

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting  
held on Thursday 3 July 2014 at 3.30pm**

**Those present:** Sir Robert Rogers KCB (Clerk and Chief Executive) (Chair)  
Myfanwy Barrett (Director of Finance)  
John Borley CB (Director General of Facilities)  
Joan Miller (Director of PICT, external member)  
David Natzler (Clerk Assistant and Director General of Chamber and Committee Services)  
Andrew Walker (Director General of HR and Change)  
Dame Janet Gaymer DBE (non-executive member)  
Barbara Scott (non-executive member)

**In attendance:** Tom Goldsmith (Board Secretary)  
Ben Williams (Assistant Secretary)  
John Benger (Acting Head, Department of Information Services)  
Paul Martin CBE (Parliamentary Security Director)  
(Item 3 only)  
Richard Ware (Director, Restoration and Renewal Programme)  
(item 4 only)  
Nina Ciuffardi (Programme Manager, Restoration and Renewal Programme) (item 4 only)  
Bob Twigger (Secretary, House of Commons Commission)  
(Item 5 only)

The Chair welcomed John Benger to the meeting.

## **1. Actions arising**

1.1 No issues were raised under matter arising.

## **2. Oral Updates**

2.1 **Janet Gaymer** noted that the Audit Committee was in the process of recommending the annual accounts to the Accounting Officer for signature.

2.2 **John Borley** reported that on Tuesday 1 July an event at been held to mark the House of Commons becoming a “Dementia-friendly Parliament”, there was now a need to ensure that practical action was taken to deliver on this pledge. It would help if a lead official could be identified to take this work forward with input from ParliABLE. The **Chair** noted that this issue raised the importance of ensuring that carers’ needs were reflected in the work of Workplace Equality Networks. Following the departure of John Pullinger there was a need to add to the number of staff on the Duty Gold rota. It was **agreed** to add Jacqy Sharpe to the Duty Gold rota.

2.3 **David Natzler** reported that DCCS and ParliREACH had held a seminar on secondment opportunities at SCS level into the Committee Office. Over 40 people had attended this event or had been briefed separately by the organiser

and links had been forged with previously unknown networks with people in Whitehall keen to work with the House Service in promoting diversity and inclusion.

- 2.4 **Joan Miller** reported that the Member migration of Office 365 was at the half way point. There had been some additional disruptions as a number of Lords were migrated at the same time, leading to an increase in calls to the service desk.
- 2.5 **John Bengier** noted that the co-location business case had been approved and thanked all those involved in the process. The House was due to debate the report of the Standards Committee that would give effect to the new Respect Policy on 14 July; communications to Members and staff would be issued on the following day, assuming the report was approved.
- 2.6 **Myfanwy Barrett** reported that that business for the re-design of the Cromwell Green Entrance had been approved; Lesley Scott had done an excellent job producing the business case.
- 2.7 **Andrew Walker** reminded Board members that the deadline for outstanding ASRs was 4 July. A new contractor had been appointed to run the Travel Office; communications to staff would be issued next week. The staff survey results had been received; overall the results were more positive than last year. The results would be sent to senior leaders and the Unions soon and to staff during the following week; departmental reports should be available in August. The PCS Union would be on strike on 10 July, with the impact possibly running over into 11 July; Heads of Departments were asked to check the impact on their business areas.
- 2.8 The **Chair** reported that he had written a letter of thanks to James van Oosterom for facilitating the Board's away day.

### **3. 2014-19 Strategic Plan for Parliamentary Security.**

- 3.1 The Board considered the Strategic Plan for Parliamentary Security. In discussion the following points were made:
  - There were a large number of strategic priorities set out in the paper and it would be a demanding task to deliver them all within existing resources.
  - A number of the points raised related to recommendations outstanding from the 2004 review of security.
  - The strategic priorities reflected a mixture of existing work that would be completed as part of BAU (such as giving advice); substantial programmes (such as SARP) and projects (such as the Jenkins Review) which were already under way and supported by dedicated resources and governance structures. Additionally, there were some new strands of work, including those focusing on awareness raising and compliance, which would be led by

the newly appointed security awareness manager. The strategic aim included reference to security supporting the business of the House and enabling access to Parliament; however the accessibility aim did not appear to be fully reflected in the priorities.

