

MANAGEMENT BOARD

Investment Board Proposal

Paper from Directors of Finance

*For the meeting of the House of Lords Management Board on 11 March
and the House of Commons Management Board on 12 March*

Purpose

1. At a Joint Meeting of the Management Boards on 21 November 2014, it was agreed to explore further the creation of a single bi-cameral Investment Board. This paper sets out a detailed proposal.

Action for the Board

2. The Board is asked to agree the proposal, and specifically to agree:
 - The title of Investment Board
 - The terms of reference (paragraphs 21 to 26 and Annex 1)
 - That the IB should review business cases subject to criteria to be developed (paragraphs 31 to 35)
 - That reports on gateway reviews should be shared with the IB, subject to approval by the SRO (paragraphs 37 to 38)
 - The membership of the Investment Board (paragraphs 40 to 45 and Annex 1)
 - The implementation date of June 2015 (paragraphs 47 to 51).
3. The Board is asked to note the proposal that the development of an investment strategy could be part of the Investment Board's role (paragraphs 28 to 29 and Annex 5). This idea needs more detailed consideration.
4. The Board is asked to note that further work will be done on the residual tasks currently carried out by the Parliamentary Estates Board PEB, with a view to deciding on its future; and to note that the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board (PICTAB) will still need to be replaced by the Digital Services Board (paragraphs 56 to 59).

Consultation and equality analysis

5. Early consultation on a draft proposal generated considerable debate, and the main themes are reflected in the paper. The majority of consultees were very supportive of creating a single bi-cameral Investment Board (IB). The main exception was the PICT Directors—they expressed more reservations about the proposal itself and the timing of any change. PEB and PICTAB have also been consulted on this proposal. PEB's comments, including those from the two non-executive members, are included in the paper. PICTAB's views will be reported at the meeting.
6. An equality analysis is not required for this proposal. An equality analysis may be required in due course for an investment strategy.

Background

7. John Borley DG Facilities in the Commons, gave a presentation to the Joint Meeting of the Management Boards on 21 November 2014. The presentation included the following recommendations:
 - An Investment Board should be established to prepare an Investment Plan on behalf of both Houses. The Board should adjust the Plan as necessary during the year.
 - The Investment Board should also act as a focal point, at corporate level, for Programme and Project Assurance and Benefits Delivery reporting.
8. The presentation went on to suggest that the purpose of the Investment Board should be to develop and oversee a single Parliamentary Investment Portfolio, including both Capital and Resource, encompassing ICT, Estate and Business Change projects.
9. An Investment Board would:
 - Appraise project and programme funding allocation through a yearly prioritisation exercise, including assessing capacity to deliver and absorb change.
 - Provide authoritative advice to the House Management Boards on the annual Investment Programme
 - Adjust Programme funding allocations in year as necessary, within the overall limits of the Investment Programme (keeping Accounting Officers informed)
 - Largely or entirely replace PEB and PICTAB.

- Be kept as small as possible.

10. Subsequently, the Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the House asked the Finance Director in the Commons to develop further the proposal to create a single bi-cameral investment board.

11. This paper makes a more formal proposal and includes:

- Rationale and benefits
- Title
- Proposed terms of reference (Annex 1)
- Discussion on matters arising from the terms of reference—namely developing a single investment strategy, review of business cases and circulation of gateway reports
- Proposed membership (Annex 1)
- Proposed timescale for implementation, and transitional arrangements
- Proposed arrangements for administrative support
- Recommendations on the future of PEB and PICTAB/Digital Services Board (DSB).

12. The current terms of reference of PEB and PICTAB and the draft terms of reference for the new Digital Services Board (in development) are attached at Annexes 2–4.

Rationale, Benefits and Risks

13. The introduction of the bi-cameral Medium Term Investment Plan, and the development of the roles of PICTAB and PEB in relation to the ICT and Estates portfolios respectively, marked a significant step forward in the planning and delivery of investment programmes and projects for Parliament. This has taken place alongside steady improvement in capacity and capability, an improved approach to business cases, and the development of a portfolio management function. But there has also been a significant increase in the ambition, complexity and pace of change.

