



MANAGEMENT BOARD

Wednesday 4 July, 10am to 12 noon in Room 1-09, Millbank House

Agenda

1. **Oral updates**
2. **House Committee agenda 17 July** **MB/2012/71**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
3. **Corporate risk register at 27 June** **MB/2012/72**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT **72A**
4. **Risk reports:**
 - a. **House of Commons RESERVED** **MB/2012/73**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by David Beamish
5. **2011/12 end of year performance report** **MB/2012/64**
[Circulated electronically only. Originally circulated for meeting on 13 June.]
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Rob Whiteway
6. **CRS D2 and E pay RESERVED** **MB/2012/74**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Tom Mohan
7. **Saturday opening** **MB/2012/75**
[Annexes circulated electronically only.]
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Liz Hallam Smith
8. **Draft Annual Report 2011/12** **MB/2012/76**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT **76A**
Memorandum by Rhodri Walters
9. **PICTAB 2011-12 Annual Review** **MB/2012/77**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Joan Miller
10. **Use of shared drives** **MB/2012/78**
Memorandum by Liz Hallam Smith **78A**
11. **Recess works to Committee Room and Principal corridors** **MB/2012/79**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Carl Woodall



- 12. Senior management awayday**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Rhodri Walters

13. Any other business

For formal decision:

- 14. Draft minutes of the meeting on 13 June**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT

For information:

- 15. Period 12 finance report**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Andrew Makower

MB/2012/81
81A

- 16. PICT Annual Report 2011-12**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Joan Miller

MB/2012/82
82A

- 17. Major works projects update**
RESTRICTED ACCESS: MANAGEMENT
Memorandum by Carl Woodall

MB/2012/83

Circulated electronically only (hard copies available on request):

Minutes of PEB on 28 May

Minutes of House of Commons Management Board on 10 May



Use of shared drives

Responsible Board Member(s) Liz Hallam Smith
Date 25 June 2012

1. I attach a paper on the use of shared drives by staff in the light of SPIRE. The paper describes the reasons for and implications of the decision of the SPIRE Programme Board not to restrict by default the use of shared drives by the administrations of both Houses and PICT once the SPIRE system is installed.
2. A similar paper was considered by the House of Commons Management Board on 14 June. They agreed that introducing compulsion on the closure of shared drives at this stage would be premature and could be counter-productive, but that the long-term aim should be to reduce usage of shared drives to the minimum. They asked the SPIRE Programme Board for information in October and December on the usage of shared drives and the reasons why they were being kept open and that the position be reviewed at the end of the implementation project.
3. I invite the Board to take a similar line on the use of shared drives.

June 2012

Elizabeth Hallam Smith, Director of Information Services



Use of shared drives by the administration staff of both Houses and PICT

Responsible Board Member(s) Liz Hallam Smith
Paper prepared by Andrew Kennon
Date June 2012

Summary: This paper informs the Board of a decision by the SPIRE Programme Board not to restrict by default the use of shared drives by the administrations of both Houses and PICT once the SPIRE system is installed.

Summary of actions requested: The Management Board is invited to:

- note the decision by the SPIRE Programme Board that teams should continue to have access, if they wish, to shared drives on an unrestricted basis, once the SPIRE system is installed;
- note that this decision goes against the recommendation from the most recent OGC review, which also suggested that the SPIRE Programme Board raise the issue at Management Board level.

Context

1. The SPIRE Programme underwent its third OGC Gateway Review in January 2012 which made the following recommendation, categorised as 'essential' to do by the end of March 2012 if the benefits of SPIRE are to be delivered:
“Present a paper to the SPIRE Programme Board and both Management Boards seeking agreement to close all shared drives as early as practical, with limited and tightly policed exceptions where essential.”
2. The SPIRE Programme Board initially accepted this recommendation but extended the timetable to act on it in order to allow for enough evidence of the behaviour of SPIRE system users to be gathered. The Board agreed to take its proposal on the recommendation to the Management Boards of both Houses in June and July.
3. For clarification, this recommendation applies to the shared drives (not personal drives) of the administrations of both Houses and PICT which are now using SPIRE and excludes any drives which are required for communication with the Members of either House.
4. While there are some areas (for example, information accessed by Members) and file types (for example, image libraries, database files) for which SPIRE is not suitable – see Annex A - all other business information can, and should, be managed in SPIRE.

Why did the Gateway team make the recommendation?

5. The Gateway review team, which included members with significant expertise and experience of successful implementation of systems such as SPIRE in government departments, stated that there is “evidence that continued availability of shared drives

has contributed to EDRM systems failing to gain critical mass with users, with the result that the benefits have not been fully realised”.

