



Minutes

Sponsor Board

Meeting date	7 June 2021
Meeting location	Virtual Meeting
Meeting time	3.00pm – 6.30pm

Members Present

Liz Peace, Chair
Baroness Scott of Needham Market
Brigid Janssen
Damian Hinds MP
Ian Levy MP
Lord Best
Lord Carter of Coles
Lord Deighton
Mark Tami MP
Marta Phillips
Simon Thurley
Simon Wright

Attendees	Item
John Benger, Clerk of the House of Commons	All
Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body	1 - 11
Simon Burton, Clerk of the Parliaments, House of Lords	All
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, PwC	9
Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body	6 & 9
Bev Weston, Director of Capital Investment, Strategic Estates	6
Claire Maugham, Communications Director, Sponsor Body	1 - 11
David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority	1 - 11
Gurdip Juty, Finance & Corporate Services Director, Sponsor Body	7
James Young, Head of Programme, Risk & Assurance, Sponsor Body	5
Johanna Porter, Board Secretary, Sponsor Body	1 - 11
Karen Watling, Programme Director Executive Assistant	1 - 11
Lucy Owen, Chief of Staff, Sponsor Body	1 - 11
Marek Kubala, Head of Governance & Parliamentary Procedure	1 - 11
Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority	1 - 11
Mike Brough, Programme Assurance Director, Sponsor Body	6
Nigel Hall, Masterplan Design Manager, Jacobs	6



Private session

Official: Liz Peace, Chair, Sponsor Board

No minutes were recorded for this item.

1. Welcome, agenda and declarations of interest

1.1 The Chair opened the meeting. A quorum was present.

1.2 The Chair updated the Board on her recent meetings with Andrea Leadsom MP, Chris Grayling MP, the Lord Speaker and the Leader of the House of Commons.

1.3 Kirsty Blackman had sent her apologies. Ian Levy had been delayed and joined the meeting at 3.50pm.

1.4 The Board NOTED the meeting agenda (SB/21/053). The QEII update from the Business Case Team was moved ahead of the items on the Annual Report & Accounts, and Corporate Plan. The item on the Conservation Framework Group Output was deferred to the July meeting of the Sponsor Board.

1.5 There were no further declarations of interests made relevant to the items on the agenda, except where previously disclosed.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

2.1 **DECISION:** The Board APPROVED the minutes of the meeting held on 4 May (SB/21/054) as an accurate record of the meeting. The minutes would be signed electronically and published on the Programme [website](#).

2.2 **DECISION:** The Board reviewed the action log (SB/21/055) and NOTED progress against the actions since the last meeting. The following points were raised and noted:

2.2.1 Concern was expressed that an update on the Heritage Collections had been a long time in coming back to the Board. The Chief Executive for the Sponsor Body said that whilst the work had taken longer than originally anticipated an additional resource had been recruited, work was progressing well, and an update would come to the Board in July.

2.2.2 The Clerk of the Parliaments confirmed that the House of Lords was being updated on the Heritage Collections and Archive projects.



3. Sponsor Body Progress Report

(SB/21/056)

Period: May 2021

Official: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

3.1 The Chief Executive for the Sponsor Body introduced the updated Sponsor Body Progress Report. The 'issues for escalation' table on page 2 of the report would be used to highlight key points of concern each month. Items would remain on the list until resolved and the Board would be updated on progress each month. The Sponsor Body would be looking to the Board to provide advice, as well as challenge.

3.2 The following points were also raised and noted:

- 3.2.1 Ongoing interaction with Parliamentary colleagues was important. Anecdotal evidence suggested that many MPs agreed that R&R needed to happen. It was essential that the Programme achieved Value for Money (VfM) and ensured work was done 'right'. This would help justify costs in the long-term.
- 3.2.2 The Board was reassured that House of Commons Decant activities were running in parallel, rather than sequentially, and that work was being done in collaboration with House of Commons colleagues. A range of different scenarios were being developed, including options for a phased approach to decant, or a continued presence for the House of Commons within the Palace.
- 3.2.3 Since the publication of the Sponsor Body Progress Report a meeting had taken place between the CEO and the House Clerks regarding the backlog of requests for information. The meeting had been positive, and actions were being taken to address the issues.
- 3.2.4 Concern was expressed about the wording of the issue relating to Phase 1 Delivery. The CEO clarified that there were no new risks to the overall Phase 1 plan and agreed to review the wording of this item in the next report. The issue was intended to highlight that the timetable for completion of the planned work during Phase 1 is constrained but the CEO confirmed that overall progress, risks and issues are reviewed on a fortnightly basis between the Sponsor Body and Delivery Authority. Any new risks would be brought to the attention of the Board.
- 3.2.5 The continued presence remained a big risk for the Programme. The report needed to include a section on this. The risk heat map was useful but contained too many for the Board to keep track of.
- 3.2.6 Public engagement was going well. Feedback from the Domestic Committees on Parliamentary Engagement plans had also been positive. Parliamentary engagement would take place over the next two months with a further period of engagement planned in the autumn. The Sponsor Body is also continuing to explore whether it might be possible for there to be a regular R&R presence on the estate after summer recess to allow more interactions with Members of both Houses to take place.
- 3.2.7 Concern was expressed about the timing of the parliamentary engagement and whether the Programme would be ready to offer a set of choices to Members and



staff. The Chief of Staff said that the views collected from the Parliamentary community at this stage would help steer and inform the Business Case; respondents would not be asked to record any specific choices about design features at this stage.

