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Introduction

In September 2017, the Communities and Local Government Select Committee relaunched the inquiry into the effectiveness of local authority overview and scrutiny committees that had been started by its predecessor earlier that year. The Select Committee published its report on 15 December 2017: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/369/36902.htm.

The Government will be looking at further ways to extend and improve transparency and is grateful both to the Committee for its consideration of the effectiveness of overview and scrutiny committees and to all those organisations and individuals who provided oral and written evidence.

Scrutiny can play a vital role in ensuring local accountability on a wide range of local issues. It is one of the key checks and balances in the system and the Government is committed to ensuring councils are aware of its importance, understand the benefits effective scrutiny can bring and have access to best practice to inform their thinking.

The Government firmly believes that every council is best-placed to decide which scrutiny arrangements suit its individual circumstances, and so is committed to ensuring that they have the flexibility they need to put those arrangements in place.

The Government is pleased the Select Committee acknowledges overview and scrutiny is functioning effectively in many local authorities and that committees are playing a key role in helping executives develop and review policy. The Government accepts, however, that in some councils scrutiny is not functioning as well as might be expected.

The Select Committee has made a number of recommendations, most, but not all, of which are for the Government to consider. The response in the following pages addresses only those recommendations aimed at the Government.

Recommendation 1: Proposed revisions to Government guidance on scrutiny committees (Page 7)

a) That overview and scrutiny committees should report to an authority’s Full Council meeting rather than to the executive, mirroring the relationship between Select Committees and Parliament.

b) That scrutiny committees and the executive must be distinct and that executive councillors should not participate in scrutiny other than as witnesses, even if external partners are being scrutinised.

c) That councillors working on scrutiny committees should have access to financial and performance data held by an authority, and that this access should not be restricted for reasons of commercial sensitivity.
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d) That scrutiny committees should be supported by officers that are able to operate with independence and offer impartial advice to committees. There should be a greater parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive, and committees should have the same access to the expertise and time of senior officers and the chief executive as their cabinet counterparts.

e) That members of the public and service users have a fundamental role in the scrutiny process and that their participation should be encouraged and facilitated by councils.

Government Response:

The Government acknowledges that the current guidance was issued in 2006 and is happy to ensure it is updated. New guidance will be published later this year.

a) The Government notes the evidence supplied to the Committee. Updated guidance will recommend that scrutiny committees report to the Full Council.

b) The Government accepts the need to limit the executive’s involvement in the scrutiny meetings. Updated guidance will make clear that members of the executive should not participate in scrutiny other than as witnesses.

c) Scrutiny committees already have powers to access documents and updated guidance will stress that councils should judge each request to access sensitive documents on its merits and not refuse as a matter of course. We will also have discussions with the sector to get a better understanding of the issues some scrutiny committees appear to have in accessing information and whether there are any steps the Government could take to alleviate this.

d) Updated guidance will make clear that support officers should be able to operate independently and provide impartial advice. It will also stress the need for councils to recognise and value the scrutiny function and the ways in which it can increase a council’s effectiveness. However, the Government believes that each council should decide for itself how to resource scrutiny committees, including how much access to senior officers is appropriate to enable them to function effectively.

e) The Government fully believes that local authorities should take account of the views of the public and service users in order to shape and improve their services. Scrutiny is a vital part of this, and scrutiny committees should actively encourage public participation. Updated guidance will make this clear.

Recommendation 2: That DCLG works with the Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny to identify willing councils to take part in a pilot scheme where the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny’s effectiveness can be monitored and its merits considered (Paragraph 35).

Government Response:

The Government will give further consideration to this recommendation.
The Government fully accepts that the chair of a scrutiny committee can have a great impact on its effectiveness. As the then Minister told the Select Committee at the oral evidence session on 6 November 2017, a chair needs to have the requisite skills, knowledge and acumen to take on the functions and achieve the outcomes that the scrutiny committee needs to achieve.

