

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 5 March 2014  
**Location:** Blue Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM)	TNA
Carol Tullo (CT)	TNA	Julie Lennard (JL)	TNA
David Thomas (DLT)	TNA	Amanda White (AW)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	Standards Advisor	TNA
Mary Gledhill (MG)	TNA	Chris Mumby (CM)	TNA
		FOI Centre Manager	TNA
		FOI Manager	TNA
		Early Modern Records Specialist	TNA
		Public Records and Information Manager	TNA
		Business and Policy Manager	TNA

**Apologies:** None

		Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>  The minutes of the previous meetings held on the 19 <sup>th</sup> February were reviewed and approved subject to a number of minor changes.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Online Bookshop</u></b>	
2.1	CM presented the project closure report to the Executive Team and explained that the project was necessary as the previous platform had become outdated and was increasingly unfit for purpose. We now possess a product that has the functionality needed and provides users the experience they would expect. This gives us a platform for growth.	
2.2	CM stated that the amount of resource required from the web team had not been adequately estimated and there was an over reliance on key individuals.	
2.3	CM suggested more scoping of the project could have been carried out after during planning and sharing of knowledge was now being encouraged.	
2.4	MG advised that no formal project management was used and it might be time to look at a project management 'light' model that would provide guidance without creating onerous levels of paperwork and bureaucracy.	

2.5	CB thanked CM for the report and commented on the impressive product we now have and thanked all those who had put so much hard work into the project.	
2.6	<b>The Executive Team noted the content of the report</b>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>MH 106 reclosure issues</u></b>	
3.1	CT introduced FOI Centre Manager, FOI Manager and Early Modern Records Specialist.	
3.2	The Executive Team reviewed the access conditions and discussed the paper.	
3.3	CB thanked the team for a well written report.	
3.4	<b>The Executive Team agreed to allow continued access.</b>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b><u>First draft Budget 14/15 review</u></b>	
4.1	AW presented an overview of the budget 14/15 highlighting the main points.	
4.2	The Executive Team discussed the draft Budget.	
4.3	CB advised that post general election it was likely that the next spending review would take place in summer or autumn 2015.	
4.4	<b>The Executive Team agreed the 2014/2015 draft Budget ahead of taking it to Management Board on Wednesday 26 March 2014.</b>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b><u>PSI - Directive Implementation</u></b>	
5.1	CT introduced Standards Advisor who was the lead on the draft consultation stage Impact Assessment regarding transposition of amendments to the PSI Directive into UK law. Public Records and Information Manager covered legislation and Business and Policy Manager worked on the Government clearance.	
5.1	Standards Advisor advised that the document distributed to the Executive Team (PSI intro) outlined the key questions for them to consider at this meeting. They had also been provided with the draft Impact Assessment (IA).	
5.2	Standards Advisor highlighted the key changes in the amendments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A move to marginal cost pricing with a number of exceptions</li> <li>• Changing to mandatory re-use – removing discretion for public sector bodies</li> <li>• The mechanism of redress – the decisions of an impartial review body would be binding</li> <li>• Extension of scope to museums, libraries and archives</li> </ul>	
5.3	Standards Advisor stated the Commission thought the pricing levels too high and wanted a reduction in costs for those who reuse information.	

5.4	Standards Advisor explained that exceptions would be made for organisations that had requirements to cover costs set in law, or other binding rules, for example trading funds such as the Met Office. Most large ministerial departments now operated marginal cost pricing already. Exemptions in the directive which covered organisations like the Environment Agency were in place.	
5.5	CB wanted to ensure that prior to Management Board we could be clear about what control we have on the outcome, what the costs were to The National Archives and what would we be committed to.	
5.6	Standards Advisor to provide PJM with the most recent version of the IA as soon as possible in order to distribute to the Management Board ahead of the March Board meeting.	Standards Advisor
5.7	Standards Advisor to provide PJM with a policy paper looking at the implications for The National Archives for discussion at the March Management Board.	Standards Advisor
5.8	<b>The Executive Team noted the IA and agreed the next steps.</b>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
6.1	CT advised that work on the Legislation.gov.uk - Drafting Tool project was progressing well.	
6.2	MG informed the Executive Team that the Stakeholder Event list is shaping up well. MG or Marketing and Communications coordinator to speak to Directors regarding staff attendance	
6.3	<b>There being no further business, the meeting was closed.</b>	

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 12 March 2014  
**Location:** Blue Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	Julie Lennard (JL)	TNA
Mary Gledhill (MG)	TNA	IT Service Delivery (Strategy) Manager	TNA
		Amanda Spencer (AS)	TNA
		Lee Oliver (LMO)	TNA
		Marketing and Communications Organiser	TNA

