Recommendations
### Categories of recommendation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it a recommendation?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression of approval</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of disapproval</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>3471</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining or justifying another recommendation</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of point</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear if it is a recommendation</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5680</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actual recommendations

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation?</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>PASC</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No “recommendations”</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>3471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “recommendations”</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>5680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Not clear if a recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not clear</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>PASC</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of “not clear”</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “not clear”</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>5680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"It is essential that the PRT should serve to enhance, rather than replace or duplicate, Iraqi decision-making"

"The security problems of the Islamic world, insofar as they represent threats to world stability of the UK’s interests, require responses no different than those applicable to the other range of risks to international security."
Clear recommendations

“We believe that arrangements for informing and consulting victims’ families under the Victim’s Charter should apply to individuals detained under the Mental Health Act 1983”

“we conclude that the existing NBC unit within the Royal Yeomanry should be retained to provide an expanded NBC capability to counter the domestic threat.”
### Who is it aimed at?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is it aimed at</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government and others</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quango/s and other public bodies</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/subnational government</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational governmental body</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several of the above</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total central g'ment</strong></td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Central government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central govt recs</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>PASC</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No “central govt recs”</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>2854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “central govt recs”</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>3466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Not clear who aimed at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not clear who aimed at</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>PASC</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No &quot;not clear &quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &quot;not clear&quot;</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>3466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not clear who aimed at

“Our view is that while it may not be desirable to have any form of compulsory voting we nevertheless consider that there should be a public debate over this”

“Islamophobia is not only an issue for Muslims: it is a problem that can only be resolved by the majority community in this country, who must acknowledge its existence”
Good examples

“The Home Office should gather reliable statistics from local authorities about the numbers of prosecutions and levels of fines”

“The Government has now made a commitment to a review of existing powers. It is essential that British Muslims are engaged fully in this review ... We believe this should be made an explicit responsibility of the reviewer of the Prevention of Terrorism Act. In parallel, the Home Office should initiate its own consultations”
Discussion point: if a recommendation cannot be addressed by a body who is required to respond to Committee recommendations, is it still worth making the point?

“for Ukraine to have a realistic chance of joining NATO, it not only needs to meet the performance criteria for membership, but it needs to demonstrate that its public are supportive of its membership.”
### What sort of action?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What calling for?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or review</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns/public info</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude change</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic action</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several of the above</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What calling for? | BIS | Defence | FAC | Health | PASC | HAC | Treasury | Total  
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---  
Not clear | 18 | 13 | 71 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 120  
Percentage not clear | 5% | 3% | 12% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 4%  
Total | 382 | 434 | 589 | 396 | 211 | 464 | 422 | 2898
How measurable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurability</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to measure</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium measurability</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtually or entirely immeasurable</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How measurable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtually or entirely immeasurable</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>PASC</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No “virtually or entirely immeasurable”</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage “virtually or entirely immeasurable”</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How measurable?

14% virtually or entirely immeasurable. Why?

- Subjective:
  
  “We urge the Government to ensure it is fully resourced to be able to operate effectively”

- Action required is unclear:
  
  “We recommend that MoD continue to seek out and eliminate inefficiencies in all its aircraft support processes but that it ensure that leaning does not go so far that the quality of maintenance is undermined by efforts to meet efficiency targets”
Response and implementation

- Coding currently being undertaken.

- Defence Committee:

  - 60 “easily measurable” recommendations coded.
What I have learnt from process

- Think about what I want from a recommendation before writing it
- Write recommendations succinctly and in the active voice
- Write recommendations in a way that emphasises central govt responsibility – even if action will be carried out by another body
- Separate out recommendations into different paragraphs to ensure a response
- Encourage Committee to challenge Government on poor responses
If a recommendation cannot be addressed by a body which is required to respond to Committee recommendations, is it still worth making the point?

“The Govt should consider doing ...” – is this a cop-out or a realistic assessment of the limitations of the Committee’s ability?

Is it worth making a recommendation if you know you can’t assess implementation?