



# HOUSE OF LORDS

## Management Board

Joint Meeting of the House of Lords Management Board and  
House of Commons Board

8th Meeting  
20 May 2016

### MINUTES

<b>Present:</b>	David Beamish	Clerk of the Parliaments
	Simon Burton	Corporate Services, House of Lords
	Liz Hewitt	Non-executive member
	Rob Greig	Digital Service ( <i>also a member of House of Commons Board</i> )
	David Leakey	Access and Security, House of Lords
	Andrew Makower	Financial Resources, House of Lords
	Tom Mohan	Human Resources, House of Lords
	Edward Ollard	Parliamentary Services, House of Lords
	Carl Woodall	Facilities, House of Lords
	Ian Ailles	Director General of the House of Commons
	Myfanwy Barrett	Finance & Corporate Services, House of Commons
	John Borley	In-house Services & Strategic Estates, House of Commons
	Tom Goldsmith	Head of the Governance Office
	Mark Hutton	Stepping Up lead, House of Commons
	Colin Lee	Chamber and Committee Services, House of Commons*
	Paul Martin	Director of Security for Parliament
	David Natzler	Clerk of the House of Commons <i>Ex officio member</i>
	Penny Young	Information Services, House of Commons

### In attendance:

- Brian Finnimore, Director of Parliamentary Estates, for all items
- Sam Jones, Portfolio Manager, for item 3

### Apologies:

- John Benger (\*Colin Lee delegated to attend in his place)
- Lee Bridges
- Patsy Richards

**David Beamish** took the chair.

## I Digital Strategy for Parliament 2016-2021

I.1 Rob Greig introduced his paper. He outlined the process of consultation and iteration which had informed the development of the strategy, including 36 workshops with over 300 members of staff, repeated considerations by the House of Lords Information Committee and the House of Commons Administration Committee, the Speakers of the two Houses and the

Parliamentary Digital Strategy Board. There was a deliberate alignment with the strategies of the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Rob Greig emphasised that this was a digital strategy for Parliament, not for the Parliamentary Digital Service. The next steps were to align the outcomes and measures with the strategies of both Houses. David Beamish pointed out that since the House of Lords was in the midst of a governance restructure the Lords strategy was in draft and subject to agreement by the successor body to the House Committee, once appointed. This was expected to take place in the autumn.

1.2 In discussion the following points were made:

- The new strategy represented a great step forward and should be supported;
- There was a lack of detail concerning value for money (as opposed to cost and efficiency); maintenance costs; and bespoke versus standard software;
- There should be a savings measure to underpin objective 7 (*Improved digital product and services enable reduced costs and savings for Parliament*);
- More clarity was needed on how business stakeholders could engage with PDS; in particular regarding what was replacing the Facilities ICT Portfolio Steering Group;
- The word 'resilient' should be included in Objective 1 (*Technology and channels are reliable and secure*);
- Reference to 're-location contingencies' should be made alongside the Northern Estates and Restoration and Renewal programmes in Objective 8 (*The parliamentary working environment benefits from the most effective use of technology*);
- It would be helpful to have clarity on which technology sat with PDS, and which elsewhere (for example, annunciators);
- Security of technology was paramount and it was desirable for the focus on security not to slip in light of other, more engaging, aspects of the strategy

1.3 In response to questions raised the following points were made by Rob Greig:

- While there was evidence that costs per user were lower than in comparator parliaments, the question of value for money had also been addressed; the efficiencies review had found that in order to realise savings which the Digital Service could offer, there was a need for investment;
- Choices regarding bespoke software versus standard software would need to be considered during the implementation phase; business assumptions about the need for bespoke software would be tested;
- The cost of maintaining systems was now included as standard in business cases; this had not previously been the case;
- The performance measures included in the strategy were illustrative rather than exhaustive; a set of KPIs including savings would be presented to the next meeting of the Digital Strategy Board in June;
- A digital advocates group had been established with representation across departments and teams to enable business stakeholders to engage with PDS; work was on-going to ensure that services to facilities would not be affected by the removal of the Facilities ICT Portfolio Steering Group;
- The word 'resilient' would be added to Objective 1;
- 'Re-location contingencies' formed part of the Restoration and Renewal Programme and there was no need to refer to it separately;
- A network consultant had been commissioned to look at non-corporate networks in operation across Parliament, and to establish owners and users.

#### **1.4 The two Boards agreed the Digital Strategy for Parliament 2016-21, subject to the changes agreed above.**

## **2 Strategic Estates**

2.1 John Borley introduced his paper. The Boards were invited to:

- Endorse the Restoration and Renewal Governance model illustrated as Option 4a (para 13);
- Commission further work to explore options for establishing a Strategic Estates Portfolio (para 16);
- Direct the R&R Programme to prepare a plan for the transfer of responsibility to a Delivery Authority (para 19).

2.2 Option 4a for the Restoration & Renewal Governance model was endorsed.

2.3 In discussion, the following points were made with regard to the recommendation in paragraph 16, to commission further work to explore options for establishing a Strategic Estates Portfolio :

- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access];*
- *[Additional information – restricted access].*

**2.4 The two Boards agreed to endorse the Restoration and Renewal Governance model illustrated as Option 4a (para 13); and to direct the Restoration and Renewal Programme to prepare a plan for the transfer of responsibility to a Delivery Authority (para 19).**

**2.5 The two Boards also agreed to commission further work to consider appropriate governance mechanisms and resourcing for Strategic Estates, in light of the recommendations of the external members of the Restoration and Renewal Board.**

**Ian Ailles** took the chair.

## **3. MTIP 2017-21: Strategic Themes and Priorities**

3.1 **Andrew Makower** introduced the paper on strategic themes and priorities for the medium term investment plan, and thanked Sam Jones for his work. The paper posed four questions; views were particularly sought on any gaps in the plan, and on how investment in decant accommodation should be dealt with in this planning round.

