

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting
held on Thursday 12th December 2013 at 3.45pm**

Those present: Sir Robert Rogers KCB (Clerk and Chief Executive) (Chair)
Myfanwy Barrett (Director of Finance)
John Borley CB (Director General of Facilities)
Joan Miller (Director of PICT, external member)
David Natzler (Clerk Assistant and Director General of
Chamber and Committee Services)
John Pullinger (Director General of Information Services)
Andrew Walker (Director General of HR and Change)
Dame Janet Gaymer DBE (non-executive member)
Barbara Scott (non-executive member)

In attendance: Tom Goldsmith (Board Secretary)
Ben Williams (Assistant Secretary)
David Leakey (Black Rod) (item 4 only)
Caroline Shenton (Archive Accommodation Study Director) (item
5 only)
John Benger (SRO, Respect Policy) (item 6 only)

1. Actions Arising

- 1.1 **Action 1: John Borley** reported that problems with mobile working were still preventing automated figure collection for reactive maintenance works; this was due to issues with the software application and delays in staff training. The revised deadline of March might not be achievable.
- 1.2 **Action 2: Tom Goldsmith** reported that the Board would receive a paper on competency framework implementation in January. **Andrew Walker** circulated a hard copy of the headline figures to the Board.

2. Performance and risk

- 2.1 The Board discussed the Internal Stone conservation work.
- 2.2 **Myfanwy Barrett** introduced the Finance Outturn report. The House had received a significant rebate from the 2005 rates appeal in the Palace. The 2005 appeal for other buildings needed to be completed before work could begin on the 2010 appeal. Estates capital expenditure forecast had reduced significantly and John Borley had commissioned a review to identify the reason behind the recurring underspend in this area. This review would be concluded ahead of next year's MTIP preparation. A decision on a supplementary Estimate was not needed until January..
- 2.3 The Board discussed the Finance Outturn Report.
- It was noted that PICT had the capacity to increase its capital spend.

- A large proportion of the underspend was due to factors outside departmental expenditure, including pension and property fluctuations and the rate rebate.
- The Audit Committee would be considering the issue of financial forecasting at its January meeting.

3. Oral updates from Board members

- 3.1 The **Chair** reported that he and the Clerk of the Parliaments had agreed to hold an additional joint Board meeting in May on factors affecting both Houses' forward plans which would allow both Boards to input into the MTIP process at an earlier stage. They had also discussed the need to find a bicameral solution to the length of queues coming in to Parliament at peak times.
- 3.2 **Myfanwy Barrett** reported on the meeting of the Pension Trustees; drafting was now complete on the Private Member's Bill to regularise arrangements for the House of Commons Members Fund.
- 3.3 **Andrew Walker** reported that the Board had received the outline report on Investors in People (IiP) and that the House had met the standard. Departmental reports would be issued in the following days and the IiP assessor would be visiting heads of Departments and their business managers to discuss the contents. The follow up work on the staff survey, focusing on the themes of trust and cohesion, had been completed. The Board would receive a paper on the outcome of both IiP and the further staff survey work at its January meeting.
- 3.4 **Andrew Walker** briefed the Board on the latest developments in the court case.
- 3.5 **John Pullinger** reported on PICTAB's discussion on "working in a digital world" and noted the importance of linking this to the other horizon scanning work the Board was doing. He reported that he would be in Myanmar during the last working week in December delivering management training to officials in the Myanmar parliament.
- 3.6 **John Borley** reported that the new Deputy Director for the Restoration and Renewal Programme would be starting in February and that the Alcatel period of the Independent Options Appraisal for the Restoration and Renewal Programme had almost finished.
- 3.7 **Janet Gaymer** reported on her meeting with the National Audit Office. The NAO were keen to be involved with the Restoration and Renewal Programme at the earliest possible stage. **John Borley** confirmed that the NAO had been briefed, and were included in the Integrated Assurance Plan.

- 3.8 **Tom Goldsmith** said that the OCE would send a message to all senior leaders the day after the Board meeting with headlines from the Board's discussions. This was part of efforts to improve communications with senior leaders.
- 3.9 The **Chair** noted that the Fees and Charges paper had been agreed by correspondence. **Myfanwy Barrett** said that it had also been seen by the Administration Committee and approved by the Finance and Services Committee. The **Chair** expressed his thanks to all staff involved in the smooth running of the recent visit by the Queen and the memorial event for Nelson Mandela.

