

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting
held on Thursday 14 March 2013 at 3.30 pm**

Those present: Sir Robert Rogers KCB (Clerk and Chief Executive)
(Chairman)
David Natzler (Clerk Assistant and Director General of
Chamber and Committee Services)
John Borley CB (Director General of Facilities)
John Pullinger (Director General of Information Services)
Andrew Walker (Director General of HR and Change)
Joan Miller (Director of PICT, external member)
Myfanwy Barrett (Director of Finance)
Alex Jablonowski (external member)
Barbara Scott (external member)

In attendance: Matthew Hamlyn (Board Secretary)
Ben Williams (Assistant Secretary)
Reg Perry (Head of Employee Relations, Pay & Policy)
item 1 only
Marianne Cwynarski (Head of Internal Communications)
item 1 only

1. Pay

- 1.1. The **Board** received an update on the pay offer and the discussions at the all-staff meetings. The **Board** discussed possible outcomes of the ballot and how they might respond to them. **Myfanwy Barrett** confirmed that it would not be possible to accrue expenditure on a pay deal to the current financial year unless a deal was reached, and the liability incurred, before the end of the financial year.
- 1.2. **Action: The Chairman** to send a message to all staff on the pay offer.
- 1.3. **Action: Andrew Walker** to ensure that the Chairman was provided with an updated briefing before the next meeting of the Commission.

2. Matters arising from previous meetings

- 2.1 **Matthew Hamlyn** reported that all actions were either completed or in hand.

3. Performance and risk

- 3.1 **Myfanwy Barrett** updated the Board on staffing changes to the Savings Programme and Business Improvement Programme.
- 3.2 **Myfanwy Barrett** reported that the income generation business case was being finalised and would be sent to the Chairman for approval shortly.

- 3.3 **John Borley** noted the high figure of off-contract spend; this seemed to indicate that there was a problem with the underlying data. **Myfanwy Barrett** said that CSD would work with the department concerned to understand the situation behind the data. **John Pullinger** noted that the figures could be presented more helpfully. **Action: Myfanwy Barrett and Matthew Hamlyn to agree how the off-contract spend figures could be better presented to the Board.**
- 3.4 **Myfanwy Barrett** noted that while the sickness absence data in her department were high, this was influenced by a number of long term sickness cases. Once those cases were removed the figure returned to the expected level. Action had been taken to address these cases. **Barbara Scott** suggested that sickness absence data should be presented with, and without, long term cases. **Action: Andrew Walker and Matthew Hamlyn to revise how sickness absence data are presented to the Board.**
- 3.5 **John Borley** noted the upward trend in carbon emission figures. Although this could be partly explained by the recent cold weather, performance during the winter would need to be improved if the new target were to be met.
- 3.6 **Myfanwy Barrett** introduced the financial outturn report. The underspend had increased since the previous report. The Department of Finance would work with departments to identify the causes and whether it indicated room for further savings. The recent programme of training for budget holders and the new template for monthly returns should improve future forecasts and allow for more informed challenge by the Department of Finance. The outcome of the pay offer would affect the final level of the underspend. While the total underspend might be greater than 5%, this did not lead to any sanctions and was no longer an issue that the NAO would formally raise in the Resource Accounts. There were defensible reasons for the House Service to have incurred an underspend, including early realisation of savings and the fact that a contingency budget had necessarily been put aside to respond to the outcome of the court case.
- 3.7 **Myfanwy Barrett** spoke to the budget risks paper. The underspend in the current financial year contrasted with the position for the next two years' budgets, where there was a gap of £2.7m that needed to be met. The paper brought together emerging budget pressures, savings that were at risk and areas of uncertainty, as well as possible areas of increased capacity. Departments needed to live within their budgets, deliver their promised savings and report any emerging underspend promptly so that they could be used to offset any additional pressures.
- 3.8 **John Borley** reported that the Department of Facilities should be able to spend the entire capital budget in the next financial year.

