

**The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom
Management Board
Minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2010**

Attending: Jenny Rowe (Chair)

William Arnold
Sian Lewis
Olufemi Oguntunde
Philip Robinson (Non-Executive Director)
Martin Thompson

Ann Achow (Secretary)

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 Apologies were received from Alex Jablonowski, Louise di Mambro and Caroline Smith.

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

2.1 The minutes were approved subject to a minor amendment to paragraph 3.5 which JR would send to AA.

3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere in the minutes

3.1. John Pennells of the Middlesex Art Collection Trust had provided the information needed so that OO could contact the insurer concerning the Court's interest in the collection.

3.2. The report of the desk top test of the Business Continuity Plan had been received. The report was due to be discussed at meeting shortly with minor amendments being made to the plan.

3.3 The meeting to discuss amendments to the scorecard had not taken place.

3.4 AA had sent the Information Security Policy to another department's SIRO but had not had a reply.

Action: AA to follow up the request for comments on the Information Security Policy with the SIRO

3.5 The draft Finance Manual had been prepared. As there was insufficient time to consider it at the forthcoming Audit Committee meeting it would be given to the Audit Committee Chair.

3.6 The issue concerning the bookcase shelves was ongoing as the recently implemented solution had not entirely solved the problem.

3.7 The question of a contingent liability arising from the revised bomb blast requirements was a technical accounting issue which would be discussed by PR and OO outside the meeting.

4. Post election landscape

4.1 Members considered JR's paper MB10/33. JR invited MB members to think about the changed environment in which the Court would be operating including resourcing issues and the extent of the constitutional change programme including the impact this might have on the volume and type of appeals which could come before the Court. It was important for all members to watch developments and announcements carefully and flag up issues to JR.

4.2 It was agreed that developing the themes from the January Awayday into a paper to be put to the President and Deputy President. This could be used to inform the Strategic Plan.

Action: JR to draft a paper drawing together the output from the Awayday.

5. Scorecard report

5.1 The Board considered paper MB 10/29 which contained scorecard figures up to and including April 2010. The target for the payment of invoices had not been achieved. OO's analysis had shown that payment delays were caused either by disputed invoices or, more frequently, by delays in processing by MoJ's contractor who handled payments on our behalf. It was agreed that:

- details of the SLA with the contractor would be obtained
- any disputed invoices would be returned for clarification or amendment rather than being retained until the dispute was settled or the goods delivered.

5.2 OO reported that the more up to date figures available since the scorecard had been completed showed a 1% overspend against budget rather than the 3% underspend tabled. He updated members on the production of the annual accounts. The sign off of the accounts by the Controller and Auditor General could not take place until the Annual Report was ready. The publication of the Annual Report was planned for 6 July.

5.3 PR and LdiM were to meet to discuss the casework section of the scorecard to see whether the information provided was sufficient to inform members on casework performance. Other MB members were to consider their sections of the scorecard and report back at the June meeting.

5.4 In view of the lack of PQs received since the Court opened it was agreed that this entry would remain until October when its usefulness would be reviewed.

Actions:

- (1) OO to obtain details of the contractor's SLA for prompt payment of invoices for JR to take up at an appropriate level in MoJ.**
- (2) SL, MT and CS to consider their sections of the scorecard and report back at the June meeting.**
- (3) LdiM and PR to meet to consider the casework entries and report back at the June meeting.**

6. Annual report 2009/10

6.1 SL gave an update on the production of the Annual Report. Contributions were being edited with a view to a draft going to JR by the middle of the following week. MoJ's Print Unit were to draw up the design and facilitate liaison with TSO. JR had minuted the President and both he and the Deputy President would have appropriate input. JR stressed, however, that the report was the Chief Executive's report to Parliament rather than the Court's report. The planned publication date was 6 July.

7. Finance and fees

7.1 OO presented paper MB 10/30 which contained a full financial information pack.

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

- The NAO had concluded their fieldwork on the final audit of the 2009/10 accounts on 22 May. No major issues had been identified.
- The technical accounting issue concerning the revaluation of the building had been resolved and signed off by the auditors.
- The budget for 2010/11 had been uploaded onto the central accounting system. The allocations reflected the need to cut budgets, for example on repairs and maintenance and library acquisitions to remain within the allocation of £12.85m with an additional £100k for capital items.

7.3. JR recorded her thanks to the Finance team for their hard work in the production of the end year accounts.

7.4 The Audit Committee were due to discuss the impact which any devaluation of the building would have on the 2010/11 budget at their next meeting.

7.5 Members discussed the presentation of the Justices' expenses for 2009/10. This issue would be taken forward out of committee.

8. Human resources

8.1 WA gave an update on the shared services work which was looking at the provision of HR, IT and finance. The timing of decisions on the HR element was likely to be driven by MoJ's HR shared services work which was due to be completed by May 2011. JR was due to meet Tony Burns to discuss progress the following week.

9. Press and communications

9.1 SL's communications update (paper MB 10/31) highlighted case coverage and commentary in the media.

9.2 The number of individual and group visitors to the court had dropped in April compared with the previous month's sharp rise. The number of separate visits to the website had dropped to 17,781. These reductions were probably due to the Easter holiday.

10. Risk

10.1 The Board discussed paper MB10/32 which comprised the current risk register. This reflected the substantive changes agreed at the April meeting. A revision to the likelihood and impact scores for business continuity would be considered in time for the June MB meeting.

11. Parliamentary Questions monthly report

11.1 There had been no new PQs received since the last meeting. The flow of FOI enquiries and internal review requests had increased as had the resource input to deal with them. All requests had been answered within the 20 day deadline.

12. Case statistics

12.1 There was nothing to report in LdiM's absence.

13. Any other business

13.1 Possible changes to the dates of the September and November MB meetings were discussed along with the need to set dates for 2011.

13.2 JR reported that the OGC post implementation Gateway Review was scheduled to take place from 27 to 29 September.

Action: AA to circulate members for their availability for MB meetings.

These minutes were approved by the Management Board on 22 June 2010.