- There was an inherent tension between access and security. There was a separately appointed Access Director whom the Security Director's office worked with closely. Although security and accessibility were inter-related, they were ultimately separate issues.
- The House Service's aim to improve customer service would also present an opportunity to strengthen the challenge culture.
- It was noted that there were currently various different groups of staff involved in physical, cyber, personnel security and access arrangements; there was also a degree of overlap between those roles.
- *It was **agreed** that **Paul Martin** would produce a high level summary of the status, resource and key problems facing the priority areas for the Board to consider.*

3.2- The Board **endorsed** the strategic aim and guiding principles in the 2014-19 Strategic Plan for Parliamentary Security.

3.3- **Paul Martin** briefed the Board on the latest development with the Security Arrangements Renewal Programme.

#### **4. Restoration and Renewal Programme: next steps**

4.1 **Richard Ware** introduced his paper. The programme was approaching the end of phase one of the project and now sought agreement on the mandate for the second phase which would take the programme up to the point of decision in principle, in early 2016. The Board was being asked to endorse the mandate; the final decision would be taken by the two Clerks.

4.3 The paper also provided an overview of the key interdependencies and the Programme Board now had a good understanding of where decisions on the Northern Estate and Archive Accommodation Programme sat on the critical path.

4.5 The Board considered the paper on the next steps for the Restoration and Renewal Programme. In discussion the following points were made:

- It would be important to consult with users of other buildings in the immediate area and there might be value in establishing a consultation forum for this group early in the process and consulting this group frequently.
- The possibility of the Archive moving to a new building in the immediate area illustrated how the surrounding environment could not be taken out of consideration.

- The overview of interdependencies was extremely helpful.
- There was a need for further work to be done on the impact on House staff.
- There had been some early conversations about staffing but it had been felt that the value of doing additional work would be minimal ahead of an option being chosen. There might now be some value in doing some scenario planning work.
- The overview of interdependencies was extremely helpful.

4.6 The Board **endorsed** the mandate for the second phase of the Restoration and Renewal Programme.

## **5. Northern Estate Refurbishment**

5.1 **John Borley** introduced his paper. The purpose of this paper was to consult the Board on how the issue should be raised with the Finance and Services Committee.

5.2 The Board considered the paper on Northern Estate Refurbishment. In discussion the following points were made:

- John Borley should lead on Member engagement, with involvement from Myfanwy Barrett, to address questions about possible impairment charges.
- Member engagement activity that had already been undertaken should be reflected in the paper.
- The paper for the Commission should contain images of the current state of the accommodation and a vision of what would be delivered under the proposals.

## **6. Draft 2015-16 Estimate and Medium Term Financial Plan 2015-16 to – 2018-19.**

6.1 **Myfanwy Barrett** introduced her paper. This was the Board's first major report of the new planning round. The departmental challenge meetings had started and had been going well; the additional questions about ICT and technological requirements had been helpful. As the challenge meetings were still under way, the budgets were a simple roll forward with a list of issues that might cause changes. Relocation planning work was missing from this list but would be picked up in the challenge meeting, as this could have significant implications. There was a gap between target and projected expenditure.

6.2 The next update would be issued ahead of the September Board meeting before being submitted to the Finance and Services Committee to inform their report.

6.3 The Board considered the finance papers. In discussion the following points were made:

- It was possible that a new Commission would change its approach to dealing with upward pressures and additional activity. The Finance and Services Committee had deliberately adopted what it saw as a neutral position so as not to bind a future Commission.

[Adjourned at 5:45]

**Sir Robert Rogers KCB**  
**Chair**

**Tom Goldsmith**  
**Secretary**