

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 3 July 2013  
**Location:** Blue Room, First Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Mary Gledhill (MG - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	Valerie Johnson (VJ)	TNA
David Thomas (DT)	TNA	Julia Stocken (JS)	TNA
Carol Tullo (CT)	TNA	[Head of Remote Services & Contact Centre]	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	[Head of Business Planning and Performance]	TNA
		[User Experience Manager]	TNA
		Nancy Bell (NB)	

**Apologies:** Oliver Morley (OM)

1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p><i>The minutes of the previous meetings held on 26 June 2013 were reviewed and approved by the Executive Team, subject to the requested minor changes being made.</i></p>	PJM
2.0	<p><b><u>Grants Panel</u></b></p> <p>DLT introduced VJ and NB            The Research Team act as Chair and Secretariat for the Grants and Academic Support Panel (GASP) which meets twice a month to evaluate projects for which The National Archives (or its partners) wish to apply for grant funding or where we will be potentially endorsing the project. Once proposals are passed by GASP the Executive Team are asked to approve.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team approved two proposals.</b></p>	
3.0	<p><b><u>After Action Review Of Falklands Transfer</u></b></p> <p>CT introduced JS and [Head of Remote Services &amp; Contact Centre] and explained that this report looked at the selection, preparation, transfer and delivery of the 2012 press event that focused on the 1982 Falklands conflict. The review had originally been internal to Information Management and Practice but had broadened in scope to include others involved in the transfer process.</p> <p>[Head of Remote Services &amp; Contact Centre] gave a brief outline of the methodology used, a summary of what went well and what went not so well and</p>	

	<p>then went through each of the seven recommendations.</p> <p>CT explained that the report had highlighted some areas where changes to our processes were required . Many of the recommendations had already been put in place and this was evidenced in the smoother running of recent events.</p> <p>[Head of Remote Services &amp; Contact Centre] to publish the summary of the report.</p> <p><b>The Executive team noted the report and thanked [Head of Remote Services &amp; Contact Centre] and JS.</b></p>	SG
4.0	<p><b><u>Fees order costing summary</u></b></p> <p>CB explained that we had now developed an outline approach to renewing the fees order pricing for discussion with Treasury.</p> <p>COS explained that a change in the approach to record copying was being considered as there was a large disparity between the numbers of estimates carried out (for no charge) and the number of records copied (for a charge).</p> <p><b>The Executive Team noted the approach and thanked [Head of Business Planning and Performance].</b></p>	
5.0	<p><b><u>Online Survey Results</u></b></p> <p>MG introduced [User Experience Manager] who gave a run through of the results from the recent online survey. The survey was completed by over 2500 users thus demonstrating plans to increase engagement were working. Overall satisfaction scored 71%, a 6% drop from the March 2012 figure.</p> <p>The key findings were:</p> <p><u>Good</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Archives website well thought out resource for online users</li> <li>• The website enables users to access a diverse and vast range of quality information</li> <li>• The website allows users to access this info and a substantial number of users find it easy to use.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bad</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty for users in finding information</li> <li>• Online search needs improvement as it is the most important user behaviour (survey run before changes to global search)</li> <li>• There is a thirst for more online content</li> </ul> <p>CT requested that [User Experience Manager] share the report with [User Experience and Online Services Manager – Legislation Services]. [update: 23/07 – PL presented the report to the IPS Managers Team Meeting]</p> <p>In order to conserve resource the Executive Team agreed that there should be a move from 3 surveys per year to 2.</p>	<p>[User Experience Manager]</p> <p>[User Experience</p>

	<b>MG thanked [User Experience Manager] and the Executive team noted the results of the survey.</b>	Manager]
<b>6.0</b>	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>DLT informed that a further 100K funding had been secured for SIRO training non-executive directors across government.</p> <p>DLT stated that there would be a beta test of the new Wi-Fi network for staff on Monday 8 July. MG called for staff to be reminded of policies relating to the use of social networking sites.</p> <p><b>There being no other business the meeting was drawn to a close.</b></p>	ALL

