**Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting
held on Thursday 16 July 2015 at 3.30pm**

Those present: David Natzler (Clerk of the House) (Acting Chair)
Myfanwy Barrett (Director of Finance)
John Benger (Clerk Assistant and Director General, DCCS)
John Borley CB (Director General of Facilities)
Rob Greig (Director of the Parliamentary Digital Service)
Penny Young (Librarian and Director General, Department of
Information Services)
Andrew Walker (Director General of HR and Change)

In attendance: Tom Goldsmith (Committee Secretary)
Lloyd Owen (Assistant Secretary)
Jane Hough
Amanda Colledge
Rachel Harrison (item 3)
Alix Langley (item 4)
Jenny Winters (item 4)
David Vere (item 5)
Aileen Walker (item 5)

1. Matters arising

1.1.   Nil

2. Finance

2.1.   **Amanda Colledge** introduced the paper, which showed the end of May
position. At present the estimate was a £0.4 - £1m resource underspend.
There was still a £2.7m contingency, and a couple of risks in that area,
particularly in relation to cyber security and additional committees, although
DCCS was hoping to absorb much of the additional funding required for the
latter in the current financial year. The only new item was the rollout of Office
365 for Members. Now that the full extent of the requirements for returning
Members was known, work was underway to outline the costs. On capital, the
current forecast was a £7m overspend. That was likely to reduce to £3.5m in
the June report. The advice remained that the contingency should not be
allocated to new items, but the position should be reviewed in September, in
case issues in the contingency could not be delivered within the year.

2.2.   **The Committee** discussed the paper**:**

-   The Committee discussed the impact of the Security Renewal Programme
on the current position. **Myfanwy Barrett** noted that there was some
uncertainty about the cost of the new arrangements and that the
programme could potentially incur additional costs during the current year

if additional police staff needed to begin work in advance of the new arrangements being adopted.

- **The Committee** discussed the Office 365 rollout. **Rob Greig** noted that there were 5000 users who were still on the old infrastructure, which needed to be replaced by 2017. There were some staff that had not been migrated, but the majority needing to be migrated were Members and their staff. This was now part of business as usual activity as the initial project had concluded.

3. Risk

3.1. **Rachel Harrison** introduced the paper. This was the second iteration of the unified risk report, pulling out risks from departmental risk registers. The red risks were the same as last month, with the cyber risk increasing. The exercise was operating effectively at gathering data across the organisation. Work was underway to incorporate security risks into the report.

3.2. The Committee discussed the paper:

- **The Chair** asked whether the scoring was an accurate reflection of the issues faced by the House. **Rachel Harrison** noted that there were some issues within projects and programmes which were not coming naturally into the unified risk report. Progress was being made to include these, but it could be swifter. Challenges remained to collate the data. The House of Lords had now agreed to move to scoring its Corporate risks inherently and to amend their risk matrix to reflect a score of twelve as red, which was a big step forward. The Committee discussed whether the appropriate risk information was being escalated to Committee level, and the tools used to collate information.
- The Committee considered the proposed changes to the risk register. **Penny Young** suggested that risk 3 should be framed more broadly. The Board discussed the implications of such a change. **Andrew Walker** said that any revised risk should be included in the Commission's strategy to assist with addressing issues that were beyond the direct control of the House Service. **The Chair** said that at present no change was required to risk 7.
- The Committee discussed the scoring of risks, and whether risks relating to security should be held at Committee level. **John Borley** said that in relation to the risk on electrical resilience, there was a medium term mitigation through the M&E programme. The work planned for the summer recess which would have some noise impact on the line of route.
- **Tom Goldsmith** reported that two actions had been agreed in the Internal Audit Report on the system of risk management, development of the mandate for the risk team, which would be agreed at the October QPR, and scoping the use of a risk tool to reduce the manual elements of risk reporting.

3.3. The Committee discussed options for a deep dive, and agreed that the risk team should focus on cyber risk and report back at the October QPR meeting.

3.4. The Committee agreed the proposed changes to risks 1 and 3, and agreed that it was content with the current risk scores. *Penny Young would work with the risk team on a revised wording for risk 3 and means of mitigating the risk.*

4. Annual HR Statistics Report

4.1. **Alix Langley** introduced the paper, noting that the quality of the underlying data had improved. It was clear from the report that changes in the workforce were connected to the decisions that were being made at senior level. The tail end of the decisions made as part of the savings programme and the move to guaranteed hours contracts were visible. **Jenny Winters** noted that the key theme was stability.

- The Committee discussed turnover and the retention of staff. **The Chair** noted concerns about lower-paid staff being able to afford to live in London. This issue could be raised with the Commission in discussion of the next pay remit. Support was available to staff to assist with the costs of living in the capital, such as the season-ticket loan scheme, and a scheme to support staff with rental deposits would be launched later in the year.
- **The Chair** asked about the increase in cases under the Valuing Others policy. **Alix Langley** noted that there was an increased profile around appropriate behaviour due to the Respect policy training. The Committee discussed the data on sickness absence. **John Benger** asked about strategies for dealing with absence due to stress. **Alix Langley** noted that there was support for managers provided by OHWS for dealing with staff suffering from stress.