14. A single bi-cameral Investment Board (IB) would move the two Houses forward another step, bridging the gap that currently exists between ICT, Estates and other investment decisions; and enabling consideration of priorities for Parliament as a whole below the level of Executive Committee / Management Board.

15. The benefits would be:

- Better visibility of all programme activity across both Houses
- More streamlined governance
- Better prioritisation and decision making
- Greater in year flexibility across the entire investment portfolio
- Better approach to bids for contingency funds
- Better visibility of delivery and benefits
- Focal point for developing our approach to programme and project management.

16. The risks would be:

- Due to the scale of capital investment, ICT being swamped by Estates and getting less attention
- Due to the immediate business criticality of digital services, Estates getting less attention than ICT
- Seen to add another layer in our decision making structures.

17. These risks can be mitigated by:

- Planning the agendas and processes to give adequate weight to ICT and Estates
- Making the right choice in relation to the future of other Boards
- Delegating appropriate powers to the new Investment Board.

18. The benefits could be expressed as success criteria if this proposal is implemented.

Title

19. This paper uses the title “Investment Board” throughout. Other suggestions have been made, and some have been discounted (such as Investment and Delivery Board). However, Investment and Assurance Board is another option.

20. The Management Board is asked to confirm that the title of this new body should be “Investment Board”.

Proposed Terms of Reference

21. The proposed terms of reference are attached at Annex 1.

22. Whilst PEB and PICTAB have no formal decision making powers and are badged as advisory, in practice they do make decisions about compiling their portfolios and managing them in year. The new IB should have a formal delegation from both Boards to make these powers explicit.
23. A number of consultation responses asked how strategic this body would be, and what sort of detail it would go into at programme and project level? How do we ensure that the IB adds value and doesn't duplicate work being done at Management Board level or in other Boards/meetings? How do we align it with the new Digital Services Board?
24. Some of this will have to be worked out as part of the next phase. The general idea is that the IB will focus its attention at portfolio and programme level, and only review projects that are very significant, contentious or have run into problems. Portfolio reporting is being developed further and will support this. The IB will make recommendations to both Management Boards (often at joint meetings).
25. In terms of the remit of the IB the main questions were:
- Will it cover programmes that sit outside the investment portfolios such as SARP and the Print/Publishing Strategies?
 - Will it cover change programmes that only affect one House or the other?
 - Will it deal with investment/change programmes that are still being done by Departments "under the radar"?
26. A core principle of the proposal is to improve visibility across both Houses of all programme and/or investment activity. The Portfolio Manager has been seeking to achieve this, and is now a bi-cameral resource. Both Houses have also been working hard to ensure that all ICT investment is going via PICTAB and not being done off-plan, on the grounds that effective prioritisation depends on full visibility and that off-plan projects put unnecessary pressure on PICT and WIS.
- 27. The Management Board is asked to note these points and the principles highlighted above.**

Investment Strategy and Prioritisation

28. The Portfolio Manager has highlighted the potential benefit of a single investment strategy or framework, drawn from the agreed Strategies of the two Houses, to improve the prioritisation of bids. The investment strategy could be based on the key strategic themes for the planning round—some initial thinking on the key questions for the next planning round is attached at Annex 5, and the intention is for these to be developed and discussed at a Joint Meeting of the Management Boards on 29 May.

29. PEB commented that creating a single investment strategy should be part of the remit of the IB. It was acknowledged that each House has different priorities, but their strategies had many common points such as technology, heritage, and looking after Members, and the investment strategy would embrace joint investments.

30. The Board is asked to note the proposal that the development of an investment strategy could be part of the Investment Board's role. This idea needs more detailed consideration.