3.2 **Penny Young** supported an effective and proportionate prioritisation process. In her view, the criteria were currently too skewed towards the security and fabric of the building, at the expense of the other priorities in the strategies of the two Houses. She also proposed that, rather than

sending out a questionnaire to lots of staff, the new portfolio board established in the Digital Service should provide the initial prioritisation assessment for digital projects. She proposed an attempt to measure “return on investment”. She was pleased that a benefits analysis would be conducted, and to some extent reassured on lifecycle replacement, although she would like further assurance. Finally, she requested no re-scoring of existing projects.

- 3.3 **Rob Greig** supported the aim to streamline the process and Penny Young’s suggestion of using the portfolio board as an initial filter. He also highlighted the need to consider closing down legacy infrastructure when building new things. In his view, efficiency needed to have greater prominence in the prioritisation process. He requested no “bundling” of projects.
- 3.4 **Carl Woodall** questioned whether the aim of the MTIP to ensure that the two Houses achieved a “satisfactory” level of safety, was sufficiently ambitious. He also noted the need to bear in mind as we move through the process that the two Houses sometimes understood terms such as income generation in different ways.
- 3.5 **David Leakey** suggested that business resilience should feature more prominently in the document and that Relocation might be brigaded with R&R.
- 3.6 **Paul Martin** pointed to the impact of the growth in public access. He considered there should be more emphasis on mitigating the highlighted risk around capacity to delivery, as this would be significant. **Ed Ollard** noted that no funds in the MTIP were currently allocated to delivery.
- 3.7 In response to a query from **Simon Burton**, it was clarified that most of the relevant security projects fell into the estates part of the MTIP, and that most spending on security was via the PED and Digital Service budgets.
- 3.8 **David Beamish** noted that the reference to income generation in the document did not signify any change in the Lords’ policy on this issue. He also agreed with Penny Young that there could be more emphasis on core business in the MTIP.
- 3.9 In response to these points, there was some discussion around the weighting process, and the need to ensure that it took proper account of the strategic priorities of both Houses. It was confirmed that no attempt would be made to prioritise the strategic programmes or to rescore any Estates project that had gone beyond CP3, and that Andrew Makower, Myfanwy Barrett and Sam Jones would review the process for rescoring existing projects which had not quite reached that stage.
- 3.10 **Liz Hewitt** agreed that it was important to focus on capacity to deliver. She also suggested that the joint board consider putting strategic outcomes and specific milestones at a higher level.
- 3.11 **Mark Hutton** asked how programmes that are not classed as estates or digital, such as change programmes, form part of the MTIP process. **Myfanwy Barrett** responded that the EPMO aimed to increase the visibility of these other projects.
- 3.12 **Andrew Makower** fully supported the proposal to use the digital portfolio in the way suggested. The intention was to empower colleagues in estates and digital services to come up with their own programmes and bring them to the Joint Investment Board for challenge. There was some discussion about the potential to remove the central top-down prioritisation process or any central statement of objectives or priorities altogether, but it was agreed that it was important to look at the investment portfolio strategically, while keeping the process as simple as possible.
- 3.13 **David Natzler** suggested that diversity and inclusion form part of the prioritisation questionnaire.
- 3.14 **The Boards agreed:**  
**(1) that, like Digital, Strategic Estates should secure its entire budget through the MTIP process, including its business as usual component;**  
**(2) the proposed statement of priorities, subject to amendments to take account of the points raised in the discussion (following which the statement would be recirculated by email);**  
**(3) that further work be carried out to ensure the two Houses have sufficient capacity to deliver the MTIP;**

**(4) to keep in mind the overall impact of the MTIP on Members and other key customers; and**

**(5) that Andrew Makower, Myfanwy Barrett and Sam Jones revisit the prioritisation process, including the questionnaire, to take account of the discussion.**

**4. Any other business**

4.1 **David Beamish** highlighted the new governance arrangements that would be implemented in the Lords later in the year; and the forthcoming election of a new Lord Speaker, who would take up office on 1 September.

4.2 **Mark Hutton** provided an update on the Stepping Up programme to implement the Director General's Review. A programme team had been established, led by him and Annette Toft with supervision from Ian Ailles. It reported to a programme board, which Mary Ollard attended from the Lords. The Communications Office, the Governance Office and Corporate Services Team had all gone live in their new compositions, and Communications had formally launched as a centre of excellence. All tier 2 posts had been filled; and the formal announcement of this would be made the following week. Once the Lords had been consulted, a questionnaire would be circulated to all boards and groups. The Business Management Group had already been disbanded. The work to establish new KPIs had begun and the team would be speaking to Lords colleagues about this. The team was working in an agile fashion and had an overarching roadmap.

4.3 **Ian Ailles** reminded the two Boards of the forthcoming joint away day on 1 July. A draft programme would be circulated over the coming weeks.

---

Secretary to the Management Board  
20 May 2016