

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting  
held on Thursday 17 June 2010**

**Those present:** Malcolm Jack (Chief Executive) (Chairman)  
Robert Rogers (Director General of Chamber and  
Committee Services)  
John Borley (Director General of Facilities)  
John Pullinger (Director General of Information Services)  
Andrew Walker (Director General of Resources)  
Joan Miller (Director of PICT, external member)  
Alex Jablonowski (external member)

**In attendance:** Philippa Helme (Board Secretary)  
[s.40] (Assistant Secretary)  
Elizabeth Honer (Director of Savings, for item 4)  
Heather Bryson (Director, HRM&D, for items 4 and 5)  
[s.40] (Head of Workforce Planning and Recruitment, for  
item 4)  
[s.40] (Head of Pay, Policy and Employee Relations, for  
item 5)

## **1. Matters arising from previous meetings**

There were no matters arising from previous meetings.

## **2. Risk and performance**

**2.1. The Chairman** asked the Board whether enough was being done to manage the corporate risks which were scored red on the scorecard. It had previously been agreed that the Board would consider one red risk at each meeting and the Director General responsible would be asked to explain their action plan for mitigating the risk. It was agreed that this should take place at future meetings. **Joan Miller** said that the House of Lords Management Board received short papers on a rolling six monthly basis from risk owners explaining the status of the corporate risks for which they were responsible.

**2.2. Joan Miller** said that the risk 3b (failure to develop IT systems) would be adequately mitigated when proper governance for the management of the numerous corporate initiatives currently underway had been developed. This might include the development of a portfolio management function. **Andrew Walker** said that the Savings Programme would involve the reappraisal of programmes to determine their relative benefits and the Board would need to decide whether they should continue.

- 2.3.** The Board considered a paper on the Risk Management Project (agenda item 8). **Philippa Helme** said that the paper proposed a revised scope and timescale for the project, which was falling behind the timetable which had initially been envisaged. It now seemed that the scope of the project had been over ambitious. Risk information would be important in enabling the Board to make decisions on savings later in the year.
- 2.4.** The Board agreed that John Borley should be appointed as Board-level risk champion, and that the scope and timescale of the risk programme should be revised. There was a need for the Board to engage in the process of risk management; it was important to focus on the risks which kept the Board awake at night, and ensure that they were properly managed.
- 2.5. Robert Rogers** noted that a draft had been received of the forthcoming Institute for Government report on the administration of the House of Commons. He asked for comments on the draft report to be sent to him by close of play. The report posed a reputational risk for the House because it did not acknowledge the progress which had been made.
- 

**2.6. Robert Rogers** said that there had been incursions onto scaffolding around the Palace on 26 May and 2 June, and a protestor had climbed onto Carriage Gates on 16 June. [s.24]. The Board would be updated as appropriate.

---

**2.7. Andrew Walker** said that the Department of Resources was at red risk status because it was currently short of trained staff resource, owing to departures to IPSA. Further support from untrained staff from other departments would not be helpful. The Department could manage without additional support at present.

### **3. Oral up-dates from Directors General**

**3.1. Andrew Walker** reported that:

- 3.1.1.** as a result of an IT issue, a large amount of scanned expenses data due to be published the following week had become inaccessible. The MEC had been notified. Data summarising the scanned information was available and would be published. PICT and DR were working to recover the data but it would not be available in time for publication the following week.
- 3.1.2.** Members would shortly be sent information on the opening of the nursery and given the opportunity to express interest in using the facility. There were presentational risks which would need to be managed.
- 3.1.3.** any uncompleted SCS reports needed to be submitted as soon as possible.

**3.2. Robert Rogers** said that elections had been successfully conducted for the Deputy Speakers and Select Committee Chairs. Individual parties were responsible for electing committee members. Elections for the Backbench Business Committee would take place in the coming weeks.

**3.3. Joan Miller** said that PICT would test the process of switching over to the remote data centre over two weekends in August. There would be some disruption to services.

**3.4. John Borley** reported that:

**3.4.1.** he was developing a proposal to refocus the accommodation programme. Consultation with the Lords would be required.

**3.4.2.** a healthcheck of the Department of Facilities had been conducted by Internal Audit; the results would be circulated to Board Members.

**3.4.3.** all Members should have been moved into their new offices by the end of the following week. Coordination with PICT was important.

**3.4.4.** attendance at some duty of care briefings for new Members had been disappointing.

**3.4.5.** three bids had been received for the Offsite Search Centre.

**3.5. John Pullinger** said that audits conducted by the Archives showed that all departments were broadly on track with their records management. It was proposed that a further healthcheck would be carried out in June 2011.

**3.6. The Chairman** said that the Commission had agreed to hold a workshop with the Management Board.

#### **4. Savings programme**

**4.1. Elizabeth Honer** introduced a paper on HR mechanisms for the Savings Programme. The Board had agreed in April that it wished to consider mechanisms for reducing staff costs, in advance of reviewing saving options in September. The level of staff savings required would depend on savings options adopted. There were a number of ways of reducing the staff bill; they were not mutually exclusive. The Board was asked to agree that further work should be undertaken to develop these options. External support would be required if the programme was to be delivered effectively.

