



# HOUSE OF LORDS

## Management Board

13th Meeting  
Wednesday 2 December 2015

### MINUTES

<b>Present:</b>	David Beamish	Clerk of the Parliaments
	Simon Burton	Corporate Services
	Elizabeth Hallam Smith	Information Services
	David Leakey	Access & Security
	Andrew Makower	Financial Resources
	Tom Mohan	Human Resources
	Edward Ollard	Parliamentary Services
	Carl Woodall	Support Services
<b>Audit Committee member:</b>	Liz Hewitt	
<b>Apologies:</b>	Rob Greig	Digital Services
<b>In attendance:</b>	Fiona Smith	Head of Property and Office Services

## 1. Review of Accommodation Strategic Plan and Principles – an update **MB/2015/80**

1.1 Carl Woodall introduced the paper, which provided an update on work in progress. He summarised engagement with Heads of Offices so far, which had taken place following the Board meeting in June 2015 and the Awayday in October 2015. A zero-based review had also been discussed by the Accommodation Working Group. As a result the Peers' TV Room had been converted into a "hot desking" space and good feedback had been received. He noted that Archives, Security and Digital had all requested additional space, which it would be necessary for the Lords to provide a share of. He noted that the provision of showers was currently separated by function and that this area would benefit from further consideration. He suggested that the adoption of a defined accommodation policy might be desirable as he considered that the manner in which space was allocated at the moment could benefit from greater clarity.

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

- A Board member urged caution about being too prescriptive in this area.
- A Board member said that it was not clear what the Board was being asked to decide and suggested that a better approach would be to calibrate the provision of space according to offices' requirements. Fiona Smith replied that the discussions with Heads of Offices had tried to take account of the different roles in, and

distinct requirements of, each office. Different approaches were still under consideration.

- A Board member said that care should be taken not to become too focused on the approach at the expense of delivery and that it might be useful to specify a short process in this respect.
- The Board noted that the paper's reference to contractors was a general one and included provision for the Restoration & Renewal (R&R) Programme.
- The Director of Information Services welcomed the paper and the proposed adoption of a policy, which should be distinct from the guidelines on the allocation of space. She noted that R&R research into the possible use of Victoria Tower, following an Archives decant, suggested that there was the potential to accommodate 150 desks for staff on an open plan basis. The projected 600,000 education service visits was considered to be too high. Carl Woodall and Fiona Smith agreed. There needed to be robust arrangements in place for the storage of materials in the QEII Conference Centre basement. Regarding shared space, she and the Director of Library Services were happy for monitoring to take place to enable more efficient use to be made of the Library suite, and that the Information Committee would need to be consulted. The term "shared space" should also be clarified in the paper.
- A Board member noted that the requirements of members and staff were different and that the refurbishment of 5 Great College Street should be an opportunity to do things differently. An open plan arrangement would be better than a cellular arrangement. They supported the further consideration of workflows, including the storage of bikes and provision of showers, to consider if a more efficient system could be devised. Going into detail in this area was desirable but could also be controversial.
- The Finance Director expressed strong support for work in this area due to the potential value for money benefits, particularly when additional space was required. In his area discussions had been constructive and his office's requirements had been understood. Regarding bicameral services it was important for the Administration to provide its share of space.
- A Board member said that the accommodation strategy should take more account of business resilience considerations, as well as the Digital Service's work on workstations, which were mutually supportive in this area.
- A Board member suggested connecting this work with the consideration of disabled access. Fiona Smith replied that this had been considered as part of the Equality Assessment work but agreed that it could be developed further.
- The Board discussed PED's requirements in this area. Fiona Smith said that discussions had taken place with PED but that an understanding of the totality would be required before further discussions could take place with the Director of PED. Fiona Smith also noted that the Commons plans in this area were currently uncertain, which presented challenges in reaching agreements on

bicameral areas.

### 1.3 The Board:

- **took note** of the development of an office-based action plan;
- **took note** of the requests for additional space allocation from the Digital Service, the Archives, the Restoration and Renewal Programme and the Office of the Parliamentary Security Director;
- **took note** of the Accommodation Steering Group's agreement to review the utilisation of shared spaces;
- **agreed** the proposed review of mess rooms, showers, bicycle racks, lockers and other facilities and the potential reallocation of space;
- reconfirmed the need to promote the Millbank House Development as decant accommodation but noted the continuing uncertainties;
- **agreed** the proposed holding of workshops for staff and members, which should factor in the Digital Service's work on workstations;
- **took note** of the main themes arising from recent consultations, including: a requirement for additional small meeting rooms; a need for more widely available and improved rest room, locker and shower facilities; support for more open plan working; pressure on space for certain offices; the potential to relocate additional staff and facilities from the Palace to outbuildings; more clarity with respect to how office accommodation is allocated. The Board noted the support expressed for informal and formal flexible working but considered that further work was required on this area before it could be considered further;
- **took note** that the Clerk of the Parliaments would welcome proposals for a defined policy on accommodation;
- **agreed** that business resilience matters should be considered further, and that a column regarding empty rooms might be added to Annex C, in the next version of the paper; and
- **agreed** that it would welcome an update on the PED discussions in due course. David Beamish also agreed to meet the Commons Facilities Director General to discuss collaborative working in this area.