6. While they accepted that there was a case for the limited retention of shared drives, it considered that their continued use in Parliament would:
 - increase the likelihood of users not adopting SPIRE
 - significantly reduce the effectiveness of the system to other users (as not all information would be shared on the system)
 - increase the risk of failure to comply with information legislation with a consequent reputational damage to Parliament.
7. Information that is held in the SPIRE system is more auditable (i.e. every action is logged), and managed (the file plan is subject to approved retention periods as set out in the Authorised Records Disposal Practice agreed by the Management Boards) than it is on shared drives.
8. In order to move from the current print-to-paper Records Management policy to SPIRE, all records (information of business activity) must be saved in the SPIRE system as a shared drive does not provide the required levels of assurance to render a paper-copy unnecessary.
9. Behavioural changes alone will not result in full use of SPIRE as an alternative for readily-available shared drives. The Gateway team believed that obtaining agreement at Management Board level that local shared drives should be restricted once SPIRE has been implemented in that area would give the SPIRE team a clear directive. It would also give team leaders a clear reason to make SPIRE work in their areas. They considered that if we did not take this action then the benefits of SPIRE, both in terms of improved efficiency and reduction of risk, would be jeopardised.

User evidence

10. From the roll out so far we have found that teams who chose to restrict their shared drives at the time of SPIRE Go Live adopt SPIRE the best and realise the greatest benefits. Of the teams already live on SPIRE, only 32 out of 60 (53%) have already restricted or closed their shared drives. Below are some examples:
 - *PICT Customer Relations Team* – They have been live on SPIRE since November 2011 and have added approximately 2000 documents in this time. In February of this year, having moved across all relevant information they deleted all information from their shared drive and closed it down.
 - *House of Lords Library* – They have been live on SPIRE since April 2012 and having moved across all required information in the first week they set their shared drive to read-only, prohibiting users from adding anything further to this drive. This has ensured that SPIRE is used by the team, enabling them to reap the associated benefits.
 - *House of Commons Committee Office* – They have been using SPIRE since March 2012, migrating over the current session and then setting this portion of their shared drive as read-only. The Committee Office Management Group has agreed to delete copies of information moved into SPIRE by the end of May. All future work will be carried out exclusively in SPIRE.

Comparators

11. The approach suggested by the Gateway Review team is consistent with that of some other organisations that have successfully implemented similar systems:
- *Wiltshire County Council* - personal drives were allowed to continue and it was planned to make shared drives read-only three – six months after their go live.
 - *Vale of Glamorgan Council* - three months from go live dates information on shared drives was frozen as read-only.
 - *Nursing & Midwifery Council* - shared drives were switched to read-only after any key data was migrated to their system and personal drives were retained.
 - *Northern Ireland Civil Service* - legacy documents remained on the shared drives and sorting them out was scheduled in as a separate piece of work. One of their key lessons learned was to put a time limit on restricting and eventually closing the shared drives.

Reasons for the SPIRE Programme Board's decision

12. The SPIRE Programme Board was well aware of the advantages of restricting shared drives but had previously agreed, at the request of PICT, not to make this part of the programme. In the light of the Gateway recommendation – which affects delivery of the benefits – the Programme Board was faced with a dilemma: whether to ignore the Gateway recommendation or whether to implement it notwithstanding PICT reluctance.
13. Either way, it was agreed that the issue would be escalated to the Management Boards. A proposal to restrict (and perhaps eventually close) most shared drives would require a Management Board decision. Alternatively the Management Board would need to be warned that a decision to ignore the Gateway recommendation could have an adverse impact on the delivery of benefits.
14. On balance, the majority view of the SPIRE board was to disregard the Gateway recommendation for these reasons:
- SPIRE has already managed to secure agreement from 50% of teams currently live on the SPIRE system to reduce and restrict their shared drives without any mandate. Continuing with this approach could ensure better buy-in to use of the system.
 - Some users would resent the restriction or closure of shared drives and would find ways around using the SPIRE system, for example by using Google docs or other applications not supported by PICT.
 - There may be some technical IT grounds for not closing shared drives. For example, the Director of PICT was concerned about levels of current remote access that could be provided and supported for the SPIRE system.

Financial and procurement implications

15. There are no financial or procurement implications arising from the decision.

Risk management

16. The SPIRE Programme risk register currently has the following risk:

| Description | Score | Mitigations | Progress |
|--|--|--|--|
| There is a risk that the benefits of the SPIRE Programme may be reduced if the SPIRE System (the corporate system for documents and records) exists alongside other repositories where documents can be created and worked on. | Likelihood 2 Impact 5 Total = 10, amber | Through change management SPIRE is working with business areas to promote the benefits of using the SPIRE system as a single repository and persuade them to restrict use of other repositories. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some business areas have now reduced or shut down their shared drives. 29/02/12 • The Clerks of both Houses and Management Board members have agreed that no personal preference for older systems should get in the way of delivering SPIRE's benefits. 26/09/11 |

17. The likelihood of this risk will increase by going against the Gateway Review recommendation. By not mandating that appropriate shared drives should be restricted after a team has gone live on the SPIRE system, it will be easier for those teams who are reluctant to fully use SPIRE, or have not scheduled time in to move relevant data across, to continue to use those shared drives.

