

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

**Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2010**

Attending: Jenny Rowe (Chair)

William Arnold  
Alex Jablonowski (Non-Executive Director)  
Sian Lewis  
Olufemi Oguntunde  
Philip Robinson (Non-Executive Director)  
Caroline Smith  
Martin Thompson (item 4 onwards)

Ann Achow (Secretary)

**1. Apologies for absence**

1.1 Apologies were received from Louise di Mambro.

**2. Approval of the minutes of the MB meeting held on 22 November 2010**

2.1 The minutes were approved.

**3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere in the minutes**

3.1 The action regarding health and safety implications for charged visitors was carried forward.

**Action: MT to investigate whether charging for visitor or group access had an impact on health, safety or fire requirements.**

3.2 SL had re-drafted paragraph 5.3 of the charging paper (MB10/52). The paper would be sent to the Justices after the Christmas recess.

3.3 There had been no news about the transmission date for the Channel 4 documentary.

3.4 MT reported that the LED lighting recommended by the Carbon Trust would be installed.

**4. Broadcast policy**

4.1 SL presented her paper MB10/66 which put forward three different policy proposals for the provision of broadcast recordings to non-broadcasters. The policy review had provided the opportunity to gather information on the number and type of requests received since the Court opened.

4.2 The current policy allowed for all filmed proceedings of the UKSC and JCPC to be made available free of charge to broadcasters for news or current affairs items and to educational establishments for educational purposes. Requests from organisations which were neither broadcasters nor educational establishments were normally refused unless there were urgent imminent judicial matters related to a case. No charges had been made for supplying recordings.

4.3 After detailed discussion the Board agreed to accept the proposal outlined in paragraph 4.1.1 of the paper. This was to continue with the current policy but to make it more explicit by setting it out on the website. It was agreed that the definition of educational establishments for the purposes of the policy should include schools, colleges and universities. It would not include any legal training specialists which charged fees. It was also agreed that the proposal to produce a more detailed licensing arrangement should go ahead.

4.4 The policy would be kept under review as it was recognised that any significant increase in the number of requests for recordings could impact on the arrangements currently in place with the broadcast contractor.

## **5. Demonstrations and security**

5.1 JR gave an oral report on the events of 9 December when the building was damaged during a student demonstration. The building had been closed to the public at 2pm and staff had been evacuated later in the afternoon. There had been no disruption to the single court case which was being heard. She updated members on progress with various meetings which had subsequently taken place or were planned.

5.2 JR wished to record her thanks to the staff of MJ Ferguson, the Court's maintenance contractor, for their swift action in dealing with the repairs.

## **6. Scorecard report**

6.1 The Board considered paper MB 10/67 which contained scorecard figures up to and including November 2010. The figure for the number of PTAs waiting to be referred to the Justices was still showing a minus figure which could not be corrected until the beginning of the new financial year when the figures would start afresh from zero. OO drew attention to the improved prompt payment of invoice figures. However, he advised members that there were moves to reduce the prompt payment target for government departments to five working days which would be almost impossible to achieve under the current contractual arrangement of one payment run each week.

6.2 The Board considered how to incorporate the JCPC case statistics into the scorecard once its administration had been transferred formally to the Supreme Court. It was agreed that the JCPC figures would be shown separately from the UKSC's and that there was no need for the scorecard to contain a breakdown of cases from individual JCPC jurisdictions. JR advised the Board that the date for the formal transfer of the administration of the JCPC to the UKSC had not yet been agreed.

## **7. Finance and fees**

7.1 OO presented paper MB 10/68 which contained a full financial information pack to the end of November.

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

- year to date expenditure against budget was showing an underspend
- fee income was running above profile
- the transfer of the JCPC budget would be handled as a Machinery of Government change, requiring ‘merger accounting’ treatment in the UKSC accounts.

## **8. Human resources**

8.1 CS reported that MoJ had confirmed that their recently announced Voluntary Early Departure scheme would be open to UKSC staff. Staff interested in applying would have to meet the MoJ application deadline of 10 January.

8.2 The staff equality and diversity data collection exercise was underway with a good response rate so far. A RNIB assessor was due to visit on 14 January to conduct an accessibility audit of the building’s court rooms and other public areas. An accessibility audit of the website was also planned to take place in January.

8.3 CS was planning to attend a meeting on 6 January with the Next Generation HR Shared Services Project Manager.

## **9. Press and communications**

9.1 SL’s communications update (paper MB 10/69) highlighted case coverage, commentary in the media, particularly on the decision in *R v Chaytor and others*, visitor and website visitor numbers.

9.2 The number of individual visitors to the Court had increased again in November, averaging 321 per day. The number of school/student groups had also risen significantly, compared with October; and there had been a small rise in the number of other organised group visits.

9.3 The number of website visitors (28,569) had shown a fall compared with October’s figure but was still higher than in September.

## **10. Parliamentary Questions monthly report**

10.1 There had been no PQs received in November. The number of FOI requests had increased in November compared with the number received during the summer months. There had been one subject access request received under the Data Protection Act. All requests had been answered within the statutory deadlines.

## **11. Case update**

11.1. In LdiM's absence it was reported that Registry continued to be very busy. The 2011 Michaelmas term was filling up; and a two week long case had already been listed.

## **12. Risk**

12.1 The Board discussed paper MB10/70 which comprised the current risk register. It was felt that the likelihood/impact scores for risks 14, 15 and 18 should be diminishing. The scores for risks 14 and 18 should be reduced whilst risk 15 should be removed at the next monthly review. The text of risk 17 should be amended at the next review to reflect recent developments.

**Actions: Risk owners to amend risks 14, 15, 17 and 18 at the January risk register review.**

## **13. Any other business**

13.1 WA gave an update on the production of the Strategic Plan. He had produced a first draft which had gone to JR and would be circulated to Management Team members for their input. JR had written to MoJ officials to enquire whether any of their planned work could have an impact on the volume or type of cases which might come before the Court. A reply was awaited.

13.2 JR reported that Lord Phillips was due to give a speech on judicial independence in the New Year (now fixed for 8 February).

13.3 OO advised the Board that the contractor who provided MOJ's Government Procurement Card scheme was changing. There was, however, no need for UKSC to change provider and it had been decided that Barclays would continue to provide this service for the Court. MoJ had introduced an online claim system for travel and subsistence expenses. Until the operation of the new system was clearer we would continue to use the current manual process.

13.4 There was a query about access to the building on the day of the Royal Wedding in April 2011. The Security Manager had been asked to make enquiries about any access restrictions.

These minutes were approved by the Management Board on 24 January 2011.