4. Business Resilience

- 4.1 The Board considered the paper on business resilience. In discussion the following points were made:
- Criteria against which to judge relocation options had now been developed. Additional work had been done to secure the Charlie location including reviewing floor plans, familiarisation visits and renewing the usage agreement. Work on other options required dedicated internal resources, which would build on the work PED had already done on decant options for Restoration and Renewal.
 - Parliament could do more to learn from best practice in other organisations.
 - BRG was linked into the Government's relocation planning work. Relocation options used by other organisations had been considered, and it had been decided to concentrate on the activity that would be difficult to replicate elsewhere (the Chambers and Committees).
 - There was a lack of clarity about how the two Houses would work together during a major incident. There was merit in having a single structure that covered both Houses.
 - The Incident Management Framework (IMF) provided a mechanism to bring together the Silvers from both Houses. There was more uncertainty at Gold level but better guidance for Golds would be produced drawing from the lessons learnt from the last exercise.
 - Further guidance and support for Golds was welcome. However, neither House was well served by having two separate structures; although a single structure could be difficult to achieve given the autonomous nature of the two Houses, creating a more effective single structure should be regarded as a stewardship issue.
 - Merging the two Houses' rotas would be a welcome first step to more effective joint working, although this would require overcoming some logistical problems.
 - It was not clear whether the Business Resilience Group (BRG) was the right body to undertake strategy development in this area and it was noted that,

although BRG was used as a sub-Board group by the House of Lords, there were no Commons Management Board members on it; one solution would be to change the Commons members.

- *The **Board agreed** to discuss a single structure for incident management with the House of Lords at a future joint meeting. **Action: Tom Goldsmith** to include Business Resilience on the agenda for a future Joint Board Meeting.*
- While the recent desk-based event had been helpful there was a need to develop a schedule of exercises. Politicians should be involved in future exercises as they would be key players in any real incidents.
- BRG had a schedule of exercises; however, the current focus was on training those who played a role in the IMF. Once the training had been completed, exercises would then test the effectiveness of the training.
- An exercise would help identify skill and knowledge gaps amongst key players as well as testing familiarisation with, and the effectiveness of, the IMF.
- *The **Board agreed** that a business resilience exercise should be conducted as soon as was practicable. **Action: Black Rod** to bring forward plans for a business resilience exercise.*
- Further work was needed on how the Houses' IMF would link into the multi-agency response that was likely to be needed in a serious incident.
- The IMF did not take sufficient account of the opportunities provided by remote working. The framework should link to DIS business continuity plans to ensure that the House was provided with briefing on the cause of relocation.

4.2 The Board noted the planned resource to conduct work on relocation planning, and **agreed** the changes in the business resilience policy.

5. Future of the Parliamentary Archives' Accommodation

5.1 The Board considered the paper on the future of the Parliamentary Archives' Accommodation. In discussion the following points were made:

- The Archives were an integral part of Parliament and it was essential that Parliament retained ownership of the Archives and took responsibility for their preservation. It was possible to maintain ownership while entrusting the documents to another organisation for safe keeping. A partially outsourced option needed detailed consideration in the next stage of the process.
- The Board asked how the archives might be divided if a two site solution was pursued. **Caroline Shenton** replied that the documents could be divided into high and low usage by the public; approximately 40% of the Archives would be categorised as high usage. Storage outside London would be considered. If storage were in London it should be near Parliament to maintain the historic connection.
- The audio-visual archive had been moved to Berkhamsted in Hertfordshire and similar solutions should be considered for the Archives. The fact that staff occasionally summoned files should not be a consideration as this was a rare occurrence.
- The National Archives option did not appear to be viable based on the experience of other archives which had been merged and given that the advice from the National Archives to was to remain a separate archive.
- The study had made good use of the new business case model. The Board asked for further information on why it was being asked to rule out the charitable trust option
- A charitable trust model would allow for a more flexible funding mix; however, giving ownership of the Archives to a Trust was regarded as problematic. The planned Parliamentary Trust could provide a means to access these funding streams without raising ownership issues.
- It was questioned why walk-in access was a requirement and whether the move to digitisation would reduce the need for hard copy access.
- The future would involve much greater remote and digital access, but only a fraction of the collection was currently digitised, and there were logistical and commercial reasons why full digitisation was not feasible in the short term.
- The relationship to the Restoration and Renewal programme was unclear. Taking a decision that another location in the Palace was not an option would simplify the R&R Options Appraisal process. However, a link to the Restoration and Renewal programme was necessary to ensure delivery.
- It was important to reduce the number of options to allow efforts to be focused. A steer on the relative importance assigned to the Archives' objectives would also be helpful, for example whether outreach and public engagement was a core part of the Archives' objectives.