## 2 Forecast Outturn, Financial Plan and Efficiencies Programme

MB/2015/81

2.1 Andrew Makower introduced the paper [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

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

- A Board member asked about the possibility of a supplementary estimate and for information about the scale of pension payments.
- A Board member noted that the proposed Efficiencies Programme was separate from the Director General of the House of Commons' review and the bicameral reviews of capacity and capability, and of

joint working. It would be important to align all of these reviews in general terms. If the Lords were to participate in the Efficiencies Programme then the oversight body should be modelled on the bicameral steering group for the Review of Joint Working, with parity of membership for each House. Andrew Makower agreed.

- The Board noted Mary Ollard's comments on the Efficiencies Programme, that there were now a great many reviews in play.
- A Board member suggested that such a Programme should adopt a strategic and prioritised approach rather than a “haircut”. They also expressed concerns about the number of concurrent reviews and the impact on business as usual and on staff.
- A Board member supported the suggestion for a bicameral steering group to oversee the Programme. The prospect of more reviews needed to be carefully managed and properly resourced.
- A Board member said that greater clarity about what the Efficiencies Programme would like to achieve would be welcome. It might usefully address relationships between the Digital Service and “the business” and the persistence of legacy IT systems. The NAO’s value for money study of projects would assist with this approach. Process reviews might also be a useful tool in this context.
- A Board member agreed with the process review point, as well as the need to bare down on unnecessary costs. They noted that the Printing and Publishing Programme Board had experienced some barriers in achieving change in terms of process. They expressed concerns about the number of reviews, which required greater alignment, and suggested that as the Continuous Improvement initiative was tackling the same issues it could be incorporated into the Efficiencies Programme.
- A Board member noted the risk of more substantial savings being required from Parliament and suggested that it would be a worthwhile exercise to consider more significant reductions in line with the obligation on government departments. A Board member agreed and noted that such discussions sometimes identified areas where potential savings could be realised.
- The Director of Facilities requested that the reference to his role in relation to the Offsite Consolidation Centre on page seven of Annex A should include a reference to Fiona Channon, in Commons Facilities, as having a dual role in this respect.
- A Board member suggested that this area could be considered as part of the planned revision of the Lords strategic plan. Andrew Makower agreed, noting that the current savings ambition was already articulated in the strategic plan and the House Committee had repeatedly confirmed it. The Board **agreed** that this should be considered as part of the review.

2.3 Andrew Makower summarised the points raised by Board members.  
*[Additional information – Restricted Access].*

2.4 The Board discussed the proposed Efficiencies Programme and **agreed** to propose that the House of Lords should participate on an equal

footing with the Commons, though concerns were expressed about the number of bicameral groups and initiatives now in play and the impact on business-as-usual and on staff. The Board would expect the Programme to adopt a strategic and prioritised approach rather than a “haircut”. Assuming that such a programme goes ahead the Board agreed to invite the Commons to agree appropriate oversight arrangements, including parity for both Houses on a steering group or programme board. *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.

### **3. Safeguarding Review of the Parliamentary Estate**

**MB/2015/86**

- 3.1 Tom Mohan introduced the paper and apologised for the late notice. The Board noted that the proposed Commons lead in this area was the Serjeant at Arms and that further work on the terms of a safeguarding policy would be conducted by Barnardo’s and the two Houses. He responded to a number of queries that had been raised by Board members in advance. The review’s conclusion was that Parliament was not doing anything wrong in this area but that it should formalise its safeguarding procedures. The issue of how to draw members’ attention to this in a proactive manner would require further consideration. He clarified that members who were vulnerable adults would be covered by the policy and that a duty of care applied to the Administration, which was required to take account of their needs and follow good safeguarding practice. There was a strong recommendation for the appointment of “champions” but this could be reconsidered if necessary. He noted that the Commons nursery was not covered as its staff were not employed by Parliament and were covered by their own safeguarding arrangements and policy. The establishment of a safeguarding body was intended to ensure that the adopted safeguarding arrangements worked well and to provide assurance to the Clerks. The departments and offices with an interest in safeguarding would need to be consulted in due course. The Board was invited to agree the overall direction of travel that was proposed.
- 3.2 The Board considered the paper and the following points were raised in discussion:
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*.
  - A Board member suggested using a “comply or explain” approach.
  - A Board member noted their experience as a trustee of the National Children’s Orchestra and that the scale of work required to implement all of the measures associated with the adoption of such a policy should not be underestimated. Such policies needed to be comprehensive but also needed to be accompanied by a much briefer and user-friendly document.
  - A Board member agreed with the proposed publication of the review, which reflected well on education service staff, who should be congratulated accordingly. Procedures could be improved in this area and consideration of the issues applicable to members should not be avoided and needed to be followed through. They asked if PPCS could be consulted in relation to contractors and Tom Mohan confirmed that it would.