3.3 DECISION: The Board NOTED the Sponsor Body Progress Report for May 2021

4. DA Programme Report

Period: April 2021

(SB/21/057)

Officials: David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority

Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority

4.1 The CEO for the Delivery Authority reported that he perceived that there had been a change in dynamic between the House Administrations, Sponsor Body and Delivery Authority since the publication of the Strategic Review. The Board responded by suggesting that this was a matter of balance and ensuring that the House Administrations could perceive the clear water between Sponsor Body and Delivery Authority whilst at the same time ensuring that the Delivery Authority received the feedback to allow it to do its job effectively. It was noted that the Governance Review would be likely to offer some useful observations and recommendations on this matter.

4.2 The Programme Director updated the Board on the key points from the report.

4.3 The following points were raised and noted:

- 4.3.1 The Chair said that the Sponsor Body had been put in place to sit between Parliament and the DA; to ensure that the DA was able to focus on delivering the detailed technical work. The Sponsor Body would be responsible for engaging with Parliamentary colleagues. She also re-affirmed that there needed to be a visible distance between the organisations to allow for this to happen.
- 4.3.2 The Primary Performance Milestones diagram formed a crucial part of the Phase 1 Management Plan; monitoring performance and illustrating the impact of change and decisions made. Around 450 deliverables (including documents and outputs from strands of work) supported the 25 milestones summarised for the Board.
- 4.3.3 The challenges in the Request for Information process were now presenting an increased risk to the design process, although were not yet an issue. The team knew from experience that the information that had been requested existed, but that they were not able to access it. The Programme would continue to place a significant demand on Parliamentary resources. Therefore, the DA was looking to provide additional resource, via secondments to improve capacity and accessibility.
- 4.3.4 The Board agreed that providing resource to support Parliament in accessing the data and information that the Programme needed was a sensible way forward, and that doing so would save money in the longer term. The requests at present were not complicated, but a 'business as usual' (BAU) organisation could not be reasonably expected to meet these and the increasing demands of the Programme.



4.3.5 The Programme Director clarified that the asbestos survey work would have to be procured through a framework as the original contract for work had been between the House of Commons and the survey company. The DA had been unable to use this contract. This re-procurement exercise had caused approximately one month's delay. The same issue could potentially impact contracts with other specialist suppliers. The CEO for the Sponsor Body had met with Parliamentary colleagues to establish a way forward.

4.4 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the DA programme reports (executive summary) for April 2021.

5. Integrated Schedule

(SB/21/058)

Official: Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority

5.1 The Programme Director talked the Board through the Integrated Schedule; stressing that it was a zero-risk schedule designed to give a consistent picture across all workstreams. The milestones in the schedule were being used to guide Programme activity and did not at this stage represent an approved schedule for R&R as this would be developed as part of the Programme Business Case.

5.2 The following points were raised and noted:

5.2.1 The information included in the schedule was indicative and should be used in discussions with great caution, and any dates given should be prefixed with 'not before'.

5.2.2 The absence of an approved decant strategy for the House of Commons presented a significant challenge for the Programme. This would be required within the next six months.

5.2.3 Concern was expressed that the current version of the Integrated Schedule did not take into account those areas of the programme scope on which future decisions will be made by the Sponsor Board. The Programme Director said the common elements such as M&E, basement works and building fabric assessments were the main schedule drivers. These were not sensitive to the outcome of other ongoing discussions such as the location of visitor and education facilities or the covering of courtyards.

5.2.4 Achieving all the necessary consents for the Programme to go ahead presented a significant risk to the Programme. However, the work would be broken down into two phases - advanced and main works, each of which was being run by separate teams to ensure the work remained on track.

5.3 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the updated integrated schedule.



**6. The Parliamentary Estate Masterplan (SB/21/059)
& Masterplanning Sponsor Board Briefing Note (SB/21/060)**

Officials: Bev Weston, Director of Capital Investment, In-House Services & Estates

Nigel Hall, Masterplan Design Manager, Jacobs

Daniel Walder, Architect, BDP

Georgina Vlasveld, Design Manager, In-House Services & Estates

6.1 The Director of Capital Investment for In-House Services & Estates introduced the item on the Parliamentary Masterplan saying that it provided a high-level vision for the whole Parliamentary Estate and had been designed to enable informed decision making. She noted that the masterplan was modular in its construction, so that elements could be delivered at different times. The plan would be revisited regularly to ensure that it remained fit for purpose.

