

## Annex B

### Your views

We would welcome your views on the issues covered by this consultation paper and any other comments and suggestions you may have.

### Questions

The specific questions which feature throughout the text of this paper are reproduced for ease of reference:

Q1. Does the proposed text on the disclosure of confidential information strike an appropriate balance between the need to treat certain information as confidential, but to allow some information to be made public in defined circumstances when to do so would be in the public interest?

Q2. Subject to powers being available to us to refer in the code to actions by members in their private capacity beyond actions which are directly relevant to the office of the member, is the proposed text which limits the proscription of activities in a member's private capacity to those activities which have already been found to be unlawful by the courts, appropriate?

Q3. Is the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity serving a useful purpose? If the Publicity Code is abolished, do consultees think some or all of its provisions should be promulgated in a different way, eg via guidance issued by local government representative bodies, or should authorities be left to make their own decisions in this area without any central guidance? Should authorities not currently subject to the Publicity Code be required to follow it, or should the current position with regard to them be maintained?

Q4. Does the proposed text with regard to gifts and hospitality adequately combine the need for transparency as well as proportionality in making public information with regard to personal interests?

Q5. Does the proposed text relating to friends, family and those with a close personal association adequately cover the breadth of relationships which ought to be covered, to identify the most likely people who might benefit from decisions made by a member, including family, friends, business associates and personal acquaintances?

Q6. Would it be appropriate for new exceptions to be included in the text as additions to the list of items which are not to be regarded as prejudicial?

Q7. Is the proposed text relaxing the rules to allow increased representation at meetings, including where members attend to make representations, answer questions, or give evidence, appropriate?



Q8. Is there a better, more user-friendly way of ensuring the text is gender-neutral, for example, would consultees consider that amending the wording to say 'you' instead of 'he or she' or 'him or her' would result in a clearer and more accessible code for members?

Comments should be sent by e-mail or post by 9 March 2007 to:

William Tandoh  
Local Democracy Directorate  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
5/G10  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU

[william.tandoh@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:william.tandoh@communities.gsi.gov.uk)