



# HOUSE OF LORDS

## Management Board

Joint Meeting with the Management Board of the House of Commons

7th Meeting  
16 May 2014

### MINUTES

<b>Present:</b>	David Beamish	Clerk of the Parliaments (Chair for item 1)
	David Leakey	Black Rod's Department
	Andrew Makower	Financial Resources
	Joan Miller	Director of Parliamentary ICT
	Tom Mohan	Human Resources
	Edward Ollard	Parliamentary Services
	Liz Hallam Smith	Information Services
	Simon Burton	Corporate Services
	Carl Woodall	Facilities
	Ian Luder	Audit Committee member in attendance
	Sir Robert Rogers KCB	Chief Executive, House of Commons (Chair for item 2)
	Myfanwy Barrett	Finance, House of Commons
	John Borley CB	Facilities, House of Commons
	David Natzler	Chamber and Committee Services, House of Commons
	John Pullinger CB	Information Services, House of Commons
	Andrew Walker	Human Resources and Change, House of Commons
	Dame Janet Gaymer DBE	External member, House of Commons
	Barbara Scott	External member, House of Commons

## I Incident management – a bicameral approach

David Beamish took the Chair.

- 1.1 **David Leakey** and **John Borley** introduced their paper.
- 1.2 The Boards noted that a Duty Gold exercise was scheduled to take place on 19 May.
- 1.3 The Boards discussed the paper. In discussion the following points were made:
  - A Board member said that the Incident Management Framework (IMF) was very complex and suggested replacing the current arrangements with a permanent team on stand-by, supplemented on a 24-7 basis by the existing pool of Duty Golds, Silvers and Bronzes, and forming part of the wider security function. Another Board member expressed concerns about such an approach in terms of costs and asked what other roles the team would be expected to fulfil in between incidents. Another Board member said that the current arrangements proved beneficial by integrating a number of staff into the IMF and that the creation of a permanent team may risk losing this degree of engagement. **John Borley** said that a full-time role was fulfilled, to an extent, in the Commons by the Serjeant at Arms and 24/7 functions like Engineers Control and the Duty Housekeeper but that that the potential benefits of full-time Duty Silvers being on-site would merit consideration. **David Leakey** noted that recent changes to the arrangements had included paying the chief of staff to be on call and maintaining a list of support staff to provide administrative support, on a voluntary

- basis with expenses.
- A Board member said that it was important for IMF arrangements to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that they were still fit for purpose. **David Leakey** said that an audit was scheduled to take place to see if Parliament complied with the British Standard, which would serve as a useful benchmarking exercise.
  - A Board member noted that the number of Commons Duty Silvers was declining, which was placing more demand on the remaining Silvers who were not remunerated for their efforts, and that it was important for the numbers to be refreshed. Another Board member agreed and said that the declining numbers should have prompted action to replenish the numbers at an earlier stage. **David Leakey** and **John Borley** replied that the number had recently increased again and noted that seven Duty Silvers was considered to be a reasonable number.

1.4 The Boards discussed whether the composition of the BRG was appropriate to deliver its objectives. A Board member said the membership ensured a positive link with the Parliamentary Estates Board on a number of projects. The Boards noted that while Mal McDougall from the Safety, Health and Wellbeing Service attended BRG meetings on an ad hoc basis the membership did not currently include any HR representatives. While the existing arrangements, including liaison between the two HR departments, was considered to be adequate the Boards agreed that it would be worthwhile for the BRG to review its links with HR.

1.5 The Boards discussed relocation planning and noted that the Relocation Contingencies Programme had begun on 6 May. *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*. The Board member asked if engagement had taken place with private sector organisations about their approach. **David Leakey** replied that engagement had taken place with private sector organisations and central government. **Robert Rogers** and **David Beamish** noted that there was an increasing level of political interest in Parliament's relocation contingency planning, which could be socialised accordingly. The Boards agreed that they were content with the initial direction of travel on relocation planning.

1.6 The Boards discussed relationships with key external stakeholders. A Board member said that the BRG should ensure that links with all relevant stakeholders had been established, including central government. Another Board member said that as Parliament was a relatively small actor in this area it was important for it to establish its position with the relevant stakeholders accordingly. A Board member asked if engagement was taking place with health authorities and local authorities. **David Leakey** confirmed that engagement was taking place with such authorities on the response to CBRN and flu pandemics, among other contingencies. On Parliament's engagement with relevant stakeholders he said this was taking place and that in some areas Parliament's approach was considered progressive. The Boards agreed that they were content with the continued development of relationships with key external stakeholders.

