

## MINUTES

R&R Client Board

|                         |                |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Meeting date</b>     | 17 July 2023   |
| <b>Meeting location</b> | Boothroyd Room |
| <b>Meeting time</b>     | 17:00–18:30    |

### Attendees

| <b>Client Board</b>             | <b>Programme Board (in attendance)</b> |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Nickie Aiken MP                 | Nigel Evans MP                         |
| Sir John Benger                 | Lord Morse                             |
| Deidre Brock MP                 |  |
| Simon Burton                    | <b>Other Members (in attendance)</b>   |
| Marianne Cwynarski              | Earl Howe                              |
| Thangam Debbonaire MP           |  |
| Lord Gardiner of Kimble         | <b>Officials</b>                       |
| Lord German                     | Michael Berry (Lords)                  |
| Andy Helliwell                  | Mike Everett (Commons)                 |
| Sharon Hodgson MP               | David Goldstone (Delivery Authority)   |
| Sir Lindsay Hoyle MP (Chair)    | Gosia McBride (Commons)                |
| Lord Kinnoull                   | Kate Meanwell (Lords)                  |
| Lord McFall of Alcluith (Chair) | Ed Potton (Commons)                    |
| Baroness McIntosh of Hudnall    | Patsy Richards (Client Team)           |
| Penny Mordaunt MP               | Charlotte Simmonds (Commons)           |
| Lord Newby                      | Jenni Singleton (Client Team)          |
| Nora Senior                     | Tristan Stubbs (Lords)                 |
| Baroness Smith of Basildon      | Matthew White (Delivery Authority)     |
| Lord Vaux of Harrowden          | James Young (Client Team)              |
| Catherine Ward                  |  |

### 1. Welcome and Standing Items

Mr Speaker chaired the meeting.

Apologies were received from Shrinivas Honap, Lord True and Sir Charles Walker MP. Earl Howe, attending on behalf of Lord True, was welcomed to the meeting. Catherine Ward was welcomed to her first Client Board meeting.

Nigel Evans MP, Chair of the Programme Board, and Lord Morse, Deputy Chair of the Programme Board, were welcomed to the meeting.

---

**The R&R Client Board agreed the minutes of its meeting on 22 May 2023 with one amendment, and that they be published.**

---

## 2. Oral Update from interim Managing Director of the Client Team

The Client Team provided an update, and noted the positive progress made in reaching the stage at which R&R shortlisting and temporary accommodation could now be discussed by the Client Board.

---

**The R&R Client Board noted the update from the interim Managing Director of the Client Team.**

---

## 3. R&R Shortlisting and Temporary Accommodation

Nigel Evans MP, Chair of the Programme Board (PB), and Lord Morse, Deputy Chair of the Programme Board, updated the Client Board on shortlisting carried out by the Programme Board.

The Programme Board had shortlisted Outcome Level 4 for the Restoration and Renewal works. Lower outcome levels had been discounted for a number of reasons, including because they did not sufficiently comply with legislation, regulation and compliance standards. The PB also considered that Outcome Level 4 appeared to provide comparatively better value for money.

Outcome Level 4 would allow for benefits and improvements to operational efficiency including new fresh air ventilation and more comfortable heating and cooling to rooms and offices; further building fabric works focusing on restoration of high heritage rooms and thermal performance improvement works to building fabric and windows; and further fire protection measures to build in resilience against possible failure scenarios.

The Programme Board had shortlisted two “construction scenarios” regarding how the works could be delivered: one full decant option (Construction Scenario C) and one “continued presence” option which would see the Commons Chamber remain in the Palace in varying locations during the works (Construction Scenario F).

Given the range of views of Members across both Houses, the Programme Board considered that there were benefits to taking forward two different delivery options for further work and analysis to enable an evidence-based decision on a single preferred option at a later point, noting that the outcome level was the time-critical input for design at this stage in the programme.

It was proposed that the QEII Conference Centre should remain the preferred location for decant of the House of Lords subject to ongoing work, and the Northern Estate (Portcullis House and Richmond House) would continue to be explored as the location for any decant for the House of Commons.

Lord Morse reported on the work of the sub-board in relation to the Delivery Authority budget, noting that savings had been identified, and that further independent business and financial reviews might be needed as the project progressed.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- The importance of endorsement of the strategic case this year and for the business case to be considered as soon as possible, noting the ongoing costs of maintaining the Estate and the possible timing of the next Election. The Client Team noted that a decision by both Houses on a preferred option could come after the general election because detailed work would need to be done to provide costed proposals for the two shortlisted delivery options including risks and mitigations associated with them, but that it would be helpful for new and returning MPs to have a sense of what delivery option to expect.

