From:

Karen Hindley

Sent:

02 May 2013 14:18

To:

Living

Subject:

Publicity Code Consultation 2013 - Response from Sandwell MBC

Attachments: Response form - Publicity Code Consultation 1 (2).doc

Please find attached the response from Sandwell MBC to the Publicity Code Consultation 2013.

This response is submitted on behalf of the organisation - a Metropolitan Borough Council - and has been approved by the Deputy Leader of the Council.

Should any further information be required in this respect, please let me know.

Karen Hindley | Strategic Lead - Improvement |

x sandwell_mbc_col1

Sandwell Council... working for you

Sandwell Council Oldbury West Midlands B69 3DE

W: www.sandwell.gov.uk W: www.sandwelltrends.info

Think before you print! Save energy and paper. Do you really need to print this email?

The information in this message must be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless explicitly stated. If you have received this message in error notify the sender and delete it. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are those of the author and may not necessarily reflect those of Sandwell MBC and no contractual arrangement is intended to arise from this communication. You should also be aware that any email may be subject to a request under Data Protection, Freedom of Information or Environmental Information and therefore could be disclosed to third parties. Please note that Sandwell MBC cannot guarantee that this message or any attachments are virus or malware free and have not been intercepted and amended.

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

e name a later of the

Response form Publicity Code Consultation 2013

About you

i) Your details

Name:	Steve Harrison
Position (if applicable)	Communications Manager
Name of Organisation (if applicable)	Sandwell Council
Address:	Communications Unit Council House Oldbury West Midlands
	B69 3DE
e mail:	E-94
Telephone Number:	

ii) Are the views expres	ssed on this cons	sultation an	official's response
from the organisation	you represent or	your own pe	rsonal views?

Organisational response		:		8 0			✓
Personal views	*		3) 12	8	20	e.	

iii) Please tick the box which best describes you or your organisation:

District council	
Metropolitan district council	1
London borough council	
Unitary authority/county council/county borough council	
Parish council	-
Membership organisation	
Newspaper proprietor	
Newspaper staff	
Business	
Councillor	
Member of the public	12
Other	

(please comment):

Statutory restriction to only four council publications a year is a sledgehammer to crack the proverbial nut given that – as the DCLG's consultation document itself acknowledges – "the majority of local authorities comply fully with the Publicity Code's recommendations".

It's hard to conclude, therefore, that council publications represent a serious threat to the local press and that the full force of the law is needed to protect it.

It is also disappointing that the consultation contains no proposals to stop councils having to place public notices in local papers. The legal requirement on us to do this is hopelessly out of date given the variety of communications channels now available.

It also means that – far from threatening local papers – councils effectively subsidise it with thousands of pounds of taxpayers' money every year.

Questions:

1. Views on the proposed legislation are invited, and in particular do consultees see the proposals as fully delivering the commitment to give greater force to the Publicity Code by putting compliance on a statutory basis?

Response:

The legislation is not needed (see comment above).

This particular question is loaded and can only have one answer, i.e. yes, of course the proposals would deliver the stated commitment. It begs, however, the underlying question of whether it is necessary.

2. If there is alternative aim of improved enforce	to the power of direction, how will ement of the code?	this meet the
	a	a)
Response:	**************************************	
No alternative is neede a threat to local papers	ed given that council publications.	ns do not represent
* * *		
		*
was not met and the imp	ites evidence of the circumstances plications of this on competition in	
was not met and the imp		
was not met and the imp		
was not met and the imp		

.