1.7 The Boards discussed the IMF guidance documents. A Board member said that it would be useful for a small card to be issued which set out Duty Gold's responsibilities as a summary of the guidance. Copies of a small IMF aide memoire were produced by a number of Board members but it was noted that while this provided a useful overview of the IMF it did not contain tailored guidance relevant to Duty Golds. Another Board member asked what security and safety guidance was provided to visitors or contractors and expressed concerns that some of these individuals might not be receiving the information. **David Leakey** replied that third party contractors received an induction and security briefing and, in the event of an emergency, doorkeepers, security staff and facilities staff were on hand to usher visitors and others out of Parliamentary buildings while evacuation messages were relayed through the speaker system. He agreed that it would be useful for this issue to be examined and said that any card that was produced to provide guidance to

visitors would have to be made available in different languages. The Boards agreed that the IMF aide memoire should be reviewed in light of the Duty Gold exercise on 19 May; that Andrew Walker should examine the possibility of producing a similar security and safety aide memoire for visitors, providing guidance of what to do in an emergency, and that the BRG should consider the degree of synergy between office contingency plans and the IMF.

## 2 Towards the Medium-Term Investment Plan 2015-19

Robert Rogers took the Chair.

2.1 The Chair thanked the Finance Directors for a comprehensive and coherent analysis of the two Houses' investment portfolios and invited them to introduce their paper.

2.2 **Andrew Makower** said that the paper had been produced in response to the Boards' desire to have earlier input into the MTIP process. A strategic discussion, focused on the size and shape of the investment portfolio, would help the next stage in the planning process. The investment projects would involve a great deal of change and it was essential that these changes were communicated to and understood by staff. The Boards would also want to assure themselves that the two Houses had the delivery capacity to achieve the planned activity.

2.3 The Boards considered the paper. In discussion the following points were made:

### ***ICT investments/Digital Parliament***

- PICTAB had identified the need to complete the work of refreshing the telephony system. It had also noted that there was a risk that neither PICTAB nor PED would be able to take responsibility for the audio-video programme, as the nature of this work fell between the remits of these two bodies. PICTAB had found resources to progress both telephony and AV this year.
- The context of considering ICT investments had changed significantly as a result of the decision to create the Digital Service and the work of the Speaker's Commission on Digital Democracy.
- A four year investment plan for ICT investment might not be feasible given the pace of technological change. Setting a sum for ICT investment without assigning it to specific programmes might be a better way to deal with the later years that fell within the MTIP window.
- An alternative model, used at the BBC, would embed more digital change in the business by placing developers in business units to enable them to respond to business needs and requirements.
- PICTAB did not think that it would be helpful to limit the freedom of the new digital director by presenting her or him with a prescriptive investment plan, but it would be helpful to give a steer on the overall shape of ICT investment and whether the budget would increase, stay the same or reduce.
- The ICT investment portfolio could be split into three categories – Digital Platforms, Digital Management and Digital Parliament – and the Head of Digital would need a flexible approach to those categories, especially the last.
- The Boards' discussion highlighted the importance of agreeing the governance of the Digital Service, how it would interact with content creators and the division of responsibility between the Digital Service and the business for driving new digital ways of working.
- The Head of Digital should be set clear goals by the business but with the freedom to decide how these were delivered.
- The creation of the Digital Service was intended to help Parliament improve its online capacity and performance and was not primarily about finding savings.

- If the creation of a Digital Parliament was a priority this needed to be reflected in the investment portfolio. The aim should be to fund the Digital Service to succeed rather than to fail. It might be helpful to frontload the online investment to help establish new programmes and initiatives the Head of Digital wanted to lead.
- Total expenditure needed to be within the terms of the two Houses' remit; this was an area where the Commons was under more pressure than the Lords.
- It was unlikely that the Head of Digital would be in place in time to inform the resource allocation for 15/16 and the projects that had secured funding during that period needed to proceed. There was headroom in 16/17 and 17/18 which could provide the Head of Digital with some additional funding.
- The Head of Digital would need the ability to initiate new streams of work upon appointment; waiting until 17/18 was not desirable.
- Excessive emphasis on the Head of Digital was unhelpful; the Digital Parliament was everybody's business. Additional funding should be found to establish a "digital challenge fund" any team could submit a bid to access. The size of this fund could be agreed outside the meeting.
- Consideration should be given to how Parliament's ICT would interact with the systems used by IPSA, as the two organisations relied on a large amount of common data. While the independence of all the organisations needed to be respected there might be opportunities to achieve savings and provide a streamlined service for users.
- The Boards accepted the PICTAB Plus proposition of a "coherent" approach to the ICT portfolio, with the following categories: Digital Platforms, Digital Management and Digital Parliament.
- The Boards agreed that the next MTIP should provide the Head of Digital with room to make their own decisions, possibly by relying upon contingency available in 2015/16.

