The Committee will meet on Tuesday 19 March at 4pm in Committee Room 2A.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
   If members have points to raise from the minutes of the last meeting it would be useful if they could notify the Clerk or write to the Chairman.

3. PROVISION OF IPADS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE MEMBERS
   A memorandum by the Clerk of Committees (H/12–13/23).

4. IMPLICATIONS OF APPOINTMENTS TO THE HOUSE
   A memorandum by the Lord Speaker (H/12–13/24).

5. PROPOSED TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMITTEE
   A memorandum by the Clerk of the Parliaments (H/12–13/25) RESERVED.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
   If members have any other business to raise it would be useful if they could notify the Clerk or write to the Chairman.

March 2013 James Whittle
020 7219 6644 whittlej@parliament.uk
PROVISION OF IPADS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Note by the Clerk of Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue previously considered by</th>
<th>Information Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For decision or information</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision(s) before the Committee</td>
<td>Paragraph 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

1. Following a recommendation by the Information Committee, the Administration conducted a trial of the use of tablet computers (iPads) in an investigative select committee setting. The trial, conducted by the Communications Committee, began in October 2012 and concluded in February.

2. The results of the trial were positive. The Communications Committee concluded that "the use of iPads for its work has proved an overwhelmingly beneficial innovation". The Committee would like to continue using iPads instead of paper circulations.

3. In February the Information Committee considered the results of the trial and Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope then wrote to the Lord Speaker inviting the House Committee to consider "providing a budget to support the provision of tablet devices to investigative select committees on an ‘all or nothing’ basis. It is our recommendation that each committee be given the option to go paperless, making the decision based on its own needs, with the process beginning from the start of the 2013-14 session". Lord Kirkwood’s letter is attached in annex 1.

**“All or nothing” model of provision**

4. The Communications Committee trial was conducted on a paperless basis: all members of the Committee had to agree to take part and receive all papers via iPad only. No paper copies were made. An electronic template was created to facilitate iPad navigation of papers. It was agreed that, as one exception to the paperless approach, hard copies of draft reports could be made available to enable easy annotation.

5. The all or nothing paperless approach was proposed to minimise costs. Some of the costs of iPad provision can be offset by savings on paper, copying and postage. In addition this approach minimises the impact on staff time: in order to ensure iPad circulations are easily navigable they are prepared in a completely different format to paper circulations, and preparing both types of circulation would require considerable extra time. Mixed circulations would not be possible within the current committee staffing and budget model.

---

1 See annex 2: letter from Lord Inglewood (Chairman of the Communications Committee) to Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope (Chairman of the Information Committee), 6 February 2013
**Costs and savings**

6. In total if all Lords investigative committees had declined paper circulations in 2012 then cost savings from paper, copying and postage would have been around £33,830 (assuming a 10 month life for each *ad hoc* committee). The average saving per committee would have been £2,415. These would be resource savings, and not all would arise on the Committee Office budget. If all committees chose to become paperless, further savings could be made in equipment costs such as copiers and printers; these would include capital savings.

7. One advantage for members of iPad circulations is that they arrive more quickly than traditional circulations through the post or internal mail, and are easily accessible for members with more than one address. Savings in staff time are, however, not easy to calculate. There is a small saving in the amount of time it takes a Committee Assistant to assemble an iPad circulation compared to a paper circulation.

8. These potential savings need to be set against the costs of iPads. Currently each new model iPad costs £452, including VAT (for a 3G SIM enabled iPad), a capital cost. In addition to the unit capital cost (cash) the Committee Office will have to budget for depreciation (non-cash); the Committee Office would assume the lifespan of an iPad to be 3 years. While it is proposed that all iPads should be enabled to take 3G SIM cards it is not proposed that the House would supply or pay for the cards, as all Members' areas now have access to the parliamentary Wi-Fi network.

9. The full cost of rolling out iPads to an average 12 member committee will depend on how many members of that committee already have iPads as part of their ICT allocation supplied by PICT. The Information Committee agreed in October 2012 that that no member would be provided with more than one tablet device by the House at any one time.

10. The capital cost of supplying all 12 members of a committee with iPads, plus three staff, would be £6,780 for units only. The resource cost of depreciation would be the same amount over 3 years. So, as the table shows, the savings in paper, printing and postage alone would offset the resource cost of provision of iPads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Resource cost pa (depreciation over 3 years)</th>
<th>Resource saving pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tablets for 12 members</td>
<td>5424</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets for 3 staff</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, printing, postage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6780</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 PICT’s current assumption is that iPads have a lifespan of two years. However, committees would be offered iPads at the start of the 2013-14 session and would be offered the newest model which it is anticipated Apple will continue to support for at least three years.

