MINUTES

R&R Client Board

Meeting date	26 February 2024
Meeting location	Boothroyd Room
Meeting time	16:45–17:45

Attendees

Client Board	Programme Board (in attendance)
Simon Burton	Nigel Evans MP
Marianne Cwynarski	Lord Vaux of Harrowden
Lord Gardiner of Kimble	
Tom Goldsmith	**Officials**
Andy Helliwell	Michael Berry (Lords)
Sharon Hodgson MP	Meg Conway-Wait (Client Team)
Shrivinas Honap	Mike Everett (Commons)
The Earl of Kinnoull	David Goldstone (Delivery Authority)
Lord McFall of Alcluith (Chair)	Gosia McBride (Commons)
Baroness McIntosh of Hudnall	Kate Meanwell (Lords)
Lord McLoughlin	Patsy Richards (Client Team)
Charlotte Moar	Charlotte Simmonds (Client Team)
Penny Mordaunt MP	Matt Smith (Lords)
Lord Morse	Tristan Stubbs (Lords)
Lord Newby	James Whittle (Lords)
Lucy Powell MP	Helen Wood (Commons)
Baroness Scott of Needham Market	James Young (Client Team)
Nora Senior	
Baroness Smith of Basildon	
Lord True	
Catherine Ward	

1. Welcome and Standing Items

The Lord Speaker chaired the meeting.

Apologies were received from Sir Lindsay Hoyle MP, Deidre Brock MP, Nickie Aiken MP and Sir Charles Walker MP.

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

The R&R Client Board agreed the minutes of its meeting on 5 February 2024 with one amendment, and that they be published.

2. Strategic Case for R&R

The Board discussed the revised strategic case and noted that it was important for all three options to be developed and judged against the same criteria before being presented to the Houses in 2025. The Board agreed to publish the strategic case before the Easter recess, with minor amendments, and advised that publication of the strategic case should be supported by reactive communications, including Q&A.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- Publishing the Strategic Case would provide the programme with a clear mandate, and fulfil commitments to its publication.
- The Strategic Case was clearer and easier to read than earlier versions.
- It would be necessary to take legal advice on whether an amendment to the 2019 Act would be necessary in order to achieve the third option. Any amendments should also ensure accountability for the decisions eventually taken under R&R.
- It was important to maintain the timeframe for a decision of both Houses by 2025.
- The Programme Board had discussed that sufficient resources would be necessary to provide the capacity to meet this deadline.
- Each option should be assessed by what was possible given resources available.
- Avoiding a decision on R&R would not be cost-free.
- The EMI option would still require some level of decant.
- Communications on the Strategic Case should stress that progress had been made, and that the new governance structures had been able to achieve more "grip".
- Governance of whatever option was chosen should provide clear lines of accountability.

The R&R Client Board <u>approved</u> the revised draft of the strategic case for publication.

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

The Board discussed the Delivery Authority's (DA) Main Estimate of £83 million for 2024/25, noting that the Estimate had been scrutinised by the R&R Sub-Board and endorsed by the R&R Programme Board. The Board provisionally approved the DA's Annual Estimate of £83 million, subject to all Client Board Members being offered individual briefings with the Delivery Authority on the Estimate, ahead of each House Commission discussing the Estimate further as part of their consideration of the revised Phase 1 Expenditure Limit.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- The DA's remuneration committee had recommended that no bonuses be paid in 2024/25.
- The DA had made some redundancies to make sure it was the right size for where the programme had reached.
- The original budget had totalled £93 million. As a result of scrutiny sessions, the DA had agreed to reflect an overprogramming amount of £10 million.
- The budget had already undergone three levels of scrutiny; the DA board, Programme Board sub-board and Programme Board.
- More scrutiny had improved value for money of the DA spend; it was now essential that money spent on surveys would be spent efficiently.
- The DA had reinstated three-year planning. This had been helpful in lining up Parliament's estimates and the programme.
- Clarity was necessary for those carrying out work on R&R – changing decisions risked increasing costs.
- Board members sought clarification on DA spend on temporary accommodation work, increased organisational capacity, surveys and communication and engagement.

- Board members requested further information from the DA on what previous spend had delivered. A clear narrative would be needed on what had already been spent in previous financial years.

The R&R Client Board:
a) approved the 2024/25 Annual Estimate of £83 million;
b) noted the corresponding revision of the Phase 1 Expenditure Limit (P1EL) to £426 million to 2024/25 (ahead of the formal decision required by each Commission to revise the P1EL) and Phase 1 Cost Assessment (P1CA) of £515 million to 2025/26; and
c) reviewed the three-year business plan to 2026/27.

---

4. Any other business and date of next meeting

The date of next meeting was 10 June 2024, 5.00pm–6.30pm. [*This date was during the dissolution of Parliament and the meeting did not take place.]*

5. Papers to note

The Client Board noted the forward look and the R&R Quarterly Report for October–Dec 2023. The Board noted the correspondence from the Trade Union Side, dated 23 February 2024.