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 24 July 2013  
**Location:** Blue Room, First Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Oliver Morley (OM - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Mary Gledhill (MG)	TNA	[Senior Project Manager]	TNA
Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	Chris Mumby (CM)	TNA
David Thomas (DT)	TNA	[Resourcing & Organisational Development Manager]	TNA
Carol Tullo (CT)	TNA	Nick Kingsley (NK)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	[Programme Support Office Manager]	TNA
		[Senior Project Manager]	TNA

**Apologies:** None

<b>1.0</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p><i>The minutes of the previous meetings held on 3 July 2013 were reviewed and approved by the Executive Team.</i></p>	<b>Action</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b><u>Framework: Lessons learned</u></b></p> <p>MG introduced CM and [Senior Project Manager] explaining that the project had delivered the desired outcomes but there were challenges along the way. Much work went into the project and the amount of work needed was perhaps underestimated.</p> <p>CM highlighted a resource issue in that there is only one procurement manager and it</p>	

	<p>was originally thought we would simple re-run the same process that had occurred four years previous, the requirements had changed significantly and the same processes and documentation could not be used.</p> <p>CM informed that feedback from those on the framework about The National Archives was good and took the Executive Team through the main finding of the Project Closure Report.</p> <p>CT explained that this resource issue was a recurring theme, outcomes achieved are good but the cost in terms of staff time is great.</p> <p>CB to discuss with the procurement manager options around getting an overview of all major procurement projects.</p> <p>CM stated that the Framework project had built a good understanding at The National Archives of digitization across western Europe.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team noted the report.</b></p>	Done
3.0	<p><b><u>Leadership and Development</u></b></p> <p>COS introduced [Resourcing &amp; Organisational Development Manager] who explained that Exec Reports had recently been surveyed regarding an update to the previous FED group training programme. Those reports that had taken part in the training thought it had been of benefit and provided a common language, framework and approach.</p> <p>It was not thought necessary to run another full programme however a few events over the year are planned. Further for new Exec Reports, we would look into using Civil Service Learning to provide new FED for those who missed out first time.</p> <p>MG raised concern that this individual budget was at odds with the FED approach.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team thanked JCP for the update.</b></p>	
4.0	<p><b><u>Grants Panel</u></b></p> <p>DLT introduced NK.</p> <p>The Research Team act as Chair and Secretariat for the Grants and Academic Support Panel (GASP) which meets twice a month to evaluate projects for which The National Archives (or its partners) wish to apply for grant funding or where we will be potentially endorsing the project. Once proposals are passed by GASP the Executive Team are asked to approve.</p> <p><b><u>Knowledge creation through Open Online Olympic Educational Resource</u></b></p> <p>The core objective of the project is the development of an online teaching and learning platform which fully exploits the potential of the web to make connections between collections related to London 2012 specifically, and the history of the Olympic and Paralympic Games more generally.</p>	

	<p>NK informed the Executive Team that the proposal had been passed unanimously at Grants Panel.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team agreed the proposal.</b></p> <p>NK informed the Executive Team that plans were underway to move to stage two of the Catalyst scheme Philanthropic fundraising and asked if a second grant application needed to be brought back to the Executive Team for approval.</p> <p>OM stated that if there were no significant differences from the original bid this did not need to come back.</p> <p>PJM to redistribute the original Catalyst proposal to the Executive Team.</p> <p>Update 31/07/13: MG raised concerns around open ended scope.</p>	Done
5.0	<p><b><u>Strategic Risk Register</u></b></p> <p>The Strategic Risk register (SRR) is maintained by the Corporate Planning team on behalf of The National Archive's Executive Team. Contents of the Strategic Risk Register are formally reviewed on a quarterly basis by the Executive Team, Audit Committee and Management Board. Each strategic risk is owned by a member of the Executive Team. These high-level risks are taken into account in judgements about our medium to long-term goals, objectives and vision.</p> <p>CB introduced [Programme Support Office Manager] who explained that the Risk Register had last been reviewed on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2013. [Programme Support Office Manager] ran through the risks.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team reviewed the Strategic Risk Register and requested a number of minor changes.</b></p>	
6.0	<p><b><u>Modernising Public Services: Project Closure Report</u></b></p> <p>COS introduced [Senior Project Manager] who outlined the findings of the report. As a programme it provided good governance for projects however it was clear that some work-streams could have been managed better.</p> <p>The library holdings project was delivered late as a result of supplier issues and the importance of strong supplier management was one of the key findings.</p> <p><b>The Executive team noted the findings of the report and thanked DA.</b></p>	COS
7.0	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>DLT explained that a business case was planned to go to MOJ. The Executive Team agreed the proposal.</p> <p>OM updated on the visit of Catherine Lee, Acting DG, visited on Friday 19<sup>th</sup> July.</p> <p>PJM raised the issue of the re-close cases that had been sent by the FOI team. OM requested this process to come back to Executive Team.</p>	PJM

