

BOARD OF THE SHADOW SPONSOR BODY

Title	Meeting Minutes	
Meeting Date	20 January 2020	
Location	Archbishop's Room, Millbank House	
Time	Start	3.30pm
	End	6.30pm

Board Members Present

Elizabeth Peace (Chair)
 Lord Carter of Coles
 Neil Gray MP
 Brigid Janssen
 Marta Phillips
 Baroness Scott of Needham Market
 Mark Tami MP
 Dr Simon Thurley
 Simon Wright

Officials in Attendance

Name	Position	Item
John Benger	Clerk of the House of Commons	
Kate Meanwell	R&R Director, House of Lords	
Sarah Johnson	CEO, shadow Sponsor Body	3
Matthew White	Programme Delivery Director, R&R Programme	4
Susannah Street	Board Secretary, shadow Sponsor Body	
Johanna Porter	Governance Support Officer, shadow Sponsor Body	
John Cryer	Programme Director, NEP	5
Amanda Colledge	Business Case Director, shadow Sponsor Body	6
Andy Piper	Design Director, R&R Programme	6
Ainsley Moore	PwC Business Case Team Lead	6
Graham McClements	Design Lead, BDP	6
Gurdip Juty	Interim Chief Operating Officer, shadow Sponsor Body	7
Mike Brough	Director of Commissioning and Delivery Assurance, shadow Sponsor Body	8
Alex Bell	Alex Bell, Workstream Lead, NEP Integration, shadow Sponsor Body	
Richard Caseby	Director of External Relations, shadow Sponsor Body	9

Apologies

Lord Deighton, Lord Geidt and Ed Ollard (Clerk of the Parliaments) sent their apologies; Kate Meanwell (R&R Director, House of Lords) represented Ed Ollard.

Declarations of Interest

At the October meeting it had been recorded that Simon Wright would be made the SRO (Senior Responsible Officer) for the Estate-Wide Engineering Infrastructure and Resilience (EWEIR) Programme. However, it had since been agreed that Simon would act instead as a strategic advisor.

1 Chair's Introduction

The Board elected Marta Phillips as acting Chair until Liz Peace could arrive. Marta welcomed the Board and congratulated Mark Tami and Neil Gray on their re-election.

Marta briefed the Board on an oral question that would be asked in the House of Lords by Baroness Rawlings on 6 February 2020.

The Board discussed press reports that the House of Lords might relocate to York. It was agreed that a letter would be sent to senior members of both Houses to confirm that the Programme would continue with the plans for the temporary decant of the House of Lords to the QEII Conference Centre unless it was instructed otherwise.

2 Notes from the previous session

The Chair had proposed some amendments to the informal notes of discussion from the December informal Board information session; the revised text would be sent to the Board.

3 Shadow Sponsor Body Progress Report

SSB/20/002

Sarah Johnson spoke to her report. She informed the Board that the National Audit Office (NAO) had begun interviewing selected staff to inform their factual report on the Programme, which would be published in Spring 2020.

Liz Peace arrived at the meeting and resumed her role as Chair.

Sarah and Matt White had met with the Infrastructure and Projects Authority to discuss lessons learnt from transport projects. They would update the Board at a future meeting.

Sarah also informed the Board that the Sponsor Body's financial figures had been reviewed and would continue to be updated over the coming meetings.

Sarah was asked if the Sponsor's risk register had been updated to reflect risks arising from a change in Government. Sarah said that the whole register was under review and the Board would be updated at their meeting on 24 February 2020.

A query was raised about the progress of the Parliamentary Relationship Agreement (PRA). Sarah said that she was happy with its progress and that the Board would be updated at their meeting on 3 February 2020.

Benchmarking visits were being planned: value for money would be prioritised and the Commons Select Committee guidance (Liaison Committee guidelines for overseas travel¹) would be followed.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

4 R&R Programme Progress Report Period: November 2019 SSB/20/003

Matt White introduced the paper and told the Board that there had been no Health & Safety incidents in the period. He noted that the Delivery team's efforts were closely focused on supporting the Business Case strategy for the Palace, rather than on closing out RIBA stage I on the Palace, which was less critical. He went on to update the Board on the progress of the Lords decant project business case, which was expected to be completed in the autumn, and an ongoing review of different cost options.

The Board asked questions about the ownership, progress and expectations of the Heritage Collections decant project. Work was ongoing to clarify the scope of the project, and to catalogue heritage items within the Palace. Matt was questioned about the proposed financial estimate for the project included in the four-year Medium Term Investment Plan, and whether it was proportional to the requirements of the assets, many of which were currently in daily use. Matt explained that as the scope of the project had not yet been finalised the estimate was very high-level and would be subject to considerable challenge and refinement as the scope became clearer; he also reminded the Board that part of the project would also consolidate existing storage facilities.

Matt informed the Board that the Delivery Team's costs had been understated in the report due to issues with the financial systems; the financial figures were under review and would continue to be updated over the coming meetings. The Team were forecasting a significant underspend which was partially due to not spending contingency funds.

The Board discussed the Delivery Team's milestones, and how the report should reflect progress against the Team's plan. Matt said these had been refreshed for the next period.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

5 NEP Highlight Report December 2019 SSB/20/004

The Board discussed the paper, which John Cryer introduced. Liz requested that the Board be updated on the proposed resilience requirements for NEP.

John noted that a Freedom of Information request relating to the NEP, and with specific reference to Richmond House, had been responded to on 17 January 2020. The Board discussed the importance of sound record keeping.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

¹ Liaison Committee guidelines for overseas travel, <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/liaison-committee/role/liaison-committee-guidelines-for-overseas-travel/>

6 Common Elements Decision Paper: Minimum Accretions

SSB/20/005

Amanda Colledge introduced the paper, which was the first Decision Paper of the agreed Business Case Strategy: the decisions made on the basis of these papers would build into a set of 'common elements' that would be common to all the scheme options presented in the Palace Outline Business Case, in combination with different scheme variables which the Board would consider later in the year. The paper considered how the development of the Palace design should take account of the text in the Resolutions agreed by both Houses in early 2018 that the Programme should remove "unnecessary and unsightly accretions to the Palace".