The Government also accepts that, in some instances, the election, rather than the appointment, of a chair might help ensure that the right individual is ultimately selected, but feels that this is a decision for every council to make for itself - we note that the Select Committee is “wary of proposing that [election] is imposed upon authorities by Government”.

A local authority is already free to elect a chair if it wishes, and the updated guidance will recommend that every council bears this in mind when deciding on a method for selecting a chair.

The Government is happy to explore with the sector how best to establish the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny committees’ effectiveness, but is not yet convinced that running pilot schemes is the best way to achieve this. The Government will therefore discuss this recommendation with the sector, including the Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny, and write to the Select Committee on this matter when we publish updated guidance.

**Recommendation 3: Councils should be required to publish a summary of resources allocated to scrutiny, using expenditure on executive support as a comparator (Paragraph 62)**

**Government Response:**

The Government does not accept this recommendation.

Many councils do not have dedicated scrutiny support staff - officers work on issues and engage with committees as part of the flow of business - so this would make quantifying the support that scrutiny committees receive very difficult. In the Government’s view, the quality of the support is the more important issue.

The Government firmly believes that each individual authority is best-placed to decide for itself how to support scrutiny most effectively.

**Recommendation 4: That the Government extend the requirement of a Statutory Scrutiny Officer to all councils and specify that the post-holder should have a seniority and profile of equivalence to the council’s corporate management team. To give greater prominence to the role, Statutory Scrutiny Officers should also be required to make regular reports to Full Council on the state of scrutiny, explicitly identifying any areas of weakness that require improvement and the work carried out by the Statutory Scrutiny Officer to rectify them (Paragraph 65).**

**Government Response:**

The Government does not accept this recommendation.

As the then Minister outlined during the oral evidence he gave to the Select Committee, decisions about the allocation of resources for the scrutiny function are best made at a local level. Each council is best-placed to know which arrangements will suit its own individual circumstances. It is not a case of one size fits all.
The key requirement for effective scrutiny is that the culture of the council is right. Where councils recognise the benefits effective scrutiny can bring, and put in place suitable arrangements, it is working well. Local authorities with a strong culture of scrutiny may invite regular reports to full council on the state of scrutiny in the council and this idea will be reflected in the updated guidance.

**Recommendation 5: The Department to put monitoring systems in place and consider whether the support to committees needs to be reviewed and refreshed. We invite the Department to write to us in a year’s time detailing its assessment of the value for money of its investment in the Local Government Association and on the wider effectiveness of local authority scrutiny committees (Paragraph 76).**

**Government Response:**

The Government does not accept this recommendation. Local authorities are independent bodies and it is for them to ensure that their scrutiny arrangements are effective.

The Government firmly believes that every council should be able to access the training it needs to carry out its functions effectively, and recognises that Government itself has a role to play in making this happen. That is why we provide funding to the Local Government Association for sector-led improvement work. It should be noted that this funding is to support local authorities on a wide range of improvement work. It is not purely to assist with overview and scrutiny.

The funding is determined annually and for 2017/18 is £21 million. The package of work that is funded from the grant is set out in a jointly agreed Memorandum of Understanding between the Department and the Local Government Association, which is refreshed annually to ensure that it remains relevant to the sector’s needs.

The Government is, of course, very keen to ensure that this funding provides value for money and that local authorities feel that the training on offer serves their needs. To this end, the Department has quarterly performance monitoring and review meetings with the Local Government Association, which are chaired by the Director-General for Local Government and Public Services.

The Government notes that not all the councillors who provided evidence to the Select Committee felt that the scrutiny training provided was as effective as they would have liked, and that the Local Government Association wrote to the Committee on 20 December 2017 to provide more information on the feedback it received on its support work.

The Government will ensure that the 2018/19 Memorandum of Understanding with the Local Government Association clearly sets out our expectation that they remain responsive to feedback they receive to ensure all training, including scrutiny training, remains relevant and effective.

