This issue was also highlighted by the 2003 scrutiny review.

4 Review Sessions

4.1 The role of the councillor

Throughout the witness sessions, a concern was expressed that in some cases it might not be appropriate for councillors to take on the role of a trustee. Given the legal obligations and potential conflict of interest with their role as a council representative, the Panel considered it important the councillor has a clear understanding of their role and the organisation before accepting a trusteeship.

The legal obligations of becoming a trustee are set out in guidance issued to councillors on appointment. In addition, councillors could be issued with the Charity Commission's "Essential Trustee" which the Panel felt provided a clear overview to the potential roles and responsibilities.

These responsibilities will also include liability as a trustee. The council does not provide insurance or indemnify the councillor while they are carrying out their duties as trustee⁸. It would be for each individual member to ensure that the outside body covers the individual liabilities of its board members. A basic policy should cover public liability and employer's liability (if necessary). Other liabilities that may need to be considered are professional indemnity for negligent misadvice and liabilities specific to the post e.g. Directors liabilities under the Companies Act or Trustees indemnity.

⁶ 2009/10 Financial year.

⁷ The grant figures do not include any discretionary or mandatory concessions also awarded to organisations through the Single Grants Gateway process.

⁸ Councillors are not covered under the council's insurance policy for their involvement with outside bodies even if their involvement or appointment to the outside body has been directly authorised by the council. The Council could perhaps consider indemnifying individual councillors if required by a particular circumstance.

The Panel noted that in most cases, trustees took a four-year term of office and though this should be standard practice to ensure a good knowledge of the organisation was developed. Although this would also depend on the requirements of the individual organisation.

Recommendation 4: That those councillors appointed to trusteeships are:

i) Fully informed of their role as part of the Member induction process and are issued with the Charity Commission's "Essential Trustee" guidance

ii) To include a reference to any service level agreement existing between the city and an outside body in their report to the council

iii) To ensure the trustee appointment is included on their register of interests held by the Monitoring Officer.

Recommendation 5: Councillor appointments to trusteeships should be for a four-year term.

4.2 Information

The Panel received evidence that the different organisations could have varying expectations of the role of the councillor representing them. Some organisations expected the councillor to provide a link to the council. For example, they may provide advice on the relevant department to speak to on a given matter and attend meetings of the organisation. Other organisations expected the councillor to liaise with the council directly on their behalf, whilst some organisations only expected occasional attendance at meetings.

Clear information from the organisation of the duties expected would help ensure the councillor with the most suitable skills and experience is appointed. For instance, an appointment with a significant time commitments may not be suitable for portfolio holder with an already demanding workload.

4.3 Nominations

A summary report based on the individual councillor and organisation reports for the previous year's term of office is made to the General Purposes Committee at the beginning of each council year. It is important for councillors and organisations to provide as much information as possible on the previous term of office to inform future appointments. However, the Panel noted that information was not always received. This means that in the past, the General Purposes Committee have not always been aware of the nuances of the individual appointments. It was suggested that in previous years, the General Purposes Committee had on occasion not appointed the most appropriate councillor, as they had not had all the relevant information before them to consider.

To improve the process and make it more informed, an alternative to the General Purposes Committee deciding appointments could be to set up a small, politically balanced “appointments group” of councillors. The Chief Executive could chair the Group in a non-voting capacity.

The politically balanced group could make recommendations to Full Council on the appointments and also serve as a forum to consider any future additional appointments. A dedicated group could develop a better understanding of the issues regarding appointments to ensure the most suitable appointments were made. This group would need to meet annually at the beginning of the new council year.

Recommendation 6: That a small politically balanced “appointments group” panel of councillors chaired by the Chief Executive be created to consider nominations for appointments to outside bodies.

In previous appointments processes there have been occasionally contested appointments for an outside body. In such future occurrences, it is recommended the appointment group take into account, factors such as the experience, knowledge, the feedback from the outside body together with the length of service of individual nominations.

Recommendation 7: The appointments group, when considering an appointment, which is contested, would take into account:

- 1) The experience and knowledge of the candidates on the remit and function of the outside body***
- 2) When a candidate is currently on an outside body, there is a report from that body on the representative. It should also take account of whether a candidate is under the two terms maximum suggested for an appointment***

Whilst most groups fell within the remit of the suggested group, the Panel considered that appointments to organisations with financial or strategic implications for the council should be within the gift of the Executive. These appointments could either be the relevant portfolio holder or another councillor the Executive deemed most suitable for the role. For example, the time commitment required for some appointments means they are not be appropriate for a member of the Executive. Either way, the Panel considered the Executive should make these appointments.

