

6. PM were subsequently asked to give a professional opinion as to the probability of the planned completion date for the Debating Chamber being met. Their (non-scientific) view was that the probability of programme achievement had dropped from 100% in August 2001 to 65% in February 2002 and that, under pressure from the resolution of the Specialist glazing and fit-out procurement issues, it now stands at no more than 15%.
7. We are all agreed that it would be a mistake to relax pressure on the team at this juncture by formally extending the construction programme. Nonetheless, we must at least privately recognise that the likelihood of achieving a building which is fully operationally complete by May 2003 is virtually nil. The paper provided by the Implementation Unit (paper ref) sets out some of the operational considerations in setting a date for migration and full working occupation. The key point is that there are a number of vital tasks which must be carried out after the building is completed but before we can fully occupy it.
8. Having discussed this issue, we feel that it may well be wise at this juncture to separate the programme for construction completion, (which we would continue to require by 1 May 2003), from the IU programme for commencement of full operational use, which would be up to the SPCB to determine but might be 31 August 2003. While making it absolutely clear to the Design and Construction teams that we continue to require the building to be handed over by 1 May, we could subject that requirement to a number of caveats relating to quality and on-costs.
9. It is relevant to note in this context that we are advised by DLE that the cost of completion will not vary significantly according to completion date but that significant extensions of the construction period (i.e. to September/October) would almost certainly result in additional costs. Otherwise, additional acceleration costs to complete would broadly equate to additional costs for extension on site.
10. From a building point of view, a decision to move the target date for occupation would not make a significant impact other than in relation to some quality issues which might be jeopardised in a desperate rush to a particular 'drop-dead' date. Our understanding is that the operational, staffing and services implications are more pressing and the Implementation Team will be able to advise further on these.

## COST

11. The SPCB will recall that the process of risk review involves the entire design and construction teams in assessing and identifying the outstanding risks which might befall the Project. It is an informed and prudent assessment at a particular stage in the project and the outcome reflects the degree of certainty felt by those participating in the review at that time. The risk register is a common and essential tool used by responsible Project Management, although most people would argue that the client's interests are not best served by making the contents