

**Minutes of the Management Board meeting  
held on Friday 23 March 2012**

**Those present:** Robert Rogers (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)  
Myfanwy Barrett (Director of Finance)  
Joan Miller (Director of PICT, external member)  
Alex Jablonowski (external member)

**In attendance:** Gosia McBride (Assistant Secretary)

**1. Staff Pension Scheme**

**1.1.** Before considering the agenda item, the Board noted that the Diamond Jubilee Addresses ceremony had been very successful. The groups of staff who had been presented to the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh had appreciated it very much.

**1.2.** The Board considered the Option to transfer the House of Commons Staff Pension Scheme into the Principal Civil Service Pension Scheme (PCSPS) paper. In discussion the following points were made:

- The Finance and Services Committee wanted the House Service to explore the option as a way of reducing the volatility of non-cash items.
- An amendment would probably be required to the House of Commons (Administration) Act. Primary legislation would be needed but a free-standing Bill was very unlikely, so it would be necessary to use a wider pensions Bill as a vehicle.
- House of Lords management had reacted fairly positively to the initial suggestion, although they did not have volatile costs on the same scale as the House of Commons. Further discussions were needed.
- The proposal might make it more difficult to recruit retired civil servants in future as new staff could be treated in line with the PCSPS in respect of abatement of civil service pensions. Existing arrangements would remain for current staff.
- The proposal could be seen as a loss of autonomy for the House. Merging the HOCSPS with the PCSPS was an unusual step to take when one of the Board's objectives was to maintain Parliament's separation from Government.

- The future was unknown. In the past the House had always benefitted from taking an independent accounting position. The Board had to be certain that the loss of independence was a price worth paying for controlling the fluctuations in pension costs.
- It was possible to explain the reasons for the merger and show that it would not prejudice the House's independence. The House had already asked the Civil Service to manage some other areas, without losing its autonomy.
- The full implications of the proposal should be put to the Finance and Services Committee.

1.3. The Board **agreed** that the proposal should go to the Finance and Services Committee in April for their consideration.

## 2. Data security governance

2.1. The Board considered the Information and Data Security paper. In discussion the following points were made:

- Information security needed stronger governance, so some sort of structure was needed. The proposed Data Security Group replaced a previous group so would not be adding another layer. The group would be bicameral. DIROs would not attend every meeting of the group, as that would make the group too cumbersome, but could attend when needed.
- It might be better for the Parliamentary Security Director to own the information security risk.
- The House was following the standard Government model, which did not work that way. The House could abolish SIROs, but they did appear to be effective.
- Responsibility for assurance on information was currently very complicated. There was the Information Management Group, the Parliamentary Security Director, and the SIROs. All three had separate meetings and boards. That made it very difficult for those developing policies relating to control of information, such as moving to Cloud. The risk of conflicting advice was very high.
- Assurance on information was very important. The Clerk as Data Controller greatly valued the role of the SIRO.
- The current Parliamentary Security Director had a lot of other issues to address. It would be worth reconsidering responsibilities when a permanent Director was appointed.
- A decision would be taken on Cloud within the next twelve months.
- The SIRO did attend the Information Management Group. Information security was covered by the Group but it was not its primary remit.

- The theory behind having SIROs was to separate risk ownership from strategic management of information security, but it was worth reconsidering the governance of information in the House to see if it could be rationalised. Most Government departments had SIROs, although not all.
- The Data Security Group could be tasked with simplifying governance arrangements. That fitted within its proposed terms of reference.
- The Parliamentary Security Director was a proposed member of the Data Security Group. It might help if Liz Hallam Smith also sat on the Group.

**2.2.** The Board **agreed** the governance arrangements proposed in the paper, subject to their being re-examined when a permanent Parliamentary Security Director was appointed. The Board also **agreed** that Liz Hallam Smith should be invited to join the Data Security Group.

**2.3.** *Action: Andrew Walker to invite Liz Hallam Smith to join the Data Security Group. Board to reconsider governance arrangements for information security in the House once a permanent Parliamentary Security Director is appointed.*

### **3. Safety Assurance**

**3.1.** The Board considered the Safety Assurance paper. In discussion the following points were made:

- The Board might prefer having a single strategic bicameral Health and Safety Committee, but the Lords wished to retain their separate Committee.
- Assurance was a process distinct from safety insurance. The existing Health and Safety Committee carried out an operational rather than assurance function. The most recent audit had made that point, arguing that the health and safety team should be doing assurance rather than hands on work. As a result the House had introduced health and safety tool kits for managers and had increased the number of contractors owning health and safety risks.

**3.2.** The Board **agreed** that the Chairman should discuss the issue further with the Clerk of Parliaments.

**3.3.** *Action: Chairman to discuss bicameral health and safety arrangements with the Clerk of Parliaments. John Borley and Andrew Walker to provide him with a brief.*

**4. Any other business**

[adjourned at 11.17

**Gosia McBride  
Assistant Secretary**

**Robert Rogers  
Chairman**

March 2012