- A Board member said that Parliament should adopt a proportionate approach in this area, supported the publication of the review and noted that more detailed work was required.
- Another Board member agreed with the need for a proportionate approach [*Additional information – Restricted Access*]. Instead of creating a new board they suggested that the Health and Safety Committee could have responsibility for this area.
- David Beamish noted that further engagement would be required with senior staff during the next phase of the policy’s development, which he would personally like to contribute to, noting that it was important for the position of the Lords to be taken into account in an appropriate manner. Tom Mohan agreed.
- [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].
- [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].
- David Beamish agreed to brief the Lord Speaker about this matter.

3.3 Tom Mohan noted that the survey of the views of children was very positive and agreed to circulate this annex to the Board, alongside the annex concerning training. He also agreed to revert to the Board with further information about the three local authorities referred to in the review, as well as any further information concerning the relevance of the Commons nursery to the development of a Parliamentary policy.

#### 3.4 The Board:

- **agreed** that a proportionate approach in the area was desirable;
- **took note** of the safeguarding review produced by Barnardo’s and **agreed** to authorise its publication subject to the views of the House Committee, House of Commons Executive Committee and the House of Commons Commission;
- **took note** of the proposed creation of a parliamentary safeguarding board and agreed that further consideration should be given to where responsibility for this matter could lie; and
- **agreed** the further work outlined in the Barnardo’s report, particularly the development of a policy statement and training programme, [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

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

MB/2015/82

4.1 David Leakey introduced the paper.

4.2 [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

4.3 [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

4.4 [*Additional information – Restricted Access*].

4.5 The Board **took note** of the update and **agreed** the revised Business Resilience Policy for the period December 2015 to December 2016.

**5. Corporate risk register as at 25 November 2015**

**MB/2015/83**

- 5.1 A Board member noted that the mitigations against the cyber risk could be elaborated further, perhaps with reference to the milestones in the run up to the 2017 target date. The Board **agreed** that Simon Burton should contact the Parliamentary Security Director accordingly.
- 5.2 The Director of Human Resources agreed to consider the target score for risk four further. The Board noted that the target date for risk five would be considered by the Board at its February 2016 meeting.
- 5.3 A Board member noted that the health and safety element of risk three had been scored red since June 2014 despite the best efforts of all concerned. David Beamish agreed to intimate the Board's collective concern about this matter in a forthcoming meeting with the Director of PED.
- 5.4 The Board **took note** of the corporate risk register.

**6. Business Planning Group Membership**

**MB/2015/84**

- 6.1 The Board **agreed** the proposed change to the BPG's membership.

**7. Parliamentary dashboard portfolio**

**MB/2015/85**

- 7.1 The Board **took note** of the Parliamentary dashboard portfolio.

**8. Minutes of the Joint meeting on 4 November 2015**

- 8.1 The minutes had been previously agreed by correspondence.

**Next Meeting:** 16 December 2015 at 10.00am

Management Board Secretary  
3 December 2015

**ACTIONS**

Meeting date	Minute item	Action	Owner	Deadline/ Status
2 December	1.3	David Beamish to meet with the Commons Facilities Director to discuss PED's accommodation requirements.	DRB	January 2016
2 December	2.2	Achieving efficiencies to be considered as part of the review of the House of Lords strategic plan.	SPB	January 2016
2 December	3.3	Tom Mohan to circulate review annexes to the Board and provide further information about the three local authorities referred to in the review, as well as any further information concerning the relevance of the Commons nursery to the development of a Parliamentary policy.	TVM	January 2016

<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>Minute item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Deadline/ Status</b>
2 December	5.1	Simon Burton to discuss possible elaboration of cyber risk mitigations with the Parliamentary Security Director.	SPB/ PM	January 2016
2 December	5.3	David Beamish to intimate the Board's collective concern about the red health and safety sub-risk in forthcoming meeting with the Director of PED.	DRB	January 2016