Recommendation 8: That due to their nature and role, the Executive should nominate councillors to the following organisations:

- ***The Canterbury Housing Advice Centre***
- ***Porchlight***
- ***The Local Government Association Rural Commission***
- ***The Local Government Association Urban Commission***
- ***The Local Government Association Coastal Issues Special Interest Group***

- **National Parking Adjudication Service Joint Committee**
- **Kent International Airport Consultative Committee**
- **Tourism South East**
- **British Resorts and Destinations Association**

4.4 Non-councillor representatives

Currently some outside body representatives formally appointed by the General Purposes Committee are not councillors. However, the Panel considered there should be a presumption that non-councillors will only be nominated if they have specialist knowledge that is valuable; or in the event that a councillor nomination is not forthcoming.

In some cases, both councillors and non-councillors are appointed to an outside body as council representatives. However, the following organisations have only non-councillor appointments.

- Cooper and Adkinson Almshouse Charity (2 non-councillors)
- John and Ann Smith Charities (2 non-councillors)
- Canterbury United Municipal Charities and Maynard and Cotton Hospital (3 non-councillors)

The Panel considered that whilst these appointments could be valuable to the organisations, the need for them to be formally made by the council should be reviewed by the recommended 'appointments group' referred to earlier in this report.

Recommendation 9: There should be a presumption that non-councillors will only be nominated as the council's representative if they have a specialist knowledge that is of particular benefit to the organisation and council.

4.5 Length of service

The Panel noted that long serving councillors were able to develop considerable knowledge and experience of the organisations they had been appointed to. This could be of value to both the organisation and council so a degree of succession planning may be appropriate to ensure continuity in the future. Longer serving councillors tended to serve on a higher number of outside bodies. At the same time new councillors were less likely to be nominated. It could be helpful if new councillors became substitutes to these more experienced councillors to ensure knowledge and expertise was not lost. This could also help new councillors gain experience through substitute roles.

The Panel agreed that to prevent this happening in the future there should be a presumption that any councillor should serve in position for two full terms then retire.

Recommendation 10: That councillors should not normally serve more than two full terms (8 years) on an outside body, subject to discussions between the city council and the outside body at the time.

5 Lord Mayor representation on Outside Bodies

5.1 The Lord Mayor

The Lord Mayor is currently involved in 21 outside bodies in the capacity of chairman, patron, trustee and honorary member/patron. The Lord Mayor is also a member of the Court of the University of Kent.

The Panel wrote to the organisations the Lord Mayor is appointed to and interviewed former Lord Mayors and relevant officers to gather their views on the subject.

The witnesses were asked to consider what they felt the value of the Lord Mayor's appointment to an outside body was to the council. Some felt it was difficult to see a direct benefit for the council, whilst the outside bodies themselves obtained some endorsement and support from the civic leader's involvement in their organisation. In many cases the position was honorary and symbolic.

The Panel used all the information gathered during the review together with the criterion to assess the suitability of the current Lord Mayor appointments. The Panel's assessment is set out in a matrix at Appendix E.

5.2 The Lord Mayor's appointments

As the Lord Mayor's office is separate from the Leader of the Council's office, the organisations the Lord Mayor is appointed to are currently determined on the advice of the Chief Executive on a case-by-case basis.

The Civic Manager expressed the view that the number of organisations to which the Lord Mayor was appointed, required a significant commitment each year. For example, in 2008/09 the Lord Mayor attended 47 engagements associated with the organisations. These engagements also required time commitment in terms of travel, and preparation such as speech writing and minute reading. Not all of the former Lord Mayors agreed with this view, suggesting that the Outside Bodies were responsible for around 10% of their time overall. Others felt that they had not spent a great deal of time on outside bodies.

The ceremonial support the Lord Mayor provides is valued by organisations as a way of raising their profile. It was suggested that some of the Lord Mayor's appointments could be transferred to the Sheriff. Canterbury has had a Sheriff since King Edward IV's Charter in 1461, which gave Canterbury the status of a County separate from Kent. The Sheriff pre-dates the Lord Mayor whose title was granted by the Queen in 1988, although the position of Mayor predates this by several centuries.