The Business Case team had considered external accretions to the Palace that had been added following the completion of Barry's original design in the mid-1800s. An assessment had been carried out by BDP which further categorised whether any such accretions were a) intrusive and b) unnecessary. The findings of this assessment had been supported by Simon Thurley and were consistent with the Palace Conservation Management Plan. Using this assessment and assessments regarding technical delivery, cost barriers and strategic benefits, the Board was asked to provide steers to the Programme Design team regarding which accretions should be removed as a minimum as part of the 'common elements' design interventions. The Board also noted accretions which would be considered as part of future options and decision papers. The paper noted that the strategic steers that had been requested from the Houses in July 2019, including on accretions, were anticipated in spring 2020.

The Board **ENDORSED** the objectives relating to the treatment of external 'intrusive' accretions as follows:

1. Objective 1: To remove any 'intrusive' accretions that currently have no necessary function (subject to VfM considerations).
2. Objective 2: To seek to replace any 'intrusive' temporary accretions that currently have a necessary function, with more sympathetic interventions or seek to make said accretions less 'intrusive' (subject to VfM considerations).
3. Objective 3: To acknowledge that there are a number of permanent 'intrusive' accretions with a current necessary function, and to consider them on a case-by-case basis in the Space Strategy paper to understand whether a less intrusive alternative should be found.
4. Objective 4: To seek to avoid the addition of any accretions that are likely to be considered 'intrusive' as part of the interventions brought about by the R&R Programme.

The Board **APPROVED** the recommendations for each category of accretions as follows:

- a. The Board **agreed** the proposed categorisation of accretions as covered by Objective 1, and **agreed** to provide a steer to remove those in this category.

- b. The Board **agreed** the proposed categorisation of accretions as covered by Objective 2 as ‘intrusive’, temporary accretions that were not located specifically for their function (and should be able to be accommodated elsewhere in the future Palace site).

Accordingly, the Board **agreed** to provide a steer to remove these accretions as a minimum, and to seek options for the re-provision of the space, which would be considered in the Space Strategy options paper.

The Board **agreed** the proposed categorisation of accretions as covered by Objective 2 as ‘intrusive’, temporary accretions that were located specifically for their current function.

The Board **agreed** that the aspiration was for these accretions to be made less intrusive, but that this would need to be considered in their strategy-specific options papers, as set out in the paper.

- c. The Board **agreed** the proposed categorisation of accretions as covered by Objective 3 as permanent ‘intrusive’ accretions with a current necessary function.

Accordingly, the Board **agreed** that whether these accretions should be made less intrusive or removed would need to be considered in the Space Strategy paper.

The steers provided by the Board would have to be confirmed in the context of the overall scheme, which would be considered by the Board in the common elements scheme paper expected in autumn 2020.

7 2020/21 Sponsor Body Financial Plan Update and Phase I Expenditure Limit Proposal

SSB/20/006

Gurdip Juty reminded the Board that they had considered the draft Programme Medium-Term Investment Plan (MTIP) for 2020/21 to 2023/24 in September 2019. He explained that this paper showed the changes that had been made as the draft MTIP had been refined since the autumn prior to its final confirmation. Sarah Johnson informed the Board that the MTIP was in the process of being signed off by both Houses. She said that the Phase I Expenditure Limit would replace the MTIP after the Sponsor Body became substantive, and that the Board would have the opportunity to review this before the end of the current Financial Year.

The Board discussed the paper and **AGREED** the revised MTIP for 2020/21 to 2023/24 for the Sponsor Body and R&R Programme Delivery.

The Board **AGREED** a 2020/21 Estimate for the Sponsor Body, noting that the split between resource and capital was subject to ongoing technical discussions with HM Treasury and inclusion of NEP.

The Board also **AGREED** the Phase I Expenditure Limit methodology.

8 Accountability Transfer Review (ATR): Transfer of Sponsorship Functions for NEP to the SSB

SSB/20/007

Mike Brough introduced the paper, which discussed the outcome of the Accountability Transfer Review regarding the transfer of sponsor functions for the Northern Estate Programme to the SSB, which had been conducted in November, and proposed actions in response. Sarah Johnson said that the ATR had largely confirmed what was already known. Further reviews that had been proposed would be consolidated into one review, which would start in the second week of February and provide an in-depth review of Workstream I, the Programme Delivery Agreement (PDA) and the Parliamentary Relationship Agreement (PRA), and Parliamentary readiness for the separation.

The Board discussed the paper and **NOTED** the recommendations made in the ATR. The Board **ENDORSED** the proposed approach to completing the actions set out in the paper in readiness for the Sponsor Body becoming substantive.

9 Political Update

Richard Caseby led a discussion on the current political landscape. He informed the Board of the work that the Programme was doing to engage with the new Government and new Members. The Board **NOTED** the update and requested to receive a paper on the engagement strategy at an upcoming meeting.

AOB

It was noted that the Board had, by correspondence, given their consent to the recommended appointment of David Goldstone CBE as the Delivery Authority Chief Executive (Designate). The terms of this appointment had been laid out in the paper titled 'Recruitment of Delivery Authority Chief Executive (Designate): Selection Panel Report and Recommendation' (SSB/20/001).

Next Meeting

The Board's next meeting would be on Monday 3 February 2020.

Small sections of these minutes have been redacted, usually for reasons such as commercial confidentiality and sensitive management information.