

Supplementary Note on Amendments tabled to Motions Nos 1 and 2

Under the terms of Standing Order No 22C (3) (a) I am to set out the financial consequences of Amendments tabled to Motions on which I have prepared a Memorandum.

- Amendment (a) to Motion No 1 in the name of Ian Blackford does not have immediate financial consequences for expenditure under the Administration Estimate, although by extending the scope it would have a marginal impact on the costs of an eventual review of the options.
- Amendment (b) to Motion No 1 in the name of Meg Hillier would have a similar financial impact on the Administration Estimate to that of Motion No 2, save that concentration on producing a costed outline business case on a single option could reduce the period before a possible decant. To the extent that were the case, it would reduce the period during which the building is at risk of an unforeseen and expensive failure.
- Amendment (a) to Motion No 2 in the name of Sir Edward Leigh and Amendment (b) in the name of Pete Wishart would not significantly affect the costs of the examination in 2018-19 and the first half of 2019-20 of the three options set out in para 8 of the Motion, although they might significantly affect longer term delivery costs.