

OUTCOME OF MEMBER CONSULTATION ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE REGISTER

As at 13 April 2007, 10 Council Members and 2 Independent Members had responded to the consultation on the publication of the Register of Members' Interests, of which 6 had commented on the proposal. The comments are set out below.

1. No. of Members who agree with the proposal to publish the Register of Members' Interests on the Council's website and would be happy for their entry in the Register to be published: 5

Comments:

- "a. I am astounded that Harrow has yet to follow the lead and good practice of most other boroughs in London in publishing this information.
- i. In such circumstances, a lay person might mistakenly but entirely reasonably conclude that Harrow's Members felt that they had something to hide.
 - ii. Given Lambeth's recent (failing) 1-star CPA rating, I would have thought that, as a general rule, it would be better to draw upon examples of good practice from 4-star, excellent authorities like the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, Wandsworth or Westminster.
 1. Of these, RBKC and Westminster both have links from the individual Members' pages to their respective declaration (as a pdf) whilst Wandsworth does a combined document for all councillors that is reached from the main councillors' page.
 2. I think the question then becomes balancing ease of access with ease of administering and updating the Register.
- b. I would like my web page on the Council website to carry my full register entry, irrespective of whether the full Register is published.
- i. If that can't be done, then I want a link added to my web page to my personal website which will have my full entry listed.
- c. There may be an argument that under only the most exceptional of circumstances, Members might be permitted to keep their home addresses confidential; personal or operational security concerns might justify this. However:
- i. As their addresses already appear on the paper record, it is just a question of easier access;
 - ii. Not revealing this information would have to be weighed against the need for ensuring maximum transparency on issues like planning or licensing to avoid charges of special interest, cronyism and nimbyism in decision-making on those bodies.
- Can I just add that I wasn't overly impressed by the layout of the Lambeth information via the modern.gov software. In fact, that software doesn't seem to be very reader-friendly in the daily updates we receive, etc.

- Since we already have pdf software licenses, I don't see what the value of modern.gov would in this instance. Perhaps you could provide some more information?
- I would further add that I would prefer to use an individualized pdf like RBKC or Westminster, and would point out to how RBKC can reach a Member's register of interests from his/her personal page and a page that gives all councillors' names and links to their registers. However, Westminster's actual pdf page is better as it includes their borough crest!"

"Welcome this – long overdue! Should try and get agreement on common format for all Councillors if possible".

2. No. of Members who agree with the proposal to publish the Register of Members' Interests on the Council's website and would be happy for their entry in the Register to be published, providing certain categories of information (eg employer or address) were not published:

6

Comments:

"I would not want my contact address to be published on website".

"I agree with this proposal, as all info is obtainable anyway. It would merely be a preference NOT to have my address and employer's details on the website".

"I would like to check for accuracy before any further information is published".

3. No. of Members who do not agree with the proposal to publish the Register of Members' Interests on the Council's website:

1

Comments:

"Members are entitled to privacy as are their spouses and family. A Registration is supported but not universal, open access for snooping or nosey people.

Do not support and wish this to be discussed at full Council".