



HOUSE OF LORDS

Management Board

13th Meeting
Wednesday 4 December 2013

MINUTES

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Present: | David Beamish | Clerk of the Parliaments |
| | Liz Hallam Smith | Information Services |
| | David Leakey | Black Rod's Department |
| | Ian Luder | Audit Committee Member |
| | Andrew Makower | Financial Resources |
| | Joan Miller | Director of Parliamentary ICT |
| | Tom Mohan | Human Resources |
| | Edward Ollard | Parliamentary Services |
| | Rhodri Walters | Corporate Services |
| | Carl Woodall | Facilities |
| In attendance: | Caroline Shenton | Archives Accommodation Study Director |

I Future of the Parliamentary Archives' Accommodation

MB/2013/95

1.1 Caroline Shenton introduced the paper and tabled a decision tree annex to inform the Board's consideration. The conclusion was that the status quo was no longer an option. Suitable accommodation for the Archives would still have to be found regardless of the Restoration and Renewal (R&R) decision, the planning for which was happening in parallel to the Archives' Accommodation study but had the potential to link up with R&R in due course.

1.2 The Board considered the paper and the following points were raised in discussion:

- It would take approximately 18 months to empty the Victoria Tower so forward planning was important.
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- All options appeared to be predicated on the assumption that the present premises were not fit for purpose. Caroline Shenton said that this assumption would be elaborated in the Strategic Outline Case (SOC). Elizabeth Hallam Smith said that TNA had audited the Victoria Tower and other Archives accommodation and considered it not fit for purpose, although the services provided were related very highly.
- The paper did not consider the records management function of the Archives, as opposed to the archival function. The implications of separating out these functions needed further consideration and would be the subject of a separate paper.
- The interaction of the study with R&R was complex and needed to be clarified. The Independent Options Appraisal would not explore options for use of the Victoria Tower but could do so if a definitive decision was taken to move the Archives. Caroline Shenton said that factoring R&R

into the Study's approach was important as there would be a five to seven year lead in time to procure a building if this option was pursued. She was liaising closely with the R&R team.

- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- The merits of locating the Archives in a dedicated site outside London were discussed. Access requirements and its status as a functioning collection may mean that any off-site location should not be too far away from Parliament. Caroline Shenton said that this option had the greatest price differential in terms of overall cost, which would serve as a useful benchmark against central London options. Transportation costs to and from would also have to be factored in. "Scan on demand" provided a potential solution for some corporate access.
- The question of ownership of the Archives, which the Clerk of the House considered to be a key principle in relation to the holdings of the House of Commons was noted; a concern which was not necessarily shared by the Clerk of the Parliaments.
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- The potential for increased public engagement opportunities was discussed, using Archives as a hook for enhanced Outreach activities. Surveys had shown that 72% of visitors to Archives exhibitions said they wanted to know more about Parliament today as a result; and 84% of participants in Archives outreach activities and workshops said the same. Caroline Shenton said that if different accommodation was available then Archives could do a lot more to open up this audience and provide a wider range of engagement activities beyond traditional research.
- On the question of the appropriate point at which to involve Members in the decision-making process, Caroline Shenton said that both Works of Art Committees and the Lords Information Committee had been informed about the study. The Board noted that clear options would have to be presented to the House Committee and Administration and Works Committee, as well as the relevant Commons authorities, in due course once costs were known.
- It might be possible to separate out the location of the more recent (last 40 years) of archives from the location of older archives, to facilitate corporate use. Caroline Shenton said that this would involve the expense of running two public services, and that while a distinction could be made between recent and older records for reference, public users ranged across chronological periods without distinction in their research.
- A programme of digitisation could make the location of the original documents less important. Caroline Shenton said that this would be a very expensive option and that the necessary resources (including space in current accommodation) were not available to do so. The Board noted that no library or archive had yet managed to digitise more than 5% of their total holdings.
- It was suggested that the London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) – the second largest holding in the UK and located in Clerkenwell rather than the City – could be worthy of examination. Caroline Shenton said that

there was already a strong relationship between the LMA and the Lords, but that LMA's solely London-focus could be seen as argument for not pursuing this further.

