

# Chichester District Council

**CABINET**

**7 April 2015**

## **Committee Rooms Audio System and Recording Meetings**

### **1. Contacts**

#### **Cabinet Member**

Josef Ransley

Cabinet Member for Support Services

Tel: 01403 820891

E-mail: [jransley@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:jransley@chichester.gov.uk)

#### **Report Author:**

Jane Dodsworth, Head of Business Improvement Services

Tel: 01243 534729

E-mail: [jdodsworth@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:jdodsworth@chichester.gov.uk)

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. That a new microphone system is purchased with the capability of making audio recordings for council use and for publication online and that the appended Project Initiation Document (PID) be approved.**
- 2.2. That the Council be recommended to approve a one year pilot to audio record and publish Council, Cabinet, Planning and Overview and Scrutiny meetings online.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 A scrutiny task and finish group met during 2012 and produced a protocol for audio recording of certain Council meetings and recommended to Cabinet that a pilot be undertaken to assess the value of recording meetings. Cabinet did not support this recommendation.
- 3.2 At Council on 23 September 2014, when considering a recommendation from Cabinet regarding Government regulations on openness of Local Government, including a requirement to allow any member of the public to take photographs, audio record or film proceedings of all meetings, excluding Part 2 agenda items, Mr Ransley reminded the Council of the previous proposal to audio record certain meetings which had failed to gain majority support. He was concerned that the Council would not have its own full record of proceedings to rebut any misrepresentation or out-of-context use of press or public recordings. Council members agreed and asked him to bring forward for consideration a further proposal on recording meetings.
- 3.3 Due to the ongoing limited life span of the microphone system, £70,000 provision has been made within the Council's Asset Replacement Programme (ARP) for a like-for-like replacement in 2015/16. The ARP was approved by Cabinet on 3 February 2015 as part of the budget spending plans (see Appendix 4 to the Budget report). Following the considerations and recommendations from the previous Task and Finish Group, it would seem

appropriate to consider all options and costs in order to future proof any replacement equipment.

3.4 The Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 18 November 2014 agreed that as Members are the primary users of the microphone system, a task and finish group be set up to consider options around a replacement microphone/audio system and to reconsider future recording of meetings.

3.5 The purpose of the review was to explore the desirability and feasibility of:

- a) Audio recording meetings or audio visual recordings of the Council, Cabinet and Committees.
- b) Making these recordings available on the Council's website taking account of previous research and:
  - i. Costs (not just the initial cost of installing equipment, but also on-going costs, such as editing and summarising) and added value, so that these can be balanced against other priorities.
  - ii. Experience of other Councils, particularly in relation to web-casting, including information about viewing figures, public response and demand.
  - iii. Legal implications, such as data protection and human rights.

#### **4. Outcomes to be achieved**

4.1 A replacement microphone system to deliver the needs of the Council over the next 10 years.

4.2 Options on whether to resource future audio recording or webcasting of the Council's meetings.

#### **5. Proposal**

5.1. Members of the OSC, after receiving the deliberations of the task and finish group, considered options for replacement of the microphone system, and recommend that a new system should be procured, subject to the project management and procurement process set out in the Constitution.

5.2. The OSC also considered options for webcasting meetings but decided against introducing this due to costs, resource requirements and a perceived lack of value for money.

5.3. Finally, the OSC recommended that a one year pilot be undertaken to audio record and publish Council, Cabinet, Planning and Overview and Scrutiny meeting audio records online.

#### **6. Alternatives that have been considered**

6.1. A webcasting proposal from Public-i was considered by the group, with pricing and specification.

- 6.2. WSCC was consulted to establish whether any shared arrangement could be progressed. However they are not updating their webcasting system at this time. This option was therefore not progressed.

## 7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. £70,000 has been set aside in the Asset Replacement Plan for replacement of the Council's microphone system. Server costs and support over 5 years will cost £10k and a further £3-£5k will be required for template design and development. These costs will be met from existing service budgets.
- 7.2. There will be 5-7 days of Webteam staff time to cover web design, development, deployment, configuration, training, server build, security testing and sign off. Member Services officers will set up the audio system at the beginning of the meeting and download the recording at the end.

## 8. Consultation

- 8.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee received the report of the Task and Finish Group and their recommendations to Cabinet are set out in paragraph 5 above.
- 8.2 Members were all invited to attend microphone system demonstrations to allow them involvement in deciding the specification of the future system.

## 9 Community impact and corporate risks

- 9.1 An audio record of the Council's main meetings published online will allow local people to have access to, and an understanding of, the Council's decision making processes. Those who find it difficult to attend meetings, due to disability, caring responsibilities, work commitments or access to transport, will be able to benefit.
- 9.2 Having an audio record on file may work to reduce the number of people who attend meetings even further. Alternatively, the number of residents listening to recordings may be very low. At the end of the one year pilot the Council would need to assess the value of audio recording meetings to assess whether it should be continued or not.

## 10 Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime &amp; Disorder:</b>		x
<b>Climate Change:</b>		x
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact:</b> Those who find it difficult to attend meetings, due to disability, caring responsibilities, work commitments or access to transport, will find the audio recordings beneficial.	x	
<b>Safeguarding:</b>		x

## 11 Appendices

- 11.1 Project Initiation Document (PID)

## **12 Background Papers**

None