



Management Board

16th Meeting
Wednesday 28 November

MINUTES

Present:	David Beamish Liz Hallam Smith David Leakey Andrew Makower Edward Ollard Rhodri Walters Carl Woodall Joan Miller Tom Mohan Malcolm McCaig	Clerk of the Parliaments Information Services Black Rod's Department Financial Resources Parliamentary Services Corporate Services Facilities Director of Parliamentary ICT Human Resources Audit Committee Member Audit Committee Member
Apologies:	Ian Luder	Director of Public Information Parliamentary Security Director Head of Property and Office Services
In attendance:	Benet Hiscock (for items 4a and 5) Peter Mason (for item 3b) Fiona Smith (for item 9)	

1 Oral updates

1.1 Board members raised the following matters:

- Six reports of the Commissioner for Standards had been published, all of which recommended no further action against members.
- The Gift Shop Christmas sale had been successful, with £34,000 sales made on one day.
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

2 House Committee draft agenda, 11 December

MB/2012/118

2.1 The Board took note of the draft agenda.

3 Audit Committee draft agendas, 14 January 2013 and 23 January 2013 (joint meeting with House of Commons Administration Estimate Audit Committee)

**MB/2012/119
120**

3.1 The Board discussed whether a paper on the restoration and renewal programme governance model should be considered at the joint meeting of the Audit Committees. It was important that the Lords was appropriately represented in the governance model. It was suggested that the item should be discussed at the Lords Audit Committee on 14 January, where a view could be taken as to whether it should be considered on 23 January at the joint meeting.

4 Corporate risk reports:

a) Reputation

MB/2012/121

Benet Hiscock attended for this item.

4.1 Liz Hallam Smith introduced the risk report. A risk appetite of open was proposed as the House did not control many of the drivers of the risk. Parliament needed to be proactive in managing the risk and seeking positive

press.

4.2 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

4.3 The following further points were raised in discussion:

- The Board discussed income generation. It was noted that income generation proposals involved major reputational risks. Members needed to be aware of these risks before agreeing any proposals.
- The figures for hits on Lords Committees internet pages compared to those of the House of Commons showed a failure to get across the Lords message on the internet.

4.4 The Board **agreed** that the Business Planning Group should consider the issue of risk appetite and make a recommendation to the Board. The Board agreed a risk score and appetite for risk 6 (reputation).

b) Security [RESERVED]

MB/2012/122

Peter Mason attended for this item.

4.5 Peter Mason introduced the risk report. The Parliamentary Security Board had considered a paper proposing a single security risk register covering the whole parliamentary estate. If this was agreed, the boards of both Houses would consider a summary of the security risk register alongside each Board's corporate risk register. Although there would always be differences in the corporate management of the security risk between both Houses, there was no variation in the view of security between the two Houses and a single security risk register would ensure that the risk was assessed and presented in the same way for both Boards. Board members made the following points in discussion of the proposal:

- It was important that the security risk remained on the Lords corporate risk register. The Board should not lose sight of the risk because of a change in methodology.
- The single risk register could be considered at a joint meeting of two Boards.
- The Board summary of the risk register would set out the top-level issues but leave out the technical detail.

4.6 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

4.7 The Board **agreed** a risk score and appetite for risk 1 (security).

c) ICT [RESERVED]

**MB/2012/123
123A**

4.8 Joan Miller responded to the comments made at the previous Board meeting ICT meeting, as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the minutes of the meeting held on 7 November (15th meeting).

4.9 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*

4.10 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

4.11 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

4.12 The Board **took note** of the update. A risk appetite, risk score and

target risk had been agreed at the previous meeting.

5 Savings strategy update and financial plan 2012 [RESERVED]

MB/2012/124

Benet Hiscock attended for this item.

124A

5.1 Andrew Makower introduced his paper. The Board discussed the proposal for developing a narrative on a savings strategy. The proposal was welcomed by the Board. The following points were made in discussion:

124B

- There was a positive story to tell in relation to savings.
- There had been no discussion in the media of savings made by the House. It was important to present the savings in the terms of savings programmes already described in the media.
- The savings narrative should be set out in the next corporate business plan.
- Communications on savings should not directly compare the Lords savings to the Commons, but rather act as a narrative of what the Lords had done.

5.2 *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

5.3 The Board discussed whether underspend in 2012/13 should be used to fund projects that could make use of the money by the end of the financial year. The Board welcomed the proposal, subject to spending continuing to represent good value for money.

5.4 The following further points were made in discussion:

- The comments by Angela Eagle in the House of Commons could be taken as a mandate for more joint working.
- There was increasingly less headroom in the financial plan as underspend was reduced.
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

5.5 The Board **agreed**:

- To adopt the narrative of a *de facto* savings programme, to be reflected in the Business Plan for 2013/14.
- Underspend for 2012/13 should be reallocated to projects which could spend it before the end of the financial year, where these projects were existing priorities which represented good value for money.
- A new Catering and Retail Service resources subsidy target of “2013/14 £1,200k, 2014/15 £1,100k, 2015/16 £1,100k less an Election benefit. CRS will aim to reduce these figures by at least £100k, to achieve a subsidy of £1m or less by 2014/15, if members will agree to radical change.”
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*. The Board noted that ongoing long-term costs arising from investment should be taken into account when agreeing additional spending.
- To apply the savings target of zero growth in real terms to 2015/16.

5.6 The Board **agreed** that the financial plan as amended would be considered at the House Committee meeting on 11 December.

- 6 Update on business resilience capability [RESERVED] MB/2012/125**
- 6.1 David Leakey introduced his paper. Comments on the drafting of the business resilience policy had been received and would be reflected in the version of the policy to be considered by the Commons Management Board.
- 6.2 The following points were raised in discussion:
- Consideration should be given as to whether members should be briefed on the business resilience policy.
 - Incidental ICT costs of business resilience plans were often underestimated.
 - *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.
- 6.3 The Board **agreed** the business resilience policy as amended and **took note** of the business resilience update.
- 7 Proposed changes to the Incident Management Arrangements MB/2012/126**
- 7.1 David Leakey introduced his paper. He noted that the fourth recommendation of the paper should have referred to the funding for the “business resilience *training* programme.” It was expected that incident management teams would not be paid, but would receive time off *in lieu* for their work. The importance of having at least one Lords chief of staff was noted. The following points were raised in discussion:
- The increasing professionalisation of incident management was welcomed.
 - The experience of PICT Extended Business Support teams had shown that five teams were required in order to ensure one team was always ready if necessary.
- 7.2 A Board member suggested that the role of those on the gold rota was not clear and that more work was required to explain what their role was. It was suggested that informal meetings of those on the gold rota would help, rather than more formal training.
- 7.3 The Board **agreed** the proposed changes to Incident Management arrangements.
- 8 Staff Christmas fund MB/2012/127**
- 8.1 Tom Mohan introduced his paper. *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.
- 8.2 The Board deferred a decision on the proposal.
- 9 Property update [RESERVED] MB/2012/128**
- Fiona Smith attended for this item.
- 9.1 Carl Woodall introduced the update. *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*. A paper on refurbishment of 6 and 7 Old Palace Yard would be considered at the Board meeting on 17 December.
- 9.2 The Board **took note** of the update.

10 Any other business

10.1 There was no other business.

11 Draft minutes of the meetings on 31 October and 7 November

11.1 The Board **agreed** the draft minutes.

12 Facilities ICT update

MB/2012/129

12.1 The Board **took note** of the update.

13 Recruitment panel update

MB/2012/130

13.1 The Board **took note** of the update.

Next Meeting: Monday 17 December at 12 noon.

Management Board Secretary
29 November 2012