HOUSE OF LORDS

Management Board

9th Meeting
Tuesday 14 June 2016

MINUTES

Present:	David Beamish	Chairman
	Simon Burton	Corporate Services
	David Leakey	Black Rod
	Andrew Makower	Financial Resources
	Tom Mohan	Human Resources
	Edward Ollard	Parliamentary Services
	Carl Woodall	Support Services
	Paul Martin	Parliamentary Security
Apologies:	Rob Greig	Parliamentary Digital Service
	Liz Hewitt	External member, Audit Committee
In attendance:	Richard Ware	R&R Programme Director (for items 1-3)
	Jonathan Smith	Head of Finance (for item 6)
	Martina Hunter	Deputy Head of Finance (for item 6)

1	**Mandate for the next phase (Phase Three) of the Restoration and Renewal Programme**	MB/2016/49

1.1 Richard Ware introduced the paper. The scope of the second phase mandate had almost been fulfilled; it would be completed once the decision in principle on the way forward had been made by both Houses. The new mandate had been amended to include "the Palace of Westminster in the context of its surroundings". However, it did not make provision for new facilities that might be required as part of the Archives Accommodation Programme (AAP) or the Relocation Contingencies Programme (RCP).

1.2 The Commons Board had considered this paper at its meeting. It had asked the Programme Director to ensure that discussions took place with the office of the Mayor of London in order for any plans to revive the World Squares Masterplan to take account of parliamentary plans for Restoration and Renewal. There was a proposal to convene a private conference after the publication of the report by the Joint Committee on the Palace of Westminster, bringing together local stakeholders – Westminster City Council, TfL, Government Property Unit, Westminster Abbey, the Mayor of London and others – to gauge the appetite for joint action in relation to common interest. There was no expectation that Parliament would lead any initiative to complete the World Squares masterplan.

1.3 In discussion the following points were made:

- Given the absence of a decision in principle it was important not to pre-empt any future decision-making by members of both Houses - this required careful communications;
- The scale and complexity of the programme required work to be undertaken in advance of the decision in principle, this was common practice in the public sector, especially if the work was to be completed before the 2030 election;
- While it was important to manage the interdependencies between the programmes, there was no need to include the AAP or RCP within the governance structure for R&R;
- It was important to avoid project creep – AAP and RCP would be distractions from the fundamental purpose of the programme;
- The new SRO for R&R must be accountable to the Clerk of the Parliaments as well as to the Clerk of the House;
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access];*
- A replacement for the R&R Programme Director should be sought as soon as possible, and the new post-holder should be a member of the AAP Board;
- The Joint Committee was deliberately being economical about decant options in order not to divert resources from restoration of the Palace.

1.4   The Board **agreed to the mandate as set out in paragraph 12. It would be important to manage fully the interdependencies between the Restoration & Renewal programme and the Archives Accommodation Programme and the Relocation Contingencies Programme; but it was not necessary to agglomerate the governance of those programmes in order to achieve that aim.**

2   Mitigating the people impacts of the Restoration and Renewal Programme   MB/2016/50

2.1   Tom Mohan introduced his paper. This was a follow-up to a paper considered by the Board in March 2016 (MB/2016/12). [*Additional information – Restricted Access.]* This was a joint programme and impacts would be considered jointly by both Boards. There was now more scope for flexibility in movement of staff between the two Houses, given the alignment of the pension schemes, and the work on aligning terms and conditions. The Board was invited to take note.

2.2   *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*

2.3   **The Board took note of the paper and broadly endorsed paragraphs 13-17. The Board agreed that the wider people impacts of Restoration & Renewal would need to be considered in detail before staff briefing meetings were held.**

3   Decant Stakeholder Group

3.1   Ed Ollard introduced the paper. The stakeholder group was intended to be informal, with no executive power or budget, and no secretariat. Its purpose was to provide oversight and intelligent client input to the R&R Programme team, and to assist the team in developing the Outline Business Case for decant in relation to the House of Lords.

3.2   In discussion the following points were made:
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- Any business case would not reach the two Clerks until the Parliamentary Security Director had signed it off.