- If a charitable trust was established, any concerns about loss of control could be mitigated by the Clerks appointing themselves and other members of Parliament staff as the majority of trustees. Concerns were expressed about complications with previous Parliamentary trust proposals. Caroline Shenton said that a partnership or charitable status arrangement might provide a more robust funding mix in future.
- Safety and security could have received greater emphasis in the paper as it will have a bearing on the location chosen. Caroline Shenton said that this was subsumed within the overall benefit of reducing the risks to the collection and would be explored in full in the SOC.
- A “do nothing” option should be considered. Caroline Shenton said that it had been; and the risks of doing nothing would be outlined in the SOC for consideration.
- Caroline Shenton noted that 60% of the collection was low-use and had been deemed as suitable for offsite storage.
- TNA and LMA had spare capacity, which may prove useful during decants; the latter having already been used for this purpose in the past.

1.3 The Board noted that the House of Commons Management Board would consider a similar paper on 12 December and agreed that it would be important to work in tandem with the Commons Board regarding this matter, including ascertaining their view on Member engagement.

1.4 The Board **agreed** that a “do nothing” option should be added to the list of options to be considered in the Strategic Outline Case and that the partnership option should be ruled out. The Board **agreed** that the following options should also be ruled out: contracting out the whole service; turning the Archives into a charitable trust; and transferring the Archives to an external provider. The Board requested further information on scoping other possible partnership options.

2 **Office 365 – implementation update**

MB/2013/96

2.1 Joan Miller introduced the paper and tabled a supplementary annex, which had been prepared in response to a question from the Parliamentary Security Director, and clarified that the move to Office 365 did not on its own remove the cyber security risk. She stated that risks still existed around the use of mobile devices, which was being considered separately in consultation with the Senior Information Risk Owners.

2.2 The Board noted the increased interest among Members about transferring data to the Cloud, including Parliamentary questions, following recent media coverage. The Information Committee had also discussed this matter.

2.3 The Board considered the paper and the following points were raised in discussion:

- What the success criteria were regarding the pilot exercises. Joan Miller

said that live mail boxes had been migrated by the end of the financial year to achieve increased resilience as well as savings. To mitigate risks the move to Office 365 had to take place soon after the mailbox migration. Very few problems had been experienced during the pilots and all had been resolved.

- A request for assurance that all current Parliamentary applications had been tested and shown to work with Office 365, application by application. Joan Miller said that an application test plan could be made available accordingly. She explained that problems experienced in relation to the Hansard Reporting Suite were a historic problem which needed to be resolved in the present context.
- The implications for Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) security and the importance of providing guidance to Members and staff in this respect.
- How the transition to Office 365 was being communicated to Members. Joan Miller said that a number of event days had been planned for Members alongside the usual channels of communication. The Whips were also being engaged to bring them up to date. A detailed communications plan would be rolled out from January onwards. It was agreed that explanatory material would be provided in the Library.
- The SPIRE upgrade to silver build had resolved SPIRE/Office 365 integration and connectivity issues. Current levels of SPIRE functionality should be preserved after the rollout.

JM

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

3 **Forecast Outturn and Financial Plan [RESERVED]**

MB/2013/97

3.1 Andrew Makower introduced the paper.

3.2 The Board discussed the level of awareness among Members that the House did not provide insurance cover for their staff, which was provided in the Commons. Andrew Makower said that the financial guidance was silent on this point and agreed to consider it further, including the possibility of clarifying the guidance.

3.3 The Board **agreed** the Forecast Outturn and Financial Plan for presentation to the House Committee and that budget-holders should be asked to treat their Forecast Outturn resource totals as binding, notifying the Finance Director as early as possible if they anticipated a risk of overspending overall.