Reviewing/Approving Major Business Cases

31. Several questions were asked about the proposal that the IB review major business cases where appropriate. Criteria will need to be developed which may include

- Total investment required
- Impact across Departments and/or across the two Houses
- Novel or contentious activity
- Complex stakeholder engagement issues or Member impact.

32. It is suggested that the IB is provided with a list of which business cases are upcoming and which are proposed for review—this would allow individual Board members to request a review of additional business cases if they had any concerns.

33. Business cases would continue to be the responsibility of the SRO and project leader, and would continue to be reviewed by the relevant programme or project board.

34. No change is proposed to the business case approval process, namely that larger business cases require approval by the FDs and the Accounting Officers above certain thresholds. However, the two FDs are reviewing the approval levels with a view to aligning them better.

35. After discussion, and noting the current differences in the approach between PEB and PICTAB, PEB agreed that business cases, subject to the sort of criteria outlined above, should be reviewed at the IB.

36. The Board is asked to endorse the development of criteria along the lines set out above, to assist with deciding which business cases should routinely go to the IB for review.

Gateway Review Reports

37. It is proposed that the IB should receive Gateway reports, subject to agreement with the SRO, as part of its assurance role. This would be a change to current practice in Parliament, where such reports are made to the SRO who decides how widely to share them. It would be preferable for the IB to receive reports with the management response.
38. There were strong feelings expressed about whether gateway review reports should be routinely shared or whether this should remain a decision for the SRO. The Terms of Reference make it clear that the agreement of the SRO is required. However, this subject may benefit from further discussion as several people highlighted the benefits of transparency and the importance of learning lessons.

39. The Boards are asked to note that reports on gateway reviews will be shared with the IB, subject to SRO approval.

Proposed Membership

40. The proposed membership is included at Annex 1. It is anticipated that the Chair will rotate between the Houses every 2 years, and be drawn from the membership. It is for consideration whether Investment Board members with executive responsibility for some of the investment in question should be excused; this question could usefully be revisited as the Straw proposals are further developed. The Nominated Head of Department is intended to represent the wider interests of the House in question.
41. The proposed membership includes 2 non-executive members, one from an ICT background and one from an estates background. At present PEB has two non-executives (one of whom also sits on the R&R Board and one of whom also sits on the Northern Estate Board), and PICTAB has one. It would perhaps make sense for the non-executive member from an ICT background to also sit on the Digital Services Board.
42. There were a number of suggestions and questions around proposed membership of the new IB. The main points were:
- Should the two Librarians, as the leads on Information Services, be members of the IB?
 - Should there be a rule that the two nominated Directors should not be opposite numbers to make the membership more diverse?
 - Should the new DG Commons (following the implementation of the Straw Committee's recommendations) be a member or possibly the Chair?

- Should the Parliamentary Security Director be included? This may be more relevant whilst SARP and Jenkins are being implemented, and less so on an ongoing basis. However, there are several physical and cyber security projects within the investment portfolios.

43. It is important to retain the balance of Membership between the Houses, and to keep the new IB at a sensible size. One possible way forward would be to allow each House to have two nominated Directors. This would give the Commons scope to include the new DG if desired, and give both Houses the scope to include their Librarian if desired. However, if both Houses have two nominated Directors and the PSD is included, the total number of members would be 12. Moreover, this is approaching a model which includes everyone on the two Management Boards, which was not the idea.

44. A point about other attendees, as observers rather than members of the IB, was raised—for instance should the Parliamentary Director of Estates be in attendance. This can be considered in the next phase.

45. PEB's view was that the membership should be as set out in Annex 1.

46. The Board's views are sought on membership of the IB. Should it be expanded slightly to allow both Houses to have two nominated Directors? Should the PSD be included? What is the optimum size of the IB?

Timescale and Transition

47. Given the key role of the new IB in the planning cycle, it is suggested that it is set up in June to coincide with the early stages of the 2016–17 planning round.

48. As this is relatively soon, a transitional period may be required. In particular PEB and PICTAB will continue to monitor 2015–16 performance until the IB is ready to take this over.