The Sheriff's remit does not currently include any specific appointments within their remit but they can attend engagements on behalf of the Lord Mayor. However, the Panel did not consider there was a more suitable method by which the appointments could be formally transferred to the Sheriff to reduce the number of Outside Bodies

covered by the Lord Mayor. They felt that the sheriff role was to deputise for the Lord Mayor and that providing a formal separate role might undermine this relationship.

A reason cited in the evidence given to the review, for the growing number of Lord Mayor appointments was that former Lord Mayors had previously accepted appointments to which they had a special interest or connection. The Panel considered that any new appointments should be made for the term of office of the individual Lord Mayor and not to the office permanently. This should be made clear to the organisation from the outset.

Recommendation 11: It should be presumed that any additional Lord Mayor appointments would be for the individual Lord Mayor's term of office.

The Panel considered it was suitable for the Chief Executive to agree these appointments. However, it is suggested that additional appointments that are proposed on a more permanent basis (e.g. beyond the current Lord Mayor one year term) should be determined by the same Panel that this review recommends be formed to consider councillor appointments. This would help ensure the number of appointments does not grow significantly in number as they have done in recent years. It would also ensure a consistency with regard to the type of organisation to which the Lord Mayor is appointed.

Recommendation 12: Any proposed future Lord Mayor Outside Body appointments that are for longer than one year should be considered by the panel of councillors chaired by the Chief Executive.

Another factor when considering the organisations to which the Lord Mayor is appointed is parity. For example, the Lord Mayor is associated with some but not all of the Alms Houses in the district. The Civic Manager also highlighted that a number of the Lord Mayor's current appointments are Kent-wide rather than district organisations. The Panel considered it was important for the Lord Mayor to maintain involvement with organisations that had direct links to district issues. For example, the Magna Carta Trust is not a district-based organisation, but the Lord Mayor's role on the Trust is important due to Canterbury's status as one of the five charter towns for the Magna Carta. At the same time, the Lord Mayor is currently appointed to a number of countywide organisations that do not have specific associations with district issues. The Panel considered that unless there were exceptional reasons for representation on organisations outside of the district, the Lord Mayor should in future only be appointed to district-based bodies. Although individual members may wish to serve in a liaison capacity, the panel recommended that the Lord Mayor could stand down from Kent-wide outside bodies.

Recommendation 13: That the Lord Mayor stand down from the following organisations from May 2010 on the basis that they are Kent-wide rather than district organisations.

- ***Kent Youth Theatre***
- ***Invicta Concert Band***

- *English Speaking Union*
- *Kent Competitive Festival*

Recommendation 14: That in future, unless there is an exceptional case, there should be a presumption against the Lord Mayor being appointed to Kent-wide organisations.

5.3 The Lord Mayor's position

The Lord Mayor has a variety of roles on outside bodies as the table below demonstrates:

Current position

Title	Role	Number of organisations
Chair	Formal chair of committee meetings and AGM	1
Honorary Chair	Acts as chair if requested	1
Honorary Member	Does not have to attend meetings or take part in AGM	2
Honorary Patron	Takes part in events as requested and name is used	2
Honorary President	Takes part in events as requested and name is used	1
Member	Takes part in committee meetings and AGM	1
Member of Court	Sits on processes at graduation ceremonies and sits on dais	1
President (shared role)	Name only, little or no involvement but attends events when able.	1
Patron	Usually only attends events when able	4
President	Attends AGM, meetings and events	3
Trustee	Attends AGM, meetings and events	4

5.4 Trusteeships and Chairman

A number of the witnesses consulted throughout the review also considered that in most cases it was not appropriate for the Lord Mayor to be a trustee of an organisation. The role of the Lord Mayor has developed so that it had become primarily ceremonial. Also whilst it was possible for councillors to develop the knowledge of an organisation over time, the short term of office for the Lord Mayor meant it could be difficult to acquire the experience needed to take on a role with responsibilities greater than that of Honorary Member or Patron. This is highlighted by the Charity Commission⁹ who suggest that newly appointed trustees undertake training, observe trustee meetings and read the annual reports, important policies

⁹ See recommendation 4.

and annual accounts of the organisation. Given the number of organisations the Lord Mayor is appointed to and the length of service the post requires, the trusteeship role is not appropriate. The recorded level of involvement and time commitment required of the Lord Mayor in 2008/09 is set out in the Matrix at Appendix E. However, the Panel noted that the level of involvement could vary year-to-year.

During the witness session with the former Lord Mayors, it was also highlighted that experience was needed for the role of Chairman. It was also remarked that chairing a meeting without prior experience of the organisation could be difficult, and was probably not the best role for a time-limited appointment such as Lord Mayor.

