

UNCLASSIFIED

Annual Report 2012-13

Committee on Standards
In Public Life

August 2013

UNCLASSIFIED

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Introduction	4
Overview of Activities	5
Review of best practice	6
Fifth biennial survey	9
Triennial review	10
Strategic Plan 2012–15.....	11
Standards Check	12
Party funding	12
Lobbying.....	14
Local government standards.....	14
Independent adviser on Ministerial interests.....	16
The Leveson Inquiry.....	16
MPs' pay and expenses	17
Outstanding Risks	17
Representations and Speeches	19
Appendix 1: About the Committee	21
Terms of reference	21
Status	22
Funding and administration.....	22
Policy on openness	22
Appendix 2: Members of the Committee	23
Members active in 2012-13 who are currently members	23
Members active in 2012-13 who have subsequently stood down	26
New members in 2012-13	24
Research Advisory Board	26
Members' attendance (1 April 2011 - 31 March 2012).....	27
Remuneration.....	27
Appendix 3: Financial Information	29
Appendix 4: Reports and Publications	30

INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee on Standards in Public Life has wide terms of reference.

“To examine current concerns about standards of conduct of all holders of public office, including arrangements relating to financial and commercial activities, and make recommendations as to any changes in present arrangements which might be required to ensure the highest standards of propriety in public life and to review issues in relation to the funding of political parties, and to make recommendations as to any changes in present arrangements.”¹

2. The Committee fulfils this role partly through its formal inquiries. In addition, we routinely monitor and consider issues and concerns relating to standards in public life, track public perception of standards of conduct of public office holders and seek to promote the Seven Principles of Public Life. We contribute to public policy development through meetings, seminars, research, speaking engagements, and by responding to consultation papers on relevant issues.
3. This report provides an overview of the Committee’s activities over the course of the financial year 2012/13. The Committee’s main project in this year has been to produce its Fourteenth Report, *Standards matter: A review of best practice in promoting good behaviour in public life*. This report aimed to analyse what has been shown to work best in promoting high standards and to take stock of current areas of risk. The project was launched in May 2012, and the final report was published in January 2013. The Committee also carried out its fifth biennial survey of attitudes to standards in public life, the results of which will be published in September 2013.
4. A triennial review of the Committee was carried out this year, the report of which was published by the Government in February 2013. As a result, on 5 February 2013, the terms of reference of the Committee were clarified in two respects: *‘...in future the Committee should not inquire into matters relating to the devolved legislatures and governments except with the agreement of those bodies’* and *‘...the Committee’s remit to examine “standards of conduct of all holders of public office” [encompasses] all those involved in the delivery of public services, not solely those*

¹ Hansard (HC) 25 October 1994, col. 758, Hansard (HC) 12 November 1997, col. 899 and Hansard (HC) 25 October 1994, col 758

*appointed or elected to public office.*²

5. Following an open competition, Lord Bew has been appointed the new Chair of the Committee effective from 1 September 2013. His term of office is for five years and is non-renewable. Following the end of Sir Christopher Kelly's term on 31 March 2013, David Prince served as interim Chair until 31 July 2013.
6. The appendices to this report provide detail about the structure and finances of the Committee.

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

General Overview

7. This year we reflected on what has been achieved since the Committee's first report in 1995. We asked ourselves whether the task was completed and, if not, what more still needs to be done. We found that while many of the original "Nolan Principles" - such as integrity, accountability and openness are widely understood and resonate closely with public expectations - the principles as a whole were still not being lived out everywhere in spirit as well as letter. There needed to be more active implementation and embedding within the day to day business of many organisations.
8. More disturbingly, the year's news was dominated by stories of governance failures and other inappropriate behaviour in institutions previously enjoying high levels of public trust and confidence, and by the failure of leadership in others, both private and public, to inculcate a culture of high standards in tune with public expectations. Many instances have involved deliberate attempts to get around codes of practice and conduct, and in some cases there are allegations involving covering up, concealment and even criminal activity. Moreover, when some individuals attempted to raise ethical issues or standards concerns they were prevented or inhibited from raising those concerns internally or speaking out on issues in the public interest.
9. So, while much of the infrastructure is now in place to support high standards - statements of principles, codes of conduct, independent scrutiny, and while standards of behaviour have improved in many areas of public life, high standards are still not yet understood everywhere as a matter of integrity and personal responsibility. Recent lapses have occurred not because individuals, often in key leadership roles, have been unaware of their responsibility and of what

² Hansard (HC) 5 February 2013, col. 7WS

Lobbying

36. The Committee continues to regard lobbying as an area in which there are genuine concerns involving suspicions that some lobbying may be taking place in secret and some individuals or organisations have more access to policy makers, so that it is not known who or what is influencing a particular decision. However, we remain doubtful that a statutory register of third party lobbyists, as proposed by the Government in a consultation paper in 2012, is the key to further reform. We believe it would be better to build on the steps already taken to increase transparency. Greater transparency might include, for example, enhancing the level of disclosure around meetings between ministers and those lobbying on behalf of a particular interest, as proposed in a report published in July 2012 by the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee. The Government renewed its commitment to introducing a statutory register of lobbyists and increasing transparency around lobbying in its mid-term review of the Coalition published in January and has recently restated that legislation will be introduced in July 2013.
37. As set out in our annual work plan, the Committee has been considering the transparency issues around lobbying, focusing particularly on those who are lobbied. To progress this work, the Committee issued a call for evidence in June and will be holding a meeting after the Parliamentary recess with interested parties, to look at what more can be done to bring greater integrity to existing arrangements. With the evidence gathered we aim to produce proportionate recommendations which will complement the proposed statutory provision and help restore the public's trust and confidence.