<b>There being no other business the meeting was drawn to a close.</b>	
--	--

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 31 July 2013  
**Location:** Blue Room, First Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Oliver Morley (OM - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Mary Gledhill (MG)	TNA	[Resourcing & Organisational Development Manager]	TNA
Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	[Strategic Business Change Manager]	TNA
David Thomas (DT)	TNA	Amanda Spencer (AS)	TNA
Carol Tullo (CT)	TNA	[IT Service Delivery]	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	Alison Webster (Awe)	TNA
		Amanda White (AW)	TNA
		[Management Accountant]	TNA
		[Interim Head of Financial Accounting]	TNA
		[Publishing Services Performance Manager]	TNA
		[Project Manager]	TNA

**Apologies:** None

<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>  <i>The minutes of the previous meetings held on 3 July 2013 were reviewed and approved by the Executive Team.</i>  PJM raised the issue of the reclose cases that had been sent by the FOI team. OM requested this process to come back to Executive Team.	<b>Action</b>  PJM
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Civil Service Annual Skills Review</u></b>  COS introduced [Resourcing & Organisational Development Manager] and [Strategic Business Change Manager].  [Resourcing & Organisational Development Manager] explained this review was being undertaken across the Civil Service to look at progress and plans to implement the Civil Service capability plan emanating from the Civil Service Reform Plan/  [Strategic Business Change Manager] stated that four areas would be looked at, these were:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership and Managing Change</li> <li>• Digital by default</li> <li>• Commercial activities</li> <li>• Projects</li> </ul> <p>OM requested the inclusion of an information management competency to be looked at.</p> <p>DLT questioned the importance of competencies during a period when staff turnover was at a high level.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team noted and approved the approach taken.</b></p>	[Resourcing & Organisational Development Manager]
3.0	<p><b><u>Network Design</u></b></p> <p>DLT introduced AS and [IT Service Delivery]. [IT Service Delivery] explained that the data switch and telephone system had been put in place between five and seven years ago and was becoming outdated. With new telephones being used and the vast increase in the volume of the digital record the time for a new network had arrived.</p> <p>[IT Service Delivery] explained that a project was planned to replace The National Archives current data switch and associated kit. This would reduce business risk due to a failure of a network component.</p> <p>People, governance structure and technology would be put in place for the delivery of site and mobile services based on the refreshed network. Technology to be fully exploited in order to improve business effectiveness and reduce costs.</p> <p>A project to replace the existing PBX and voice services with modern, cost effective services to be undertaken. Improved service and reduced costs planned outcome.</p> <p>AS explained that a key component of the project was the relationship with people and their needs. Both internal users of our systems and external remote users.</p> <p>CB stated that it seemed a very considered approach in an environment that was very dynamic.</p> <p>MG asked if there was an expectation of a move toward bringing your own device, in the reading room, and if this would affect the project.</p> <p>[IT Service Delivery] responded that as there was not a huge demand for this at present it would not affect our plans on what we need to do. It may be looked at again at the end of thin client's life span.</p> <p>OM advised that the key element was to provide a secure protected core for the business. It was not foreseeable for staff to work on personal devices and connect to the core network.</p>	

