

**The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom
Management Board**

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2010

Attending: Jenny Rowe (Chair)

William Arnold
Louise di Mambro
Alex Jablonowski (Non-Executive Director)
Sian Lewis
Caroline Smith
Olufemi Oguntunde (items 1-7)
Martin Thompson (items 4-16)

Ann Achow (Secretary)

Tony Burn (invited for item 4)

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 Apologies were received from Philip Robinson who had submitted written comments to the Chair in advance of the meeting.

2. Approval of the minutes of the MB meeting held on 27 May 2010

2.1 The minutes were approved subject to an amendment to paragraph 3.5.

3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere in the minutes

3.1. OO confirmed that the Court's interest in the Middlesex Art Collection had been reflected in our insurance policy. The policy came into effect on 10 June 2010 at a cost of £3000 pa.

3.2. A meeting to review the report from the desk top test of the Business Continuity Plan had taken place with a follow up note circulated for comment. Recommendations were being addressed with some already in place. The next step was for Business Area Continuity Plans to be drawn up. Those for the library and IT services were to be completed first to see whether the template was suitable.

3.3 The issue concerning the bookcase shelves was ongoing. JR was due to meet Alan Sloan on Friday.

3.4 AA had received comments back from her contact at the Government Office for London on the UKSC's Security Information Policy and would circulate any revisions to MB members for approval.

3.5 In his written comments PR confirmed that the accounting treatment arising from the revised bomb blast requirements was correct.

3.6 JR reported that the President and Deputy President were content for her to approach Lord Kerr and Sir John Dyson to ask them to consider post election constitutional change programme issues which might affect the work of the Court, for example the volume and type of appeals. In addition she hoped that she could secure a short term resource from the House of Commons staff to look at policy issues.

3.7 JR had drawn together a paper from the output of the Awayday and would circulate it to Board members.

Action: JR to circulate Awayday paper.

3.8 PR and LdiM were due to meet later in the day to discuss the case statistics section of the scorecard.

3.9 AA had confirmed revised dates for the September and November 2010 MB meetings and was working on dates for 2011.

3.9 Preparation for the OGC Gateway Review scheduled for 27 to 29 September would begin with a discussion at the July MB meeting.

Action: AA to include OGC Gateway review on the July MB meeting agenda.

4. Shared services

4.1 Tony Burn was invited to attend this part of the meeting to give a presentation (paper MB10/40) on the work he had been doing on finance, HR and IT shared services. These services were currently delivered to the Court via MOJ contracts. It was noted that MOJ were in the process of introducing significant changes to their shared services delivery, starting with HR. The nature of the final MoJ product could impact on the Board's decisions in this area. Following detailed discussion the Board agreed the following:

- Further work was needed to explore service improvements and cost cutting with MOJ, particularly in areas such as the prompt payment of invoices and the need for the introduction of a Purchase Order system.

Action: OO

- No changes would be made in the short term to the current HR arrangement with MOJ. It was recognised that some issues, for example branding, would have to be resolved if we were to continue with the service in the longer term. Carrying out all of the Court's HR work in-house would still require access to specialist policy advice as well as to other services, for example staff welfare.
- Discussions would continue with MOJ regarding the IT service.

- In the short to medium term the concentration would be on finance initially, followed by HR with a closer look at IT next year.

4.2 Tony Burn had further meetings booked with MOJ which would allow the Board to take stock of developments.

5. Scorecard report

5.1 The Board considered paper MB 10/34 which contained scorecard figures up to and including May 2010.

5.2 Points discussed and agreed were:

- Training and development figures would be expressed as an average for each member of staff rather than as the total number of activities undertaken
- No changes were identified to the section dealing with visitor and website statistics
- There was no need to enter a RAG colour coding for health and safety and security incidents
- The section on sustainability would be retained although not populated whilst the first year's benchmarking exercise was underway. In the meantime it was important to collate information on carbon offsetting, particularly in relation to air travel, video and telephone conference use etc. JR asked that MT make contact with the Carbon Trust.

Action: MT to contact the Carbon Trust for information about reducing carbon use.

6. Finance and fees

6.1 OO presented paper MB 10/35 which contained a full financial information pack.

6.2 The key points for the Board to note were as follows:

- Year to date expenditure to the end of May was running at 4% below profile
- The Audit Committee had approved the 2009/10 year end accounts on 28 May.

7. Spending review.

7.1 HM Treasury had issued departmental guidelines for the 2010 Spending Review covering the period up to and including 2014/15. Returns were required by 16 July. A meeting had been arranged with Treasury officials to agree our approach to the review.