4. Oral updates from Directors General

- 4.1 **John Borley** reported that ParliAble was launching its e-disability learning package, and asked Board member to promote its use in their Departments. Diversity training was mandatory for all staff but this did not seem to be widely known. *Action: **Andrew Walker** and the Diversity and Inclusion team to ensure that all staff were made aware of the need to complete disability awareness training.*
- 4.2 The new arrangements for attendants following the implementation of the Business Improvement Plan were working well. Philip Collins had been appointed as a team leader on a high-risk gateway review for an external organisation.
- 4.3 **Andrew Walker** confirmed that 19 members of staff were due to leave under the latest Voluntary Exit Scheme, with seven leaving through other routes. The next VES round would launch soon, which would be targeted at catering staff. A pre-feasibility study was under way for the potential relocation of the Parliamentary Archives.
- 4.4 **Myfanwy Barrett** reported that the Savings Programme Board had discussed how to move towards a culture of continuous improvement. Andrew Makower had indicated that the House of Lords would be keen to be involved in discussions as to whether this could be a bicameral piece of work.
- 4.5 **Alex Jablonowski** congratulated John Borley on the substantial increase in the Department of Facilities EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) score; consideration should be given to using this scheme in other departments.
- 4.6 **David Natzler** reported that the House would sit late on Monday to consider amendments to implement the Leveson proposals on press regulation. The Procedure Committee looked likely to suggest moving Private Members' Bills from sitting Fridays to the evening of another day which, if implemented, would increase the pressure on Chamber-facing services. Managers would need to consider how to mitigate the impact of the strike on Budget Day. **John Borley** reported that his understanding was that the local branch of PCS would not be participating in this strike.
- 4.7 **Matthew Hamlyn** reported on the latest Members' constituency staff open day which had received positive feedback. Members had requested that these events more frequently. The Board agreed that the OCE should see if an event could be run in this calendar year. *Action: **Matthew Hamlyn** to investigate the possibility of holding additional constituency staff open days.*

5. Corporate Business Plan

- 5.1 The Board considered the paper, in the discussion the following points were made:
- In the previous year's plan, there had been no performance target for capital expenditure, but it had been re-introduced this year, as it was good practice to have a performance indicator for this area.
- 5.2 *The Board amended and **agreed** the Corporate Business Plan and agreed the actions in the covering paper.*

6. Management Board effectiveness

- 6.1 **Matthew Hamlyn** introduced the paper and invited the Board to consider how it wished to use the forthcoming away day. A draft agenda was circulated for consideration.
- 6.2 The Board considered the paper. In the discussion the following points were made:
- The agenda should focus primarily on the Board's own development and behaviour rather than consideration of policy.
 - A Myers-Briggs workplace preference assessment would be a useful way of allowing the Board to address some of the challenges identified by the NAO review.
 - Further Board development and feedback, including 360 reviews, could be taken forward after the awayday.
 - The agenda should be shorter to allow for detailed consideration of a few topics.
 - The day should be run by an external facilitator.
- 6.3 *The **Board agreed** the actions in the cover paper.*
- 6.4 *The **Board agreed** that the away day should focus on Board development and initial ideas for the 2015-20 Strategy.*
- 6.5 *Action: The **Board Secretariat** to arrange for a Myers-Briggs assessment to be undertaken by Board members before the awayday; and to arrange a facilitator for the awayday in consultation with DHRC.*

7. Role of the Resource Management Group

- 7.1 The Board considered the paper. In the discussion the following points were made:
- The Board could make more effective use of this group. The Resource Management Group (RMG) currently got sight of policies and Board papers too late in the process. There would be value in RMG considering detailed draft policies before they were considered by the Board.
- 7.2 *The Board **agreed** the revised terms of reference for RMG.*

8. Incident Management Framework

8.1 The Board agreed the revised Incident Management Framework.

9. A.O.B

9.1 The **Chairman** updated the Board on the progress of the review of the Respect policy. The review team had done a very good job in extremely difficult circumstances and a paper setting out possible ways forward would be discussed by the Commission at its next meeting. The Board would have an opportunity to consider this issue again after the Commission discussion.

9.2 *The Board **agreed** to consider the outcome of the follow-up workshops on the staff survey at a future meeting.*

9.3 The Board considered the take note paper on the HR Delivery Programme. *The Board **agreed** that the corporate outcomes of the HR Delivery Programme would be managed and monitored as in Option 1 of the take note paper. They would, however, be clearly identified as dependencies of the HR Delivery Programme and tracked and reported as such via the HR Delivery Programme's regular reporting to the Management Board (for the avoidance of doubt, it would not be limited to material included in the Programmes and Projects dashboard). This arrangement would make clear which areas of work the Programme was responsible for delivering, and which areas (outside the programme scope) on which it was providing information.*

[adjourned at 5:50 pm]

Matthew Hamlyn
Secretary

Robert Rogers
Chairman

20 March 2013