**4.2.** [s.36(2)(b) and s.36(2)(c)]

**4.3.** *In discussion the following points were made:*  
[s.36(2)(b) and s.36(2)(c)]

**4.4.** *In discussion the following points were made:*

- It would be important to communicate with staff about the Savings Programme, once the Commission had made decisions about savings targets on 21 June. The Board would need to be ready to answer questions about the programme at the meeting of the senior leadership cadre the following Friday (25 June). Staff and Unions would want to be involved in developing savings options.
- The Civil Service Compensation Scheme was currently in disarray following a court judgment.

**4.5.** The Board agreed that further work on HR mechanisms should be taken forward by HRM&D and that Elizabeth Honer should return her focus to managing the Savings Programme. The Board agreed that the objectives of staff-related savings should be: to ensure that the organisation retains its capability to support Parliament in both the short and long term; and, to ensure that staff feel they have been treated fairly and with respect, and have been supported through the process.

**4.6.** *Action: HRM&D to develop work on HR mechanisms to facilitate decisions on savings to be taken in September.*

## **5. HR policies, processes and procedures**

**5.1. Heather Bryson** asked the Board to consider whether to extend transitional relief to certain staff in the Official Report (OR). There were real management concerns about morale in the OR and managers judged that the issue needed to be resolved before the HR policies, processes and practices programme was concluded. Transitional relief had been introduced during negotiations over the last pay deal as part of the move to reduce pay for work during unsocial hours to a reasonable rate. Any extension would have a differential impact on staff because some had already ceased to receive transitional relief.

**5.2.** *In discussion the following points were made:*

- In the longer term the Board should consider whether the current service levels, which required work during unsocial hours, were necessary, given the cost of achieving them. An alternative would be to accept a delay in the production of Hansard.
- It was difficult to deal with any single HR issue without creating knock on effects. Agreeing to an extension of transitional relief in the Official report would exacerbate problems with staff required to work unsocial hours elsewhere in the House.
- The issue in the OR could be prioritised within the HR PPP programme.
- Other staff asked to find savings would be resentful of a decision to extend additional payments to a certain group of staff.
- The decision would need to be communicated quickly, probably at the same time as messages about the savings programme
- [s.36(2)(b) and s.36(2)(c)]

- 5.3. The Board agreed to end transitional relief to the Official Report as planned.
- 5.4. **Andrew Walker** said that the Government had announced that civil servants earning a total of £58,000 or more (including pay and allowances) would have their name and salary published. There was a need to establish whether this would be implemented in the House, and to make sure that staff who would be affected were aware.
- 5.5. *Action: DR to provide the Board with further information on Government proposals to publish civil servants' pay details and engage with the OCE to develop communications to staff.*

## 6. Strategy development

- 6.1. **Philippa Helme** said that the paper from the OCE presented ideas for developing the strategic plan, which could be discussed at the 25 June meeting of the Senior Leadership Cadre. A proposed timetable for the workshop on 25 June was also included.
- 6.2. *In discussion the following points were made:*
- Any group work should be directed. One option was to group together people working in similar operational areas to target discussions.
  - The staff attending would want answers to the questions they were being asked by their staff, particularly about savings. Questions could be gathered in advance to ensure that substantive answers could be given. It would be important to set out the planned future programme of staff consultation and involvement.
  - The desired outcomes from the event were giving senior staff a good understanding of what the Board's strategy meant, and engaging them in developing the plans to deliver it.
- 6.3. **The Chairman** thanked John Pullinger for his papers on Public Engagement and Information Management. He suggested that the strategies should be distilled into briefer documents for future consideration. **John Pullinger** acknowledged that the public engagement paper retrofitted existing programmes to the Board's strategy; while planning would need to reflect the resources available.
- 6.4. *In discussion the following points were made:*
- Information management**
- The principles for information management seemed right but more exploration of their priority, costs and risks would be required before spending decisions could be made.
  - It might be more prudent for the House to be an "early adopter" of ICT, rather than a leader, as the paper (and Board Strategy) proposed, to reduce associated risks.

- It might not be desirable for all Parliamentary business processes to be e-enabled. It was clear that electronic methods would dominate, and some could create savings, but this did not mean that paper would disappear.
- Parliament was a place of record and it would always be necessary to keep hard copies of some documents.

### ***Public engagement***

- The Board's new strategy would need a new approach to public engagement, in a context of reducing costs.
- The paper presented three options for responding to reductions in funding: using the resources of others to deliver Parliamentary services (as exemplified by the Treasury Committee inquiry which had been run through the website [moneysavingexpert.com](http://moneysavingexpert.com)); some form of sponsorship or partnership; and income generation.
- The Speaker's Advisory Council on Public Engagement had met twice. Its activities would affect work in this area.
- All staff were potential advocates for Parliament. Many members of the House Service already spent a significant amount of their time passing on their knowledge of Parliament to different groups. This work reflected the House Service's role of stewardship of the institution theme.
- The anniversary of the Magna Carta in 2015 would be an opportunity to exploit in terms of public engagement.
- The new government was keen to involve the public in Parliamentary processes; legislation and select committees would be key candidates.

6.5. The Board noted the papers on public engagement and information management, and agreed that their expenditure implications needed to be considered further. The strategies needed to be fully integrated with the Board's overall strategy to enable decisions on priorities to be made.

## **7. Any other business**

There was no other business.

[adjourned at 18.28

**Philippa Helme**  
Secretary

**Malcolm Jack**  
Chairman  
25 June 2010