4 **Update on business resilience capability and annual approval of Business Resilience Policy [RESERVED]**

MB/2013/98

- David Leakey introduced his paper [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

4.1 [*Additional information – Restricted Access*]

4.2 The Board expressed its thanks to Simon Blackburn for producing the very helpful relocation options annex, which provided the first proper framework for future planning in this area.

4.3 The Board **took note** of the update and **agreed** the revised Business Resilience Policy for the period November 2013 to November 2014.

5 Relocation Office Accommodation Arrangements [RESERVED]

MB/2013/99

5.1 Carl Woodall introduced his paper and tabled a series of plan drawings to inform the Board's discussion. The paper had been prepared following discussions with Heads of Office but they would receive further notification in due course.

5.2 The Board **took note** of the proposed allocation of accommodation within the plan drawings as a basis for further work and agreed that they should be verified with Heads of Office before Interior Design and Furnishings (IDF) and PICT were engaged with regarding the furniture, IT and telephony requirements of the plan. The Board should receive an update in January 2014 before the plans were taken further.

CVW

6 First annual review of corporate groups

MB/2013/100

6.1 Rhodri Walters introduced the paper and noted that it was difficult to wind up groups once they had been established; that some reclassification of nomenclature was necessary; and that any rationalisation needed to be discussed with the House of Commons Management Board. The list of corporate groups attached to the paper as an annex formed a useful basis for going forward.

6.2 The Board discussed whether better bicameral governance of access and events was desirable but noted that the bicameral Parliamentary Visitors Board and Exhibitions Advisory Group already considered such matters.

6.3 The Board **agreed** that the list of corporate groups should be appended to the Management Board handbook; that two bicameral Management groups should be invited to change their names; and for the House of Commons Management Board to be notified about the review and invited to conduct a joint review of the bicameral groups, which constitute the majority of groups.

RHW/MBT

7 Second quarter performance report

MB/2013/101

7.1 The Board **took note** of the performance report and noted that Internal Audit had recently conducted a review of the performance management framework which might necessitate further changes to the form of future quarterly reports.

8 Risk report: Staff [Reserved]

MB/2013/102

8.1 Tom Mohan introduced his paper and noted that the definition of staff turnover would receive further consideration within the HR office.

8.2 The Board discussed whether the residual and target risk scores should be scored lower than 12.

8.3 The Board discussed issues surrounding Members' behaviour and its

impact on staff. The House of Commons' Respect policy was noted. Tom Mohan said that this matter had been raised in the People Strategy workshops and would be followed up in this context.

8.4 The Board **agreed** that the residual and target risk scores should be revisited; a risk appetite of "Cautious"; that the Board should "Treat" this risk; and noted the mitigating actions underway or planned.

9 Corporate risk register as at 22 November

MB/2013/103

9.1 The Board noted that the Business Planning Group had discussed the present form of the register on 28 November and agreed that each risk entry should be no longer than one page; that a single score should be deduced for each risk; and that entries should be restricted to the main strategic tasks in each area, in order to improve the utility of the register. The Board Secretary would ensure that this guidance was adhered to when the next edition of the register was compiled.

MBT

9.2 The Board further noted that the BPG had agreed on 30 October that a risk workshop should be held in early 2014 for all Heads of Office and others involved in assessing risks.

9.3 The Board **took note** of the corporate risk register.

10 Any other business

10.1 The Board considered whether a draft paper by Black Rod concerning proposed changes to the opening times of Black Rod's Garden Entrance should be considered by the Administration and Works Committee on 10 December without prior consideration by the Board. David Leakey said that the purpose of the paper was to address mounting Member concerns about long queues for Member events, and security concerns, rather than to achieve cost savings.

10.2 The Board **agreed** that the draft paper should be circulated to Board members for comments before being circulated to the Administration and Works Committee for their consideration on 10 December.

11 Management Board forward plan 2014

MB/2013/104

11.1 The Board **took note** of the 2014 forward plan.

12 Minutes of the meeting on 20 November.

12.1 The minutes had been previously agreed by correspondence.

Next Meeting: Monday 16 December 2013 at 10am.

Management Board Secretary
13 December 2013