8. Charging

8.1 The Board discussed WA's paper MB10/39 on charging for visitor access to the Court. JR explained that given the current economic climate and the Chief Executive's statutory duty under the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 to provide an efficient and effective system to support the Court in carrying on its business she was obliged to explore all options to reduce costs. It was accepted that charging for access could potentially have an impact on the Court's overall objectives and outreach work, but it was an option that had to be researched and considered.

8.2 The paper explored a variety of revenue raising options. These covered charging for visitor leaflets, charging for guided daytime group tours, charging for evening tours as an optional extra to the evening events room hire initiative which was to be launched shortly and charging for individual visitors during the periods when the Court was in recess.

8.3 The Board discussed the options in detail, noting the possible adverse impact on reputation, education and outreach work whilst accepting that it had a duty to consider all options.

8.4 The Board accepted that there would be set up costs associated with any charging regime including the purchase of cash and credit card handling equipment, training of staff and increased banking and accounting control measures. The following actions were agreed:

- Evening guided tours should be charged, not least because there would be an additional staff cost **Action Sue McKenzie (SM)** (*Note – action allocated by WA after the meeting*)
- Staff involved in giving charged tours would need training and should follow a set script so that there was consistency of quality **Action: CS to liaise with SM about recruiting and training a pool of staff volunteers to act as evening guides**
- A priced glossy self guided tour leaflet and a cash till for the reception desk should be procured with a view to both being available in time for the start of the summer recess on Monday 2 August **Action: SL (leaflets) and MT (cash till)**
- Purchase of one or two 'mobile' credit card machines, ideally in time for use by the start of the summer recess should be taken forward, as these could be used for the payment of Court fees and evening events hire., as well as the purchase of leaflets **Action: MT in liaison with SL and OO** (*Note – action owners allocated by WA after the meeting*)
- Finance procedures covering cash handling and the training of staff would be required **Action: OO to develop in liaison with CS** (*Note – action owners allocated by WA after the meeting*)
- The success of the evening tours would be monitored before a decision was taken on charging for daytime tours **Action: SM to monitor** (*Note – action owner allocated by WA after the meeting*)

- Individual and group visitors would be surveyed through the summer to assess their willingness to pay **Action L di M and SL in liaison with CS to invite the Justices secretaries to conduct a sample exit survey of visitors during the summer recess** (*Note – action owners allocated by WA after the meeting*)
- The issue would be reviewed at the end of the summer recess, with a report for the October MB meeting. **Action AA to commission a paper for the October MB** (*Note – action allocated by WA after the meeting*)

9. Annual report 2010/11

9.1 Progress on the production of the Annual Report was on target for laying in Parliament on 6 July and publication on 7 July.

10. Human Resources

10.1 CS reported that MoJ, acting solely as a supplier of HR services for the Court, had blocked the processing of paperwork for two completed recruitment exercises. JR was pursuing this matter at a senior level in MOJ in her capacity as Accounting Officer.

11. Press and communications

11.1 SL's communications update (paper MB 10/36) highlighted case coverage and commentary in the media.

11.2 The number of individual visitors to the court had dropped slightly in May compared with the previous month. Group tours had remained steady. Although figures for June were not yet complete, visitor levels so far this month had increased sharply. The number of separate visits to the website had risen to 18,239.

11.3 JR had approached Michael Beloff QC, the chairman of British Association for Sport and Law in connection with mounting an exhibition at the Court in 2012 to coincide with the London Olympics. The initial response had been favourable.

12. Parliamentary Questions monthly report

12.1 There had been no new PQs received. The flow of FOI enquiries and internal review requests had steadied. All requests had been answered within the 20 day deadline.

13. Case statistics

13.1 LdiM reported a steady stream of applications.

14. Risk – quarterly review

14.1 The Board discussed paper MB10/37 which comprised the current risk register. They were content with the assessments and risk mitigation measures contained in the register.

15. Health and safety

15.1 The Board discussed paper MB10/38 which was the quarterly Health and Safety Report. Key points to note were:

- A decision had been made to purchase a defibrillator and security officers would be trained in its use.
- DSE assessments were up to date.
- The Court would receive weekly newsletters and updates from the British Safety Council.
- Slips and trips posed the greatest risk in the Court's staff and visitor environments although incidents were few.

15.2 There had been one recent accident when a member of staff had cut his finger using a knife to open boxes to assist a contractor. It was noted that the knife was not kept in the public part of the building and would in future be locked away when not in use.

16. Any other business

16.1 The President was to have his first bi-lateral meeting with the new Lord Chancellor on 1 July. The Lord Chancellor and Lord McNally were due to visit the Court on 14 July.

16.2 WA had signed the Annual Assessment of Information Risk Management in his capacity as Senior Information Risk Owner.

These minutes were approved by the Management Board on 27 July 2010.