3 In the Communications Committee trial 3 of the 12 committee members already had iPads so 9 members were provided with one as part of the trial.
11. At most, the capital cost of this proposal in 2013/14 could be £84,980 if all members on all committees and sub-committees, plus three staff per committee, needed iPads. This is the high-end figure; having surveyed Chairmen it is anticipated that only a few committees will opt immediately for paperless working and some members of those committees will already have iPads. Therefore this is likely to be affordable within the Committee Office capital budget.

12. This paper only considers savings arising from reducing paper and postage for committee papers. During the trial undertaken by the Communications Committee those Members who chose to use their iPads for other parliamentary work found them very useful. If this scheme encouraged more Members to use iPads for general parliamentary business, then the savings to the House could be greater. Work is also underway to develop iPad friendly applications for accessing HL Business and Hansard, and significant further savings could be realised if the use of iPads drives down demand for printed documents.

Recommendation

13. I invite the Committee to agree that:

a) all House of Lords investigative committees should be given the option of moving to paperless working at the start of the new Session (training and support will be provided);

b) if significant additional budget provision is needed by the Committee Office to implement this policy the Committee should be asked to approve this in the autumn during the Forecast Outturn exercise (given the likely savings it is unlikely that a significant new budget will be needed);

c) House of Lords committee members should only be offered the loan of an iPad on the Committee Office budget when the whole committee has agreed to go paperless and where the individual member has not already received an iPad from PICT as part of their IT allocation;

d) iPads should be loaned to committee members on the understanding that Members will use them for committee work and will return them to the Committee Office when they are no longer a member of a paperless committee; thought should be given as to whether it should be possible to transfer Committee Office iPads to Members’ ICT to enable Members leaving committees to choose to retain their iPads as part of their IT entitlement; and

e) the Committee Office should carefully track costs and savings arising and should subject the policy to a value for money review after the first year.

Philippa Tudor
Clerk of Committees
11 March 2013
7 March 2013

Baroness D'Souza
Lord Speaker
House of Lords

Dear Frances,

I am writing to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Information Committee to invite the House Committee to consider making provision for the wider use of tablet devices by House of Lords investigative select committees.

In March 2012, the Information Committee recommended that a trial be conducted by an investigative select committee to evaluate the case for committees conducting their work electronically using tablet devices, rather than the traditional method of paper circulations. The trial, conducted by the Communications Committee during the course of its media convergence inquiry, began in October 2012 and reported its findings in February. Those findings are attached at Annex 1. It is important to note at the outset that the trial was conducted on an "all or nothing" basis. This meant that no hard copies of Committee papers were provided to Members, with the sole exception of draft reports.

The findings of the trial were considered by the Information Committee at its meeting on 27 February. Members noted the strong positive case that emerged from the trial, and supported offering other investigative select committees the chance to move to tablet working in place of paper. The Information Committee also agreed that any developments should be taken forward only on the same "all or nothing" basis as the Communications Committee trial. This was decided because of the significant staff, material and equipment costs which would otherwise be occasioned by the preparation of concurrent paper and electronic circulations.

The Information Committee has therefore asked me to invite the House Committee to consider providing a budget to support the provision of tablet devices to investigative select committees on an "all or nothing" basis. It is our recommendation that each committee be given the option as to whether to go paperless, making the decision based on its own needs, with the process beginning from the start of the 2013-14 session. We strongly consider that such provision should be taken forward in accordance with the policy, agreed by the
Information Committee in October 2012, that no member be provided with more than one tablet device by the House at any one time.

I understand that the Committee Office is preparing a paper that sets out detailed recommendations as to how such an approach would operate in practice, including the additional budget requested and the cost-benefit case. I would be grateful if you would consider that paper alongside this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Archi Kirkwood.
Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope  
Chairman, Information Committee  

6 February 2013

As you know, following the recommendation of your Committee last year, the House of Lords Select Committee on Communications has been conducting a trial of iPads for its inquiry into media convergence which began in early October. The trial does not formally expire until the end of the Committee’s inquiry, which will not be until the Easter recess, but the end of the inquiry is in sight, and the Committee considered that it was in a position to report back to you ahead of time. This response has been agreed by the whole Committee and is based on a questionnaire filled in by Members and observations made throughout the trial. I should point out that the basis of the trial was that all members of the Committee had to agree to take part and receive all their papers via iPad, with no paper copies circulated. To facilitate the trial, the staff of the Committee designed a structured, navigable, single file (in PDF format) for each circulation, within which each paper was separately linked.

