

Adams Holly

From: Hazel Smith [hazel.smith@miltonvillage.org.uk]  
Sent: 14 October 2011 17:59  
To: Adams Holly  
Subject: Re: FW: Draft Constitution Review Paper - Use of Social Media & Recording Meetings

Dear Holly

As I understand it, the proposal is that an unedit ed copy be retained by the people doing the recording, for 4 months. This is a bit arbitrary and the edited footage may well be used after that time, mightn't it? There is no time given within which it must be used or destroyed. The people making the recording own the footage and determine when and how it is used, is there a mechanism by which we could retain some control over it?

Hazel

On 14/10/2011 13:29, Cllr Smith HM wrote:

-----  
**From:** Adams Holly  
**Sent:** Friday, October 14, 2011 1:28:52 PM  
**Subject:** Draft Constitution Review Paper - Use of Social Media & Recording Meetings  
**Importance:** High  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Dear members

Since March 2011 the Council has been looking at issues surrounding public / press recording of meetings and the use of social media at meetings. Attached is a draft paper for the Constitution Review Working Party meeting at 1.30 pm on Thursday 10 November 2011. All councillors are invited to attend the meeting. If you would like a hard copy of the agenda please let me know by 7 November 2011.

Whether or not you are able to attend, please let me have your written comments before noon on 28 October 2011 and these will be appended to the report for consideration by the CRWP.

As this is a draft report it is for internal circulation only. It has been on the Forward Plan since May 2011, and any members of public who wish to comment on the publicly available material may do so through their local councillor or by contacting me directly. Members of the public can obtain the reports previously considered from <http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/mgIssueHistoryHome.aspx?IId=5342>. The final version of this report will become available to the public on Wednesday 2 November 2011, and public consultation will continue up until 24 November when Council meets to make its final decision.

Since the consultation with councillors and with the public is still underway, there aren't any appendices C and D at the moment.

I'm happy to provide any clarification of matters in the report.

Kind regards  
Holly

Holly Adams  
Democratic Services Team Leader  
South Cambridgeshire District Council  
T: 01954 713030  
F: 01954 713149  
W: [www.scambs.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.scambs.gov.uk/meetings)  
Follow us on Twitter - [twitter.com/southcambs](https://twitter.com/southcambs) and Facebook - search 'South Cambridgeshire'

\*\*\*\*\*

## Adams Holly

---

**From:** Dr D.R. de Lacey [del2@hermes.cam.ac.uk] on behalf of Dr DR de Lacey [del2@cam.ac.uk]  
**Sent:** 17 October 2011 14:34  
**To:** Adams Holly  
**Subject:** Amendments to standing orders (Recording of meetings)

Dear Holly,

I believe you want responses to the above document. I must say I think it has been very poorly written. The confusion over the intention of Standing Order 21.4 is an indication that it was badly drafted in the first place (see below for specific concerns) and the remedy is to clarify the Order itself, not to add equally unclear riders.

Para 2 (a) and (b): I do not see what this has to do with recordings, but it raises some issues which it fails to address.

(b) Can a point of information not include a place where the Council has inadequate (or no) information rather than just incorrect information?

How should the member indicate, 'whilst another member is speaking', that it is a point of information on which he or she wishes to speak?

Para 2 (c) This does not appear to have been properly thought through by the Working Party. What precisely is the WP trying to permit and/or forbid? There are some preliminary issues to be settled before the wording is adopted.

1. What is a photographic recording if not visual? Should it not be 'and / or visual recording in any format (including by photographic means)'?

2. What other visual means are there: is it intended to forbid a Member (or a visitor) doodling an image of the Chairman?

3. Who is to be included? Councillors and Officers appear to be ignored. Some of the latter have been breaching this SO whenever presentations are made; and see my comments on 15, below. Only when we clearly understand the answers to these can we even begin to draft a clear Order. This text is not clear.

2 (d) Again I am not happy this is adequately clear. Is the phrase 'social media' (which, for instance includes YouTube) adequately unambiguous? The Order should make explicit precisely who is included, since 2 (c) implicitly refers only to the media and public and could hence exclude Members and Officers. Is that intended? This wording does not tell us. Does 2(d) override 2(c) or vice versa?

15. I just do not understand how such an interpretation, broad or narrow, could encompass recordings other than audio or visual, and if it did then the clerk of the meeting has been breaking it every time. What is needed is clear thinking in the language used, not new and equally muddled orders.

28 It is significant that even those presumed to be most au fait with these technologies include the phrase 'after meetings'. That is surely the right time.

### Appendix A

Para 2 What about Councillors and Officers?

Para 11 This is redundant in the light of para 14.

### Appendix B

This is a terrible muddle. The author needs to decide whether it is to be produced from the viewpoint of the Council or from that of the applicant.

'I would like to' (which should surely be 'I wish to' or 'I hereby apply to') suggests the latter, in which case the use of 'you' below is simply confusing.

'at the following meeting' suggests that 'Name' means name of meeting!

It would be so easy to produce a clear and simple application form, but this is not it.

I look forward to a significantly better document for us to consider in November.

Best wishes,  
Douglas