



## Minute

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Board of IPSA Thursday 15 May 2014**

Present	Sir Ian Kennedy, Chair Sir Neil Butterfield Liz Padmore Anne Whitaker Tony Wright  Paul Hayes, Interim Chief Executive  Nick Lee, Head of Board and Chief Executive Office	Head of Communications Publications Manager [items 4 – 5] Philip Lloyd, Director of Finance and Operations John Sills, Director of Policy Head of Policy [items 1 – 5] Judith Toland, Director of Programmes
Apologies	None.	
Status	As approved at the meeting of the Board on 15 October 2014.	
Publication	For publication no later than 26 November 2014.	

## **1. Welcome**

1.1. The Chair welcomed the Board to the meeting.

### Declarations of interests

1.2. There were no new declarations of interests.

## **2. Action list and matters arising**

### *IPSA/140515/2 – Action list*

2.1. The Board noted that planning work already completed meant that MPs standing down would be aware of their obligations well ahead of their ceasing to be MPs.

2.2. There were no other matters arising.

## **3. IPSA's arrangements for liaison with MPs**

3.1. The Head of Board and Chief Executive Office introduced a presentation setting out options for the future development of the arrangements for ensuring that the views of MPs were represented.

3.2. The Board agreed to note the presentation of the Head of Board and Chief Executive Office.

**Nick Lee to provide a further paper for the Board in autumn 2014, setting out further proposals for the development of the liaison arrangements between IPSA and MPs.**

## **4. Speaker's Committee for the IPSA**

4.1. The Interim Chief Executive reported back on the meeting of the Speaker's Committee for the IPSA (SCIPSA) he had attended the previous day, convened to consider IPSA's Estimate for 2014-15.

4.2. The Board agreed to note the report of the Interim Chief Executive.

## 5. Review of IPSA's publication scheme

### *IPSA/140515/3 + annex A – Review of IPSA's publication scheme*

5.1. The Head of Communications introduced a paper setting out proposed changes following the review of IPSA's publication scheme. He reported, in particular, that:

- the recent public consultation on proposed changes to the publication scheme was the first such exercise since it was established in 2010;
- the consultation had focussed on two types of data for publication: those relating to MPs' costs and claims and those relating to IPSA's own administration; and
- IPSA had received relatively few responses to the consultation – just six formal returns.

### Reward and recognition payments for IPSA's staff

5.2. The Board agreed not to publish reward and recognition payments for IPSA's staff, broken down on an individual basis.

### Expenses incurred by IPSA's staff

5.3. The Board noted that:

- IPSA currently only published expenses incurred by senior staff within IPSA; and
- it was not common practice in the public sector for the expenses of staff at all levels to be published.

5.4. The Board agreed that it would be disproportionate routinely to publish the details of all expenses incurred by junior staff within IPSA.

### Policies and procedures

5.5. The Board agreed to publish policies and procedures covering recruitment, health and safety, and diversity and equality.

### Remuneration of the Board

5.6. The Board noted that the remuneration of each member of the Board was already published, in £5,000 bands, as part of IPSA's annual report and accounts.

5.7. The Board agreed to continue, as currently, to publish the Board's remuneration in £5,000 bands.

MPs' staff

5.8. The Board agreed not actively to publish the length of service for MPs' staff.

MPs' landlords

5.9. The Board agreed that it would be inappropriate routinely to publish details of MPs' landlords' addresses.

Reward and recognition for MPs' staff

5.10. The Board noted that:

- IPSA did not currently publish each individual reward and recognition payments made to MPs' staff but, rather, the total paid by a particular MP over the course of a year; and
- this arrangement did not provide transparency where a number of payments were made by an individual MP to staff members.

5.11. The Board agreed to publish details of each individual reward and recognition payments made by MPs.

Contingency applications

5.12. The Board noted that the proposal to publish details of unsuccessful applications for contingency uplifts followed a recent request made under the Freedom of Information Act for such data.

5.13. The Board agreed to publish details of unsuccessful applications for contingency uplifts.

Claims for stationery

5.14. The Board noted that:

- concerns had recently been expressed about the manner in which the costs of MPs purchasing stationery were published; and
- work was under way to identify an alternative mechanism for publishing this data while maintaining transparency about the costs MPs incurred in the course of their parliamentary duties.

## **6. Publication website**

### *IPSA/140515/4 – Publication website*

6.1. The Head of Communications introduced a paper setting out proposed improvements to IPSA's publication website, to ensure that the data it contained was presented fairly and in a way which was as user-friendly as possible.

6.2. The Board noted that:

- there was a distinction, already clear on the publication website, between MPs' costs (such as running an office and employing staff) on the one hand and their personal expenses on the other (such as travel and subsistence);
- some MPs felt that the use of aggregate totals for all expenditure over the course of the year led to unfair comparisons, not least where business costs were conflated with what would by others be considered to be 'expenses';

6.3. The Board agreed:

- that it was important that the publication website made clear the purpose of each budget, and the end to which it was to be used;
- that the website should be changed to make clear the distinction between office costs, accommodation costs, travel and subsistence costs and miscellaneous costs;
- to publish information on each MPs' budget, the reason for that budget (e.g. if they have received a contingency uplift), as well as their expenditure against it;
- to publish payroll and staffing costs as a single entry, rather than broken down;
- to continue, as now, to publish the total expenditure incurred by each MP;
- to publish details of all contingency applications; and
- to make clear on the website that side-by-side comparisons of total expenditure could be misleading.

## **7. MPs' and MEPs' pension schemes**

### *IPSA/140515/5 – MPs' pension scheme, partnership-style pensions and reform of the MEPs' pension scheme*

7.1. The Head of Policy introduced a paper setting out the proposed approach to the ceiling and floor in MPs' pension scheme, to the proposal that MPs be offered partnership-type pensions as an alternative, and to the introduction of a new scheme for MEPs.

### Ceiling and floor in the MPs' pension scheme

7.2. The Board agreed:

- to introduce a ceiling and floor within the MPs' pension scheme to control the long-term cost and to protect members of the scheme from short-term volatility, as in other public-service pension schemes being introduced by the Government;
- only to count the costs of service in the new (post-2015) CARE scheme for the purposes of calculating the ceiling and floor;
- given the risk of volatility that would exist if IPSA were to take a different approach, to discount income received by the PCPF from investments in calculating the ceiling and floor;
- that the mechanism for managing the cost of the scheme should be rates of contribution; and
- to assess the ceiling and floor at the same time as the triennial valuation of the scheme.

### Partnership-style pensions for MPs

7.3. The Board noted that:

- while partnership-type pension were available to some in the Civil Service, they were principally available to those on low pay or working in the Civil Service for a relatively short period and would, therefore, need the portability of a partnership scheme; and
- the circumstances for MPs were different.

7.4. The Board agreed not to offer partnership-style pensions to MPs.

### Reforming the MEPs' pension scheme

7.5. The Board noted that:

- IPSA was responsible for the pension scheme for just six MEPs, who had opted out of the centralised pay arrangements for MEPs; and
- there were strong cost-effectiveness arguments against introducing a new pension scheme, not least that few, if any, MEPs would actually be subject to the new scheme.

7.6. The Board agreed not to introduce an entirely new pension scheme for MEPs.

**8. Any other business**

8.1. There was no other business.