

MINUTES

R&R Programme Board

Meeting date	12 December 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)
Lord Morse	Charlotte Simmonds (Client Team/Commons)
Sir Geoffrey Clifton Brown MP	James Young (Client Team)
Mark Tami MP	Andy Helliwell (Lords)
Wera Hobhouse MP	Kate Meanwell (Lords)
Lord Sherbourne of Didsbury	David Goldstone (Delivery Authority)
Paul Duffree	Mike Everett (Commons)
Lord Collins of Highbury	Jenni Singleton (Client Team)
Tom Goldsmith	Bev Weston (Commons)
Simon Burton	Chris Elliott (Commons)
Dr Michele Dix	Chris Dawson (Commons)
Steve Hails	Tanya Coff (Delivery Authority)
Sir Jonathan Stephens	Catherine Murphy (Delivery Authority)

1. Welcome and Standing Items

Nigel Evans MP chaired the meeting.

Apologies were received from Sir Edward Leigh MP.

Programme Board Members agreed the Minutes for the meeting of 21 November, subject to the following amendments:

- Item 2 –proposed amendment to better reflect discussion at the previous meeting: Board Members felt strongly that if indicative costs were not included in the strategic case, it would not enable a properly informed or transparent debate in Parliament.
- Item 5 DA supplementary Estimate – removal of the words *in addition to*, third line.

Subject to the changes above, the Programme Board agreed to their publication on the PB website.

There were no matters arising.

2. Update from Managing Director of the Client Team

The Managing Director (MD) of the Client Team (CT) updated the Board on the revised strategic case, which had been reduced in length, contained more information on the sequencing and timing of works, and further clarity on the fallback option of enhanced maintenance and improvement. Indicative costs had also been removed from the draft, following feedback from the Client Board on 14 November but four options were presented in an annex, to show how costs could be covered, should Client Board so wish. Client Board Members would be consulted individually in early January on the revised draft, ahead of usual pre-briefings and then formal Client Board consideration on 5 February.

The November Highlight Report was being prepared and would be circulated to Board Members separately.

The MD, Chief Executive of the Delivery Authority, and the Accounting Officers would be appearing before the Parliamentary Works Estimates Commission on 10 January for scrutiny of the DA's Supplementary Estimate.

The R&R Programme Board **noted** the update from the MD of the Client Team.

3. Revised Strategic Case

The Board was briefed on the revised strategic case report, noting the feedback from the Client Board's meeting on 14 November. During the discussion which followed, the following points were made:

- Board Members questioned what would happen to the programme's timetable if the Client Board did not agree the report in February. In response, the Accounting Officers said that they would need to consider whether delay would result in undue risk or nugatory spend, and that they would need to offer advice to both Boards in that eventuality. The DA said that further delay was likely to affect confidence in the programme and raise questions about the DA's mandate for further expenditure.
- It was noted that presenting a strategic case to the Houses at this stage was a commitment that had been given but not a requirement under the Parliamentary Buildings (Restoration and Renewal) Act 2019.
- Board Members noted that the revised draft should include more detail on the shortlisting process which the Board undertook between March and June, to better demonstrate the rigorous work done to identify a credible shortlist.
- Board Members suggested that the enhanced maintenance and improvement 'fallback option' be compared to the two shortlisted options using an image or table in order to

provide greater detail; they were keen to make it clearer that the scope is untested but likely to be less transformational and entail greater health and safety risks which may be more costly and disruptive to mitigate, all of which underlined the need for further work to support its assessment.

- Board Members noted concern with the enhanced maintenance and improvement fallback option, particularly the health and safety risks posed which they considered would need careful mitigation. The revised report should make clearer the circumstances under which the enhanced maintenance and improvement fallback option would be pursued.
- Board Members said that the revised report should emphasise that there are two recommended options, which have been endorsed by the Client Board, plus a fallback option for consideration if, at a later date, the Houses fail to agree with either of the shortlisted options; the Board noted associated risks with further delay.
- The Board's unanimous view was that full indicative costings should be included in the revised strategic case, particularly with a view to ensuring any debates in the Houses before Easter were appropriately informed.
- Board Members requested to see the revised strategic case again before it was discussed by Client Board at their February meeting. It was noted that the timing of the next Programme and Client Board meetings would make this challenging but Programme Board Members would see the revised strategic case again.

The R&R Programme Board **reviewed** the revised draft Client Board report on the strategic case.

4. Temporary Accommodation Update

The Board was provided with an update on temporary accommodation from CT and Strategic Estates (SE) staff. Clarity was sought by Board Members on the timing and sequencing of works on the Northern Estate (NE). SE staff said that SE was adopting a less linear approach to the sequencing and that works were being staggered over a number of years. SE was planning and prioritising sequencing on the NE around decant requirements rather than asset replacement.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- A Board Member sought clarification that work on Portcullis House (PCH) roof would not impede access to the NE and requested information from SE on planned works to PCH. SE confirmed that access would be maintained, although alternative routes might be required, and agreed to provide the Board with information on planned works to PCH.
- Board Members asked why RH was being developed by SE and not the DA. In response, SE said that work on Richmond House (RH) is interrelated with works on Norman Shaw North and the wider Northern Estate, which is being delivered by SE. Transferring RH to the DA would add further risk due to operating in a constrained environment.
- Board Members asked for clarification by the next Board meeting regarding which individual on the Client Board has overall accountability for ensuring SE delivers temporary accommodation and that there are no slippages.
- Board Members noted that a key concern raised at the last Client Board meeting was around the timetable and sequencing of temporary accommodation works, and requested that information on sequencing would be brought back to the Board. Proper

oversight and assurance would be needed on sequencing for both Programme Board and Client Board. The CT and SE confirmed that the intention was for works by SE on RH to be reported to the R&R programme board and to use programme approval routes to speed some internal processes.

The R&R Programme Board **noted** the progress on temporary accommodation and that a temporary accommodation strategy paper will be brought to the Board in January 2024.

5. Delivery Authority Annual Estimate for 2024/25 and three-year Business Plan to 2026/27

DA officials briefed the Board on the DA's Main Estimate for 2024/25 and three-year business plan. The proposed Estimate totals £83m and had been developed in the context of continuing uncertainty about the scale and timing of many DA activities. An organisational review was undertaken by the DA over spring/summer 2023. This had resulted in the reduction of around 20 staff roles and much more significant reduction in contracted resources. The Estimate had been scrutinised by the R&R Sub Board, who were content with the budget. Programme Board Members noted that the three-year plan would need to be reviewed again as circumstances may change. The DA confirmed that the plan would be updated as assumptions changed and shared with the Board at later dates. The Board also noted that, if endorsed, the Estimate would subsequently be reviewed by the Client Board before it was considered by the Parliamentary Works Estimates Commission.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) **endorsed** the 2024/25 Annual Estimate of £83m;
- b) **noted** the proposed revised Phase 1 Expenditure Limit (P1EL) of £426m to 2024/25 and Phase 1 Cost Assessment (P1CA) of £515m to 2025/26; and
- c) **reviewed** the Three-Year Business Plan to 2026/7

6. Any other business and date of next meeting

A Board Member requested a paper from the DA setting out the accessibility improvements that would be delivered under the shortlisted Outcome Level (OL4). The DA agreed to provide this.

The next meeting would be 23 January, 1300-1600.

7. Papers to note

The Board noted the forward look.