49. Not surprisingly some concerns were raised about the timing of implementation. These centred around the parallel implementation of the Straw Committee's recommendations in the Commons and the move to the new Digital Service and creation of the Digital Services Board, both of which are creating some uncertainty. Some people felt that creating the IB alongside a lot of other governance changes was too ambitious.

50. There are however strong reasons to start this new approach in June, namely to tie in with the start of the new Parliament and the start of the next planning round. There is also an argument that it would be confusing to start the new Digital Services Board on one basis and change it a few months later to strip away some of its remit. If we delay, we will have to wait another year, and there will inevitably be new reasons why it is not a good time.

51. On balance PEB felt it was best to get the IB up and running in June.

52. Does the Management Board agree that the IB should commence in June?

Support Arrangements and EPPMO

53. The IB will need its own secretariat. It is suggested that secretariat services (booking meetings, compiling agendas, circulating papers and taking minutes) are carried out by staff in one of the Clerk's offices, possibly on a rotating basis. There may also be a need for them to produce papers on governance—for instance a report to the first meeting seeking agreement to the Terms of Reference. In due course this could be reviewed, particularly if a centralised programme and project management function is established.

54. Currently staff in PED, PICT and Finance in both Houses provide reports and general support to PEB and PICTAB and this will continue to be required by the Investment Board. All financial reports, particularly those relating to the MTIP process, will come via the lead Finance Director.

55. Several people asked about the creation of a central or enterprise programme and project management office (EPPMO)—something that was also proposed at the Joint Meeting of the Management Boards last November. No further work has been done on creating an EPPMO, although it is anticipated that this will be picked up later in the implementation of the Straw Committee's recommendations, once the new DG Commons is in post.

What this means for PEB and PICTAB/DSB

56. The current terms of reference for PEB are attached at Annex 2. Once the new IB is in place, the remaining functions of PEB relate to Estates strategy and the oversight and management of PED. It provides a single source of Board-level advice to PED with an external element, which does have value. One option might be to use occasional meetings to consult key stakeholders

on the Estates Strategy and take advice. Other PEB functions can become business as usual, with the Facilities Directors bringing the most important matters to the Executive Committee / Management Board.

57. This approach would be dependent on ensuring adequate mechanisms to provide assurance to the House of Lords Facilities Director on the performance of PED, for example via a service level agreement.
58. PEB felt that a gap analysis would be useful to establish exactly what the remaining functions are and how best they could be covered. The PEB non-execs see a continuing role for PEB in terms of performance and delivery but recognise that it could have a different membership. It could challenge the subject matter experts and provide assurance on technical, managerial, capability and performance issues. PED, for example covers a range of reactive and planned maintenance, environmental and health and safety performance responsibilities that operate below a strategic investment monitoring regime.
59. The current terms of reference for PICTAB are attached at Annex 3, and initial thinking on the role of a new Digital Services Board is attached at Annex 4. Given the significance of the creation of the Digital Service to both Houses, it would seem appropriate to proceed with the creation of the DSB with a modified remit. It would still have an important role to play in developing the digital strategies, approving key policies, supporting the new Director, and engaging stakeholders in the digital agenda.
60. The new IB would include R&R in its planning cycle and overview of delivery, but the R&R Board would continue in its own right, along with other individual programme boards as required.
61. The Parliamentary Accommodation Programme Board would continue in its current form.

Next Steps

62. There is a Joint Management Board awayday on 27 March which may provide an opportunity to take stock and confirm the way forward. If both Management Boards agree to proceed, then we can move into an implementation phase.
63. The two Management Boards will wish to consider the extent of political engagement in this new approach. At present the House Committee and the Commission review the Medium Term Investment Plan, and Committees in both Houses regularly show interest in particular programmes and/or investments—they have had regular reports on SARP for instance and have

been consulted on works programmes that affect Members or may cause disruption. It would therefore be sensible to advise Members in both Houses of the new approach.