**Apologies:** David Thomas (DLT), Carol Tullo (CT)

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meetings held on the 5<sup>th</sup> March were reviewed and approved subject to a minor change.</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b><u>Project Refresh</u></b></p> <p>2.1 IT Service Delivery (Strategy) Manager gave the Executive Team an update on project progress.</p> <p>2.2 IT Service Delivery (Strategy) explained the procurement process. Following an Invitation to Tender exercise three bids had been received. IT Service Delivery (Strategy) outlined that technology quality of proposal and costs were major parts of the consideration. Approval from the Executive Team was now being sought for the preferred bidder. The next step would be to seek Cabinet Office approval from the Public Services Network Authority team.</p> <p>2.3 IT Service Delivery (Strategy) Manager advised that DLT was in support of the proposal.</p> <p>2.4 <b>The Executive Team supported the proposal.</b></p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b><u>3rd Quarterly Complaints Review Recommendations Report</u></b></p> <p>3.1 COS introduced LMO who presented the report.</p> <p>3.2 LMO explained that following a lengthy and complex complaint in 2012, the Independent Complaints Reviewer made the following recommendation:</p> <p>3.3 <i>Appropriate formal feedback should be given to the Chief Executive to provide reassurance that action has been taken and to confirm the date of completion.</i></p> <p>3.4 LMO informed that this quarterly report is intended to fulfil the second part of the above recommendation.</p> <p>3.5 LMO took the Executive Team through the report.</p> <p>3.6 The Executive Team noted that all outstanding actions had been completed by the end of December 2013.</p> <p>3.7 LMO advised that he was currently looking at enriching the reports with information on themes and trends.</p> <p>3.8 CB thanked LMO and asked he thank Service Quality and Complaints Manager for ongoing work in handling complaints.</p> <p>3.9 <b>The Executive Team noted the report.</b></p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b><u>Stakeholder Event 24 March</u></b></p>	

4.1	MG introduced Marketing and Communications Organiser.	MG
4.2	MG explained that good progress was being made in the planning of the event and invite acceptance responses were promising. A list of staff attendees had now been agreed with Directors.	
4.3	MG said that to minimise potential inconvenience to staff the internal communications team will be asked that arrangements are widely communicated.	
4.4	CB emphasised that the event was a big opportunity and was confident that the team would run it well.	
4.5	<b>The Executive Team agreed the proposal.</b>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
5.1	MG informed the Executive Team that on Thursday 13 March, The National Archives is making the second batch of digitised First World War unit war diaries from France and Flanders available online through our First World War 100 portal.	
5.2	<b>There being no further business, the meeting was closed.</b>	

# Minutes

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 19 March 2014  
**Location:** Blue Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Kew  
**Attendees:**

Clem Brohier (CB)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	Programme Manager – 20 Year Rule Programme	TNA
Mary Gledhill (MG)	TNA	Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions	TNA
David Thomas (DLT)	TNA	Environment and Sustainability Manager	TNA
Carol Tullo (CT)	TNA	Paul Davies (PD)	TNA
		Valerie Johnson (VJ)	TNA
		Nick Kingsley (NK)	TNA
		Alison Webster (AWe)	TNA
		Senior Project Manager	TNA
		Jim Wretham (JW)	TNA
		Jane Craigie-Payne (JCP)	TNA
		Trainee Management Accountant	TNA
		Peter Brooker (PB)	TNA
		Amanda White (AW)	TNA

**Apologies:**

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
	The minutes of the previous meetings held on the 12 <sup>th</sup> March were reviewed and approved subject to a minor change.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b><u>Series Level Time Plan (SLTP)</u></b>	
2.1	CT introduced Programme Manager – 20 Year Rule Programme and Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions to the Executive Team. Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions explained that the SLTP was an important tool that aided other government departments to move from record selection to accessioning.	
2.2	The National Archives was working collaboratively with other government departments and third parties to make this process as effective as possible. The SLTP facilitated an intelligence led, managed process.	
2.3	Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions advised that in January 2013 an Excel version had been launched and although it had been a useful tool that assisted in delivery there were a number of issues that the development of a web based version had resolved. With a large number of multiple transfers version control was a problem, access to the Excel documents was found to be problematic for some departments and file size was an issue in regards to sending via email.	
2.4	Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions stated that a further benefit of the web based version of the SLTP was the ability it gave The National Archives to easily access the data held and to extract metrics.	
2.5	Programme Manager – 20 Year Rule Programme took the Executive Team through a demonstration of how the system worked showing the way that key dates are flagged. The SLTP was not mandatory however departments are being advised of the benefit to them of adopting the process.	
2.6	Head of Selection Transfer and Accessions explained that the system would go live today and thanked the Systems Development Department for all their help.	Programme Manager – 20 Year Rule Programme
2.7	DLT advised Programme Manager – 20 Year Rule Programme to check with the Departmental Security Officer regarding accreditation of the new system.	
2.8	CB thanked all involved in the planning and design of what was now an effective planning tool.	
2.9	<b>The Executive Team noted the progress made.</b>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b><u>Landscaping and biodiversity update</u></b>	
3.1	CB introduced PD and Environment and Sustainability Manager. PD explained	