In summary, the Committee concluded that the use of iPads for its work has proved an overwhelmingly beneficial innovation. There were a number of prominent advantages cited, including:

- the ease with which papers can be accessed and navigated;
- the ease with which great quantities of information can be stored and organised;
- the portability of Committee papers;
- savings in paper; and
- the way in which connectivity enhances circulations and is also useful during meetings - circulations can draw on the resources available on the internet and the internet can be accessed during meetings to check claims made by witnesses.

The strongest drawback reported was the difficulty of annotating papers and, as a result, a very small minority of Members have resorted occasionally to printing out, of their own accord, certain small parts of the circulation. It is possible to annotate papers on an iPad, but it is quite cumbersome and time consuming. This is not an insuperable barrier when the
Committee is taking evidence; Members have often just used a few sheets of paper for note taking. However, as the Committee comes to consider drafts of its report, some Members will probably wish to use hard copy. When the Committee agreed to the iPad trial, a condition of the trial was that they could resort to hard copy for the consideration of drafts of a report. This condition has largely been borne out.

The savings in paper are stark. To date, the total number of pages circulated to each Member of the Committee during its media convergence inquiry (15 meetings) amounts to approximately 750 pages. If the Committee had been working with paper, this would have amounted to 17,250 pieces of paper being used (papers for Members, staff and spare sets). The cost of the production and distribution of 17,250 pages would have been approximately £950 (costs of paper, photocopying, and postage - savings of staff time have not been included in this calculation, see below).

This saving of course needs to be set against the costs of iPads and data connections (£452, including VAT, for the unit, and £15 each per month for data charges). On the face of it, the life-span of an iPad would have to be quite long before the savings in paper, photocopying and postage were recouped. However, there is a whole raft of additional factors to consider, such as possible savings in reducing over time the provision and maintenance of printers and the expensive photocopiers the Committee Office currently needs to support circulation. Clearly, there is a piece of very detailed, complex work to be done here on the quantifiable cost-benefit case of more Committees moving to paperless circulations. I understand that staff are beginning to undertake this work.

It might also be worth noting that while some Members did not use their iPads for other parliamentary work, many did, and they found them very useful in this context as well. It is also interesting how many Members reported that they became ‘converts’ rather more quickly than they anticipated. It is fair to say though that Members mastered the technology at varying speeds. Some Members feel that they would like to receive more training from PICT, though they also recognise that they need to become more familiar with the devices themselves and take some time to practice annotating documents. As a final observation, I don’t think any Member is suggesting that the iPad could be a substitute for a desktop or laptop per se; the lack of programmes, such as Word, would be sorely missed.

In terms of the experiences of staff, while some considerable work was required initially to design an iPad friendly interface, since then it has proved easier and less time consuming than paper circulations, though the savings in time are not dramatic. It should be stressed that savings in staff time are predicated on the whole Committee being paperless; any appetite for some Members of the Committee being paperless, but others not, would create a good deal more work and I understand could require extra staff to support the two separate forms of circulation. Electronic circulations also have the benefit of giving staff more time to prepare papers, as, obviously, the time it takes papers to go through the post is taken out of the equation. As a consequence, papers are often better developed and the information circulated more up to date. Furthermore, posted papers often get delayed or go missing and the increase in reliability brought about by electronic circulations is significant.

---

1 It should be noted that more information has been circulated electronically than probably would have been the case if circulating paper. It is another strength of the iPad that you can circulate material of perhaps more marginal interest, without worrying about wasting paper.
To conclude, the Committee has enjoyed the trial and would very much like to continue using their iPads for Committee work, at the expense of paper circulations. However, it should remain the case that Members may, if they wish, receive hard copy of drafts of reports. If annotation tools were to improve, then this might change.

I hope this is helpful in informing your deliberations and I look forward to hearing what recommendation you might make on the future use of iPads for Committee work. The Committee is very grateful for being given the opportunity to conduct the trial.

If it would be helpful, I would be delighted to meet with you to discuss further.

ingletonwood
Chairman of the House of Lords Communications Committee
HOUSE OF LORDS

HOUSE COMMITTEE
IMPLICATIONS OF APPOINTMENTS TO THE HOUSE
Memorandum by the Lord Speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue previously considered by</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For decision or information</td>
<td>For decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision(s) before the Committee</td>
<td>Paragraph 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

1. On 1 February, the Chairman of Committees received a letter from Lord Forsyth of Drumlean asking the Procedure Committee to consider the implications of further appointments to the House. Lord Forsyth’s letter and the Chairman of Committee’s reply are attached as Annex 1.