- The Archives by themselves were not the basis on which to conduct outreach activity.
- The relatively small number of truly important historic documents should be kept in or near Parliament. The vast majority of the records should be stored elsewhere.
- A dedicated building did not seem necessary; focus should be on finding a usable space rather than whether a whole building was necessary.

5.2 *The **Board agreed** that the following options should not be taken forward to the next stage in the business case process:*

- *Moving to another location in the Palace*
- *The Joint World Heritage Site Archive*
- *The National Archives*
- *A Charitable Trust*
- *A fully contracted out service.*

The follow options should be considered further:

- *Do nothing (for comparison purposes)*
- *A space in London*
- *A space outside London*
- *A hybrid option with a small number of documents on site and the rest stored elsewhere.*

5.3 *The Board gave a strong steer in favour of a hybrid/partially contracted out-sourced model.*

6. Respect Policy Implementation

6.1 The Board considered the implementation of the Respect Policy. In discussion the following points were made:

- Two different sets of training would be needed. One was on dealing with clients in difficult situations, which should be targeted at areas with high levels of Member contact. The second was for managers to ensure that they were clear on their responsibilities under the revised Respect Policy.
- It would not be possible to finalise the second category of training until the revised Respect policy was agreed. However there was no reason why the first category could not start being delivered before then. The first stage of delivering this training would be to identify the areas of the business where staff had a high level of Member contact.
- Splitting the delivery of the two types of training would also help manage the pressure on DHRC.
- The Board would send a clear message that this training would be mandatory for the relevant staff.

- This could provide an opportunity for DHRC to refresh the training and development offered to managers to ensure that the expectation of managers, across a range of areas, were made clear.
- 6.2 *The Board **agreed** that training on dealing with customers in difficult situations should be provided to staff in those areas which had extensive dealings with Members; this training should take place as soon as possible. Training for managers in their responsibilities under the Respect policy would be delivered when the policy was finalised. **Action: Andrew Walker** to develop a plan for delivering this training.*
- 6.3 *The **Board agreed** that, following consultation with the Commissioner's Office, a message should be sent to staff updating them on the developments with the Respect Policy.*

7. Office 365 update

- 7.1 The **Chair** said that there were three main areas where the Board would like assurance: security, implementation arrangements, and compatibility with SPIRE, records management practices and compliance.
- 7.2 **Joan Miller** said that PICT was still awaiting a decision from the SIROs on the overall position on security. This would be informed by the view taken by the Accreditor and should be provided early the following week. The current change affected only the server environment; other projects were planned on mobile device access and the network. Moving e-mails to the cloud would start in January and would be delivered quickly as users would not require much support.
- PICT was developing a communication with the SUN who would be identifying super-users in their areas to support the roll out.
- 7.3 The Board considered the paper. In discussion the following points were made:
- PICTAB had discussed communication with Members. There was some confusion about what was planned and it was important to ensure that the new service must provide at least as good a service as was currently offered; this included access to SPIRE.
 - The first stage of roll out needed to go well, otherwise there was a risk that the whole project would be damaged by negative perceptions.

8. Estimate 2014-15 and Medium Term Financial Plan

8.1 **Myfanwy Barrett** introduced the Estimate 2014-15 and Medium Term Financial Plan paper. The most significant changes from previous iterations were the addition of the Intelligence and Security Committee, and developments with the Northern Estate decant. Advice had been given to the Accounting Officer that an adjustment should not be made to take account of the possible acquisition of an additional building as there was too much uncertainty. The **Chair** confirmed that he had accepted this advice. **Myfanwy Barrett** noted that this year's exercise had highlighted the need to bring the Parliamentary Security Director's Office into the process. In the Autumn Statement the Chancellor had announced further departmental savings, a pay review that was due to be completed in 2015-16 and changes to employer pension contributions. These developments would impact on the environment in which future MTFPs were developed. The proactive publication of financial data would be reviewed to develop a more consistent publication system that matched best practice.

9. A.O.B.

9.1 The **Chair** agreed to discuss the issue of resources for the challenge culture work with the Parliamentary Security Director at their next bilateral.

[adjourned at 18:50pm]

Tom Goldsmith
Secretary

Robert Rogers
Chairman