64. Communication will need to make clear how the IB relates to the new Commons arrangements, the new Digital Service and R&R. It is important that this changes does not come across as additional bureaucracy.

Financial and procurement implications

65. There are no direct financial or procurement implications save in relation to external members. The proposals for external members would be cost-neutral.

Risk management

66. Risks have been outlined above.

Myfanwy Barrett, Director of Finance, House of Commons
Andrew Makower, Director of Finance, House of Lords

3 March 2015

New Bi-Cameral Investment Board: Draft Terms of Reference

- a. To develop the Medium Term Investment Plan through a yearly prioritisation exercise and make authoritative recommendations to the Executive Committee/Management Board;
- b. To consider dependencies and obtain assurances on capacity to deliver the investment plan, and any other major programmes;
- c. To obtain advice on the overall impact of change arising from programmes, including ongoing costs, savings and support;
- d. To ensure that all relevant Departments/Teams are consulted and contribute to the development of the investment programme;
- e. To communicate the plans to senior leaders across both Houses;
- f. To monitor delivery of major programmes against agreed baselines in terms of time, cost and benefits;
- g. To monitor risk and maintain portfolio risk registers;
- h. To adjust programme funding allocations in year as necessary, within the overall limits of the Investment Plan and in line with the Finance rules of both Houses;
- i. To review major business cases where appropriate¹ and provide advice to the Finance Directors;
- j. To seek assurance on governance and delivery as appropriate through receiving reports from the Programme and Project Assurance team, Gateway Reviews (with the agreement of the SRO) and Internal Audit Reviews;
- k. To provide strategic direction to the programme and project management community across Parliament and sponsor professional development;
- l. To report major successes and concerns to the Management Boards.

¹ It is envisaged that Investment Board Members would have access to major business cases and could discuss them at the meetings where appropriate. This will vary according to the nature of the programme and other scrutiny activity.

Membership

Chair:

Membership:

- Finance Director, House of Commons
- Finance Director, House of Lords
- DG Facilities, House of Commons
- Facilities Director, House of Lords
- Parliamentary Digital Service Director
- Nominated Head of Department from each House
- 2 non-executive members: one from an ICT background, one from an Estates background

Total number of members, assuming chair drawn from list of Members = 9.

Parliamentary Estate Board (PEB)

Terms of Reference

The Parliamentary Estate Board (PEB) is a sub-committee of the Management Boards of the House of Commons and the House of Lords. PEB provides advice and assurance to the Boards according to the following remit:

- To support the Parliamentary Director of Estates (PDE) in preparing proposals for agreement by the two Management Boards.
- To sponsor the bicameral Estates Strategy for approval by the two Management Boards (including new build, refurbishment, maintenance, acquisitions, leases and disposals).
- To consider the Strategic Property Review.
- To keep Estates governance arrangements under review, removing bureaucracy and ensuring compliance with the requirements set out in the Finance and Procurement Rules of the House of Commons and the Finance Manual of the House of Lords.
- To review the performance of the Estates Team.
- To consider Parliamentary Estate Directorate's (PED) business and financial plans.
- To consider policy initiatives and sponsor them through to presentation to the two Management Boards and Domestic Committees.
- To validate the programmes and projects required emanating from the annual requirement and corporate plans of the two Houses.
- To recommend the Boards required to oversee identified projects and programmes.
- To recommend the convening (and dissolution) of Project Boards as appropriate.
- To monitor the delivery of the projects not supported by a delivery board to provide assurance to the Management Boards that they are aligned and progressing to completion in accordance with their respective performance/cost/time envelopes.
- Approve the Maintenance Service Definition.

The PEB will annually:

- Consider the PED Parliamentary Estate Strategy (25 year plan).
- Endorse the Annual Requirement and the forthcoming Outline Business Case for the year ahead.

- Assure itself that the Estates Work programmes and projects for inclusion within the Medium Term Investment Plan (MTIP) are prioritised, fundable and deliverable.
- Approve the Annual Report on the performance of PED and advise the Management Boards thereon.
- Review the top risks in the PED Risk Register.