2. Following discussion with me, on 13 February, the Chairman of Committees replied saying that as Lord Forsyth’s letter raised a number of matters, many of which were outside the remit of the Procedure Committee, he would forward the letter to me as Chairman of the House Committee. The House Committee could then consider the points raised in Lord Forsyth’s letter and take a view on how to proceed with each.

Points raised by Lord Forsyth’s letter

3. In his letter, Lord Forsyth proposes responding to further appointments by moderating the “rate of introductions” to reflect the House’s “capacity constraints”.

   Capacity constraints

4. Lord Forsyth does not make it clear what he means by capacity constraints. However, they could include a number of things for which other domestic committees are responsible. For example:
   - Constraints on office accommodation or space in the Chamber would be the responsibility of the Administration and Works Committee;
   - Constraints on the catering services would be the responsibility of the Refreshment Committee;
   - Constraints on taking part in the proceedings of the House (e.g. during oral questions) or on securing places on Select Committees would be the responsibility of the Procedure Committee and Liaison Committee.

5. No doubt the size of the House is a factor that all domestic committees already bear in mind. However, if the Committee were minded to explore some or all of these issues further I could write to the relevant domestic committees to consider the implications of further appointments for their areas of responsibility.
6. The Committee is invited to decide whether I should write to the relevant domestic committees inviting them to consider the implications of current capacity constraints and, if so, which committees should be contacted.

_Moderating the rate of introductions_

7. Moderating the rate of introductions is Lord Forsyth’s proposed solution to the problems he foresees. However, reducing the rate of introductions is likely to be considered a quite radical step.

8. When a select committee was established in 1997 to review the ceremony of introduction the House first agreed a motion asking the Queen “that she will be graciously pleased to place her prerogative and interest so far as they may be concerned at the disposal of the House of Lords for the purpose of the consideration of alterations in the ceremony of Introduction.” The rationale behind this is that, while the House may regulate the rate of introductions, in so doing it impinges upon the Royal Prerogative. The debate on Lord Steel of Aikwood’s motion on 28 February reinforced the impression that there was little appetite to do this.\(^4\)

9. I propose at this point, therefore, to focus only on whether there are problems created by increases in membership and, if so, what those problems are. If any problems are identified, the Committee might then wish to consider a range of possible solutions.

\(^4\) HL Deb 28 February 2013 cols 1165–1186

Lord Speaker
March 2013
Implications of appointments to the House

Many thanks for your letter regarding the introduction of new peers, which reached me on 1 February.

You suggest that the Procedure Committee might report on “the implications of further appointments”, with particular reference to “capacity constraints”. You also seek “guidance from the committee on the options open to the House”.

Your letter thus raises several distinct issues, which would normally fall to different committees. Capacity constraints (including space in the Chamber, office accommodation, catering facilities) are the responsibility of the Administration and Works Committee or the Refreshment Committee, under the strategic guidance of the House Committee. The legal implications of any attempt by the House to prevent the introduction of new peers (thus frustrating the royal prerogative) could be considered by the Committee for Privileges and Conduct, sitting judicially. The Procedure Committee itself has, over the years, made recommendations on the rate of introduction of new peers, and on the conduct of the ceremony itself. These rules are reflected in paragraph 1.13 of the Companion to the Standing Orders.

Given the complexity and range of issues involved, I suggest that it might be best for the House Committee to consider this matter in the first instance, so that they can take a strategic look at all the issues. If the House Committee agreed that there should be a comprehensive review of the implications of new appointments to the House, the Administration could be asked to undertake some further work and then some areas could, perhaps, be passed to other committees to look at as appropriate.

I have discussed this matter with the Lord Speaker, who would be content to put your proposal before the House Committee at one of its forthcoming meetings. I am sure that the Lord Speaker will be in touch again in due course once the House Committee has considered your letter.

The Rt Hon the Lord Forsyth of Drumlean
House of Lords

cc. The Rt Hon the Baroness D’Souza CMG
House of Lords
Dear John,

Given the pressure in the House to cut costs and accommodate the existing number of Peers, I wonder whether the Procedure Committee might report on the implications of further appointments. In particular, I wonder if the rate of introduction should be moderated to reflect the agency's constraints. Of course, it is a matter of regret that the Steel Bill is still before us. I know that Lord Steel has a motion on the Order Paper concerned with these matters, but it would be helpful to have guidance from...
The Committee on theAPHIS open to the House
in protest its ability to produce properly.

Yours ever,

Michael