

MINUTES

R&R Programme Board

Meeting date	17 April 2023
Meeting location	Ministerial Conference Room, Palace of Westminster
Meeting time	13:00-16:00

Attendees

Programme Board	Officials
Nigel Evans MP	Dr Patsy Richards (Client Team)
Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP	David Goldstone (Delivery Authority)
Sir Edward Leigh MP	Charlotte Simmonds (Client Team/Commons)
Mark Tami MP	James Young (Client Team)
Wera Hobhouse MP	Andy Helliwell (Lords)
Lord Sherbourne of Didsbury	Kate Meanwell (Lords)
Simon Burton	Matt White (Delivery Authority)
Steve Hails	Mike Everett (Commons)
Sir Jonathan Stephens	Marek Kubala (Client Team)
Lord Morse	Meg Collins (Lords)
Paul Duffree	John Thursfield (Client Team)
	Richard Judge, IAAP Member
	Andy Piper (Delivery Authority)
	Chris Dawson (Client Team)
	Chris Elliott (Commons)
	Jenni Singleton (Client Team)
	Phil Dennison (Client Team)

1. Welcome and Standing Items

Nigel Evans MP chaired the meeting.

Apologies were received from Lord Collins of Highbury and Sir John Benger.

Programme Board members agreed the minutes of meeting of 28 March, subject to the following amendments:

- Item 5 amended to reflect the Board’s discussion on the complexity and importance of asbestos as a health and safety concern.
- The DA said that Item 4 should reflect that the DA would publish the technical report on options, subject to approval of the report itself by the Programme Board and endorsement of the R&R Client Board.

The Board agreed to publish the Minutes on the website.

2. Update from Managing Director of the Client Team

The Managing Director (MD) updated the Board on drone and survey works over the Easter Recess and briefed the Board on the new format Quarterly Report for Q4 of 2022-23, which was proposed to be published on the Board’s website alongside the IAAP report.

The Board was informed that further external assurance of the options development and assessment process had been carried out by David Orr, an external independent expert. His review had given ‘reasonable assurance’ for the Programme, the highest level of assurance that could be expected for a programme of this scale and complexity. Recommendations focused on clear engagement, transparent decision making, understanding and explaining uncertainty in the estimates and managing future change. The report would be circulated to the Board, who would also see an overall assurance plan at the next meeting.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) noted the update from the Managing Director of the Client Team; and
 - b) endorsed the publication of the Quarterly Report, subject to inclusion of financial information once available.
-

3. Visit to Manchester Town Hall

Staff from the Client Team (CT) briefed the Board on proposals for a day visit to Manchester Town Hall, currently undergoing its own restoration works. Board Members asked about the value and timing of the visit and which decisions the visit would help inform. In response, DA and CT officials said that the Manchester Programme, which was at a later stage in their restoration works, faced similar challenges to R&R. The visit would provide the Board with a better understanding of the risks involved in restoring a heritage building, and the delivery constraints in doing so, and could help inform shortlisting.

The R&R Programme Board approved the Board visit to Manchester Town Hall.

4. Member Engagement

CT and House of Lords officials briefed the Board on the proposals for 1:1 engagement with Members and Peers, which was proposed to commence at the beginning of May to seek feedback

on possible trade-offs required by the Programme. Party groups would be offered briefings and uptake for the 1:1 engagement would be encouraged by Party whips. The Board's views were sought on the draft engagement materials, including the draft questions for 1:1 interviews.

In the discussion, the following points were made:

- Engagement was important but would be challenging. It was important to be realistic about how many Members would take up the offer of 1:1 engagement.
- Material used for engagement should make clear the cost of doing nothing and include information on health and safety, while also seeking to highlight the benefits of restoring the Palace.
- The ordering of the questions should be reconsidered, to enable the Board to better understand Member priorities.
- Members and Peers would want information on temporary accommodation if they were being asked for feedback on possible decant lengths.