The PEB will consider at each meeting or as occasion may require:

- Papers on Estates policy prior to presentation to the Management Boards
- Reports on projects, performance and levels of service
- Reports on major infrastructure programmes
- Specific briefings in accordance with the Annual Cycle (attached).

The PEB consists of the Director General of Facilities, HoC, Director of Facilities, HoL; the two Finance Directors and up to two external members co-opted by the PEB. The PDE, the Deputy PDE and Head of Projects, the Director, House of Commons Facilities Finance will be in attendance at meetings. There will be occasional attendance by other key PED personnel. All members of both Management Boards will receive papers of the PEB ahead of meetings and any member of either Board may attend.

By agreement between the Chairmen of the two Management Boards one of the internal members will act as Chairman of the PEB. The Chairmanship will rotate between the two Houses every two years.

The PEB will be quorate if both Houses are represented and at least one of the Facilities Directors and at least one of the Finance Directors are present.

The PEB will meet at least quarterly and will generally meet monthly except in August.

PICTAB

Terms of Reference

The Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board (PICTAB) is a sub-committee of the Management Boards of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, with the following remit:

- to support the Director of Parliamentary ICT (D-PICT) in preparing proposals for agreement by the two Management Boards and give advice to D-PICT on the strategic management of PICT;
- to act as a forum in which representatives of senior management in the two Houses assist D-PICT in formulating a bi-cameral ICT strategy for approval by the two Management Boards;
- to keep ICT strategy under review;
- to monitor and challenge PICT performance and risk management and other ICT project performance and risk management;
- to consider PICT's business and financial plans, and to advise the Management Boards on priorities for ICT;
- to consider ICT policy initiatives, usually before presentation to the two Management Boards;
- to determine the portfolio of programmes/projects involving information management and ICT needed as a result of the strategies of the two Houses (including the Information Management Strategy and the ICT strategy);
 - to ensure that the portfolio is that which collectively makes the greatest contribution to the strategies of the two Houses;
 - to ensure that the portfolio does not exceed the capacity of PICT to deliver, nor the ability of stakeholders in the two Houses to engage with programmes and projects;
 - to ensure that the programmes and projects within the portfolio are prioritised in terms of their contribution to the strategic objectives of the two Houses;
 - to ensure that the portfolio is balanced in terms of timing; contribution to strategic objectives; impact, risk and resource;
- to monitor the delivery of the portfolio of programmes and projects involving information management and ICT, providing assurance to the Management Boards (or for single House projects the Board of the House concerned) that the programmes and projects are aligned and progressing to completion in accordance with their respective performance/cost/time envelopes;
- where necessary, to recommend reallocation between funds set by the Management Boards for the portfolio of programmes and projects involving information management and ICT.

The PICTAB does not deal with operational-level issues which are the responsibility of the PICT Management Board.

The PICTAB will annually:

- consider the PICT Business and Financial Plans for approval by the two Management Boards;
- take note of ICT risk management strategy.

The PICTAB will consider at each meeting, or as occasion may require:

- papers on ICT policy prior to presentation to the two Management Boards;
- reports on performance and levels of service, including both numerical and customer satisfaction information;
- draft business cases for major projects.

The PICTAB consists of D-PICT, members of each Management Board nominated by the respective chairmen, and up to two external members co-opted by PICTAB. All members of both Management Boards will receive papers of the PICTAB ahead of meetings and any member of either Board may attend.

By agreement between the chairmen of the two Management Boards, one of the nominated members other than D-PICT will act as chairman of the PICTAB. The chairmanship will rotate between the two Houses every two years.

The PICTAB will be quorate if D-PICT, at least one other Board member from each House and at least one of the Finance Directors are present.