	<p>AS and [IT Service Delivery] to bring this back to Exec Team after the 6+6 forecast in order to seek approval.</p> <p><b>OM thanked AS and CO and the approach was noted.</b></p>	AS
4.0	<p><b><u>Culture Project: Project Closure Report</u></b></p> <p>COS welcomed [Project Manager].</p> <p>During the summer of 2010, the Executive Team and Exec Reports identified the challenges The National Archives would face over the next few years, and how to deal with them. The Culture Project emerged from this work, with a brief to answer a tough question in an equally tough economic environment: How do we ensure an open, participative, and transparent culture where we save money, and where The National Archives is still a good place to work?</p> <p>The project has come to its conclusion, having met its objectives and deliverables. The project has always advocated a continuous improvement approach and the outcomes from the project have now become business as usual for the HR and Organisational Development department.</p> <p>[Project Manager] explained that during year one of the project twelve new events and initiatives were introduced. During the second year the People Plan, Skills Survey and Alumni Programme were introduced.</p> <p>OM stated that the project had achieved much and really had helped to make the organisation a better place.</p> <p>CB advised that the values work strand was of great importance and had produced great results during a time of financial constraint.</p> <p>OM requested COS to consider what was needed next for the organisation.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team noted the content of the report.</b></p>	COS
5.0	<p>CB introduced his team.</p> <p><b><u>June Dashboard</u></b></p> <p>The Dashboard is a monthly reporting and monitoring mechanism for the Executive Team.</p> <p>The Dashboard provides an easy reference of how the Performance Indicators for The National Archives have performed in the month and alerts the Executive Team to those where achievement is under threat and where some remedial action may be necessary.</p> <p>Performance Indicators for 2013-14 can be found in the 2011-15 Corporate Business Plan.</p>	

	<p>[Strategic Business Change Manager]took the Executive Team through the various metrics on the Dashboard.</p> <p>OM requested that users of web chat be asked how satisfied they were with the experience upon completion of a session as part of the overall survey.</p> <p>OM asked for the removal of 3D charts from the dashboard in order to improve readability.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team noted the June Dashboard.</b></p> <p><b><u>First Quarter project report</u></b></p> <p>AWe reviewed the First Quarter project report with the Executive Team.</p> <p><b>The First Quarter project report was noted by the Executive Team.</b></p> <p><b>OM thanked CB and his team.</b></p>	<p>[Strategic Business Change Manager]</p> <p>[Strategic Business Change Manager]</p>
<p><b>6.0</b></p>	<p><b><u>Command and HCP project update</u></b></p> <p>CT introduced [Publishing Services Performance Manager] and [Project Manager].</p> <p>[Publishing Services Performance Manager] explained that the plan had been to provide ‘nose to tail’ publishing.</p> <p>On boarding to the Print Vendor Partner (PVP) contract led by Government Procurement Service (GPS). Enabling organisations to produce Command and C&amp;HC papers for laying before Parliament, providing print copies for legal deposit, Parliament and originating organisations. The production of PDFs and bibliographic data.</p> <p>On the commercial side PDFs available for publishers to provide print on demand services. All papers published online in PDF form, content migrated from Official Documents Website to .gov.uk</p> <p>SB outlined the proposed communications schedule.</p> <p>OM stated that changes being introduced and communication schedule should be brought to Executive Team attention at an earlier opportunity.</p> <p>CT explained that there had been a lag as a result of Executive Team meetings timing.</p> <p>MG stated that it had been a great achievement to get GPS and GDS onboard.</p> <p><b>The Executive team thanked HC and SB for the update.</b></p>	

7.0	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>OM informed the team that away day minutes to be distributed to Exec Reports next week. Next steps to be taken.</p> <p>COS explained a facilitator had been arranged for the planned Management Board away day and Executive and Non Executive Directors would be contacted individually beforehand.</p> <p><b>There being no other business the meeting was drawn to a close.</b></p>	