3.3   The Board agreed to amend the terms of reference [*Additional information – Restricted Access.*]

3.4   The Board **agreed to the establishment of an informal stakeholder group, subject to the changes agreed to the terms of reference.**

4   Cyber Security Awareness Training

4.1   Simon Burton introduced the paper. Attitudes and behaviours were important in ensuring cyber security. The short mandatory training was a first step in increasing awareness and promoting safe cyber practices. The paper was strongly supported by the members of the Board.

4.2   A question was asked concerning staff with tangential access to ICT. Training would be provided for them in classrooms, as it had been for fire safety. A related point was made about some staff wishing to access their parliamentary accounts from mobile devices in order to see staff newsletters for example, but being refused on the grounds that the Administration wanted to avoid the proliferation of devices with such access. There was concern that not all groups of staff were being treated equally. It was agreed that more work should be done to establish the needs for access, and how permissions for access were managed.

4.3   The Chairman asked that Rob Greig send the link to the online cyber security module, once ready, to all members of the Board in order for them to complete the training at the earliest opportunity.

4.4   The Board **agreed to mandate a short online cyber security learning module by all House staff and contractors.**

5   Proposals for Management Response to NAO VFM Review

5.1   Andrew Makower introduced the paper. The Commons Board had considered the paper previously and had expressed enthusiasm for measuring benefits and capturing lessons learnt. There was some dissatisfaction with the business case process, but no clarity as to whether it was the process or the delivery at fault. Members of the Commons Board had asked for a teach-in on 'agile', the PDS programme for more agile management. Members of the Lords

Board asked whether the invitation to the teach-in on 'agile' could be extended to them.

5.2   In discussion the following points were raised:
- The business case process was slowed by budgeting and value for money processes; it was for discussion how agile the process could be without compromising due diligence;
- *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*
- It would be helpful to distinguish between programmes which delivered new value and those which reduced existing risk; delays in reducing risk were more damaging than delays in delivering new value;
- The vulnerabilities in projects and programmes tended to be staff-related rather than process-related;
- There needed to be a follow up to the capabilities review; the Joint Investment Board was due to consider next steps, but the Board would benefit from an update.

5.3   **It was agreed that the Board would receive an update at a future meeting on the progress made following the capabilities review.**

6   **Draft Resource Accounts 2015/16**   **MB/2016/54**
6.1   Andrew Makower introduced the paper. The format of the accounts had changed this year, in line with guidance issued by HM Treasury. It was now recommended that annual resource accounts be published jointly with annual reports; this had been discussed at a meeting of the Audit Committee and was due for consideration for next year's annual report. One difficulty presented by the proposal arose from a governance point of view: the Resource Accounts were currently signed off by the Audit Committee and the Annual Report by the House Committee. This would need to be considered in light of the new governance structure.

6.2   There was a brief discussion of items that had changed this year, [*Additional information – Restricted Access*]; the upward valuation of the Parliamentary Estate, and the pensions transfer which appeared as a balance sheet movement.

6.3   The Board **agreed the draft annual resource accounts.**

7   Westminster Hall Contingency Plans [RESERVED*]***   MB/2016/5554

    7.1   *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*

    7.2   **The Board took note of the Westminster Hall contingency plans.** *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*

8   Corporate risk register as at 7 June 2016   **MB/2016/56**

    8.1   *[Additional information – Restricted Access]*

    8.2   **The Board took note of the risk register as at 7 June 2016.**

9   Any other business

    [Additional information – Restricted Access]

                      MB/2016/57

10   Finance report for period 12

    The Board took note of the Finance report for period 12.

                        MB/2016/58

11   House of Lords Portfolio Dashboard

    The Board took note of the House of Lords portfolio dashboard.

12   Minutes of the meeting on 20 May 2016

    The minutes had been previously agreed by correspondence.

Next Meeting: Wednesday 6 July 2016 at 10.00am

Management Board Secretary
14 June 2016

ACTIONS

Meeting date	Minute item	Action	Owner	Deadline/ Status
14 June	2	Consideration of wider staff impacts of R&R	TM	Before staff briefings on R&R take place
14 June	4	Review of how permissions for access to parliamentary network accounts from mobile devices is managed	TM/RG	n/a
14 June	4	Link to online cyber security learning module to be sent to all Board members once available	RG	When the learning module is available
14 June	5	Update on follow up work to capabilities review to be presented to MB	AM	July Board meeting
14 June	7	Senior managers meeting to be convened to brief staff on Westminster Hall contingency plans	BR/DRB	Before summer recess (21 July)