A new Digital Services Board: remit, composition, chair

Remit

1. **The new Digital Services Board should be a sub-committee of both Management Boards and we propose that it should:**
 - **Support the work of the Digital Service, and its Director, in ensuring that digital delivery is at the forefront of Parliament's work, integrated into departmental business planning, and that user needs are prioritised; and in engaging others in achieving these aims**
 - **Support the Director in developing Parliament's digital strategy, subject to final approval by the Management Boards, and in delivering the strategy**
 - **Make recommendations to the Management Boards about the allocation of funding for ICT/digital investment, as part of the MTIP process**
 - **Review significant ICT/digital business cases and provide advice to the Finance Directors on the issues they raise**
 - **Agree the Digital Service's strategic performance measures and provide a forum for discussion of performance against those measures**
 - **Agree policies for Parliament's online services, including the website, intranet and social media, and support the Director in implementation.**
2. **There are a number of new features of this approach:**
 - **The new board would have an overview of both digital strategy and expenditure, ensuring that the two Houses could approach the task of focusing on digital delivery in a coherent and co-ordinated manner. Greater visibility for expenditure on**

online services across Parliament would be a particularly significant advantage, filling a vacuum which has hindered the efficient and effective development of Parliament's online services in recent years.

- It would explicitly support the new Director in their role in promoting and implementing change across Parliament.
- It would be expected to reach decisions and resolve conflict unless there was a clear need to escalate matters to the two Management Boards, for example if a question of strategic importance was involved. It would work collaboratively and in partnership across both Houses and the Digital Service to formulate strategic priority and direction for digital matters. In doing so, it would provide a more coherent and coordinated means of reaching decisions than would be the case if issues had to be taken to the two Management Boards separately.

3. **The Management Boards are invited to consider and agree the broad remit for the Digital Services Board.**

Composition

4. The Digital Services Implementation Team make the following recommendations about the composition of the new board:
 - **All members of both Management Boards should receive papers for the new board.**
 - **All executive members of both Management Boards (including the Director of the PDS) should be entitled to attend the new board, although we would not expect the corporate officers to do so.**
 - **There should be two external members of the new board, with ICT and digital expertise.**
5. A number of managers with an interest in ICT matters currently attend meetings of PICTAB to observe proceedings. They thought that it was an important way of understanding the rationale for decisions and for picking up signals about likely future developments. Some of the Management Board members we interviewed welcomed this transparency and openness. Others thought that the Director would be better supported by the frank discussion and effective decision making possible if the new Board met in private. **On balance, we share this view and recommend that the new board should follow the practice of its parent bodies and meet in private. As with the Management Boards, it would be normal practice to invite non-members to attend for specific items of business, including, for example, to present papers. Effective communication of information about the discussion and the outcome of meetings would be essential.**

Chair

6. The chair will be expected to support the work of the new Director. He or she must give the Director latitude to bring their professional expertise to bear on Parliament's digital challenges, helping to shape outcomes which meet both Houses' strategies and distinctive cultures.
7. **The choice of chair will be for the two corporate officers to make: we suggest that this should be a joint decision. Whoever is chosen must command confidence in both Houses. It would be desirable for the position of chair to alternate between the two Houses. Chairs should be expected to serve for at least two years.**

Key Questions for the Next Investment Planning Round

The Journey to 2020

Theme 1: Developing our estate for the future

- What are the key decision points and milestones, and what does the spend profile look like for Northern Estate, Southern Estate and R&R from 2015 to 2020, and how does this align with the remainder of the Estates portfolio?
- What will be the wider impacts, notably on Members and House staff, of decision making on these major Estates Programmes?
- What is the strategic plan for the Archives and how does this fit with R&R?
- What are the main improvements required in relation to physical security measures?
- What is the strategic plan for relocation in an emergency and how does this fit with other Estates plans, particularly decant arrangements?

Theme 2: Going Digital

- What is the emerging digital strategy, taking on board but not limited to the findings of the Digital Democracy Commission, and what does this mean for our investment plans?
- What is the print and publication strategy for each House and is this fully supported by our investment plans?
- Have we achieved/will we achieve adequate network resilience and cyber security on the basis of current plans?