### ***Printing and Publishing***

- Work was under way on successor arrangements to the current TSO contracts. Where possible the Houses should explore joining up services. The Boards discussed the proposed onsite "print on request" function and the proposal to have two separate printing facilities.
- The second printing location would not be a full print unit, it would be more akin to a reprographics centre. Investment in a second location would need to be fully justified in a business case.
- As part of the changes to printing and publishing it was hoped that users would be persuaded to accept a reduction in the quality of the printed material to bring it in line with that provided by other Parliaments.
- Ongoing work to change users' demands and behaviour provided an opportunity for the new Digital Service. Both WIS and PICT were already being involved in this work.
- The link between current expenditure on e-publishing under the TSO contracts and planned investment in a Digital Parliament was not clear.
- The two Houses spend £9m on publishing of which e-publishing is a small part. From 2016-17 the overall spend will reduce and some spend will be changed to provide services in a different way. The Boards needed to consider how to use the resources that were released by this change.
- As TSO currently drove half of Parliament's online content, thought would need to be given to how to support the existing content, and underlying systems, while the new system was developed.
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- The current system, with two different decision points on website content, had an impact on the coherence of the website. Bringing all content in House provided an opportunity to

redesign the website around the needs of the users and to reconsider the link between the official records and rolling content.

- The Boards agreed that it was premature to establish a dedicated Printing and Publishing Programme and that printing and publishing should go forward as change programmes in each House's business, not as an additional ICT-related programme in the MTIP.

#### ***Future of Archives Accommodation Programme***

- The paper proposed that the Archives Accommodation Programme should be a free standing programme outside the Estates portfolio, alongside Restoration and Renewal.
- It would be helpful to have clarity about the future destination of the Archives in order to reduce uncertainty.
- It would be helpful if developments in the Archives Programme could be captured in the Southern Estate master plan, as there were some key dependencies, but the Archives Programme would not be managed as part of the Southern Estate master plan.
- Neither Board had taken a decision on the preferred option for the future of the Archives accommodation, as the options were still being worked up as part of the Strategic Outline Business Case. The Boards were being asked to take an independent decision about how the funding for this programme should be treated.
- The Boards agreed that the Future of the Archives Accommodation Programme should feature as a free-standing programme outside the Estates portfolio.

#### ***Communication***

- The Boards agreed the proposed narrative structure for the new MTIP. The Boards agreed that presentation of the investment expenditure in the "postcard" was helpful.
- Thought should be given to putting "Digital Parliament" ahead of the other digital investment categories. The "Future Estate" category should also be renamed so its purpose was easier to understand.

#### ***Delivery Capacity***

- Progress had been made in increasing both Houses' delivery capacity but further improvements were required.
- Both Houses needed to increase their contract management capacity and more specialist contract management was required. This would be particularly important if a commercial delivery partner model was used. This would likely be achieved through a mixture of developing internal staff and external recruitment.
- Further guidance and support for Senior Responsible Owners (SROs) would be essential. There was scope for greater resource sharing, learning lessons from other projects and reducing duplication which could be achieved through the creation of a project leaders' community.
- The Boards agreed that the Commons Change team would be invited to apply the "Pictures of Change" approach to the MTIP, to inform the Boards' next joint meeting on 21 November. That meeting would also consider a report on capacity to deliver the MTIP, which would be prepared by the group being established to coordinate the implementation of the SRO review, the Lessons Learned report on Network refresh, the internal audit report on Programme and Project reporting, the new systems for prioritisation and RPCA, the corporate portfolio plan, the reviews of PED forecasting, and RCOB, PPM and contract management professionalisation.

#### ***Other***

- The review of the Commons Strategy was not considered likely to affect the MTIP significantly in ways not already discussed.

- The proposal to create a group to co-ordinate implementation as set out above was agreed, with John Borley as sponsor, a target of the end of 2014 and a moratorium on further change initiatives in this area until then.

### **3 Any Other Business**

- 3.1 The Boards noted that this would be the last joint Board meeting attended by Joan Miller, John Pullinger and Robert Rogers. The Boards thanked them all for their contribution.

**Next Meeting:** 6 June at 9.00am.

---

Secretary to the Management Board  
20 May 2014