The Board noted that the absence of information on decant/temporary accommodation was problematic and discussed whether engagement should be split into separate phases. In response to Board Member questions on when information on temporary accommodation would be available, the CT said that a paper would be brought to the Board's next meeting setting out the options for temporary accommodation during R&R works, which would need to be provisionally confirmed before the summer recess. The Board welcomed this and requested that information on existing office space be included. The Board agreed that political discussions would be needed to determine the availability of temporary accommodation options, including the QEII Conference centre, and that CT and House staff could engage with senior stakeholders on what temporary accommodation options, including the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, might be available.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) agreed that Member engagement be split into two phases and that phase one would commence in May, focusing on 1:1 engagement on trade-offs concerning cost, disruption, duration out of the Palace, future-proofing works, and office space;
 - b) agreed that phase two would focus on engagement on temporary accommodation; and
 - c) agreed that the finalised material for engagement in May should be approved by the Chair and Deputy Chair.
-

5. Oral briefing from the Independent Advice and Assurance Panel

The Board was briefed by Richard Judge, lead member of the Independent Advice and Assurance Panel (IAAP), on the IAAP's report on the Programme. The Board discussed the recommendations from the report, including the need to improve engagement, design for uncertainty and the necessity of being upfront about the true costs of delay to the works. The Board also discussed the Parliamentary Buildings (Restoration and Renewal) Act 2019 ('the Act') and the need to further explore the art of the possible under the Act, including the extent to which work could be broken

down into phases. The DA noted that whilst the Act placed constraints on R&R works until the Houses had agreed and approved fully costed proposals, there was also significant constraint in the nature of works. The Board requested that the Client Team produce a glossary of key terms for phasing and that the DA, CT and Strategic Estates (SE) produce a paper exploring the art of the possible for R&R works under the Act. The DA, CT and SE agreed to do this.

The Board thanked Richard Judge for attending, and for the work of the IAAP in carrying out their review.

The R&R Programme Board considered the findings of the IAAP and their implications for the shortlisting of Delivery Options.

6. Phasing and Visualising R&R

The Board was briefed by the DA on recent, on-going and proposed phasing of R&R works through possible projects for early R&R works and enabling works, and was shown visualisations of what the Palace might look like during the main R&R works. A Board Member asked about the scope of enabling works, and whether the Act would need amending to allow these. In response, the DA confirmed that preparatory works were permitted under the Act. Planning permission requirements were discussed and whether any of the proposed outcome levels presented an issue from a planning perspective. A Board Member sought confirmation that R&R main works could be phased, the DA confirmed that it was possible, and two construction scenarios did allow for it but required significant additional temporary services. The Board requested that the DA and CT prepare a paper on visualisation and early works for the R&R Client Board, which would also include a summary of what was possible under the Act. The Board also requested that the DA and SE further develop the options proposed for preparatory, early and enabling works. The DA, CT and SE agreed to this.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) noted the recent, on-going and proposed phasing of restoration and renewal works;
 - b) noted the objectives of an early R&R project endorsed by the Client Board, and potential ideas for candidate projects; and
 - c) noted the type and quantum of R&R enabling works to prepare the Palace for the main works.
-

7. R&R Shortlisting of the Delivery Options

The Board resumed discussion on the shortlisting process. DA and CT officials re-presented the key evaluation criteria for the remaining options under consideration, and the Board considered how they could reduce the delivery options and identify a 'landing zone' or shortlist. The Board discussed the lower Outcome Levels and whether they would deliver outcomes compatible with modern building and health and safety and other standards. The Board requested that the DA

prepare a paper for the next meeting, setting out further information on the scope and benefits achieved from each Outcome Level, including health and safety risk, and any legal or planning related issues. The DA agreed to do this.

Construction Scenarios were discussed, and the following points and queries were raised:

- Construction Scenario is the biggest driver of risk and cost
- The Board needed to understand whether there was a risk of costs being more likely to rise under particular Construction Scenarios or Outcome levels.
- The Board needed to see and understand how the DA had calculated their assumptions on the cost risk of disruption.
- Board Members asked whether assumptions on costs for temporary accommodation were reflected in the cost estimates the DA had prepared. In response, the DA confirmed they had included assumptions on decant cost in their figures.
- Board Members asked whether it was possible to calculate how the cost of repair work and maintenance might come down over a 30-year period under each option.

The Board requested that the DA prepare a short summary of disruption and risk for each Construction Scenario for the next meeting, and information on how they had calculated their assumptions on cost risk of disruption. The DA agreed to do this. The Board also requested that the DA, working with in-House teams, prepare information on how much maintenance spend/cost was expected to be reduced by under each option. The DA agreed to do this once a landing zone or shortlist had been identified.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) noted the content of the paper on Delivery Options and its supporting appendix, which provided a summary of the process of shortlisting delivery options;
 - b) considered the delivery options, construction scenarios and outcome levels; and
 - c) requested further information on outcome levels and construction scenarios for the next meeting.
-

8. Any other business and date of next meeting

There was no other business.

The date of the next meeting was Wednesday 10 May, 14:00-17:00. The Chair reminded the Board that the National Audit Office had been invited to attend part of the meeting to discuss value for money.

9. Papers to note

The Board noted the forward look.