

MMINUTES

R&R Programme Board

Meeting date	17 December 2024
Meeting location	Ministerial Conference Room, Palace of Westminster
Meeting time	13:00-15:00

Attendees

Programme Board	Officials
Judith Cummins MP	Charlotte Simmonds (Client Team)
Lord Vaux of Harrowden	James Young (Client Team)
Lord Collins of Highbury	Andy Helliwell (Lords)
Marie Goldman MP	Michael Torrance (Lords)
Mark Tami MP	Tanya Coff (Delivery Authority)
Steve Hails	Matt White (Delivery Authority)
Dr Michele Dix	Katya Cassidy (Client Team)
Paul Duffree	Meg Conway Wait (Client Team)
Sir Jonathan Stephens	Bev Weston (Commons)
Simon Burton	Jenni Singleton (Client Team)
Tom Goldsmith	Andy Piper (Delivery Authority) (for item 5)

1. Welcome and standing items

The Chair welcomed everyone to the December meeting of the R&R Programme Board.

The Programme Board agreed to the publication of the minutes of the meeting on 26 November.

2. Update from Managing Director of the Client Team and monthly highlight report

The Managing Director of the Client Team updated the Board, including on:

- the Programme Highlight Report for October, including that the R&R Client Board had requested sight of ongoing summary of costs across all areas which would be provided through the report in future;
- discussions at the December R&R Client Board meeting and key directions given on temporary accommodation and continuation of work on all three options;

- a planned meeting between the Chair and the President of the House of Commons Trade Union side in response to his letter to the R&R Client Board to discuss ongoing engagement;
- the independent review of effectiveness of R&R governance, reiterating that the role of the Programme Board remains aligned with the role set out in the terms of reference and suggesting that the Programme Board consider them in light of the review recommendations; and
- the planned all-Member email from the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Programme Board due to be sent in January.

The Board discussed the timescale of the advice that the Programme Board would provide to the Client Board. Board members noted that it was critical that the Client Board was provided with the necessary information to understand the differences in maturity between the options.

The R&R Programme Board noted the update from the MD of the Client Team and the October Programme highlight report.

3. Options assessment process

Client Team officials briefed the Board on the options assessment process.

The Board requested more detail on the objectives and assessment criteria, including detail from a health and safety perspective throughout the construction process and information on disruption to business of the Houses, and how disruption would be measured.

Board members requested that information about the impact on the cultural value of the building and UK tourism be included in the assessment of the options.

The Board discussed and agreed the importance of ensuring information was presented in a format that could be comprehensible to the Boards and Houses, including use of images or other methods to explain different types of disruption or to explain different phases or stages and the lived experience, the impact on the building and risks or benefits during them for each option and the variance between options.

The Board was supportive of re-using the model developed for the earlier down-selection and 'scenario-based', weighted analysis of options to allow for objective comparison over the different delivery timescales for the three options.

A Board member requested, and received, assurance that the approach was in line with HMT Green Book guidance and highlighted the need for a VFM assessment by the Accounting Officers.

Board members noted the importance of engagement with the unions and a plan for involving them in discussions.

The Board requested a revised plan on a page for 2025 so that the Board can effectively track progress in the coming year.

The Board agreed to consider options for changing the name of the EMI option and its two variants (BAU and BAU+) to better represent the scale of the work intended.

The R&R Programme Board:

- a) *noted the proposed approach and timeline for assessing the different options for delivering the R&R Programme, and how temporary accommodation and phasing will be considered;*
- b) *considered whether the Programme Board requires a particular focus on specific criteria or topics to support the assessment process; and*
- c) *noted the approach to assurance of the information presented to support the options assessment process.*

4. Quarterly progress reports

Client Team officials briefed the Board.

The Board discussed the inclusion of business as usual work in the progress reports and requested clearer wording to distinguish works not formally part of the R&R Programme.

A Board member requested a change to the description of the Early Works milestone, to avoid giving the impression that design work for early works project had completed.

The Board discussed the cost information included in the reports. It was agreed that the Client Team would take forward work on how to include wider R&R financial information in the quarterly reports ensuring alignment with other reporting.

The R&R Programme Board approved the quarterly reports covering the periods April to June 2024 and July to September 2024.

5. Phasing

Delivery Authority officials briefed the Board on phasing of the R&R works.

The Board discussed phasing, including the similarities between a phased approach and continued presence and EMI.

The Board noted the importance of collaboration between Strategic Estates and the Delivery Authority and were provided with assurance that ongoing collaboration, including monthly design forums, was effective and providing information to feed into ongoing Board discussions on comparability and variance.

The R&R Programme Board noted the progress made on identifying and evaluating how phasing could be applied to the continued presence option.

6. Any other business and date of next meeting

The Programme Board discussed a paper on public polling.

Delivery Authority officials provided information to the Board on cost comparability with other major projects, noting that there were lessons to be learnt from other renovation work but the scope of R&R is very different from other notable restoration works (e.g. Notre Dame).

Board members were informed that the Sub-Board were assured about the competence and capability of the external technical assurance being commissioned.

The date of the next meeting would be 21 January 2025.