

# **The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom**

## **Management Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2015**

Attending: Jenny Rowe (Chair)

William Arnold

Chris Maile

Louise di Mambro

Olufemi Oguntunde

Martin Thompson

Ben Wilson

Stephen Barrett (Non-Executive Director)

Alex Jablonowski (Non-Executive Director)

Kenneth Ludlam (Non-Executive Director)

Paul Brigland (Secretary)

#### **1. Apologies for absence**

No apologies were received. JR welcomed SB to his first meeting.

#### **2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 29 June 2015**

2.1 The minutes were approved subject to two minor textual corrections.

#### **3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda**

3.1 JR confirmed she had updated the Justices on the BCP test that had been held in March 2015.

#### **4. Declaration of conflicts of interests**

4.1 No declarations of conflicts of interest were made.

## 5. Monthly Information Dashboard

5.1 The Board noted the contents of paper MB15/42, and in particular the following points –

- The term figures had been amended following a query raised at the June meeting. MT queried the figures for JCPC appeals dismissed and it was agreed that the Registry would check this figure.
- PB explained that the Dashboard was a work in progress and whilst it was fully useable RAG status flags would be added to those fields where it was appropriate.

**Action point: LdiM to clarify JCPC appeals dismissed and amend if required.**

## 6. Risk Register

6.1 The Board considered paper MB15/43.

6.2 The following points were noted -

Risk 1 – This had been updated in the light of meetings with the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney General. It was possible there would be a consultation on a ‘Bill of Rights’ in the autumn. It was agreed that this should remain ranked as a ‘high’ risk until the situation becomes clearer.

Risk 4 – This risk relates to major terrorist attacks and not to activity by protest groups, which is covered at Risk 15. SB said that he would like to have a better understanding of what security issues we consider and what arrangements we have in place to mitigate these.

Risk 5 – This risk had been ranked as ‘medium’. There is now a plan to mitigate this as far as was possible in an organisation of our size. We were also moving away from the ‘one person with specialist knowledge’ scenario by arranging for members of staff to share knowledge where practicable (e.g. IT, website management, Registry functions).

Risk 10 – JR was due to speak to the FCO.

Risk 11 – The Board considered if the impact scoring for this risk should be raised. It was noted that the issue was being kept under close review.

Risk 16 – “*Breakdown of relationships between the Executive or Parliament*”. This was a new risk which had been added following the discussion at the MB Workshop earlier in July. JR had ranked the risk as ‘Low’ likelihood but ‘High’ impact.

Risk 17 – “*Efficiency of Dealing with Casework*”. This was a new risk which had been added following the discussion at the MB Workshop earlier in July. JR had ranked the risk as ‘Low’ likelihood but ‘Medium’ impact. LdiM would need to amend the risk as the new Registry structure was put into place.

- 6.3 Following discussion at the MB Workshop there was a further risk to be added in the future covering ‘Corporate Reputation’.
- 6.4 KL asked if cyber security was a risk to be added. PB said that he would be amending Risk 7 to cover this and that he had arranged for TNA to provide a training session for Board members at the December 2015 meeting.
- 6.5 It was agreed that Risk 14 covering “*Lower than expected fee income*” could be removed from the register until March 2016.

**Action point: BW to consider and add a Corporate Reputation entry to the October Risk Register**

**Action point: PB to remove Risk 14 until March 2016.**

## **7. Finance and fees**

- 7.1 The Board noted paper MB15/44 and the attached spreadsheets (annexes A and B). The Board noted the following points -
  - Gross year to date spend was 2% under budget, which was in line with expectations.
  - Contributions for the second quarter had been received from the jurisdictions in July as expected.
  - Fee income continued to be above the level projected.

- 7.2 It was noted that any underspend in the second half of the financial year would be able to be used on projects provided they were justifiable and represented value for money.
- 7.3 The Annual Report & Accounts had been laid before Parliament on 11 June.
- 7.4 The Board noted that alternatives were being considered to the current off-site storage arrangements for older case papers. The aim was to reduce costs and make the eventual transfer of records to TNA more efficient.
- 7.5 OO reported that in the previous week the Chancellor had announced the terms of SR2015. Unprotected departments could expect to be asked to make savings of between 25%-40%. Other departments, including the UKSC, could be asked to make reductions of between 5%-10%. It was expected that we should be able to bridge any gap by raising fees income. Discussions were also ongoing with MoJ and HMT about the MoJ contribution to our running costs.
- 7.6 JR said that she was producing a note for the Justices covering SR2015 and would circulate a copy to the Non-Executive Directors. AJ suggested that the note should include bullet points on what we had already done to make savings and efficiencies.

## **8. Press and communications**

- 8.1 The Board noted the contents of paper MB15/45, and the following points –
- The cases of *Sharland v Sharland* and *Gobil v Gobil* had attracted significant coverage.
  - The decision to grant permission in the *Barry Beavis* parking fine case had also gained a lot of coverage.
- 8.2 Visitor numbers remained high. A lot of work had gone into the Magna Carta events planned for the remainder of the week and also the summer exhibition.
- 8.4 The number of on-line visitors had remained healthy and there had been a reduction in the bounce rate.

- 8.5 There had been over 10k users of the video-on-demand service in June and the Communications Team had received positive feedback. The provision of the service would be reviewed in March 2016. JR said that future funding of the service had been discussed at the User Group meeting.

## **9. Human Resources**

- 9.1 The Board noted the following points –

- 7 JAs were due to finish at the end of the week. Their replacements would start on 7 September 2015. Some of them had raised queries about undertaking pro-bono work.
- 1 of the Judicial PAs had resigned and a replacement was being sought, possibly from the RCJ.
- Following the review of the Registry structure an exercise seeking expressions of interest for posts on temporary promotion would be undertaken whilst the structure was being finalised. Adverts for permanent posts would then be run.
- MyCSP would be sending annual pension statements to CM for checking before they are issued to staff.
- The pay award would come into effect in the following month and would be reflected in August salaries.
- There was an upgrade to the Octopus HR system due on 24 August that aimed to improve the appearance and functionality of the system.

## **10. Parliamentary Questions and Freedom of Information**

- 10.1 The Board noted that 5 FOI requests had been received in June and no PQs had been tabled.

- 10.2 One request had been for copies of our Hospitality & Gifts Register. The Board agreed that this should be published annually on the websites and in the Annual Report.

**Action point: PB/CM to arrange annual publication of the Hospitality & Gift Register**

## **11. Case update**

- 11.1 The list for the following term had been circulated to Justices and LdiM was awaiting comments. It would be a busy term.

## **12. Quarterly Health & Safety**

- 12.1 The Board noted the contents of paper MB15/46.

## **13. Quarterly Equality and Diversity**

- 13.1 The Board noted the contents of paper MB15/47.
- 13.2 KL queried the figure of 25% who had not defined any ethnicity. CM said that some staff had not answered this question or had chosen the 'prefer not to say' option. The Board noted that work would be undertaken at the end of summer to encourage staff to update their records.
- 13.3 SB asked how the UKSC compared with other public sector organisations. CM explained it was difficult to make comparisons as we are such a small organisation.

## **14. AOB**

- 14.1 JR thanked AJ for his service as a Non-Executive Director and presented him with a book signed by other Board members,
- 14.2 JR said that as this was her last Board meeting she wanted to thank all Board members, past and present, who had worked with her and given such good support.

UKSC  
August 2015