Local government standards

38. Under the Localism Act 2011 the new local government standards regime came into effect on 1 July 2012. The Committee welcomed the introduction of a mandatory requirement for local authorities to adopt a local code of conduct based on the Seven Principles of Public Life and the intention to encourage a greater sense of local responsibility for standards and to reduce the number of vexatious complaints.
39. While we recognise that the new system needs time to properly bed in, we do, however, have certain concerns:
- Due to the emphasis on local ownership of standards we would expect the new regime, like the previous one, to function well in those areas where party leaders are prepared to provide the

UNCLASSIFIED

necessary leadership and example. It is likely to do less well where such leadership is inadequate.⁵ History suggests that problems are most likely in areas with monolithic political cultures and correspondingly little political challenge, where partisan rivalry is most bitter and tit-for-tat accusations most common, or in those predominantly rural areas with significant numbers of independent members without the benefit of party discipline.

- Under the previous arrangements local authorities and an independent tribunal had the power to suspend members for varying periods of time as a sanction against poor behaviour. The only sanctions now available, apart from through the use of a political party's internal discipline procedures are censure or criminal prosecution for deliberately withholding or misrepresenting a financial interest. We do not think these are sufficient. The last few years have seen a number of examples of inappropriate behaviour which would not pass the strict tests required to warrant a criminal prosecution, but which deserves a sanction stronger than simple censure. While censure may carry opprobrium in the political arena it is often considered unacceptably lenient by the public relative to other areas of their experience. Coercion of other members or officers is one category of offence with which it will be difficult to deal adequately under the new arrangements.
- Under the previous arrangements allegations about poor behaviour were determined by standards committees independently chaired by individuals who were not themselves members of the local authority. Under the new arrangements every local authority must appoint at least one independent person whose views it will seek, and take into account, before making its decision on an allegation that it has decided to investigate. We doubt that this will be sufficient to provide assurance that justice is being done and, equally important, that it is seen to be done.
- In the transition to the new system local authorities may have lacked proper time to prepare. In early June 2012 we wrote to all local authorities in England to ask about their preparations for implementing the new regime which came into force on 1 July 2012. The Committee was concerned that so late in the day, nearly half of those who responded had yet to adopt a new code and around four fifths had yet to appoint an independent person. The fact that the Regulations and Order which took effect from 1 July were laid only on 6 June cannot have helped their preparations.

⁵ Not forgetting that in several prominent recent cases it is the behaviour of leaders themselves that have been under question.

UNCLASSIFIED

40. While inevitably there have been various teething problems with the new regime, the Committee will continue to monitor the implementation and its effectiveness, particularly in relation to public confidence that any wrongdoing is tackled promptly and transparently in the absence of any external investigation and scrutiny.

Independent Adviser on Ministerial Interests

41. In a report published in March 2012, the Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) raised the possibility that the Independent Adviser on Ministerial Interests was in practice insufficiently independent, as he or she is appointed personally by the Prime Minister, is supported from within the Cabinet Office, and cannot instigate his or her own investigations. Investigations can only be undertaken at the request of the Prime Minister. We agreed, and argued for the independence of the role to be increased and the power to instigate investigations to be granted.
42. The Independent Adviser on Ministerial Interests has carried out one investigation since then, finding in June 2012 that the then Conservative Co-Chairman had committed a minor breach of the Ministerial Code by not declaring a business relationship. However, there has also been controversy over the Prime Minister's decisions not to refer allegations made in 2012 about a possible breach of the code by the then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport in relation to the bid by News Corporation for BSkyB to the Independent Adviser, on the basis that the issue would be looked at during evidence sessions for the Leveson Inquiry. It would in our view have taken much of the politics out of the issue, to everyone's advantage, if the decision on whether to investigate separately had been taken by the Independent Adviser – even if, as he might well have done, he had taken the same view. It is too easy for a Prime Ministerial decision not to refer, to be interpreted, however unfairly, as being motivated by a desire to avoid uncomfortable revelations.
43. In July 2012 our then Chair, Sir Christopher Kelly, issued a statement arguing for the Adviser to have the power to instigate investigations. The debate is still ongoing, and we continue to monitor it with interest.

The Leveson Inquiry

44. Part 1 of the Leveson Inquiry into the culture, practice and ethics of the press was published in November 2012. The Committee submitted written evidence to the Inquiry in 2011, and welcomed the contribution it made to the debate on press regulation and public standards in the UK more