It could provide clarity for the organisations, Lord Mayor and the public if the Lord Mayor took on the same role for each appointment. For example, he could be Honorary Patron (Takes part in events as requested and name is used) for the majority of organisations. This would clarify the role of Lord Mayor and ensure that the outside bodies appointed suitable trustees if required. The organisations involved would need to be consulted on any changes to the role of the Lord Mayor to ensure the organisations requirements continued to be met.

Recommendation 15: Wherever possible, the Lord Mayor's role on outside bodies should become Honorary Patron.

6. Conclusion

During the course of the review, the Panel considered a wide variety of evidence and reviewed information from a number of Outside Bodies. From the evidence presented, it was clear that the presence of councillors on outside bodies can bring a number of benefits in terms of improved relations with the local community. However, there are a number of areas where inconsistencies exist and changes could be considered. The evaluation carried out by the panel has revealed anomalies in the status of Members who sit on outside bodies, rather than their presence per se; and that some of the panel's recommendations are designed to help regularise this.

Finally, the recommendations relating to improving the appointments process will help to address the review concern of inappropriate growth and regularise the appointments process to ensure that Member resources are used appropriately and effectively.

Appendix A: Summary of recommendations

Recommendation 1: If an organisation does not provide a report to the council for two consecutive years, the necessity of the appointment should be reviewed.

Recommendation 2: That the councillor representatives on the following organisations be transferred to a newly recognised liaison role:

- ***The cross Channel Arts Association***
- ***The Canterbury and District Voluntary Action and Support***
- ***The Canterbury and Herne Bay Volunteer Centre***

Recommendation 3: That councillor representation on the following organisations be reduced to one¹⁰:

- ***Age Concern (Herne Bay)***
- ***Canterbury District Citizens Advice Bureau***
- ***Canterbury Housing Advice Centre***
- ***Canterbury-Reims Twinning Association***
- ***Canterbury Relief in Need Charity***

Recommendation 4: That those councillors appointed to trusteeships are:

i) Fully informed of their role as part of the Member induction process and are issued with the Charity Commission's "Essential Trustee" guidance

ii) To include a reference to any service level agreement existing between the city and an outside body in their report to the council

iii) To ensure the trustee appointment is included on their register of interests held by the Monitoring Officer.

Recommendation 5: Councillor appointments to trusteeships should be for a four-year term.

Recommendation 6: That a small politically balanced "appointments group" panel of councillors chaired by the Chief Executive be created to consider nominations for appointments to outside bodies.

Recommendation 7: The appointments group, when considering an appointment, which is contested, would take into account:

- 1) The experience and knowledge of the candidates on the remit and function of the outside body***

¹⁰ The current number of councillor representatives are set out in Appendix D of this report.

2) When a candidate is currently on an outside body, there is a report from that body on the representative. It should also take account of whether a candidate is under the two terms maximum suggested for an appointment

Recommendation 8: That due to their nature and role, the Executive should nominate councillors to the following organisations:

- **The Canterbury Housing Advice Centre**
- **Porchlight**
- **The Local Government Association Rural Commission**
- **The Local Government Association Urban Commission**
- **The Local Government Association Coastal Issues Special Interest Group**
- **National Parking Adjudication Service Joint Committee**
- **Kent International Airport Consultative Committee**
- **Tourism South East**
- **British Resorts and Destinations Association**

Recommendation 9: There should be a presumption that non-councillors will only be nominated as the council's representative if they have a specialist knowledge that is of particular benefit to the organisation and council.

Recommendation 10: That councillors should not normally serve more than two full terms (8 years) on an outside body, subject to discussions between the city council and the outside body at the time.

Recommendation 11: It should be presumed that any additional Lord Mayor appointments would be for the individual Lord Mayor's term of office.

Recommendation 12: Any proposed future Lord Mayor Outside Body appointments that are for longer than one year should be considered by the panel of councillors chaired by the Chief Executive.

Recommendation 13: That the Lord Mayor stand down from the following organisations from May 2010 on the basis that they are Kent-wide rather than district organisations.

- **Kent Youth Theatre**
- **Invicta Concert Band**
- **English Speaking Union**
- **Kent Competitive Festival**

Recommendation 14: That in future, unless there is an exceptional case, there should be a presumption against the Lord Mayor only be appointed to Kent-wide organisations.

Recommendation 15: Wherever possible, the Lord Mayor's role on outside bodies should become Honorary Patron.