- That before any vote on the subsequent costed proposals for the works it would be useful for Members to receive information on the cost and risks associated with not making a decision on R&R.
- That more detail was needed on costs of the various scenarios, particularly using net present value figures.
- That it was necessary to present a real choice between two options; some felt that only one option should be put forward given there was likely to be a difference in cost and time.
- Whether the options presented were sufficiently creative and whether the time and funding available for survey work had been maximised; in response it was noted that additional surveys had been carried out over the last two years and that the multiple options presented included new proposals and concepts for use of space.
- That another scenario had previously been presented to the Programme Board on a 'rolling programme of works', which broke the Palace down into zones, and whether this should be included; the Client Team noted that, subject to costing, an enhanced maintenance scenario, equivalent to a rolling programme, would be included in the proposal in line with good practice for business cases.
- That any option chosen would need to prioritise work in certain areas before others.
- The need for flexibility in the timing and the risk of additional costs being identified after or before the work commenced.
- That the Houses had been making progress with ensuring other areas of the Estate were upgraded in advance; but the ability to move out of the Palace was limited until additional space was available, and this should be factored into the schedule.
- That the R&R Act should not hinder R&R work being carried out at the same time as other ongoing projects.

---

#### **The R&R Client Board:**

**a) endorsed the recommended shortlist identified by the Programme Board, which would be presented compared to an enhanced maintenance (“do minimum”) option;**  
**b) agreed that Westminster Hall should not be used if a continued presence of one Chamber (construction scenario F) were to be maintained in the Palace; and**  
**c) endorsed that the QEII Conference Centre remained the preferred location for decant for the House of Lords subject to ongoing work, and that the Northern Estate (Portcullis House and Richmond House) should continue to be explored as the location for any decant of the House of Commons.**

---

## **4. Strategic Objectives and End State Vision**

The Client Team introduced the paper. There were seven proposed Strategic Objectives, focusing on: fire protection, health and safety, and security; business continuity; heritage; accessibility and inclusion; environment; social value lasting legacy; and value for money.

The paper also set out the approach to developing a short draft End State Vision Statement for the Programme. This would be based on the full End State Vision endorsed by the Programme Board, which was a series of statements describing the intended outcomes achieved by delivering Outcome Level 4. The aim of the End State Vision was to be broader than considering the physical building, and to be accompanied by a compelling narrative describing the wider opportunity and long-term outcomes.

The End State Vision Statement would be used for Member, Members’ staff and House staff engagement after Conference recess. The Programme Board had requested that the draft End State Vision Statement should focus on the Palace as the centre of the UK’s democratic system, which must be preserved for future generations.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- That the Programme’s support for stonemasonry skills across the UK represented a good example of social value.
- That the Strategic Objectives should underline the Programme’s support for developing skills across the UK.

---

**The R&R Client Board endorsed the Strategic Objectives, subject to an amendment to underline the Programme’s support for developing skills across the UK.**

---

## 5. Annual Progress Report and Quarterly Report

The Client Team introduced the paper. The paper sought the approval of the Client Board to lay and publish the first R&R annual progress report since the move of the Client Team in-house. It also provided the quarterly report covering the period April – June 2023 which had already been approved by the Programme Board and which would be published at the same time. The requirement for an annual progress report had been set out in the R&R Act.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- That the Sponsor Body had previously been responsible for the annual report.
- That the Annual Progress Report would be useful for communications and engagement around the Programme, and subject to debate in the Lords.
- That inclusion of information on ongoing surveys should be considered.

---

**The R&R Client Board:**

**a) agreed the publication of the draft annual progress report 2022/23 ahead of summer recess; and**

**b) noted that the quarterly report (2023–24 Q1) had been approved by the Programme Board and would be published at the same time.**

---

## 6. R&R Programme Board Member Nomination

The Client Team introduced the paper, which invited the Client Board to agree the nomination of a fourth external member of the Programme Board and to report this nomination prior to a motion for approval in both Houses.

---

**The R&R Client Board agreed the nomination of Dr Michèle Dix as a member of the R&R Programme Board and to report this nomination prior to a motion for approval in both Houses.**

---

## 7. Any other business and date of next meeting

The date of next meeting was 31 October 2023, 4.45pm–6.30pm.

## 8. Papers to note

**The Client Board noted the forward look.**