

### **Ethical Walls Procedure**

This procedure is designed to be read alongside the protocol on the Respective Roles of Members and Officers and Dealing with Conflicts of Interest.

It is recognised that there may be rare occasions most commonly in a regulatory context or where a council owned/ influenced company/organisation context (Council Entity) has been established where it is not possible to reconcile the interests of the two Councils or those between the council(s) and a Council Entity with their respective legal responsibilities.

Such conflicts shall be managed by ensuring that relevant officers working for each side are ring fenced from each other to ensure that due regard is taken of the respective and conflicting duties and interests and the need for certain matters to remain confidential to the individual Council or Council Entity. This procedure sets out how this will operate in practice.

### **Background**

An Ethical wall, cone of silence, screen or firewall is a business term describing an information barrier within an organisation that is erected in order to prevent exchanges or communication that could lead to conflicts of interest and/or the disclosure of information which is confidential to one Council or the other or to a Council Entity. For example an ethical wall may be erected to separate and isolate people who make investments from those who are privy to confidential information that could influence the investment decisions, in newspapers between journalists and advertising executives to protect editorial independence and in law firms where different solicitors are acting for different clients on the same issue.

For the vast majority of members and officers there will be no conflict of interest in working for, being appointed to or advising more than one Council or Council Entity, in fact most officers and members will not experience this during their time in local government. However, a small number of officers and members mainly those holding Executive, senior management, statutory, legal, financial, regulatory and planning posts may face situations where they become aware of conflict or potential conflict between the councils or between one or both of the Councils and a Council Entity. There is a need for officers and members in these posts to maintain vigilance in identifying these situations where conflict could arise. Whilst there is no definitive list of these situations, these might include where one authority is consulting the other with regard to planning policy, planning applications, boundary changes, electoral areas or other situations where there is either an implied or express duty to consult and/or co-operate.

Similar situations apply with regard to legal matters where the Councils are on either side of a dispute and the consideration of homelessness applications to one Council where there may be a local connection identified with one of the others. Similar situations apply to the Council(s) and Council Entities where an officer or member may be a Director or trustee or where an officer or member who is a Director may be dealing with other officers or members in their capacity as Directors or trustees of another Council Entity.

In all cases officers and members should always err on the side of caution and seek advice as it is much better to deal with and plan for potential conflicts, as when actual conflicts are identified it may be that too many officers and members are already acting for one side or the other and/or the erection of the Ethical Wall may be too late. The creation of an Ethical Wall does require a level of maturity and respect from those on either side of it. For instance it is not uncommon for a manager to be on one side and a direct report on the other.

If there is a conflict or significant risk of a conflict, between the councils, or between the Council(s) and a Council Entity the officer or member must not act for both, except where the councils or the council(s) and the Council Entity are expressly pursuing the same common objective. In all cases of conflict or potential conflict a decision should be sought immediately from the Monitoring Officer. The Monitoring Officer in deciding whether there is a conflict or whether the officer or member can act for multiple organisations, will ensure that the overriding consideration is the best interests of the individual organisation, and in particular, whether the benefits of the officer or member acting for all them outweighs the risk.

If the Monitoring Officer feels that there is a risk of conflict or that the interest of the organisations are not best served by an officer or member acting for both they will invoke this procedure.

## **Procedure**

When a conflict or potential conflict is identified an officer or member should alert the Monitoring Officer or one of his deputies.

The Monitoring Officer will provide advice to the officer on whether there is a conflict and in all cases alert all JMT members. The Monitoring Officer will maintain an audit trail of his actions and any advice given, including a list of active Ethical Walls.

In the case that a conflict or potential conflict is identified the Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the relevant members/ JMT officers) will draw up a list of the officers who will be representing the interests of each party.

The Monitoring Officer will alert those on the list, JMT members, relevant lead members and any external parties to the discussion, that an Ethical Wall has been put in place and who they should deal with.

Once the Ethical Wall has been erected, officers on either side of the wall should treat and behave towards the other Council or Council Entity and the officers representing it with full regard to the issue in question as if they were an external organisation. That is information supplied by the other party should be thoroughly and critically examined and not taken on trust or face value, and information which is confidential to the interests of the organisation they represent must not be disclosed to the other party.

Whilst this relationship should be respectful and business like, it should be based on auditable correspondence as opposed to verbal communications as such documents could later be relied upon in legal action.

It should be agreed where files and electronic correspondence should be held and neither party should access information held by the other. Appropriate access restrictions will be established by ICT Services for information held electronically.

Officers should only advise members and officers on their side of the wall. Reports to committees must be in the name of and signed off by officers on the correct side of the wall and officers should not be present at meetings at any time when they are dealing with the issue on the other side of the wall.

The Ethical Wall should only be used for the issue in question and does not extend to any other areas of work.

When the issue in question has been successfully concluded the Monitoring Officer(s) should be notified and they will close the issue on the list of active Ethical Walls if they deem it appropriate.

In the case of an Ethical Wall between the Councils, the list will contain a minimum of two named officers on either side, one of which will be the Monitoring Officer, a Deputy Monitoring Officer or a legal officer. The Head of Paid Service (or in her absence or case of conflict her deputy) will not normally be assigned to either side of the wall and will not become involved in the issue. This enables the Head of Paid Service to arbitrate on any issue including human resources implications which may arise in the operation of this procedure. For employees in shared teams the identity of their employing Council will not necessarily dictate the side of the Wall to which they are allocated.

## **Statutory Officers and Section 113 Agreement Dispute Resolution Procedure**

All Councils must have a Head of Paid Service, a Monitoring Officer and a Section 151 Officer. These officers are part of the management teams and have a legal obligation to act in the best interests of the authorities which appointed them.

It is imperative that the statutory officer system is robust and resilient therefore statutory officers should ensure that they appoint deputy statutory officers who may act for the other council(s) in case they are conflicted. To account for this and also to ensure there is sufficient statutory officer resilience; the recommendation is that each statutory officer appoints at least one, but preferably two deputies.

If any of these statutory posts consider that there is a conflict of interest within their area of responsibility, which has not been resolved through invoking this procedure and which is affecting the ability of any of the individual Councils to function effectively the most appropriate statutory officer(s) may take a report to the full Councils setting out the conflict of interest and proposals for resolution and invoke the Section 113 Agreement dispute resolution procedure between the Councils or the relevant shareholder agreement/ Memorandum of Understanding Dispute resolution procedure for Council Entities if necessary.