

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting
held on Thursday 16 April 2015 at 3.30pm**

Those present: Dame Janet Gaymer DBE (non-executive member) (Chair)
John Borley CB (Director General of Facilities)
Rob Greig (Director of Parliamentary Digital Service)
David Natzler (Clerk of the House)
Barbara Scott (non-executive member)
Jacqy Sharpe (Acting Director General of Chamber and
Committee Services)
Andrew Walker (Director General of HR and Change)

In attendance: Tom Goldsmith (Board Secretary)

John Owen (item 4 only)
Mal McDougal (item 5 only)
Bob Twigger (item 6 only)
Neil Jarvis (Assistant to Board Secretary)

Apologies: Myfanwy Barrett
John Bengner

1. Actions arising

- 1.1 The Board noted the updates on the actions agreed at previous meetings.
- 1.2 **Jacqy Sharpe** agreed to update the Board by email on replacement of the annunciator software. **Rob Greig** was concerned about the risk this posed; the company currently providing support did not wish to continue and the current software was not adequately stored nor supported by the Parliamentary Digital Service.
- 1.3 **David Natzler** reported that he had met those responsible for administering the security clearance process and had concluded that there were not any feasible options for speeding up the process significantly. The House was getting a good level of service compared to other organisations and the officials responsible appreciated the importance of this work for the House. They had welcomed the prospect of regular future meetings at operational level.

2. Oral Update from Board Members

- 2.1 **David Natzler** asked Board Members to direct any enquiries concerning party negotiations after the election to him. He reminded the Board that the date of the first session and state opening remained in place regardless of the outcome of the election.

- 2.2 **John Borley** noted re-carpeting in PCH was proceeding as planned (18 tonnes).
- 2.3 **Tom Goldsmith** reported on plans for the senior leadership event on 23 April: David Natzler would introduce the session, David Vere would outline current work on cultural change, John Bengner would give an update on General Election planning and John Borley would update senior leaders on R&R and the Northern Estate. Penny Young would also be in attendance.
- 2.4 In the absence of the Director of Finance, **Rob Greig** updated the Board on problems with the recent upgrade of HAIS. He noted there was a pause on replying to the latest correspondence from Unit 4 to allow time to consider the best course of action. He thought, given there were two primary stakeholders, namely HR and Finance, it might be best for the Parliamentary Digital Service to resolve the current problems and possibly to look at alternative arrangements for procuring this software in the future. **Andrew Walker** said it was important to consider both the contractual issues and the underlying issues of functionality. **Janet Gaymer** noted the HAIS upgrade would be considered at the next quarterly review meeting.

3. Financial remit and planning guidance

- 3.1 The Board deferred formal consideration of the paper from the Director of Finance until the Quarterly Performance Review.
- 3.2 The Board noted the draft planning guidance.
- 3.3 **Janet Gaymer** said that she expected the financial remit would be considered at an early meeting of the new Commission.

4. General Election Planning and Post-Election Offering

- 4.1 **John Owen** introduced the paper from the General Election Planning Group. He reported that since the paper had been prepared the status of delivering the new wi-fi service for Members, as noted in paragraph 18, had changed and the upgraded system will now be ready in time. He also acknowledged that departments across the Service were working collaboratively and positively on the project.
- 4.2 **Andrew Walker** updated the Board on recent meetings with IPSA to address differing perceptions from IPSA and the House on the HR service that would be made available to arriving and defeated Members. **David Natzler** asked for clarification on support available to defeated Members. **John Owen** said the plans were fairly extensive, with advice provided from HR and IPSA in Westminster and elsewhere, working to the former Members' timetables based on feedback from defeated Members after the last election.
- 4.3 **Rob Greig** raised two concerns. Firstly, he noted the catalogue of IT equipment available to Members would be expanded to include Apple computers as well as iPads. He said the Service Desk function had not been

allocated resources – access to Apple computers and the necessary skills – to provide adequate support for these additional devices. He imagined there would be a reasonably high demand for Apple computers and was concerned the Digital Service could only provide basic support. Secondly, he noted electronic meeting papers distributed in the House for tablets needed Good Reader software which is only available for iPads. The catalogue for equipment now includes a range of other tablet computers which would not be compatible. **Barbara Scott** said the catalogue needed to state these matters clearly so that Members were clear when choosing.

- 4.4 **David Natzler** asked about how many returning officers had not yet contacted the project team. **John Owen** said there were currently 164 to respond and the team were now calling each individually. The pack of information given to each returning officer has also been sent to each of the political parties and that they could also make it available to successful candidates.
- 4.5 The Management Board was impressed by the work to date, the project management and the quality of the information brought to the Board. **Janet Gaymer** asked for the Board's thanks to be passed to the project team. She also noted that it was important to record all the lessons learned to include areas that had gone well, matters that had been problematic and how co-operative external stakeholders had been. In addition, **David Natzler** noted that the response from staff on the Buddy Programme had been universally positive and this approach should be continued. **Barbara Scott** was concerned the paper mentioned a cut-off time for the telephone divert system for Members to contact their 'buddy'. **John Owen** said the post-election offering was the start of an ongoing relationship with Members of the new Parliament and, specifically on the telephone diverts, he would investigate if they could be extended where requested.