6.2 BDP provided the Board with a presentation on the long-term aspirations for the Parliamentary Estate. The following points were raised and noted:

6.2.1 The Masterplan Team were reviewing the masterplan options to understand whether they achieved the core principles or aspirations of the overarching masterplan. Any options that did not fulfil, or have the potential to fulfil, the principles would not be developed further. Interdependencies would be highlighted, and proposals amended as needed. The masterplan was focused on principles rather than solutions.

6.2.2 There did not need to be an absolute alignment between R&R and the Masterplan; it was unlikely that the 'do-essential' scheme would meet all the masterplan's aspirations and would therefore be classed as a transitional scheme that could be developed upon further at a later stage.

6.2.3 It was possible that the Programme might be able to support the aspirations of the masterplan in areas outside of the Palace itself, but to do so would need to be assessed as providing the best overall value for money.

6.2.4 It was suggested that the commentary on heritage within the masterplan needed to be revisited under the guidance of a heritage expert.

6.3 **DECISION:** The paper was provided for Information only; no decision was taken.

7. Business Case: House of Lords Decant Update (SB/21/063)

Officials: Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body

Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, PwC

7.1 The Business Case Director updated the Board on the House of Lords Decant following the publication of the Strategic Review. The Business Case Team working with the Delivery Authority had introduced a do-minimum option for the QEII Conference Centre, in line with the Strategic Review recommendation. There were challenges concerning the operational viability and affordability of some options; these were currently being worked through.

7.2 The following points were raised and noted:



- 7.2.1 The DA Board had considered the House of Lords Decant at its previous meeting and was of the view that, as the use of the QEII as a decant location was temporary and the legacy use of the building uncertain, the Programme should deliver against a minimal scope for a minimal cost.
- 7.2.2 The affordability of the QEII remained a point of concern for Sponsor Board Members. It was suggested that the Programme should look again at issues such as replacement of certain elements of plant and should also consider as a comparator the role that a different maintenance regime could play in minimising costs. There needed to be more certainty about the building's legacy and how the refurbishment costs might be divided between the various public sector parties.
- 7.2.3 The Programme needed to be certain that it had considered all options before a final business case was presented. There needed to be a keen focus on cost reduction.
- 7.2.4 The Board asked whether the QEII could, if a continued presence model was adopted, be used to house the Lords for longer, keeping Members of Parliament in the Palace and transitioning them from the Commons to Lords chambers. In such a case more may have to be spent on the refurbishment to ensure that the QEII was habitable for a longer period.
- 7.2.5 The Board asked about the extent of the M&E replacement assumed in Option 0. The Programme Director would provide a briefing to explain this further.
- 7.2.6 The Board ask about the legacy use for the QEII, noting that it was not for the Programme to determine, but rather the Parliamentary Masterplanning team. It was noted that the Masterplanning team had not yet identified a long-term legacy use for the QEII.

7.3 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the update on the House of Lords decant project, including the timetable for agreeing the recommended option and the Outline Business Case. The Board ADVISED on the political handling issues arising.

8. Annual Report & Accounts

(SB/21/061)

Official: Gurdip Juty, Finance & Corporate Services Director, Sponsor Body

8.1 The paper was taken as read. The following points were raised and noted:

- 8.1.1 The Clerk of the Parliaments offered the support of the House of Lords Comms Team to land the Annual Report & Accounts with Peers once it had been laid in Parliament.
- 8.1.2 The AAC would review the ARA again in detail, with the Chair of the AAC and the Chair of the Sponsor Board providing final sign off. The Board indicated it was content with the presentation and narrative.

8.2 **DECISION:** The Board REVIEWED the current draft of the Annual Report & Accounts and APPROVED the document for publication subject to a further review by the Audit and Assurance Committee and a final review by the Chairs of the Sponsor Board and AAC.



9. Corporate Plan 2021/22

(SB/21/062)

Official: Claire Maugham, Communications Director, Sponsor Body

9.1 The paper was taken as read. The following points were raised and noted:

9.1.1 The Board said the paper read well; more work could be done to highlight the key deliverables for the next twelve months.

9.2 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the Corporate Plan for 2021.

10. Conservation Framework Group Output

(SB/21/064)

Officials: Dr Simon Thurley, Sponsor Board Member

Philip Smith, Engagement Project Manager, Sponsor Body

Julian Flannery, Head of Architecture, Delivery Authority

10.1 The paper was deferred until the July Sponsor Board meeting.

11. Comments, announcements, and other business

11.1 The Board NOTED the Future agenda (SB/21/065).

11.2 There was no further business.

11.3 The date of the next meeting would be confirmed shortly.

11.4 The Chair brought the meeting to a close at 6.37pm.

12. Papers enclosed for information

12.1 Draft Minutes of the Audit & Assurance Committee meeting on 17 May 2021 (SB/21/066)

12.2 Letter Re: Continued Presence (SB/21/067)

Signed by:

Date: 5 July 2021