	<p>that there had been some minor concerns raised about the recent landscaping work and both the Executive Team and staff should have been given more detailed information ahead of the work beginning.</p> <p>3.2 Environment and Sustainability Manager presented on landscaping plans and Executive Team approval was being sought for additional work.</p> <p>3.3 Environment and Sustainability Manager explained that intervention was necessary to remove trees in order to protect pond lining and to allow greater levels of sunlight to hit the pond. Native aquatic plants were to be introduced in order to provide a healthy balanced and dynamic natural attraction. The grounds were an important part of The National Archives and created an important shared space for staff, visitors and the local community.</p> <p>3.4 After seeking expert advice, a cost effective replanting plan had been agreed. The mixture of plants, shrubs and trees would improve biodiversity and provide impact and colour.</p> <p>3.5 Environment and Sustainability Manager outlined the additional planned work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A further 8 dying trees identified for replacement – Pocket Park</li> <li>• Aquatic planting to help restore pond health and ecological balance</li> <li>• Water garden at Pocket Park entrance</li> <li>• Interpretation board and signage</li> </ul> <p>3.6 <b>The Executive Team thanked PD and Environment and Sustainability Manager and agreed the additional planned work.</b></p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p>	<p><b><u>Grants Panel</u></b></p> <p>DLT introduced VJ and 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><u>Collecting Cultures for Archives</u></p> <p>NK explained that there was disappointment that the Collecting Cultures for Archives application had had to be withdrawn.</p> <p><u>Manorial Documents Register Enhancement project</u></p> <p>NK gave the Executive Team a brief outline of the proposal explaining that The Federation of Family History Societies would be funding the acceleration of the digitisation of the Manorial Documents Register. Archive Sector Development department would manage the project.</p> <p>VJ advised that the Systems Development Department had been consulted and</p>	

4.8	<p>were happy and the proposal was unanimously agreed by GASP.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team supported the application.</b></p>	
5.0	<p><b><u>Project Exception Report</u></b></p> <p>5.1 Senior Project Manager and AWe presented the Investment bid exception report that looked at projects that had a RAG status of either amber or red.</p> <p>5.2 AWe explained that the Executive Team had requested monthly reports as we approached year end.</p> <p>5.3 It was agreed to move the Board of Trade Design Service project to GREEN.</p> <p>5.4 <b>The Executive Team noted the report.</b></p>	
6.0	<p><b><u>Proposals for The National Archives Norwich Office</u></b></p> <p>6.1 CT introduced JW, PD and JCP. JW explained that with planned retirement in December 2014 three staff would remain at the Norwich office. This situation is unsustainable. It is proposed that The National Archives should vacate the space no later than March 2015 once options had been explored.</p> <p>6.2 <b>Update to be given to the Executive Team once agreed recommendations completed.</b></p>	JW
7.0	<p><b><u>Public Library Subsidy Scheme (PLS)</u></b></p> <p>7.1 The PLS is a subsidy designed to assist libraries in the purchase of official publications. The PLS is available to all local authority-funded public libraries in the United Kingdom. The subsidy is provided in order to facilitate public access to print parliamentary and government materials.</p> <p>7.2 The scheme is administered by Her Majesty's Stationery Office and moved to The National Archives in 2006.</p> <p>7.3 As part of our budget reviews a project team at The National Archives had reviewed this scheme and sought Executive Team approval for the next stage and recommendations.</p> <p>7.4 <b>The Executive team agreed that options should be explored directly to refresh the conclusions from the 2009 work. Outcome to return to the Executive Team.</b></p>	JW
8.0	<p><b><u>February Dashboard</u></b></p> <p>8.1 PB presented this item to the Executive Team.</p> <p>8.2 The Dashboard is a monthly reporting and monitoring mechanism for the Executive Team.</p>	

8.3	The Dashboard is tabled for the Executive Team to review performance against published and internal Performance Indicators and acts as a prompt for action where performance is of concern. Performance indicators can be found in the 2011 – 2015 Corporate Business Plan.	
8.4	PB took the Executive Team through the 7 metrics that had altered since the previous review.	
8.5	COS commented that the Rolling 12-month sickness metric had improved by over one day per Full Time Employee on the 2012/13 figure.	
8.6	PB advised the Executive Team that the auditors had found no significant issues with the 21 metrics in use.	
8.7	<b>The Executive Team noted the content of the Dashboard.</b>	
9.0	<b><u>Finance and Procurement Report</u></b>	
9.1	AW presented this item.	
9.2	AW explained that net expenditure for the month was £104K(3%) higher than forecast following catch up work relating to the Cooling towers and Emergency lighting projects.	
9.3	AW advised that we remain on track to hit our financial targets for the year. We continue to manage our cash position closely.	
9.4	AW explained that changes to employer pension contribution arrangements would, in effect, mean a 1.3% cut in our budget 2015/16.	
9.5	<b>The Executive Team noted the Finance and Procurement Report.</b>	
10.0	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>	
10.1	A discussion was had regarding the provision of hospitality. CB requested MG check what guidance was on Narnia and refresh if necessary.	MG
10.2	Reclosure Panel: The Executive Team noted the decision of the Reclosure Panel (13 March 2014) to recommend reclosure of cases.	
10.3	<b>There being no further business, the meeting was closed.</b>	