5. Safety Management Update

- 5.1 **Mal McDougal** introduced her paper and said that while the majority of the actions from the Deloitte audit report had been implemented, the three outstanding actions represented a challenge. She thanked colleagues for their co-operation, particularly those in Facilities.
- 5.2 **Andrew Walker** thought the RACI model approach would give clarity about who would be responsible for which aspects of safety and give real confidence to the Board. **John Borley** agreed the RACI approach would be helpful in identifying responsibilities particularly in relation to those shared with the Lords. He also welcomed the constructive, professional dialogue taking place between Mal McDougal and Brian Finnimore, the Acting Director of Estates.
- 5.3 **Mal McDougal** said the safety team would be strengthened by two new staff who were starting soon. **Andrew Walker** said these posts were key in improving the partnership between estates and safety management.

- 5.4 **David Natzler** asked about the number of safety co-ordinators and whether these should be increased. **Mal McDougal** thought that Facilities in particular might need additional co-ordinators given the breadth of this area of the business, possibly one in accommodation, one in catering and one in PED.
- 5.5 **Janet Gaymer** was concerned about how to achieve cultural change. **Mal McDougal** said the Safety Laboratory's safety climate tool seemed to be a promising aid for providing insight. She felt the solution would be two-pronged: a commitment to ongoing and better communication, and integrating safety into work rather than being seen as a stand-alone issue. She was working with David Vere on incorporating safety into the People Strategy. Finally, she felt it was important to focus also on the consequences of non-compliance. **Jacqy Sharpe** agreed; in DCCS, where she met the safety co-ordinators regularly, they found showing possible consequences of 'near misses' a powerful way to underline the importance of the issue.
- 5.6 **Barbara Scott** was concerned that any work on culture change should be within the context of change across all activity; cultural change was everyone's responsibility and needed a global approach. She also felt a follow up report from Deloitte on compliance would be useful especially if the person who did the original audit was available as continuity was a key factor. **Andrew Walker** agreed and asked that on the wider issue of compliance across the Service, any future audit should be sponsored by the Clerk. **David Natzler** confirmed that he was indeed the sponsor of the compliance audit planned for the current year.
- 5.7 **Janet Gaymer** said the Management Board considered safety management as a top priority and was determined to support the safety management team on implementing the changes set out in the report.

6. Governance Committee implementation

- 6.1 **Janet Gaymer** said it was important to ensure a handover from the Management Board to the Executive Committee and Executive team. **Tom Goldsmith** agreed and said that the new 'Forward Look' document and communications grid (which the Board would be considering at the next Quarterly Performance Review) might aid the process. He also noted that existing Board Members were likely to be part of the Executive Committee, at least in its initial formation, thereby ensuring continuity.
- 6.2 **Tom Goldsmith** and **Bob Twigger** introduced their paper and asked the Board to note progress, endorse the proposed support structure and agree the name of the combined office. **Bob Twigger** said he was working on papers for the first meeting of the new Commission for it to consider some of the issues to be decided.
- 6.3 **Barbara Scott** said she harboured some reservations about acting before the Director General arrived in post but on balance felt it important to keep momentum of the implementation and agreed some areas needed to progress. Tom Goldsmith noted the recent co-location of the OCE and

Domestic Committees team was already reaping benefits. **Bob Twigger** thought it was important for the new Director General to have available resources from the start. He also noted that another benefit of bringing the two teams together aided the transfer between Management Board and Executive Committee.

- 6.4 **David Natzler** asked about arrangements for transfer between Management Board and Executive Committee after the new Commission was formed. **Bob Twigger** confirmed that the papers he was drawing up for the Commission's first meeting dealt with this issue including delegations from the Commission. **Janet Gaymer** and **Barbara Scott** both noted that consideration would need to be given to whether they could continue their work with discussion groups and in championing after the Management Board ceased to exist.
- 6.5 **Rob Greig** underlined the importance of communications during periods of change and not to under-estimate the need for regular communications to all staff even if there had not been developments or that they were unaffected by the changes. **Andrew Walker** agreed that regular communications were needed even if simply setting out issues which remained unresolved.
- 6.6 The **Board endorsed** the new support structure and proposal to merge formally the two teams in October 2015. The **Board agreed** the new office would now be known as 'Governance Office' pending further consideration of the name in October 2015.

7. **Any Other Business**

Quarterly Performance Meeting

- 7.1 **Tom Goldsmith** noted the next meeting of the Management Board was a quarterly performance meeting. A different approach was being trialled. The pack would be emailed to the Management Board two weeks before the meeting with an invitation to identify areas they wished to include for discussion and this would inform the agenda of the meeting.

The meeting ended at 5.20pm