5. Substantive Discussions

People Strategy

5.1. **David Vere** gave a brief update on the people strategy. Culture Change workshops had been held for 70 managers and 120 staff. Cass had interviewed Ex-Co members and some Members. There had been a positive response – staff had been keen to give their views. Work was underway to set out a series of values and behaviours, and work on career development was continuing. The first stage of introducing IPRs had been completed: 87% of managers and 42% of staff had gone through the training, although staff sessions had not been mandatory. IPR objectives would now be reviewed. BMDs would be asked to provide assurance that the necessary conversations were taking place and being recorded. Work was ongoing to develop technical competencies for specific business areas. A recruitment exercise for a talent manager was underway in that strand. The People Strategy Programme

Board would meet the following week to discuss priorities for delivery.

5.2.   The Committee discussed the paper:

- The Committee discussed the priorities for the Programme Board. The focus should be on completing and embedding existing work, particularly on culture change, before other aspects of the programme were developed. In relation to IPRs, gathering information about the quality of manager-staff conversations was key.
- Staff concerns about the impact of R&R would become more and more of an issue as R&R acquired a higher profile. The People Strategy would need to take account of these concerns. The unified House Service strand would need to consider how to integrate the 320 new staff insourced from the police. Members' staff should also be included in that thinking as well.
- The deadline for the time recording interface was tight. **David Vere** provided an update on the project but noted that the critical path was very tight. It would be clearer by the end of August whether the new system would be delivered by 2 November. Andrew Walker reported that some SCS staff had raised concerns about why time recording was necessary for SCS staff.

5.3.   The Committee confirmed that SCS staff should continue to take part in time recording.

AV Programme

5.4.   **John Angeli** said that the programme had been created to address the lack of a joined up vision on AV. Sound and vision were looked after by different departments, unlike in many other parliaments. The broadcasting service had not known what to do with the online aspect of broadcasting, and it was only now beginning to reap rewards. Resilience had improved in recent years. Sound and vision contracts had recently been merged. A new online video service had been launched and Members were making good use of the new features. Live logging had not been done by any other Parliament before, and it was not that common in the media. The long term tape storage contract had been cancelled and tapes were being digitised. Eye-level cameras had also been installed in the Commons chamber. The focus for recent changes was the challenge from a Member to turn around video of speeches more quickly.

5.5.   The Committee discussed the paper:

- This was a bicameral area which was increasingly multi-purposed. There was more scope for understanding why proceedings were broadcast and how this might be used. The Committee discussed the role that the House should play in editorialising content, and how to share content effectively with others.
- **John Angeli** noted that there were new APIs to allow for more

personalised access to data on data.parliament.uk and there were APIs in relation to live logging that would allow people to use the data themselves. The Committee discussed opportunities for maximising the use of the data provided. Indexers in DIS and the WPU in DCCS could potentially provide useful partnerships. **John Angeli** agreed to explore options with each.

<u>Retail Services</u>

5.6.   Penny Young introduced the item and noted that there were two issues to consider - the shop at 50 Parliament Street and the retail management system. It was now clear that provision of an alternative location for the shop was unlikely, and the Committee was asked to remove this issue from the list of red risks. The issue could be revisited in light of the impact of the Northern Estate Project. The retail management system was going live the following week, but the cost of implementation had been greater than anticipated. Additionally a CI review was underway on forecasting of costs in retail. Budgets were going to be rebuilt bottom up. The development of the new system would be reviewed. In particular there had been problems arising from integration with HAIS and other internal systems.

5.7.   The Committee discussed the paper:

- The Committee discussed future investment in retail and the objectives of the external retail offering. Any additional investment would need to provide a significant return. The effectiveness of the existing shop would be reviewed.
- The Committee discussed options for reviewing the development of the retail management system and the problems encountered during development. Internal Audit were conducting a review later in the year.

6. MTFP

6.1.   **Myfanwy Barrett** introduced the paper, which was a first look at the financial framework from 16/17 onwards. There were additional pressures expected in future, such as the increase to the policing budget and from relocation contingency planning. Significant expenditure was expected in 16-17 onwards, and this would need to be approved by the relevant Member Committees as an exception to the current remit.

6.2.   The Committee discussed the paper:

- The Committee discussed the necessity of briefing the relevant Member bodies on the additional cost pressures.
- The Committee discussed the process improvements being delivered by the Continuous Improvement team, and the impact of the senior staff review and the review of joint working on the budget.
- The Committee discussed what approach would be taken if a further

savings programme was required, and how to promote alternative ways of working.

6.3.   *The Committee agreed that **Myfanwy Barrett** would discuss additional cost pressures with the Finance Committee.*

AOB

None.