18. However, the Programme Board accepts this risk based on the points raised in paragraph 16.

19. The following SPIRE benefits will be harder to achieve if there is not consistent use of the SPIRE system

- ability to create, find, store and share electronic information more quickly, easily and with confidence;
- reduced storage, only keeping information that is needed.

Update from the House of Commons Management Board

20. The Commons Management Board considered the take note paper on SPIRE and the use of shared drives on 14 June 2012. In discussion the following points were made:

- Most EDRM projects failed because the new system was not enforced. It was important to be directive.
- The paper did not reflect the full discussion at the SPIRE board. Experience to date was of very good take-up and little risk of the project failing. Teams were closing down shared drives voluntarily as they did not wish to manage two systems. Pushing staff too hard could lead to unexpected consequences, for example, staff might try to avoid using the parliamentary network altogether when working remotely. The SPIRE board had therefore agreed that teams should continue to have access, if they wished, to shared drives on an unrestricted basis, once the SPIRE system was installed. That decision could always be reviewed at a later date.
- Some teams were continuing to save documents on shared drives even though they had been SPIRE-d.

- The best thing would be to seek assurances from teams after they had had SPIRE for a number of months, so that the process of closing shared drives would be a gradual one.
- A dual economy with a legacy system running alongside SPIRE should not be permitted. There had been significant investment in SPIRE and management needed to be sure the full benefits would be realised.
- Shared drives would definitely need to close, subject to a small number of exceptions such as those set out in the paper, but the key point was how to achieve this aim. How would the best result be achieved given the culture of the House Service?

21. The Board agreed:

- to note the conclusions of the paper;
- that introducing compulsion on the closure of shared drives at this stage would be premature and could be counter-productive;
- that the long-term aim should be to reduce usage of shared drives to the minimum;
- to ask the SPIRE Programme Board for information in October and December on the usage of shared drives and the reasons why they were being kept open; and
- to review the position at the end of the implementation project.

June 2012

**Liz Hallam Smith, Director of Information Services
Andrew Kennon, Senior Responsible Owner SPIRE**

Annex A – information which is out of scope of the SPIRE system

| Category | Options |
|---|---|
| <p>Reference materials originating from outside Parliament:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • materials downloaded from the internet • external standards and guidance • news articles and press cuttings • supplier catalogues or brochures • special interest newsletters to which an office or department subscribes • publications received in hard copy <p>Reference copies of Parliamentary publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • copies of corporate newsletters • Printed Committee Reports • Library Research Papers and Standard Notes | <p>If shared with others in a team/department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save to a reference area on a managed shared drive • Upload to a SharePoint team site <p>Of personal interest only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save to a personal drive or <i>Mydocs</i>, or • keep in hard copy <p>Note: Reference materials should be reviewed regularly and obsolete, out-of-date and superseded information deleted/destroyed.</p> |
| <p>Images or artwork retained for use in marketing, communications and publicity materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • libraries of reference photographs e.g. of Parliamentary buildings, catering images, staff directory photographs etc • extensive photographs of events • stock images for use on internet and intranet pages • final artwork for leaflets and posters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save to a managed shared drive • Upload to a SharePoint team site, or • Keep in hardcopy |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Formats not suitable for inclusion in SPIRE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Microsoft Access databases• Linked spreadsheets e.g. <i>spreadsheets saved separately but linked to each other</i>• Applications which store complex documents as multiple files e.g. <i>publications created in Adobe InDesign</i>• FrameMaker files generated as part of the Bill process | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Save to a managed shared drive <p>Note: This information is subject to disposal instructions in the <i>Authorised Records Disposal Practice</i> and should be reviewed regularly and deleted as appropriate.</p> |
| <p>Structured information stored in corporate application or other databases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Line of business applications and databases e.g. <i>financial and HR systems, library catalogues, room and events booking systems</i>• Routine reports generated from a corporate database or other system which can be recreated easily e.g. <i>from HAIS, HAISL</i> | <p>Retain information in the original application in which it was created.</p> <p>Note: This information is subject to disposal instructions in the <i>Authorised Records Disposal Practice</i> and procedures must be put in place to delete information in accordance with this.</p> |