**Recommendation 6: Scrutiny committees must be able to monitor and scrutinise the services provided to residents. This includes services provided by public bodies and those provided by commercial organisations. Committees should be able to access information and require attendance at meetings from service providers and we call on DCLG to take steps to ensure this happens (Paragraph 90).**

**Government Response:**
Updated guidance will remind councils of the requirements set out in regulations that allow scrutiny members to access exempt or confidential documents in certain circumstances. As mentioned in response to the Select Committee’s recommendation on guidance, the Department will also have discussions with the sector to get a better understanding of the issues some scrutiny committees appear to have in accessing information and whether there are any steps the Government could take to alleviate this.

In terms of service providers’ attendance at meetings, when councils are tendering contracts with external bodies they should carefully consider including requirements to ensure they are as open and transparent as appropriate. Ultimately, however, it is up to each council to decide how best to hold to account those who run its services.

Recommendation 7: The Government to make clear how LEPs are to have democratic, and publicly visible, oversight. We recommend that upper tier councils, and combined authorities where appropriate, should be able to monitor the performance and effectiveness of LEPs through their scrutiny committees. In line with other public bodies, scrutiny committees should be able to require LEPs to provide information and attend committee meetings as required (Paragraph 96).

Government Response:

The Government agrees on the importance of clear and transparent oversight of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The Industrial Strategy made clear the continuing important role of LEPs in delivering local economic growth.

The MHCLG Non-Executive Director Review (published in October 2017), looked at a range of governance issues for LEPs. The Review made a series of recommendations that we have accepted in full and are now implementing. As part of this we have published guidance for LEPs on a range of issues including publication of agenda and papers for LEP Board meetings. This will make the proceedings of LEPs more transparent for local people.

The National Assurance Framework for LEPs states that democratic accountability for the decisions made by the LEP is provided through local authority leader membership of LEP Boards. In places where not all local authorities are represented directly on the LEP board it is important that their representatives have been given a mandate through arrangements which enable collective engagement with all local authority leaders. Many LEPs already go much further in allowing democratic scrutiny of their decision making.

The MHCLG Non-Executive Director Review into LEP governance and transparency explored the extent to which scrutiny was embedded into LEP decision making. The review acknowledged that each LEP had their own arrangements to reflect: legal structure, the complexity and needs of the locality and local requirements to ensure value for money; engagement; and democratic accountability. The Review concluded that it was not appropriate to be prescriptive on the specific arrangements that all LEPs needed to adopt due to the variation in LEP operating models.

The Government committed in the Industrial Strategy White Paper to reviewing the roles and responsibilities of LEPs and to bringing forward reforms to leadership, governance, accountability, financial reporting and geographical boundaries. Working with LEPs, the Government committed to set out a more clearly defined set of activities and objectives in early 2018. MHCLG will write to the Select Committee following the conclusion of this Ministerial review into LEPs to provide an update.
Recommendation 8: We are concerned that effective scrutiny of the Metro Mayors will be hindered by under-resourcing, and call on the Government to commit more funding for this purpose. When agreeing further devolution deals and creating executive mayors, the Government must make clear that scrutiny is a fundamental part of any deal and that it must be adequately resourced and supported. (Paragraph 104)

Government Response:

The Government accepts this recommendation.

At the Budget it was announced that the government will make available to mayoral combined authorities with elected mayors a £12 million fund for 2018-19 and 2019-20, to boost the new mayors’ capacity and resources. Combined Authorities could use some of this resource to ensure that scrutiny and accountability arrangements within the CAs are effectively resourced and supported.

Further to this, the recent Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017, developed with assistance from the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the National Audit Office, provides for the rules of operation for local overview and scrutiny and audit committees to robustly hold combined authorities and mayors to account. The order ensures that there are strong scrutiny arrangements in place consistently across every combined authority area and sets out clear requirements, strengthened appropriately to match the new powers and budgets being devolved, for the arrangement of overview and scrutiny and audit committees in all combined authorities.

Combined authorities are subject to existing relevant legislation applying to local authorities, including the strong finance and audit requirements around ensuring value for money and sustainability. Local democratic accountability, including through the scrutiny of directly-elected mayors, is a crucial and fundamental aspect of devolution.